Volume 4 Number 2 (2026)
July-December 2026
Page: 4056-4074

Journal of Creative Power and Ambition (JCPA)
https://edujavare.com/index.php/jcpa
E-ISSN: 3031-4054
DOI: 10.70610/jcpa.2229

From Rowdy to Ideas: Conflict Management and Service-Based Constructive Negotiation in Governance of the Tasikmalaya City DPRD in the Era of Public and Digital Openness

Kepler Sianturi[1], Juliman Simarmata[2], Robert Juni Tua Sitio[3]
[1,2,3,4] Doctoral Program in Educational Management, Tarutung State Christian Religious Institute, Indonesia
* Correspondence e-mail; keplersianturi864@gmail.com

Article history Submitted: 2026/07/01; Revised: 2026/09/02; Accepted: 2026/11/03

Abstract

Conflicts and differences of interest are dynamics that cannot be separated from the administration of government, including in the governance of the Regional People's Representative Council (DPRD) of Tasikmalaya City. In the era of public and digital openness, these dynamics are increasingly complex as the demands for transparency, public participation, and the dissemination of information through various digital platforms increase. Conflicts that are not managed constructively have the potential to hinder the decision-making process and reduce the effectiveness of the implementation of the DPRD's institutional functions. This research uses normative legal research methods with a conceptual approach and a legislative approach through a literature study of laws and regulations, scientific literature, and relevant sources related to conflict management, constructive negotiation, governance, and public services. This research emphasizes the importance of implementing open communication, common interest-oriented negotiations, and responsible use of digital technology to support institutional transparency and accountability. Constructive conflict management is expected to direct differences in interests from conflicts to productive ideas and solutions, so that the governance of the Tasikmalaya City DPRD becomes more responsive, transparent, accountable, and oriented to the interests of the community.

Keywords Conflict Management; Constructive Negotiation; DPRD; Public Openness; Public Service.

© 2026 by the authors. This is an open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY SA) license, https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/.

INTRODUCTION

The dynamics of the implementation of local government cannot be separated from differences in interests, views, and policy orientations among the actors involved in it. In the context of regional legislative institutions, these differences are a consequence of the diversity of political backgrounds, constituent aspirations, and community interests that must be accommodated in the decision-making process. The Regional People's Representative Council (DPRD) as a regional people's representative institution has a strategic role in the formation of regional regulations, budgeting, and supervision of the implementation of local government. The dynamics of conflicts that arise in the

implementation of institutional functions need to be managed appropriately so as not to hinder the implementation of the DPRD's duties, but can be part of the process of exchanging ideas, testing arguments, and refining public decisions (Arum, 2021).

Conflicts in government organizations cannot always be seen as negative. Differences of opinion that are managed constructively can encourage evaluation of policies, broaden perspectives in solving problems, and improve the quality of decisions. On the other hand, conflicts that are not handled effectively have the potential to develop into tensions between parties, hinder communication, weaken coordination, and reduce trust in the decision-making process. In the governance of the DPRD, these issues are important because the decisions made are not only related to the internal interests of the institution, but also affect the implementation of government and the fulfillment of people's aspirations. Thus, the main problem is not only how to eliminate conflicts, but also how to manage differences of interest in order to produce understanding and decisions that can be accounted for (M. Afzalur, 2002).

One relevant approach to managing these dynamics is conflict management combined with constructive negotiation. Conflict management provides a framework to recognize the sources of differences, understand the characteristics of the parties involved, and determine a resolution approach that is appropriate to the situation at hand. Meanwhile, constructive negotiation allows the parties to build dialogue, convey arguments, identify common interests, and find alternative solutions that can be rationally accepted. In the context of the DPRD, this approach needs to be directed not only at the achievement of agreements between the parties, but also at the quality of the substance of the decision, the representation of community aspirations, and the public interest as the main orientation of the implementation of local government. Thus, conflicts can be placed as productive deliberation spaces, not just conflicts that must be won by one of the parties (Weni, 2018).

The urgency of conflict management and constructive negotiation is increasingly strengthening in the era of public and digital openness. Information disclosure allows the public to obtain information about policies, activities, and decisions of government institutions more broadly. At the same time, the development of digital technology accelerates the dissemination of information, expands the space for public participation, and increases demands on transparency and responsiveness of public institutions. This condition presents an opportunity for the DPRD to strengthen communication with the public and expand the absorption of aspirations. However, the digital space can also accelerate the dissemination of incomplete information, sharpen differences of opinion, and increase public pressure on the decision-making process(Stefanus, 2025).

In the context of the Tasikmalaya City DPRD, discussions on conflict management and constructive negotiation are relevant to understand how differences in interests in institutional governance can be directed towards a more collaborative and public service-oriented decision-making process. This relevance does not mean that every difference of opinion must be understood as a conflict that hinders institutional performance. On the

contrary, differences need to be analyzed based on the characteristics, sources, and dynamics behind them so that the resolution approach used is not uniform. Analysis of the context of the Tasikmalaya City DPRD also needs to place communication, information disclosure, and the use of digital technology as elements that have the potential to support the dialogue process as well as a factor that demands careful management. With this approach, conflict management does not stop at resolving conflicts, but is part of efforts to strengthen the quality of institutional governance.

Although conflict management and negotiation have been widely discussed in organizational and public administration studies, their application in the governance of regional legislative institutions needs to be analyzed by paying attention to the characteristics of the relationship between actors, the function of political representation, the demands of information disclosure, and the orientation of public services. The conceptual challenge lies in how to align differences in political interests with the need to produce quality decisions that can be accounted for to the community. In addition, digital openness needs to be understood not only as the provision of information, but also as part of the public communication environment that affects the formation of perceptions, the delivery of aspirations, and acceptance of institutional decisions (Efriza, 2024).

In addition, the effectiveness of conflict management in regional legislatures is also determined by the ability of institutional actors to distinguish substantive interests from positions maintained in a debate. Different political or institutional positions do not always close the opportunity for agreement to be reached if the dialogue process is directed at identifying the needs, goals, and problems that are the basis of these differences. In this case, constructive negotiation serves as a mechanism to bring together various views through the exchange of arguments, alternative assessments, and the search for solutions that can be proportionately acceptable to the parties concerned. This approach also requires a commitment to decision-making procedures, respect for differences of opinion, and a willingness to consider the interests of the community as a common orientation. Thus, the success of negotiations is not solely measured by the achievement of an agreement, but also by the quality of the process taken, the legitimacy of the decisions produced, and its benefits for the implementation of local government (Roger, 2011).

Another dimension that needs to be considered is the relationship between conflict management and public trust in representative institutions. Public trust is not only influenced by the decisions produced, but also by how the decisions are discussed, explained, and accounted for. Decision-making processes that take place without adequate communication have the potential to cause misunderstandings and widen the distance between representative institutions and the communities they represent. On the other hand, the provision of relevant information, explanations of policy considerations, and meaningful participation spaces can help the public understand the institutional process while providing input to the policies being formulated. In this context, public openness and digitalization need to be placed as part of a governance ecosystem that supports two-way communication,

not just an instrument for the publication of institutional activities.

In the literature on organizational behavior, the perspective on conflict has shifted from a view that considers conflict as something detrimental to the organization to an understanding that conflict can have a constructive impact if managed appropriately. Gibson et al. as well as Kreitner and Kinicki place understanding and management of conflict as an important part of managerial competence that is closely related to the negotiation process. In the context of education and leadership, Abdul Azis Wahab emphasizes the importance of leaders' ability to manage conflict as a dynamic inherent in organizational life, not just trying to eliminate it (Abdul, 2008). In line with this view, Stephen R. Covey offers relevant principles to build constructive working relationships, namely think win-win, seek first to understand, then to be understood, and build synergy (Stephen R. 2004)

These principles emphasize that conflict does not have to end in prolonged conflict, but can be a means to build mutual understanding, strengthen cooperation, and produce better decisions. Covey explains the integrative orientation through the win-win thinking *principle,* which is a mindset that seeks to achieve mutual benefits in every interaction. If an agreement that benefits both parties cannot be reached, Covey offers an acceptable no-deal alternative, so that the parties do not need to impose an agreement that is detrimental to one of the parties and can still maintain good relations.

Conflict management that is oriented towards public services also requires a balance between internal institutional interests and community needs. Political dynamics are a legitimate part of the democratic process, but differences in interests need to be managed so as not to override the implementation of representation functions, the formation of local regulations, budgeting, and supervision. Therefore, conflict resolution needs to consider conformity with legal provisions, process openness, proportionality of interests, and the impact of decisions on society. This orientation allows conflict management to function not only as a mechanism to relieve tension, but also as an instrument for evaluating the cooperation process, the quality of deliberation, and institutional responsibility in the implementation of local government (Finansia E, 2023).

Based on this description, this study aims to analyze the dynamics of conflict and differences in interests within the governance of the Tasikmalaya City Regional House of Representatives (DPRD) in the era of public and digital openness. It also examines conflict management strategies and constructive negotiation through communication, collaboration, and information disclosure, as well as their contribution to strengthening public service-oriented governance. The discussion focuses on transforming the meaning of conflict from a source of disagreement into a productive process of dialogue and the exchange of ideas. The concept of *from noisy to ideas* emphasizes the importance of managing differences constructively so that institutional processes can generate higher-quality decisions that are transparent, accountable, and responsive to community needs. Accordingly, this study explores three main aspects: the dynamics of conflict and differences in interests within the governance of the Tasikmalaya City DPRD in the era of public and digital openness; the

implementation of conflict management strategies and constructive negotiations based on communication, collaboration, and information disclosure; and the contribution of conflict management and constructive negotiation to realizing responsive, transparent, accountable, and public service-oriented governance.

This research focuses on analyzing conflict dynamics and differences in interests within the governance of the Tasikmalaya City DPRD, examining strategies for implementing conflict management and constructive negotiation through communication, collaboration, and information disclosure, and strengthening the orientation toward public services in institutional decision-making processes. The study seeks to develop a conceptual understanding of conflict management that extends beyond conflict resolution by encouraging the creation of spaces for dialogue, mutual understanding, and the formulation of solutions that accommodate the interests of all parties proportionately. Through this approach, differences are expected to become constructive inputs in institutional decision-making and contribute to more democratic, transparent, accountable, and responsive governance.

METHODS

This research uses normative *legal research methods,* which are research that focuses on the study of legal norms, legal principles, and concepts relevant to the problem being studied. This research aims to analyze conflict management and constructive negotiation in the governance of the Tasikmalaya City DPRD in the era of public and digital openness, especially in supporting transparent, accountable, and public service-oriented decision-making. The approaches used include a statute *approach* to examine legal provisions related to local government, DPRD institutions, public information disclosure, and public services, as well as a *conceptual approach* to examine conflict management theory, constructive negotiation, communication, collaboration, and good governance.

The research material consists of primary legal materials in the form of relevant laws and regulations, secondary legal materials in the form of scientific books, journal articles, research results, and expert opinions, and tertiary legal materials that support the explanation of legal terms and concepts. The collection of materials is carried out through literature studies by identifying, selecting, and examining sources related to conflict dynamics, differences of interest, negotiation strategies, information disclosure, and institutional governance of the DPRD. The materials used are selected based on their relevance and relevance to the formulation of the problem so that the analysis has an adequate juridical and conceptual foundation.

The analysis of research materials is carried out qualitatively through legal interpretation and conceptual analysis by linking the provisions of the law with the principles of conflict management and constructive negotiation. The analysis is directed to identify the characteristics of conflicts and differences in interests, examine their resolution strategies through open communication, collaboration, and the use of digital technology, and formulate conflict management orientations that support transparency, accountability,

responsiveness, and public services. Through this method, this research is expected to produce conceptual arguments on how differences in interests in the governance of the Tasikmalaya City DPRD can be directed into constructive ideas and solutions for improving the quality of institutional decision-making.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Dynamics of Conflict and Differences of Interest in the Governance of the Tasikmalaya City DPRD in the Era of Public and Digital Openness

Concepts and Perspectives of Conflict in Public Organizations

Conflict in public organizations is a condition that arises when there are differences in interests, goals, values, perceptions, or priorities among individuals and groups involved in the administration of government. Conflict does not always indicate organizational failure, but can be a consequence of diversity of views in the policy formulation and decision-making process. From an organizational perspective, conflict can be constructive if it is managed through dialogue, exchange of arguments, and joint search for solutions. On the other hand, conflict can be destructive if it develops into personal conflicts, polarization of interests, or competition that hinders the achievement of organizational goals (Wahyudi, 2021).

In management studies, conflict can be understood through three main perspectives, namely traditional perspectives, human relations, and interactionism. The traditional perspective views conflict as something negative so it needs to be minimized or avoided. The human relations perspective recognizes that conflict is a natural part of organizational life because individual differences and interests cannot be completely eliminated (Purba, 2024). Meanwhile, the interactionist perspective views certain conflicts as something that can encourage organizational dynamics, critical evaluation, and renewal. This last perspective is relevant for understanding public organizations that require the exchange of ideas and differences of views in producing quality decisions(Arum, 2021).

In the context of the Regional People's Representative Council (DPRD), conflicts have characteristics related to political representation, the implementation of legislation, budget and supervision functions, and the distribution of community aspirations. Differences in views between members, factions, and stakeholders can arise due to differences in development priorities, constituent interests, and assessments of public policies. In these conditions, conflicts cannot be assessed solely based on the existence of differences of opinion, but need to be seen from the management process and its impact on the implementation of institutional functions. Differences that are discussed openly and based on arguments can enrich considerations in decision-making, while conflicts that are not managed properly have the potential to hinder policy discussions and reduce public trust(Nurul, 2023).

In general, there are three main views on conflict, namely the traditional view, the human relations view, and the interactionist view. These three views have different perspectives on understanding conflict, ranging from the assumption that conflict must be

avoided to the understanding that conflict can be a means of improving the performance and quality of decision-making. In the context of the DPRD, these three views are the basis for understanding and managing differences of opinion constructively. The development of these three views shows that conflict does not always have to be seen as a threat to institutions. Conflict can become a problem when it develops into a personal conflict, but it can also be beneficial if managed through open communication, rational argumentation, and constructive negotiation (Stephen P. 2015).

In the era of public and digital openness, conflict management in public organizations also faces challenges in the form of increasing public access to information and the rapid dissemination of views and criticism through digital media. This condition expands the space for public participation, but at the same time increases the risk of misunderstandings, the formation of incomplete opinions, and the escalation of conflicts if information is not conveyed clearly and proportionately. Therefore, the concept of conflict in DPRD governance needs to be placed in the framework of deliberative democracy, which is a process of exchanging views and arguments that prioritizes rationality, openness, and consideration of common interests. This framework is the foundation for understanding the dynamics of conflict and differences of interest in the governance of the Tasikmalaya City DPRD, as well as explaining the importance of conflict management directed at constructive resolution and improving the quality of public services (Andi, 2025).

In addition to these three perspectives, conflicts in public organizations can also be analyzed based on their sources and the degree of their occurrence. Conflicts can stem from differences in objectives, limited resources, unclear authority, differences in interpretation of rules, and imbalances in access to information. Based on their level, conflicts can occur at the individual level, between individuals, between groups, and between organizational units. Within the DPRD, the source and level of conflict can be interrelated, for example when differences in development priorities intersect with political interests, the distribution of budget resources, and the aspirations of the community. Identification of the source of conflict is important because each form of conflict requires a different approach to handling according to the characteristics of the problem and the parties involved (Siti Asiah, 2017).

Understanding conflict is also related to the organization's ability to distinguish between substantive conflicts and relational conflicts. Substantive conflicts arise due to differences of opinion regarding the substance of policies, program choices, budget allocations, or alternative solutions to public problems. Relational conflicts, on the other hand, develop due to communication problems, distrust, prejudice, or less harmonious interpersonal relationships. This distinction is important because substantive conflicts can provide benefits if they encourage critical testing of arguments and policy evaluation, while uncontrolled relational conflicts can divert attention from the substance of the problem to personal conflicts. Therefore, public organizations need to build dialogue mechanisms that allow differences of opinion to remain in the corridor of discussion that are rational, professional, and oriented to the interests of society(Efriza, 2024).

In the governance of the Tasikmalaya City DPRD, the concept and perspective of the conflict can be used as an analytical framework to assess how differences in interests are managed in the institutional process. The DPRD not only functions as an arena for articulating political interests, but also as a representative institution that has responsibility for the formation of regional policies, budget discussions, and supervision of government administration. Thus, the quality of conflict management needs to be seen from the ability of the parties to maintain differences of views while building understanding based on arguments, rules, and community needs. Public openness and the use of digital media should strengthen the process through the provision of accessible information, responsible communication, and meaningful participation spaces. This framework emphasizes that constructively managed conflicts have the potential to be a means of institutional evaluation and improvement of public decisions, not just conflicts that must be avoided(Sri Sundari, 2023).

The effectiveness of conflict management in public organizations is also determined by leadership, organizational culture, and applicable decision-making mechanisms. Leadership that is open to criticism can create a space for dialogue that allows each party to express their views without fear of pressure or marginalization. An organizational culture that upholds professionalism, respect for differences, and institutional responsibility also supports proportionate conflict resolution. Conversely, closed communication, the dominance of certain interests, and weak dispute resolution mechanisms can increase tensions and hinder the achievement of agreements. In the context of the DPRD, these factors are relevant because the decision-making process involves a variety of actors with political interests and orientations that are not always in line. Therefore, strengthening deliberative leadership and a culture of dialogue is an important part of building an institutional environment that is able to manage differences productively (I Nyoma, 2023).

The study of leadership and management in the academic environment of the State Christian Institute (IAKN) also provides relevant perspectives to enrich understanding of conflict management, especially through discussions on leadership, communication, organizational culture, and responsibility in achieving common goals. Studies on the development and supervision of educational supervision models, for example, highlight the importance of the function of supervision and continuous improvement in supporting the achievement of organizational goals. Meanwhile, research on the relationship between principals and organizational culture with teacher performance shows the relevance of communication and organizational culture in supporting the implementation of tasks and achieving common goals. These ideas can be translated into three main principles. First, conflicts need to be managed by prioritizing the interests of the community as constituents represented and served. Second, communication between parties must be maintained to remain open, constructive, and dignified by prioritizing mutual respect. Third, every decision made needs to be tested based on the principles of public ethics, especially justice,

integrity, transparency, and responsibility, so that conflict resolution can be accountable to the community (Pasaribu, 2024).

In the context of the DPRD, this reflection can be applied through three main principles. First, conflicts need to be managed by prioritizing the interests of the community as the parties served, not solely the interests of individuals, groups, or factions. Second, communication needs to be built in an open, proportional, and respectful manner so that differences of opinion can be discussed through rational arguments without damaging the relationship between the parties. Third, the resulting decisions must consider integrity, justice, institutional responsibility, and the public interest so that the agreement reached can not only be accepted by the parties involved, but can also be ethically accountable to the community. These three principles emphasize that the success of conflict management in public organizations is not solely measured by the achievement of agreements, but also by the quality of the dialogue process, the legitimacy of decisions, and the ability to support the responsible implementation of institutional functions.

Conflicts in public organizations need to be understood as an institutional phenomenon that has political, administrative, social, and communicative dimensions. It is not enough to handle conflicts or accelerate the achievement of agreements, but must consider the root of the problem, the balance of interests, the quality of the deliberation process, and the impact of decisions on society. For the Tasikmalaya City DPRD, this understanding is a conceptual foundation to place conflicts as part of democratic dynamics that need to be managed responsibly. This perspective also directs the discussion to the importance of identifying the sources and dynamics of conflict in the institutional environment, especially when public openness and the development of digital media increasingly affect communication patterns, opinion formation, and accountability demands for representatives(Hermawati, 2024).

Sources and Dynamics of Conflict in DPRD Governance in the Era of Public and Digital Openness

The source of conflict in the governance of the Regional People's Representative Council (DPRD) can be traced from the diversity of political interests, differences in policy orientation, competition in determining development priorities, and differences in interpretation of community needs. As a representative institution of the people, the DPRD brings together various interests brought by members, factions, council fittings, local governments, and community groups. This diversity is part of the democratic mechanism, but it has the potential to cause conflict when each party maintains its priorities without considering the common interests. Conflicts can also arise due to limited budget resources, differences of views in the discussion of draft regional regulations, and differences in assessments of the implementation of supervisory functions (Hermawati, 2024).

In addition to differences in political interests, the dynamics of conflict in the DPRD are also influenced by institutional structures and decision-making mechanisms. Differences in views between factions, disagreements about the discussion agenda, and differences in

strategies in fighting for the aspirations of constituents can affect the deliberation process and the formation of agreements. In certain situations, conflicts can develop into competitions that slow down policy discussions if they are not accompanied by effective communication and a willingness to find common ground. On the other hand, differences of views managed through clear arguments, negotiations, and institutional procedures can broaden perspectives in assessing a problem. Therefore, conflict dynamics need to be understood based on the substance of differences, inter-stakeholder relations, and mechanisms used to resolve them, not solely from the emergence of contradictions in the political process (Suwanda, 2016).

The era of public openness has brought changes to the way the public supervises and assesses the performance of the DPRD. Access to information about meeting agendas, policy discussions, budget use, and institutional decisions increases the demand for the process of government administration to run in a transparent and accountable manner. This openness provides an opportunity for the public to express criticism, supervise policies, and fight for interests that have not been accommodated. However, openness can also cause tension when there is a difference in perception between institutional decisions and public expectations. Inconsistencies between the information conveyed, the explanations given, and public understanding can cause suspicion and a decrease in trust in representative institutions. This condition shows that public openness is not sufficiently understood as the provision of information, but also requires clarity of communication and institutional willingness to explain the basis of considerations behind a decision (Ricky, 2022).

The development of digital technology has further expanded the space for the emergence and development of conflicts in governance. Social media and various communication platforms allow information about the activities of the DPRD to spread quickly, so that public responses to a policy can be formed in a short time. On the one hand, these developments strengthen public participation and expand the channels for expressing aspirations. On the other hand, incomplete information, different interpretations, and the spread of unverified narratives can magnify misunderstandings and sharpen conflicts. Conflicts that originally took place in internal discussion spaces can develop into debates in the digital public space and affect public perception of the integrity and performanceof institutions (Fatih, 2024).

In the context of the Tasikmalaya City DPRD, the sources and dynamics of the conflict can be used as a framework to understand the challenges of managing differences of interest at the local government level. However, the identification of conflicts that actually occur requires the support of evidence, such as meeting documents, policy products, official statements, verifiable news reports, or the results of previous research. Without such evidence, the discussion of the Tasikmalaya City DPRD should be placed as a conceptual analysis, not as a claim that a particular conflict has occurred. This approach is important to maintain academic accuracy while distinguishing between the general characteristics of conflicts within representative institutions and specific dynamics that can be proven in the

local context. Conflict dynamics in DPRD governance are also related to the difference between short-term political interests and long-term regional development needs (Nurak, 2021).

In carrying out the function of representation, DPRD members have the responsibility to fight for the aspirations of constituents, while in an institutional capacity, the decisions made need to consider the interests of the community at large. The two orientations can go in the same direction, but also have the potential to cause tension when the demands of certain groups are not aligned with development priorities or regional budget limitations. This situation demands a prioritization mechanism based on public needs, objective considerations, and accountable arguments. Thus, conflict resolution does not solely depend on the ability of actors to defend their interests, but also on the willingness to place the interests of the community as a basis for consideration in the decision-making process (Bernardus, 2022)

Communication between institutions also determines how conflicts develop and are resolved. The relationship between the DPRD, local governments, regional apparatus, and the community requires a clear exchange of information so that differences in understanding do not develop into wider disputes. Unclear information about policies, division of authority, follow-up of aspirations, or the basis for consideration of a decision can cause a gap in perception between the parties. In such conditions, communication that is only formal and one-way is not necessarily able to answer the problems that are developing. Two-way communication is needed that provides opportunities for each party to convey reasons, test arguments, and obtain adequate explanations. This communication mechanism can help identify the root of the conflict while building trust as a prerequisite for negotiation and problem resolution in a constructive manner (Subrata, 2025).

In the process of solving problems, the ability to understand the situation, analyze the problem, and consider alternative solutions is an important aspect in making the right decision. The process does not only depend on the ability to identify problems, but also on meticulousness in assessing information and determining appropriate resolution steps. Conflict management is a process that is necessary to manage differences in individual interests, views, and characteristics so that they do not develop into conflicts that hinder social relations and the achievement of common goals. Conflict resolution needs to be carried out through a constructive approach by prioritizing open communication, mutual respect, and cooperation in finding solutions. In the context of the Tasikmalaya City DPRD, this principle is relevant to manage differences in political views and interests among its members. Differences do not have to be eliminated, but need to be directed through dialogue and negotiation that allows each party to convey arguments and consider common interests (Panjaitan, 2013).

In conflict management, dialogue and respect for differences are important elements in building social integration. Differences in backgrounds, values, views, and interests are not always a source of division, but can be managed constructively through open

communication and a willingness to understand the perspective of the other party. In the context of the DPRD, this approach is relevant because interaction between members involves various political views and interests. Therefore, conflict management needs to be directed at efforts to build understanding without eliminating differences, so that the decision-making process continues to take place deliberatively, respects diversity, and is oriented to the interests of the community (Sinaga, 2026).

In addition, conflict dynamics need to be seen from their impact on the quality of decisions and public trust in representative institutions. Conflicts that are not managed effectively have the potential to slow down decision-making processes, reduce the effectiveness of coordination, and create the perception that political interests take precedence over the needs of the community. On the other hand, conflicts that are handled through fair procedures, open dialogue, and transparent consideration can encourage evaluation of policy alternatives and strengthen the legitimacy of decisions. In the digital environment, these impacts are increasingly important because the public can judge institutional processes not only based on the final results, but also on the disclosure of information and responses to criticism (Mardiyanta, 2023).

Conflict Management Strategy and Constructive Negotiation in the Governance of the Tasikmalaya City DPRD

Conflict management strategies and constructive negotiations are important approaches in maintaining the effectiveness of the governance of people's representative institutions in the midst of a diversity of political interests and community demands. Conflict management is not directed to eliminate differences of view, but rather to identify the sources of disputes, understand the interests of the parties, and determine a resolution mechanism that is in accordance with the characteristics of the problem. In the context of the Tasikmalaya City DPRD, this approach is relevant to support the implementation of legislation, budget, and supervision functions so that they continue to run effectively despite differences of views among council members and with other stakeholders. Conflicts that are managed systematically can be a space for evaluation of policies and decision-making processes, while conflicts that are left without a resolution mechanism have the potential to hinder coordination and reduce the effectiveness of the implementation of the legislative function(Amal, 2020).

The implementation of conflict management requires the selection of a strategy that considers the level of interest, inter-stakeholder relationships, and goals to be achieved. In the study of conflict management, approaches can include avoidance, accommodation, competition, compromise, and collaboration. Each approach has different conditions of use and consequences. Avoidance can be used when the problem is not urgent, while accommodation can be considered when maintaining relationships between actors is more important than defending certain interests. Compromise allows the parties to adjust each other's demands to reach an agreement, while collaboration seeks to find solutions that can accommodate the fundamental interests of all parties. In the governance of the DPRD,

collaboration and compromise based on rules, rational arguments, and the interests of the community need to be considered because the decision-making process is not only related to inter-stakeholder relations, but also to policy consequences for the public (Nurak, 2021).

Constructive negotiation is an instrument for translating conflict management strategies into a process of dialogue and agreement-seeking. Negotiation is not solely understood as a bargaining process to win certain interests, but as a mechanism to identify needs, explain differences, and formulate alternative solutions that are rationally acceptable. This process requires openness in conveying arguments, the ability to listen to other parties' views, and the willingness to evaluate options based on their benefits and consequences. Within the DPRD, constructive negotiation can support policy discussions, determination of budget priorities, and alignment of community aspirations with the authority and capacity of local governments (Agianto, 2021).

The success of conflict management strategies and constructive negotiations is also determined by the quality of communication and trust between the parties. Open communication allows each actor to convey their interests clearly while understanding the reasons underlying the other party's views. Conversely, closed communication, incomplete information delivery, and the tendency to build assumptions without clarification can magnify misunderstandings. Therefore, the DPRD needs to develop a dialogical, fact-based, and respectful communication pattern. Structured discussion forums, recording of agreement results, and clarity regarding follow-up decisions can help prevent recurring conflicts. This approach also strengthens accountability because the conflict resolution process has a traceable basis and results (Sjoraida, 2025).

Optimization of Conflict Management and Constructive Negotiation to Realize Public Service-Oriented Governance of the Tasikmalaya City DPRD

Conflict management and constructive negotiations in the governance of the Tasikmalaya City DPRD need to be directed at efforts to realize a decision-making process that is not only able to accommodate differences in interests, but also ensures the fulfillment of the principles of responsiveness, transparency, and institutional accountability. Conflicts that arise between members of the DPRD, factions, and with the executive are part of the political dynamics and implementation of local government that cannot always be avoided. Therefore, conflict resolution needs to be carried out through dialogical communication, rational exchange of arguments, and negotiations oriented towards finding common ground based on the public interest. This approach is important so that differences of opinion do not develop into obstacles in the implementation of the DPRD's legislative, budget, and supervisory functions, but become an instrument to produce more inclusive and accountable decisions (Ulung Pribadi, 2024).

Optimizing conflict management and constructive negotiation also requires an institutional mechanism that ensures the openness of the process, clarity of the basis for decision-making, and evaluation of the results of conflict resolution. In the context of the Tasikmalaya City DPRD, any agreement produced through the negotiation process should

ideally not only reflect compromises between political interests, but also consider the needs of the community and its impact on the quality of public services. Transparency is needed so that the public can know the processes and considerations that underlie the decision, while accountability serves to ensure that the decision can be accounted for politically, administratively, and legally in accordance with the applicable authority. Thus, conflict management and constructive negotiation can be a strategic instrument to strengthen the governance of the Tasikmalaya City DPRD that is responsive to the aspirations of the community, open in the decision-making process, and oriented towards public interests and services (Chowdhury, 2024).

In the era of public and digital openness, conflict resolution strategies need to be accompanied by transparent and responsible information management. Information about the policy discussion process, decision-making basis, and follow-up on public aspirations needs to be conveyed in accordance with the provisions of public information disclosure and legal confidentiality limits. The use of digital media can expand public access to information and open up wider space for participation. However, the use of technology needs to be balanced with information verification, clarification delivery, and proportionate institutional response to public criticism. In this way, the digital space is not only a means of disseminating information, but can also support dialogue and build trust between representative institutions and the public (Azka, 2022).

In addition to the selection of a resolution strategy, the implementation of conflict management in the governance of the DPRD requires clear procedures so that each dispute can be handled consistently and proportionately. The procedure can begin by identifying the main problems, mapping the interests of the parties, determining the space for dialogue, and agreeing on a resolution and follow-up mechanism. In this process, each party needs to have a balanced opportunity to present arguments without ignoring legal provisions, institutional rules, and principles of public interest. Documentation of the discussion process and the outcome of the agreement is also needed to ensure that the resulting decision has a clear basis for consideration. With a directed procedure, conflict resolution does not only depend on personal relationships between actors, but is part of institutional governance that can be evaluated and accounted for (Subrata, 2025).

Another aspect that needs to be considered is the role of leadership and facilitation in the constructive negotiation process. Meeting leaders, faction leaders, council fittings leaders, or other parties with authority according to the context of the issue can help keep discussions focused, prevent dominance of certain parties, and encourage the search for solutions based on the substance of the problem. In situations where communication between parties is at an impasse, facilitation or mediation can be considered to help clarify interests, reduce tensions, and find alternative solutions. Nonetheless, the role of the facilitator must still pay attention to the formal authority and applicable decision-making procedures. This approach is important so that the agreement reached not only reflects the balance of political power, but

also considers the feasibility of the policy, compliance with the rules, and its consequences for society (Crupi, 2022).

Conflict management strategies and constructive negotiations need to be accompanied by an evaluation of the implementation of the agreements that have been reached. An agreement cannot be considered successful just because the conflict has subsided or the parties have expressed agreement. Evaluation needs to pay attention to the clarity of the division of responsibilities, consistency in the implementation of decisions, the achievement of goals, and their impact on resolving public problems. In the context of the Tasikmalaya City DPRD, the evaluation can conceptually be directed to the extent to which the results of policy discussions, budgeting, and supervision are able to respond to the needs of the community and can be held accountable openly. The results of the subsequent evaluation can be used as material for improvement for the next negotiation and decision-making process (Salomo, 2023).

In its implementation, the achievement of the agreement is closely related to the *bargaining strategy* used to manage differences of interest. Walton and McKersie distinguish the bargaining strategy into distributive and integrative. Distributive bargaining is oriented towards a limited distribution of resources (*fixed pie*), so that the advantage of one party tends to be the loss of the other. In contrast, integrative bargaining seeks to produce a win-win *solution.* Fisher and Ury emphasized the importance of interest-based negotiations, not just positions, through separating parties from problems, identifying interests, creating mutually beneficial choices, using objective criteria, and preparing the best alternative if an agreement is not reached (*Best Alternative to a Negotiated Agreement* or BATNA). In the context of the Tasikmalaya City DPRD, this approach is relevant to direct differences of views in policy and budget discussions towards an agreement that considers the interests of all parties and the needs of the community.

In addition to a systematic process, the effectiveness of negotiations is also influenced by the characteristics of the individuals involved. Factors such as personality, emotional intelligence, mood, experience, and communication skills can affect the way a person conveys interests and responds to differences. However, individual characteristics need to be understood along with situational factors that also determine the outcome of negotiations. In the context of the Tasikmalaya City DPRD, negotiation skills can be developed through training, experience, and evaluation of the decision-making process. The composition of the negotiating team also needs to consider the diversity of characters, for example combining individuals who are firm in defending interests with individuals who are able to build relationships and bridge differences. This combination is expected to strengthen the quality of communication, reduce the potential for misunderstandings, and encourage the achievement of agreements oriented towards the public interest (Sharma, 2013).

CONCLUSION

The dynamics of conflict and differences of interest in the governance of the Tasikmalaya City DPRD are part of the institutional process influenced by the diversity of

political interests, differences of views in decision-making, and the demands and aspirations of the community. In the era of public and digital openness, these dynamics are increasingly influenced by the speed of information dissemination and increasing public attention to the process and results of institutional decisions. Conflict therefore needs to be understood not solely as an obstacle, but as a dynamic that can be managed constructively to improve the quality of deliberation and decision-making.

Conflict management requires a strategy that integrates conflict management and constructive negotiation through open communication, collaboration between stakeholders, and information disclosure. This strategy places dialogue, identification of common interests, and the search for acceptable solutions as the basis for resolving differences. With this approach, negotiations do not stop at compromises between parties, but are directed to produce decisions that are rational, participatory, and consider the interests of the community. Conflict management and constructive negotiation ultimately need to be directed to realize responsive, transparent, accountable, and public service-oriented governance of the Tasikmalaya City DPRD. The essence of ideas *from noisy to ideas* lies in the ability to turn differences and conflicts into dialogue, inputs, and productive alternative solutions. Thus, the success of conflict management is not enough to be measured by the easing of conflicts, but also by the quality of the decision-making process, openness of accountability, and alignment of decision results with the needs of the community. The implementation of conflict management and constructive negotiation also needs to pay attention to the involvement of the community as interested parties in the policies and decisions of the DPRD.

Public aspirations are not enough to be positioned as formal input, but need to be considered in the process of identifying problems, formulating alternative policies, and evaluating decisions. Such engagement can be facilitated through hearings, public consultations, absorption of community aspirations, and the use of digital communication channels that can be accessed responsibly. Through these mechanisms, the difference between institutional interests and community needs can be identified early on so that potential conflicts can be anticipated before they develop into more complex issues. However, public participation needs to be accompanied by a clear follow-up mechanism so that the public can know how their aspirations are considered in the decision-making process. Thus, constructive negotiations not only take place among the internal actors of the DPRD, but also support a more open and participatory relationship between representative institutions and the community.

The effectiveness of conflict management strategies and constructive negotiations is determined by the consistency of the application of democratic principles, compliance with legal provisions, and orientation to the public interest. Open communication, collaboration, information disclosure, and continuous evaluation need to be combined in one mutually supportive framework. Within this framework, differences of interest are treated as part of the democratic process, while conflict resolution is directed to produce decisions that have a

clear and accountable basis for consideration. For the governance of the Tasikmalaya City DPRD, this approach provides a conceptual foundation to link conflict management with improving the quality of public services. The idea from rowdy to idea thus represents a shift from unproductive opposition to dialogue that produces solutions, from fragmented interests to the pursuit of common interests, and from formal agreement to decisions that provide real benefits to society.

REFERENCES

Agianto, Rifqi, Setiawati, A., & Firmansyah, R. (2021). Analysis of communication and business negotiation techniques in start-up dramas. *Journal of Communication and Media, 1*(2).

Al Fatih, I. Z. (2024). The role of social media in political campaigns in Indonesia in the last five years: Between democracy and information manipulation. *COMSERVA: Journal of Research and Community Service, 4*(7).

Amal, M. K. (2020). Towards a deliberative conflict resolution? A reflection on state inclusive response to Sunni-Shi'a tension in Indonesia's democracy. *Qudus International Journal of Islamic Studies, 8*(2).

Amir, A. S., et al. (2025). *The role of social media in the formation of public opinion* (pp. 25–27).

Asiah T. Pido, S. (2017). *Conflict management: Theory and application* (pp. 16–18).

Azka, H. N., & Najicha, F. U. (2022). The implementation of public information disclosure as an effort to realize a transparent and accountable government. *Citizenship Journal, 6*(1).

Chowdhury, M. A. M., & Hossain, M. B. (2024). Citizen participation and democratic governance in public service delivery: A legal perspective from Indonesia. *Law and Democracy Insight, 2*(1).

Covey, S. R. (2004). *The 7 habits of highly effective people: Powerful lessons in personal change*. Free Press.

Crupi, J. (2022). Collective policy design: An inclusive approach to legislative negotiation. *Cardozo Journal of Conflict Resolution, 24*(1).

Darmawati, A., & Harsono, M. (2021). The development of conflict thinking: An overview of the history and nature of conflict. *Journal of Management Science, 18*(1).

Efriza, & Mendrofa, E. K. (2024). *Conflict management: A review of concepts, reality, and conflict management*.

Fisher, R., Ury, W., & Patton, B. (2011). *Getting to yes: Negotiating agreement without giving in* (3rd ed.).

Hagata, S. A., Darojat, A., & Destyfitriana, I. (2025). *Analysis of social media buzzer dynamics in the 2024 presidential election*.

Haliza, N. A., Fendri, A., Andora, H., Khairani, & Rosari, A. (2023). Budgeting of the basic fund of the regional house of representatives in the regional revenue and expenditure budget. *Syntax Literate: Jurnal Ilmiah Indonesia, 8*(1).

Hermawati, Y. (2024). The evolution of social media: From the beginning to the present. In *The role of social media in the formation of public opinion*.

Narayana, G. (2020). Information disclosure and good governance in Indonesia. In *Bunga rampai: A decade of public information disclosure in Indonesia*.

Nurak, A. P. N., & Wardani, S. B. E. (2021). Conflict of interest between regional leaders and DPRD in the preparation of regional expenditure revenue budgets. *JISoP: Journal of Social and Political Science Innovation, 3*(1).

Panjaitan, B. (2013). Students' cognitive processes in mathematical problem solving. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan, 19*(1).

Pasaribu, A. G., & Sormin, R. M. B. (2024). *Education administration*. Alinea Edumedia.

Prayudi. (2019). The relationship between the DPRD and regional heads: A study on the use of regional policy-making consultation mechanisms. *Review, 24*(4).

Pribadi, U., et al. (2024). Nexus of public organization, transparency, and accountability in Indonesia's digital governance. *Journal of Public Affairs, 24*(3).

Purba, J. S., Nadapdap, A. S., Silalahi, L. B., Samosir, L., & Aritonang, O. T. (2024). Model development management and supervision of educational supervision. *Innovative: Journal of Social Science Research, 4*(3).

Puspita, W. (2018). *Conflict management: An approach to psychology, communication, and education*.

Rahim, M. A. (2002). Toward a theory of managing organizational conflict. *International Journal of Conflict Management, 13*(3).

Republic of Indonesia. (2014). *Law Number 23 of 2014 concerning Regional Government*, Articles 148(1) and 149(1)–(3).

Ricky, & Rahimallah, M. T. A. (2022). Public information disclosure in Indonesia (perspective of accountability, transparency and participation). *Wahana Bhakti Praja: Jurnal Ilmiah, 12*(2).

Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2015). *Organizational behavior* (16th ed.; R. Saraswati & F. Sirait, Trans.).

Salomo, R. V., & Rahmayanti, K. P. (2023). Progress and institutional challenges on local governments performance accountability system reform in Indonesia. *SAGE Open, 13*(4).

Samosir, L., Sitio, R. J. T., Naibaho, F. R., & Silalahi, M. D. (2023). Exploring the dynamics of faith and social integration: A cross-institutional analysis of religious moderation among students in Medan State University and North Sumatra University. *Muharrik: Jurnal Dakwah dan Sosial, 6*(2).

Sharma, S., Bottom, W. P., & Elfenbein, H. A. (2013). On the role of personality, cognitive ability, and emotional intelligence in predicting negotiation outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Psychology Review, 3*(4).

Sinaga, K. M., & Panjaitan, B. (2026). Conflict management between students in boarding theological colleges: A conceptual review. *Mitra Sriwijaya: Jurnal Teologi dan Pendidikan Kristen, 7*(1).

Siringoringo, A. D., Harianja, S. D., Pakpahan, B. A. S., Panjaitan, B., & Lubis, B. B. (2024).

The relationship between principal communication and organizational culture with the performance of state junior high school teachers in Doloksanggul District. *Curere Journal, 8*(1).

Sjoraida, D. F., Setianti, Y., & Priyatna, C. C. (2025). Government communication in regional budget management: A study of transparency and public participation. *RIGGS: Journal of Artificial Intelligence and Digital Business, 4*(2).

Subrata, R., Arifin, F., & Maarif, I. (2025). Hybrid dispute resolution in administrative law: Toward an integrated model for government conflict management. *Journal of Judicial Review, 27*(1).

Sundari, S. (2023). *Conflict management and change in organizational dynamics*.

Suwanda, D. (2016). *Improving the function of the DPRD in the preparation of responsive regional regulations*.

Wahab, A. A. (2008). *Anatomy of educational organization and leadership: A study of the organization and management of educational organizations*. Alfabeta.

Wahyudi. (2021). *Conflict theory and its application to the social sciences*.

Watungadha, F. E. (2023). *Conflict management strategy for public sector organizations*.

Widiana, I. N. W., et al. (2023). *Organizational behavior and culture*.