

## Collaborative Governance Base on Phenta Helix in Improving Uninhabitable Houses in Tangerang City

Yudi Muhtadi<sup>A</sup>, Bambang Heru Purwanto<sup>B</sup>, Soleh Suryadi<sup>C</sup>

### Abstract

This study aims to analyze the implementation of collaborative governance based on phenta helix in the improvement of habitable houses in Tangerang City and the inhibiting factors. This study uses a descriptive qualitative research method because it aims to explore and observe an object to be studied. Based on the objectives of the study, the focus of the study is to analyze collaborative governance factors with a 6-factor approach as research variables, namely system context, diversity, collaborative dynamic, collaborative action, outcome of collaborative action, and adoption through collaborative penta helix five collaborating actors, namely local government, private sector, academics, community and mass media in the program to improve habitable houses in Tangerang City. The conclusion of the study found several inhibiting factors, namely policy and legal framework, consequential incentives, resource conditions, and network characteristics. The steps taken to overcome the obstacles of collaborative governance based on phenta helix in the improvement of uninhabitable houses in Tangerang City so that it runs effectively are to implement the enacting new management process based on phenta helix by creating a new policy and legal framework involving phenta helix elements, namely government, academics, private sector, community and mass media in the governance of uninhabitable house improvements in Tangerang City.

**Keywords:** Policy And Legal Framework, Enacting New Management Process, Consequential Incentives.

### INTRODUCTION

The Uninhabitable House Improvement Program in Indonesia, including in Tangerang City, aims to improve the condition of uninhabitable houses to support poverty alleviation, fulfill the right to a decent life as stipulated in Article 28 of the 1945 Constitution, and support the SDGs and handling of slum areas. However, limited APBD budget and fiscal dependency are the main obstacles, as stated by Kuncoro (2004).

Collaboration between local governments and external parties is the solution, with collaborative governance involving non-state actors in decision-making, as described by Ansell & Gash (2008) and Emerson & Nabatchi (2015a). This collaboration involves five elements of the Penta

<sup>A</sup>Universitas Pasundan, Bandung, Indonesia, Email: [tubagusyudi@unis.ac.id](mailto:tubagusyudi@unis.ac.id)

<sup>B</sup>Universitas Pasundan, Bandung, Indonesia

<sup>C</sup>Universitas Pasundan, Bandung, Indonesia

Helix: government, private sector, community, academics, and media (Wasistiono, 2010).

This program refers to various regulations such as the 1945 Constitution, Law Number 23 of 2014, Law Number 1 of 2011, and PUPR Ministerial Regulation No. 13-PRT-M-2016. In Tangerang City, Mayoral Regulation Number 59 of 2023 and the Decree of the Head of the Housing, Settlement and Land Agency Number 800/Kep.56-Bid.Perkim/2023 stipulate guidelines for implementing this program, including requirements for recipients of assistance.

Although the program has shown success in terms of the number of home repairs, there are obstacles such as budget shortfalls and long waiting times for beneficiaries, as well as uncertainty in post-rehabilitation home maintenance. This problem is exacerbated by policies that have not involved academics, the private sector, communities, and the media in program governance.

The penta helix concept in the 4.0 era offers a strategic collaboration solution to address development issues, as explained by Lindmark, Stureson & Roos (2009) and Mohr and Speakmen. By involving all five components of the penta helix, it is hoped that the Uninhabitable House Improvement program in Tangerang City can be more effective and sustainable.

The Penta Helix model, involving academia, business, community, government and media (ABCGM), is designed to accelerate development by bringing together different sectors. The concept, which is an extension of the Triple Helix, expands collaboration to create more inclusive innovation by involving communities and media in the development process.

According to Mohr and Spekman (1994), key attributes of effective partnerships include power, trust, dedication, coordination, and interdependence. In addition, effective communication is essential, including sharing information, engaging in goal setting, and joint planning. Conflict resolution in interorganizational relationships can affect partnership outcomes, with positive resolution increasing the chances of relationship success (Mohr & Spekman, 1994).

In the context of the Penta Helix, each actor has an important role:

1. Academics: As a source of the latest knowledge and ideas, academics function in identifying regional potential and developing programs (Muhyi, 2017).
2. Business: As an enabler, the private sector provides infrastructure, capital, and supports sustainable growth (Etzkowitz & Leydesdorff, 2000).
3. Community: Acting as an accelerator, the community is involved in the adoption of economic processes and promotion (Muhyi, 2017).
4. Government: As a facilitator, regulator, and controller, the government regulates and facilitates development and innovation policies (Howlett & Ramesh, 1995).

5. Media: Functions as an expander by promoting development and creating brand image (Cooper et al., 1998).

In the implementation of Uninhabitable House Improvement in Tangerang City, it is important to involve all elements of Penta Helix. The media, for example, can increase program visibility and public participation. Academics can contribute through community service and the Independent Learning-Independent Campus (MBKM) program, while the private sector can utilize CSR to support budget allocation.

This study aims to analyze the implementation of Penta Helix-based collaborative governance in the uninhabitable housing improvement program in Tangerang City, identify inhibiting factors, and find solutions to optimize implementation. The Penta Helix model offers a more comprehensive and original approach to managing development projects compared to the more limited collaborative governance model in previous theories.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **Contemporary Public Administration**

The Public Administration Paradigm has developed from the Old Public Administration (OPA) paradigm to the Contemporary Public Administration paradigm. The OPA paradigm, which includes five phases (from the political-administrative dichotomy to state administration as state administration), emphasizes the role of government as the sole regulator and efficiency as the main value (Thoha, 2014:18; 2014:73). However, dissatisfaction with the power approach in OPA has encouraged the birth of a new paradigm that is more public-oriented and responsive, namely New Public Administration (NPA), New Public Management (NPM), New Public Service (NPS), Governance, Good Governance, and Sound Governance (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2006:1; Cooper et al., 1998:15).

NPA emerged as a reaction to OPA by emphasizing social justice, attention to community needs, and improving public welfare. NPA added social justice as a major focus of public administration and included values such as equal rights in public services, accountability, change in public management, responsiveness to citizen needs, and interdisciplinary and applied approaches in the study of public administration (Frederickson, 1987:9; 1987:10; 1987:52).

NPA aims to improve management, efficiency, economy, and social justice by emphasizing flexibility in public organizations to respond to change (Frederickson, 1987:13). In Keban's perspective (2014:4), NPA shifts from the paradigm of "administration of public" in OPA to "administration for public," where the community as citizens has an important role, and development programs and public services must be based on community problems and demands.

New Public Management (NPM) emerged from the concept of public management as an interdisciplinary study that integrates planning, organizing, and controlling with human, financial, and political resources (Overman, 1984:88; McKevitt & Lawton, 1994:56).

NPM, which began to develop in the late 1970s and early 1980s in the UK and the US, focused on increasing efficiency and flexibility in public bureaucracy and prioritizing collaboration between government, society, and business (Gruening, 2001:1; Hughes, 1994:29; Mahmudi, 2005:43).

Key characteristics of NPM include a shift from rigid bureaucracy to a more responsive management system, the introduction of market mechanisms, and competition in the public sector (Hood, 1991:12). NPM promotes principles such as efficiency, accountability, and the use of markets to improve public services (Osborne & Gaebler, 1992). NPM strategies involve clarity of purpose, controlled competition, and results-based management (Osborne & Plastrik, 1997:16; Barzelay, 2001:15).

New Public Service (NPS) was introduced by Denhardt & Denhardt (2003), emphasizing the principle of "Serving, not steering" and aims to improve the shortcomings of NPM by focusing on democratic, fair, and accountable public services. NPS prioritizes community participation and emphasizes the role of government as a public servant, not as a business manager (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2003:18, 20, 30). This paradigm introduces principles such as serving citizens rather than customers, and being oriented towards public interest and community independence (Rusli, 2015; Keban, 2014:4).

### **Governance and Good Governance**

The term "governance" comes from the word "govern," which means to rule or manage, and can be applied in both the public and private sectors. In the context of the public sector, governance means governance or government administration.

There are various definitions of governance:

1. General Concept: The act of managing in the public and private sectors (Emerson & Nabatchi, 2015a).
2. Collective Action: The combination of norms and rules that govern the behavior of individuals and groups (Ostrom, 1990).
3. Process: How to direct decisions and actions across sectors (O'Leary & Vij, 2012).
4. Specific: Efforts to coordinate and monitor activities within partnerships or institutions (Bryson et al., 2006).

According to the UN (Cheema & Rondinelli, 2007:6), governance is the use of political, economic, and administrative authority to manage state problems. The World Bank (Wasistiono, 2010) defines governance as the way state power is used to manage resources for community development. UNDP (1997) defines governance as the use of political, economic, and administrative authority to manage national problems at all levels.

Fukuyama (2013:4) states that governance is the government's ability to create and enforce regulations and provide services. The difference between "government" and "governance" is that government refers to a body or institution with formal power, while governance involves mutual agreement and does not necessarily depend on formal power.

Good Governance emerged as a response to the crisis of governance, especially in Africa in the 1980s, and aims to rebuild public trust in government by improving performance and accountability. The characteristics of good governance include transparency, accountability, cleanliness from abuse of power, and honesty. To realize good governance, leaders are needed with visionary, unifying, empowering, controlling ratio-emotions, and integrity.

### **Collaborative Governance**

Collaboration, cooperation, and coordination are concepts often used in administration and governance, but each has its own distinct characteristics. Collaboration involves the process of sharing creation between autonomous organizations, where the parties involved are committed to achieving common goals through formal or informal negotiation. It includes deep integration, the establishment of shared structures, and rules for managing relationships and solving complex problems (Shergold, 2008; Thomson, 2009). In contrast, coordination is the process of integrating the goals and activities of separate units in an organization, with a focus on synchronizing and arranging so that activities across units run harmoniously. Coordination emphasizes efficiency in achieving organizational goals without the need for the establishment of collaborative structures (Stoner & Wankel, 1986; Syafiie et.al., 2001). Meanwhile, cooperation is the process of sharing ideas and resources that are mutually beneficial without requiring deep integration as in collaboration. Cooperation focuses on the exchange of resources and mutual benefits, but does not involve the same level of interaction or commitment as collaboration (Westra, 1999; Syafrudin, 1993).

In the context of governance, collaborative governance involves public bodies working together with non-state stakeholders, such as the private sector and civil society, in decision-making processes and the management of public policy. Collaborative governance emphasizes formally organized forums, direct participation of all relevant parties, and a focus on achieving consensus for more effective policy implementation (Ansell & Gash, 2007; Emerson & Nabatchi, 2015). It aims to address public problems that cannot be solved by one organization alone, by involving multiple actors in a more inclusive and goal-based process.

The Collaborative Governance Model by Ansell & Gash (2007) and Emerson & Nabatchi (2015) provides an in-depth framework for understanding how collaboration between parties can be effective in decision-making. Ansell & Gash (2007) identified five main variables in their model. First, Starting Conditions, which include asymmetries of power, resources, and knowledge, incentives and barriers to participation, and history of cooperation or conflict between the parties involved. Second, Facilitative Leadership, which includes empowerment of participants. Third, Institutional Design, which includes inclusive participation, exclusivity of the forum, clarity of ground rules, and

transparency of the process. Fourth, Collaborative Process, which consists of face-to-face dialogue, trust-building, commitment to the process, shared understanding, and intermediate outcomes. Finally, Outcomes, which are the final results of the collaborative process. Their proposition emphasizes that initial conditions, power, incentives, and conflict history influence the effectiveness of collaborative governance (Ansell & Gash, 2007).

Meanwhile, Emerson & Nabatchi (2015) offer an Integrative Framework for Collaborative Governance that identifies six key factors. First, System Context which includes the condition of public services or resources, policy and legal frameworks, socio-economic and cultural characteristics, networks, political dynamics and power relations, and history of conflict. Second, Drivers such as uncertainty, interdependence, consequential incentives, and initiating leadership. Third, Collaboration Dynamics, which includes principal involvement, shared motivation, and collaborative action. Fourth, Actions resulting from the dynamics of collaboration and contributing to outcomes. Fifth, Outcomes from the collaboration process. Finally, Adaptation in CGR and system context based on the results achieved (Emerson & Nabatchi, 2015). Both models emphasize the importance of institutional design, collaboration dynamics, and initial conditions in determining the success of collaborative governance.

In the Collaborative Governance model according to Emerson & Nabatchi (2015), Shared Motivation consists of four main sub-factors. First, Trust is an absolute requirement that allows participants to go beyond personal perspectives and understand the interests of others. Second, Mutual Understanding relates to respect for differences and the ability to understand the positions and interests of others. Third, Internal Legitimacy ensures that participants have credibility and confidence in collaboration. Fourth, Commitment shows the attachment between participants through various forms, including MoUs or cooperation agreements (Emerson & Nabatchi, 2015:66-67).

Capacity for Joint Action includes four sub-factors. First, Procedural and Institutional Arrangements involve formal rules and protocols and institutional design to manage interactions. Second, Leadership is important in facilitating and managing the dynamics of collaboration, including the role of mediator and facilitator. Third, Knowledge includes the information needed for collaborative action. Fourth, Resources include sharing resources and budgets to achieve common goals (Emerson & Nabatchi, 2015:68-73).

Collaborative Actions are the follow-up to the dynamics of collaboration, which can take various forms of action such as securing support, implementing new policies, or deploying staff (Emerson & Nabatchi, 2015a). Outcomes of collaborative actions include changes in conditions to achieve goals and the resulting effects, both in physical and non-physical forms (Emerson & Nabatchi, 2015a). Finally, Adaptation is a significant change in response to outcomes, including

adjustments in the context system, CGR, and collaboration dynamics (Emerson & Nabatchi, 2015a).

## **METHOD**

The research method used by researchers in this study is a qualitative method with a descriptive approach (Sugiono, 2015). Qualitative research is a study that is intended to understand an event experienced by the research subject, including behavior, views, motivations, other actions as a whole by describing them in the form of words and language, in a natural context by using various natural methods (Moleong, 2007).

Data collection in this study used observation techniques, interviews, literature studies, and Focus Group Discussions (FGD). To conduct qualitative data analysis, the author analyzed descriptive data, consisting of written and oral information from informants, as well as facts and symptoms that emerged from the results of observations. Data analysis used the Miles & Huberman model (1992), consisting of three simultaneous activity flows, which include data reduction, data presentation, and verification and drawing conclusions.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### **The Uninhabitable House Repair Policy in Tangerang City**

Mayoral Regulation Number 56 of 2023 regulates the repair of uninhabitable houses (Rutilahu) in Tangerang City. This guideline establishes the criteria for Rutilahu which includes building safety, occupant health, and minimum building area. The Regional Government can rehabilitate or repair Rutilahu to address extreme poverty and reduce slum areas by involving local communities.

Requirements for program beneficiaries Rutilahu includes having a local ID card and family card, domiciled and having a family in the area, earning a maximum of the city's minimum wage, and having a permanent residence on land with valid documents. Recipients must not have other land or building assets, have never received similar assistance in the last 10 years, and are willing to maintain the house after repairs.

The submission of improvements begins with a proposal by the Head of the Neighborhood Association or the Head of the Citizens Association, then submitted to the Development Planning Deliberation at the Village, District, and Regional Apparatus Forum levels. Proposals can also be made through DPRD recess by paying attention to poverty issues, stunting, health, and urban slums. The proposal was submitted to the Housing, Settlement and Land Agency for verification and determination as a list of aid recipients.

The Policy for Repairing Uninhabitable Houses in Tangerang City also has technical guidelines in the form of a decree of the Head of the Housing, Settlement and Land Service number: 800/Kep.56-Bid.Perkim/2023 Concerning Guidelines for the Implementation of Repairing Uninhabitable Houses in 2023, where this guideline regulates

the procedures for self-management of Repairing Uninhabitable Houses in Tangerang City starting from the preparation stage, implementation stage, monitoring evaluation and supervision stage through elements involving the Housing, Settlement and Land Service, District and Village Governments, Inspectorate and elements of the Self-Management Implementing Community Group (POKMAS).

### **Duties and Functions of the Organization for Managing Uninhabitable House Repair Activities in Tangerang City**

The management of uninhabitable housing repairs in Tangerang City involves several elements, namely the Housing, Settlement and Land Agency, Sub-district and Village Governments, Inspectorate, Self-Managed Community Groups (POKMAS), and beneficiaries. The Housing, Settlement and Land Agency is tasked with determining beneficiaries, preparing implementation guidelines, preparing budgets, determining POKMAS, and conducting monitoring and evaluation.

Sub-district and Village Governments foster and evaluate POKMAS, check documents and project compliance, assist in implementation, and monitor and report activities. The Inspectorate supervises and evaluates the implementation and accountability of spending. POKMAS is responsible for forming teams, submitting proposals and RAB, preparing KAK, signing contracts, and implementing and reporting activities. Beneficiaries must seek additional needs with the help of the local community.

### **Achievements in Repairing Uninhabitable Houses in Tangerang City**

The Uninhabitable House Repair Program in Tangerang City has been implemented since 2014 with a total of 8,182 housing units repaired by 2023. The success of this program includes increasing the number of aid recipients, implementation of rehabilitation according to guidelines, permanent houses being renovated, increasing clean living behavior, and effective cooperation between POKMAS, RT, RW, Kelurahan, Community Organizations, and the Perkim Service. However, there are obstacles such as lack of budget that hinders the fulfillment of decent housing standards, uncertainty of time for grant recipients, and difficulties in maintaining renovated houses due to family financial conditions.

**Table 1. Achievements in Repairing Uninhabitable Houses in Tangerang City**

No.	Subdistrict	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023	Total
		RTLH	RTLH	RTLH	RTLH	RTLH	RTLH	RTLH	RTLH	RTLH	RTLH	RTLH
1	Batucapeer	12	13	82	110	70	23	-	20	22	25	377
2	Benda	-	-	39	107	113	44	-	19	20	89	431
3	Cibodas	-	-	26	219	93	40	-	9	23	51	461
4	Cileduk	-	-	91	112	76	22	-	21	30	82	434
5	Cipondoh	-	52	118	233	122	27	-	28	41	48	669
6	Jatiuwung	9	-	103	189	92	21	-	39	29	52	534
7	Karagtengah	-	-	102	99	32	14	-	29	31	67	374
8	Karawaci	-	2	188	203	152	-	-	31	62	55	693
9	Larangan	-	-	107	97	114	46	-	14	32	54	464
10	Neglasari	-	-	239	655	150	64	-	33	40	41	1222
11	Periuk	9	-	74	72	66	21	-	23	30	32	327
12	Pinang	-	-	201	70	145	61	-	51	53	60	641
13	Tangerang	23	-	35	148	98	51	-	33	37	44	469
<b>Total Units</b>		<b>53</b>	<b>1107</b>	<b>1451</b>	<b>2314</b>	<b>1323</b>	<b>434</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>350</b>	<b>450</b>	<b>700</b>	<b>8182</b>

Source: Tangerang City Public Works and Housing Agency

The Uninhabitable House Repair Program in Tangerang City, despite its positive impact, faces several obstacles that reduce its effectiveness. The main obstacles include a suboptimal data information system, resulting in invalid recipient and proposal data and house completion not according to the specified time. In addition, POKMAS as the self-managed implementer often lacks expertise in reporting information systems, design, and financial report management. Policy factors are also a problem because they have not effectively involved Pentahelix elements in the latest technical guidelines and regulations that have been set.

### **Implementation of Collaborative Governance Based on Phenta Helix for Repairing Uninhabitable Houses in Tangerang City is Not Yet Effective**

The implementation of Penta Helix-based Collaborative Governance in the improvement of uninhabitable houses in Tangerang City is still ineffective, if analyzed based on the six factors proposed by Emerson & Nabatchi (2015b): system context, drivers, collaboration dynamics, collaborative actions, results of collaborative actions, and adjustments.

The system context includes the condition of public services, policy and legal framework, socio-economic characteristics, networks, political dynamics, and history of conflict. In Tangerang City, public services are considered good with various awards for service innovation such as Laksa, Tangerang Live, and SPAN. Support for the business climate is also positive, as evidenced by good administrative services and infrastructure. The private sector, through CSR programs, has contributed to the improvement of uninhabitable houses.

However, despite resources such as budget from the Regional Revenue and Expenditure Budget and the involvement of staff from the Housing and Settlement Agency, and the Community Empowerment Agency, the involvement of academics, the private sector, communities, and the mass media is still less than optimal. The CSR potential of the industry in Tangerang City has not been fully utilized, and the private sector has not been directly involved in this program. This shows that

despite various potentials and initiatives, the implementation of Collaborative Governance still faces challenges in optimizing existing involvement and resources.

**Table 2. Number of Large and Medium Industrial Companies by District in Tangerang City**

Subdistrict	Big Industry	Medium Industry	Large + Medium Industry
Ciledug	1	2	3
Larangan	2	2	4
Karangtengah	2	4	6
Cipondoh	8	17	25
Pinang	4	5	9
Tangerang	6	12	18
Karawaci	27	33	60
Jatiuwung	121	113	234
Cibodas	27	26	53
Periuk	30	61	91
Batuceper	33	32	65
Neglasari	14	35	49
Benda	9	12	21
<b>Tangerang City</b>	<b>284</b>	<b>354</b>	<b>638</b>

Source: BPS Tangerang City

The COVID-19 pandemic that hit from 2019 to 2021 caused an economic downturn in Tangerang City, impacting the decline in local revenue and the budget for the Uninhabitable House Repair (RTLH) program. However, in 2023, the economy began to recover, with the industrial and tax sectors increasing, creating new opportunities for funding through Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR).

From 2014 to 2023, the Tangerang City RTLH program has successfully repaired 8,182 housing units. The Tangerang City Government, through the Housing and Settlement Agency, has regulated this policy with Tangerang Mayor Regulation Number 56 of 2023 and Head of Agency Decree Number 800/Kep.56-Bid.Perkim/2023. However, the involvement of academics, the private sector, communities, and the mass media in this program has not been optimal.

The socio-cultural conditions in Tangerang City, with its ethnic diversity and high tolerance, support collaboration in the RTLH program. However, there are still social and economic gaps that must be addressed. Network characteristics indicate that the information system and frequency of interaction between stakeholders need to be improved, because currently there is no specific information system for RTLH and the frequency of interaction is limited to public forums.

The political dynamics and power relations in Tangerang City are well supported by policies and support from the DPRD, although organizational control and control mechanisms in RTLH governance have not fully involved all related parties. The history of conflict is relatively low, with security and public trust well maintained, supporting the implementation of a harmonious and participatory RTLH program.

Overall, although there has been progress, improvements in cross-sector collaboration and information systems are needed to

maximize the effectiveness of the Uninhabitable House Improvement program in Tangerang City.

Currently, collaboration between academics, the private sector, communities, and the mass media in the policy of Improving Uninhabitable Houses (RTLH) in Tangerang City is not optimal. Tangerang Mayor Regulation Number 56 of 2023 and Decree of the Head of the Housing, Settlement and Land Agency Number 800/Kep.56-Bid.Perkim/2023 have not involved all parties effectively in managing this program (Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 40 of 1999; Tangerang City Regional Regulation Number 8 of 2012). This is contrary to policies that require the involvement of various parties, such as the tridharma of higher education regulated in Permendikbud Number 3 of 2020, corporate social responsibility according to Tangerang City Regional Regulation Number 8 of 2012, and the function of the mass media according to Law Number 40 of 1999 concerning the Press (Permendikbud Number 3 of 2020).

**Table 3. Community Empowerment Agency Management Tangerang City**

No.	Manager	Amount
1	City Level	1 Administrator
2	Sub-district Level	13 Administrators
3	Sub-district Level	104 Administrators
	Amount	118 Administrators

Source: Tangerang City BKM Management

Academics are expected to contribute through research and community service, while the private sector needs to engage in social responsibility programs. The mass media serves to disseminate information to increase public participation in development. However, the implementation of the policy shows a lack of adequate synergy and collaboration between these parties.

The interdependence between government, academics, the private sector, and the mass media is important in the context of RTLH policy. The government relies heavily on academics for research and community service, the private sector relies on permits and infrastructure, and the mass media relies on information provided by the government and other sectors (Yukl, 2013). The Tangerang City CSR Forum acts as a mediator between the government and the private sector, while the mass media serves as an information channel that supports this collaboration (Emerson & Nabatchi, 2015b).

Incentives play a key role in encouraging collaboration. Positive incentives, such as performance allowances, have been shown to be effective in increasing government motivation, but incentives for community groups, such as Community Empowerment Agencies (BKM) and Community Association Chairpersons, are still less than optimal. As explained by Emerson & Nabatchi (2015b), positive incentives in the form of rewards can motivate individuals or groups to collaborate, while negative incentives or punishments can affect the level of participation. The Rector of the Syekh-Yusuf Islamic University of Tangerang, Prof.

Dr. H. Mustofa Kamil, Dip.RSL, M.Pd., emphasized that incentives for academics and the private sector should not only be in the form of financial support, but also ease in conducting research and community service (Emerson & Nabatchi, 2015b).

Initiative leadership plays an important role in encouraging collaboration and implementation of development programs. The leadership of the Mayor and Deputy Mayor of Tangerang, H. Arief R. Wismansyah and H. Sahrudin, demonstrate a strong commitment to implementing the vision of sustainable city development. Their vision for Tangerang City includes improving the quality of human resources and developing environmentally friendly facilities and infrastructure (Yukl, 2013).

Their leadership is characterized by innovation and creativity in the provision of public services. Information systems such as the Suggestion Box Aspiration Service (LAKSA), the National Public Service Complaint Management System (SPAN), and the People's Online Aspiration and Complaint Service (LAPOR) are examples of innovations that have successfully received awards from various institutions, including the Ministry of Home Affairs and the United Nations Public Service Awards (UNPSA) (Emerson & Nabatchi, 2015b). According to Yukl (2013), leadership that takes the initiative involves strategic vision, commitment, and creativity in solving problems. The leadership of H. Arief R. Wismansyah and H. Sahrudin has proven this by creating various innovations that support stakeholder participation and increase the effectiveness of development programs in the City of Tangerang.

Collaborative dynamics are at the heart of the Collaborative Governance Regime (CGR), which describes how the collaborative process develops and how participants move from the initial stage to concrete actions (Emerson & Nabatchi, 2015b). In the Uninhabitable House Improvement program in Tangerang City, collaborative dynamics are seen in meetings between local governments and community elements, such as the Community Empowerment Agency and Community Empowerment Institutions. This forum discusses various aspects from proposals to program reporting, but has not directly involved academics, the private sector, and the mass media in the collaborative governance process.

Principled engagement occurs continuously and involves participants in achieving common goals through dialogue and collaboration based on normative principles (Emerson & Nabatchi, 2015b). In the context of Uninhabitable Home Improvement, this process includes discovery, definition, deliberation, and determination. Discovery occurs through forums such as the Citizens' Discussion and Development Planning Deliberation (Musrembang), which produce program proposals that are then discussed and verified. Definition and deliberation are carried out through FGDs and meetings to determine tasks and responsibilities, as well as budget determination through the Tangerang City DPRD Plenary Meeting.

Shared motivation includes trust, mutual understanding, internal legitimacy, and shared commitment (Emerson & Nabatchi, 2015b). Trust is formed from good governance and supportive regulations, while mutual understanding develops from respect for differences. Internal legitimacy refers to the credibility and legitimacy of regulations that support collaboration, such as Tangerang Mayor Regulation Number 56 of 2023. Shared commitment is seen in the existing commitment between the Regional Government and the Community Empowerment Agency, although the involvement of the private sector, academics, and mass media is still limited.

Capacity for joint action consists of the preparation of procedures and institutions, leadership, knowledge, and resources (Emerson & Nabatchi, 2015b). Although there are procedures and institutions regulated in the Mayor's Regulation and the Head of the Department's Decree, the involvement of the private sector, academics, communities, and mass media is still not optimal. Good leadership and effective collaboration can improve this situation, by involving more parties in formal agreements such as MoUs and MoAs, and utilizing the potential resources of the private sector.

In implementation, the private sector has contributed through CSR, but has not focused on the Uninhabitable House Improvement program. According to the Head of the Tangerang City CSR Forum, H. Mulyanto, the potential for funds from large industries can be better utilized if involvement in this program is increased (Interview, March 4, 2023). Overall, the complete involvement of academics, the private sector, communities, and the mass media in collaborative governance of Uninhabitable House Improvement still needs to be strengthened to achieve more effective results.

Collaborative action is an action that encourages the achievement of goals that are impossible to achieve individually. In the policy of Repairing Uninhabitable Houses in Tangerang City, there are nine forms of collaborative action according to Emerson & Nabatchi (2015b):

1. Securing Endorsements: The Tangerang City Government secures support from academics, the private sector, mass media, and communities through the socialization of related regulations.
2. Enacting New Policy Measures: Tangerang City Government strengthens compliance by signing MoU and MoA with the five elements of Penta Helix.
3. Marshalling External Resources: Collecting resources from various parties such as government budget, academic facilities, private sector CSR, mass media, and community support.
4. Deploying Staff: Deploying staff from the five elements to support policy implementation.
5. Siting and Permitting Facilities: Placing and permitting the use of facilities from each element to accelerate policies.
6. Building or Cleaning Up Sites: Carrying out construction or renovation of infrastructure supporting the program.

7. Carrying Out New Management Practices: Conduct coordination and meetings to discuss strategies and implementation schedules.
8. Monitoring Implementation: Monitoring program implementation to identify obstacles and achievements.
9. Enforcing Compliance: Enforcing compliance with evaluation and monitoring results.

However, field research shows that this policy has not been effective because it only involves a few elements (Housing Service, Inspectorate, community groups, neighborhood association heads, and neighborhood association heads), and does not involve Penta Helix elements such as academics, the private sector, communities, and mass media which have important resources and capacities.

Outcomes of collaborative actions include intermediate changes in conditions necessary to achieve goals and the effects resulting from achieving those goals. These outcomes can be physical, environmental, social, economic, or political changes (Emerson & Nabatchi, 2015b).

In the Uninhabitable House Repair program in Tangerang City, which began in 2014 and will last until 2023, 8,182 houses have been repaired. Mrs. Rini, one of the grant recipients, expressed her gratitude to the Tangerang City Government, stating that her previously poor house is now nice and clean, and hopes that this program will continue (Interview, June 10, 2024).

The Chancellor of Syekh Yusuf Islamic University, Prof. H. Mustofa Kamil, stated that the program evaluation showed positive results such as increased housing resilience, reduced extreme poverty, and implementation of rehabilitation according to guidelines. Cooperation between various parties was also considered to be going well (Interview June 14, 2024).

However, field research identified several problems, including budget shortfalls that made it difficult to meet housing construction standards, delays in providing assistance, and difficulties in maintaining rehabilitated housing due to family financial conditions.

According to Emerson & Nabatchi (2015b), adaptation is an important element in understanding the evolution and performance of Collaborative Governance Regime (CGR), although it is often less prominent. Adaptation includes transformative changes that respond to the results of collaboration, both in the context system, CGR, and collaboration dynamics. Adaptation involves institutional adjustments, where CGRs must adjust to changes outside and inside the organization, and face the consequences of their actions.

In the context of Uninhabitable House Improvement in Tangerang City, institutional adaptation includes adjustments by government agencies such as the Housing and Land Agency and community institutions to ensure accountability in accordance with applicable regulations and guidelines. This adaptation is necessary to improve outcomes and overcome barriers.

Head of the Tangerang City Housing and Settlement Agency, Ir. R. Sugihharto Achmad Bagdja, M.Sc., stated that the current policy has had a positive impact by reducing poverty and overcoming slum areas, despite budget constraints. The evaluation by Syekh Yusuf Islamic University aims to review budget allocation so that the policy can achieve quantity and quality targets.

Field research shows that CGR must be able to adapt to economic, socio-cultural, information system developments, and community dynamics so that the Uninhabitable House Improvement policy can continue to develop and achieve the desired targets.

### **Inhibiting Factors of Collaborative Governance Based on Phenta Helix in Improving Uninhabitable Houses in Tangerang City are Not Yet Effective.**

Based on the analysis of the implementation of Phenta Helix-based Collaborative Governance in the Repair of Uninhabitable Houses in Tangerang City, several significant obstacles reduce the effectiveness of the program. First, human and financial resource factors indicate that deficiencies in technical competencies, such as in civil engineering and accounting, as well as budget constraints, hamper the implementation of the program. As a result, several repaired houses do not meet the safety, health, and minimum area standards in accordance with the Decree of the Head of the Housing, Settlement and Land Service Number: 800/Kep.56-Bid.Perkim/2023 and Mayoral Regulation No. 56 of 2023 (Emerson & Nabatchi, 2015b).

Second, policy factors and legal frameworks also act as barriers because existing policies do not directly involve academics, the private sector, communities, and the mass media, which hinders cross-sector collaboration that is essential for the success of the program (Emerson & Nabatchi, 2015b).

Third, information system factors related to poorly managed data, such as potential house damage, repair proposals, and data on houses that have been built, make it difficult to achieve the target of completing habitable houses (Emerson & Nabatchi, 2015b).

Fourth, the consequences of incentives are also an issue. Positive incentives such as rewards and negative incentives such as punishments have not been fully implemented effectively. The Community Empowerment Agency (Pokja) and RT/RW administrators have not received optimal support, while the Perkim Service and the sub-district/district have received performance allowances (Emerson & Nabatchi, 2015b).

These barriers indicate the need for improvements in resource management, more inclusive policies, better information systems, and more effective incentive mechanisms to improve program outcomes.

### **Efforts made to overcome the Barrier factors so that Phenta Helix-Based Collaborative Governance in the Repair of Uninhabitable Houses in Tangerang City runs Effectively.**

To overcome the obstacles in Phenta Helix-based Collaborative Governance in the Uninhabitable House Improvement program in Tangerang City, the following strategic steps need to be implemented:

1. Optimizing public resources and services by designing new management and policies involving academics, the private sector, the media and communities.
2. Leveraging political dynamics and power relations to shape inclusive and participatory policies.
3. Using the history of previous conflicts to create better and more inclusive policies.
4. Initiative leadership is important to implement new management with the principles of involvement, mutual motivation, mutual trust and understanding.
5. The implementation of new management must be accompanied by a comprehensive policy framework involving various stakeholders, with a focus on engagement, shared motivation, internal legitimacy and consequential incentives.

These steps aim to enhance collaboration, optimally utilize resources, and strengthen policies to achieve program effectiveness.

### **CONCLUSION**

The implementation of collaborative governance based on the Phenta Helix for the improvement of uninhabitable houses in Tangerang City is still not effective due to several obstacles. There are several inhibiting factors, namely policy and legal framework, consequential incentives, resource conditions, and network characteristics. The steps taken to overcome the obstacles of collaborative governance based on phenta helix in the improvement of uninhabitable houses in Tangerang City so that it runs effectively are to implement the enacting new management process based on phenta helix by creating a new policy and legal framework involving phenta helix elements, namely government, academics, private sector, community and mass media in the governance of uninhabitable house improvements in Tangerang City.

### **REFERENCES**

- Alter, C., & Hage, J. (1992). Ornization Working Together. In SAGE Publications, inc (Vol. 37, Issue 6). <https://doi.org/10.1108/prt.2008.12937fab.024>
- Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative governance in theory and practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(4), 543–571. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mum032>
- Aulia H, B. (2020). Collaborative Governance in the Implementation of Surabaya Mayor Regulation Number 41 of 2015 concerning General Guidelines for the Implementation of the Surabaya City

- Slum Area Social Rehabilitation Program.
- Bell, E., & Scott, T. A. (2020). Common institutional design, divergent results: A comparative case study of collaborative governance platforms for regional water planning. *Environmental Science and Policy*, 111(April), 63–73. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2020.04.015>
- Bryson, J.M., Crosby, B.C., & Stone, M.M. (2006). The design and implementation of cross-sector collaborations: Propositions from the literature. *Public Administration Review*, 66(SUPPL. 1), 44–55. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00665.x>
- Emerson, K., & Nabatchi, T. (2015a). Collaborative governance regimes. *Collaborative Governance Regimes*, 1–264. <https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12278>
- Emerson, K., & Nabatchi, T. (2015b). *Collaborative Governance Regimes*. Georgetown University Press.
- Flye, M.E., Sponarski, C.C., Zydlewski, J.D., & McGreavy, B. (2021). Understanding collaborative governance from a communication network perspective: A case study of the Atlantic Salmon recovery framework. *Environmental Science and Policy*, 115(August 2020), 79–90. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2020.10.001>
- Hadilinatih, B. (2018). Collaborative Governance in Eradicating Corruption. *Jurnal Enersia Publika*, 2(1), 1–12. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cirp.2016.06.001><http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.powtec.2016.12.055><https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijfatigue.2019.02.006><https://doi.org/10.1016/j.matlet.2019.04.024><https://doi.org/10.1016/j.matlet.2019.127252><http://dx.doi.org>
- Ibrahim, AS, Akanbang, BAA, Nunbogu, AM, Kuusaana, ED, & Ahmed, A. (2020). Collaborative customary land governance: Motivations and challenges of forming land management committees (LMCs) in the upper west region of Ghana. *Land Use Policy*, 99(August), 105051. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2020.105051>
- Junaidi. (2015). Collaborative Governance in an Effort to Resolve the Electricity Crisis in Tanjungpinang City. 10. [http://jurnal.umrah.ac.id/wp-content/uploads/gravity\\_forms/1-ec61c9cb232a03a96d0947c6478e525e/2016/08/jurnal-1.pdf](http://jurnal.umrah.ac.id/wp-content/uploads/gravity_forms/1-ec61c9cb232a03a96d0947c6478e525e/2016/08/jurnal-1.pdf)
- Kathrin, B. (2019). Collaborative governance in the making: Implementation of a new forest management regime in an old-growth conflict region of British Columbia, Canada. *Land Use Policy*, 86(April), 43–53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2019.04.019>
- Kuncoro, M. (2004). *Regional Autonomy & Development*. Erlangga.
- Lebo, F.B. (2019). Evaluating a collaborative governance regime in renewable energy: Wind power and the Lake Erie Energy Development Corporation (LEEDCo). *Environmental Development*, 32(October 2018), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envdev.2019.06.004>
- Lestari, D., & Muktiali, M. (2017). The Role of Stakeholders in the

- Development of Water Hyacinth Clusters in Banyubiru District. *Journal of Region and Environment*, 5(3), 141. <https://doi.org/10.14710/jwl.5.3.141-155>
- Marcucci, E., Gatta, V., Marciani, M., & Cossu, P. (2017). Measuring the effects of an urban freight policy package defined via a collaborative governance model. *Research in Transportation Economics*, 65, 3–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.retrec.2017.09.001>
- O'Leary, R., & Vij, N. (2012). Collaborative Public Management. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 42(5), 507–522. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074012445780>
- Ostrom, E. (1990). Institutional Analysis and Development: Elements of The Framework in Historical Perspective. In *Historical Developments and Theoretical Approaches in Sociology: Vol. II*.
- Pamungkas, OD, & Sudibyoy, DP (2021). Collaborative Governance in the Uninhabitable House Improvement Program in Surakarta City. *Journal of Governance and Policy Innovation*, 1(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.51577/jgpi.v1i1.68>
- Pratama, I., & Salmon, P. (2019). Implementation of Collaborative Governance in Slum Eradication and Local Potential Development Issues in Coastal Areas of Tangerang Regency. *Journal of Public Administration and Government*, 1, 21–34.
- Riadi, S., & Rivai, A. (2020). Community Participation in Implementing the Poor Residents' House Renovation Program in Silae Village, Ulujadi District, Palu City. *Journal of Public Administration and Government*, 2(2), 54–59. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.22487/jpag.v2i2.110>
- Sedarmayanti. (2003). Good Governance in the context of regional autonomy, efforts to build effective and efficient organizations through restructuring and empowerment. (Issue Part 1). <http://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&btnG=Search&q=intitle:Policy+Networks+and+Good+Governance+?+A+Discussion#0>
- Sedlacek, S., Tötzer, T., & Lund-Durlacher, D. (2020). Collaborative governance in energy regions – Experiences from an Austrian region. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 256. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.120256>
- Thompson, G., & Pforr, C. (2005). Policy Networks and Good Governance – A Discussion. 10. <http://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&btnG=Search&q=intitle:Policy+Networks+and+Good+Governance+?+A+Discussion#0>
- Wasistiono, S. (2010). Regional Financial and Asset Management: A Structural Approach Towards Good Governance. In Bandung: Fokusmedia.
- Zaenuri, M. (2016). Tourism-Disaster Governance in the Perspective of Collaborative Governance: Study of Tourism-Disaster Volcano Tour Merapi in Sleman Regency.
- 1945 Constitution Article 28 concerning Human Rights;  
Law No. 23 of 2014 concerning Regional Government;

Minister of Education and Culture Regulation No. 3 of 2020 concerning National Standards for Higher Education;  
Mayor Regulation No. 56 of 2023 concerning Guidelines for Implementing the Repair of Uninhabitable Houses;  
Regional Regulation No. 8 of 2012 concerning Social and Environmental Responsibility of Limited Liability Companies;  
Decree of the Head of the Perkim Service No. 800/Kep.Big.Perkim/2023 Concerning Guidelines for Implementing the Repair of Uninhabitable Houses.

---