

George C. Edward III's Policy Implementation Model in the Livable Housing Development Program in North Bolaang Mongondow Regency

Supriadi Goma^{1*}, Rahmisyari², Arifin³

^{1,2,3}Universitas Ichsan Gorontalo, Indonesia

*Corresponding author: arifin.unisan@gmail.com

Abstract

This study analyzes the implementation of the Livable Housing Development Program in North Bolaang Mongondow Regency using George C. Edward III's policy implementation model. The analysis focuses on communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure, while also identifying contextual supporting and inhibiting factors. A qualitative case-study design was used. Data were designed to be obtained through in-depth interviews, observation, and documentation involving purposively selected actors from the housing agency, field facilitators, sub-district and village governments, social affairs officials, beneficiaries, and an academic informant. Data analysis followed the Miles and Huberman interactive model and data credibility was addressed through source triangulation, technique triangulation, and member checking. The findings indicate that policy transmission has operated through formal and digital channels, but clarity and consistency remain uneven, particularly regarding beneficiary self-help obligations, material distribution schedules, and technical information. Resources are available but are constrained by personnel, operational support, logistics, fiscal capacity, and the integration of social and technical beneficiary data. Implementers generally show positive disposition and commitment, although support intensity varies across locations. The bureaucratic structure and division of roles are relatively clear, but special cases are handled slowly because escalation procedures are not sufficiently adaptive. Geographical conditions, weather, local mutual cooperation, builder availability, and beneficiary capacity strengthen or weaken implementation. The study recommends standardized beneficiary communication, improved facilitator-to-area allocation, integrated data verification, performance indicators for facilitation, and time-bound escalation procedures.

Keywords: Policy Implementation; George C. Edward III; Livable Housing; Communication; Resources; Bureaucratic Structure

INTRODUCTION

Livable housing is a basic public service closely related to safety, health, dignity, and quality of life. Government housing programs therefore require not only adequate policy design and budget allocation but also effective implementation at the local level. In practice, housing assistance involves multiple actors, including local government agencies, village governments, field facilitators, technical personnel, and beneficiary households. The interaction among these actors determines whether policy objectives are translated into completed and occupied houses.

The implementation of the Livable Housing Development Program in North Bolaang Mongondow Regency presents a particular administrative challenge because beneficiaries are geographically dispersed and implementation depends on coordination, logistics, field supervision, and beneficiary self-help capacity. The supplied research document indicates that the program covers processes of beneficiary identification, verification, technical planning, material distribution, facilitation, monitoring, and coordination across administrative levels. Such a setting makes policy implementation a process issue rather than merely a matter of counting completed housing units.

George C. Edward III's model provides a useful analytical framework because it emphasizes four determinants of implementation: communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure. Communication concerns transmission, clarity, and consistency of policy messages; resources encompass personnel, budgets, facilities, information, and authority; disposition refers to implementers' understanding, acceptance, and commitment; and bureaucratic structure concerns standard operating procedures, division of responsibilities, and coordination mechanisms. The model is particularly relevant when implementation performance varies across locations despite a common policy framework.

Previous studies cited in the research document show that housing and poverty-reduction programs may face problems related to coordination, administrative requirements, resources, beneficiary data, and geographical accessibility. However, studies that examine the four Edward III variables together in the context of a geographically dispersed housing program in North Bolaang Mongondow remain limited. This contextual gap is important because local geography, social cooperation, beneficiary capacity, and

inter-organizational coordination can modify how the four implementation variables operate.

Accordingly, this study aims to analyze the implementation of the Livable Housing Development Program in North Bolaang Mongondow Regency through the four variables of George C. Edward III and to identify contextual factors that support or constrain implementation. The study contributes by interpreting the Edward III model in a local housing-policy context in which geographical access, beneficiary readiness, social capital, and administrative coordination interact.

THEORETICAL REVIEW

Policy implementation.

Policy implementation refers to the process through which policy decisions are translated into actions by governmental and non-governmental actors to achieve predetermined objectives. Edward III emphasizes that a well-designed policy can still fail when implementation conditions are inadequate. The model identifies communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure as central determinants of implementation.

George C. Edward III model.

Communication must be transmitted accurately, clearly, and consistently to the actors responsible for implementation and to the target group. Resources include human resources, budget, facilities, information, and authority required to carry out policy. Disposition refers to implementers' willingness, understanding, acceptance, and commitment to execute policy. Bureaucratic structure concerns procedures and division of authority that organize implementation. In this study, the four dimensions are operationalized in the context of the Livable Housing Development Program.

Livable housing program.

The program is a local government intervention intended to improve housing conditions for low-income households. The research document identifies key implementation stages including beneficiary data collection, verification, technical assessment, beneficiary determination, material provision, construction assistance, monitoring, and handover. The program therefore depends on coordination between formal government structures and community-level participation.

Research gap and analytical proposition.

Existing studies cited in the thesis generally indicate that communication, resources, implementer commitment, administrative procedures, and local conditions affect housing-program implementation. The present study extends this discussion by examining how the four Edward III dimensions interact with geographical dispersion, mutual cooperation, beneficiary readiness, and logistical constraints. The analytical proposition is that implementation effectiveness is achieved when communication is mutually understood, resources are matched with geographical and case complexity, implementer commitment is institutionalized, and bureaucratic procedures remain accountable while being sufficiently adaptive to special cases.

METHOD**Research design.**

The study uses a descriptive qualitative approach with a case-study strategy. The design is intended to describe and interpret implementation processes in their real administrative and social context without manipulating variables.

Setting and study population.

The study is located in North Bolaang Mongondow Regency, focusing on the Department of Housing, Settlement Areas and Land Affairs and the actors involved in the Livable Housing Development Program. The program context covers six sub-districts and dispersed beneficiary locations, creating practical demands for communication, transportation, monitoring, and data verification.

Sampling technique/procedure.

Purposive sampling is used to select informants who possess direct knowledge or experience of program implementation. The research document identifies ten informants representing the housing agency, technical/field facilitators, sub-district and village government, social-data management, beneficiaries with different implementation conditions, and an academic informant for theoretical triangulation.

Code	Informant position	Role
------	--------------------	------

INF-01-KD	Head of Housing Agency	Key policy implementer
INF-02-KB	Head of relevant technical division	Technical implementer
INF-03-PT	Technical/field facilitator	Field implementation
INF-04-CM	Sub-district head	Territorial coordination
INF-05-KL	Village head/Lurah	Village implementation
INF-06-SP	Social Affairs data staff	Data support
INF-07-RS	Beneficiary—completed house	Beneficiary perspective
INF-08-DP	Beneficiary—house in progress	Beneficiary perspective
INF-09-AK	Beneficiary—problematic/stopped case	Negative-case perspective
INF-10-AK	Academic	Theoretical triangulation

Instruments and data collection.

Data collection uses semi-structured interviews, observation, and documentation. Interview questions cover transmission, clarity, and consistency of communication; human resources, budget, facilities, and beneficiary data; implementer understanding, acceptance, and commitment; and standard procedures, division of tasks, and coordination. Documentation includes technical guidelines, budget documents, beneficiary data, activity reports, meeting records, and policy documents.

Data analysis.

Data are analyzed using the Miles and Huberman interactive model consisting of data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing/verification. Data are coded around the four Edward III dimensions and contextual factors. Credibility is strengthened through source triangulation, technique triangulation, and member checking.

RESULTS

Communication.

Policy transmission operates through formal letters, coordination meetings, village-level socialization, field facilitators, telephone communication, and WhatsApp groups. These channels enable rapid exchange of photographs, videos, locations, and progress information. However, the clarity and consistency of messages are not fully uniform. Differences remain concerning beneficiary self-help obligations, labor costs, distribution schedules, additional materials, and the status of unused materials. Thus, transmission is relatively strong, while message clarity and consistency require improvement.

Resources.

The program has basic resources in the form of government personnel, field facilitators, budgetary support, facilities, and beneficiary data. Nevertheless, resource adequacy is uneven. Field personnel are limited relative to the geographic spread of beneficiaries; operational transport and communication support are important; fiscal capacity does not fully cover the broader housing backlog; and beneficiaries differ in their ability to finance complementary costs. Social and technical housing data also require factual verification because poverty databases do not automatically describe current physical housing conditions.

Disposition.

Implementers generally understand and accept the program objectives and demonstrate commitment through verification, monitoring, facilitation, and problem solving. Positive disposition is also reflected in efforts to maintain beneficiary criteria despite informal requests. Nevertheless, the intensity of commitment differs among villages and implementation levels. Some local governments actively support beneficiaries, while others rely heavily on field facilitators. Beneficiary willingness to accept assistance also does not always imply readiness to meet self-help obligations.

Bureaucratic structure.

The program has an identifiable implementation flow covering village proposals, administrative screening, factual verification, beneficiary determination, technical preparation, implementation, facilitation, inspection, and handover. Roles are relatively clear: the housing agency leads technical implementation; social affairs supports social data;

69

sub-district and village governments facilitate local coordination; and field facilitators connect technical requirements with beneficiary conditions. The main weakness arises in special cases such as beneficiary replacement, data changes, stalled construction, material shortages, and technical adjustments. These cases often require several layers of clarification and approval, creating delays.

Supporting and inhibiting factors.

Key supporting factors include leadership and implementer commitment, field facilitators, active village governments, digital communication, factual verification, beneficiary readiness, and local mutual cooperation. Major constraints include geographical access, weather, transportation costs, material availability, limited personnel, data inconsistency, beneficiary economic capacity, builder availability, and slow administrative escalation for special cases.

Dimension	Main finding	Implementation implication
Communication	Transmission is available, but clarity and consistency vary.	Standardize information and establish a single clarification channel.
Resources	Personnel, logistics, fiscal capacity and data integration remain constrained.	Allocate resources according to area difficulty and beneficiary risk.
Disposition	Commitment is generally positive but varies across actors and locations.	Institutionalize commitment through supervision and performance indicators.
Bureaucratic structure	Roles and procedures are clear for routine cases but slow for special cases.	Create adaptive, time-bound escalation procedures.
Context	Geography, weather, mutual cooperation and beneficiary capacity shape outcomes.	Use local risk mapping in planning and monitoring.

DISCUSSION

Communication and implementation.

The findings reinforce Edward III's argument that communication is not merely the existence of transmission channels. A policy message must also be understood accurately and consistently by implementers and target groups. In the housing program, formal communication provides administrative legitimacy, while digital communication accelerates field coordination. Yet differences in beneficiary understanding regarding self-help obligations and material status show that rapid transmission cannot substitute for message clarity. The finding is consistent with studies cited in the thesis that emphasize coordination and administrative clarity in local housing and poverty-reduction programs.

Resources and geographical context.

The findings demonstrate that resource adequacy should be assessed relative to geographical and case complexity rather than by nominal quantities alone. A limited number of facilitators may be sufficient in a compact service area but inadequate when beneficiaries are widely dispersed. Transport time, weather, material delivery, and beneficiary self-help capacity convert geographical conditions into resource requirements. This extends the application of Edward III by showing that resources are context-dependent implementation capacity.

Disposition as institutionalized commitment.

Positive disposition supports implementation because actors are willing to verify beneficiaries, monitor construction, and solve problems. However, reliance on individual initiative creates inconsistency. Commitment becomes more durable when it is translated into routines, supervision, performance indicators, and clear responsibilities. The finding is in line with the thesis discussion that implementer commitment must be institutionalized rather than treated solely as an individual moral attribute.

Bureaucratic structure and adaptive accountability.

The study does not indicate that bureaucracy is absent; rather, the problem lies in the adaptability of procedures to non-routine cases. SOPs provide accountability and traceability, but excessive layers of approval can slow decisions when beneficiaries stop construction, data change, or materials become unavailable. Therefore, the policy implication is not to remove controls but to distinguish routine and special cases and

establish a time-bound escalation mechanism. This interpretation is consistent with the literature cited in the thesis regarding administrative complexity in housing rehabilitation programs.

Contextual contribution.

The study's main analytical contribution is the contextualization of the Edward III model. Geography, local mutual cooperation, beneficiary readiness, builder availability, and coordination do not replace the four core variables; they strengthen or weaken how the variables operate. For example, geography increases resource requirements, mutual cooperation can compensate for logistical limitations, and fragmented coordination can reduce the effectiveness of otherwise adequate communication and bureaucratic structures. The model is therefore most useful when applied with sensitivity to local implementation conditions.

CONCLUSION

The Livable Housing Development Program in North Bolaang Mongondow Regency has established basic implementation structures, actors, communication channels, resources, and implementer commitment. Nevertheless, implementation effectiveness is not yet uniform across locations. Communication is relatively well transmitted but remains uneven in clarity and consistency; resources exist but are constrained by personnel, logistics, fiscal capacity, beneficiary readiness, and data integration; disposition is generally positive but varies in intensity; and bureaucratic procedures are clear for routine cases but insufficiently adaptive for special cases. Geographical conditions, weather, mutual cooperation, builder availability, and beneficiary economic capacity operate as contextual factors that strengthen or weaken the four Edward III dimensions. The study therefore concludes that implementation improvement requires an integrated approach rather than strengthening a single dimension in isolation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Standardize a beneficiary information package explaining assistance components, self-help obligations, estimated additional costs, material status, work stages, complaint channels, and consequences of non-completion. Adjust field-facilitator allocation, transport support, and monitoring frequency to geographic accessibility and case complexity. Integrate social beneficiary databases with technical housing verification and require factual verification before final beneficiary determination.

Convert implementer commitment into measurable routines through supervision, facilitation-performance indicators, and periodic evaluation. Develop a special-case escalation SOP specifying case categories, responsible officers, minimum documentation, decision authority, and maximum response time.

LIMITATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

The study is bounded by a single local government context and a qualitative case-study design, which limits statistical generalization. Future research could compare several regencies, incorporate beneficiary outcome indicators, and examine how geographic accessibility, social capital, fiscal capacity, or digital coordination influence the effectiveness of policy implementation. A mixed-method design could also connect implementation processes with measurable housing completion, timeliness, targeting accuracy, and beneficiary satisfaction.

REFERENCES

- Statistics Indonesia (BPS) of North Bolaang Mongondow Regency. (2025). North Bolaang Mongondow Regency Statistics.
- Da Costa. (2024). [Reference as listed in the research document].
- Dewi, & Purnamasari. (2024). [Reference on RUTILAHU implementation as listed in the research document].
- Edward III, G. C. (1980). Implementing Public Policy. Congressional Quarterly Press.
- Ilhami, et al. (2024). Research methods. [Publisher as listed in the research document].
- Kogoya, et al. (2024). [Reference on program implementation as listed in the research document].
- Lamagoa, et al. (2025). [Reference on poverty-policy implementation as listed in the research document].
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (2014). Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Moleong, L. J. (2017). Qualitative Research Methodology (Revised Edition). PT Remaja Rosdakarya.



- Nugroho, R. (2018). Building Superior Public Policy in the Democratic Era. *Jurnal Academia Praja*, 8(2), 21–37.
- Pateda, N., Sulila, I., & Isa, R. (2024). Implementation of poverty alleviation policy through the habitable housing program in Gorontalo City. *Socius: Jurnal Penelitian Ilmu-Ilmu Sosial*, 1(9). <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.11091621>
- North Bolaang Mongondow Regency Government. (2022). North Bolaang Mongondow Regent Regulation Number 35 of 2022 concerning the Status, Organizational Structure, Duties and Functions, and Work Procedures of Regional Government Agencies.
- North Bolaang Mongondow Regency Government. (2023). North Bolaang Mongondow Regent Regulation Number 14 of 2023 concerning Amendments to Regent Regulation Number 35 of 2022.
- Rohaniati, et al. (2021). [Reference on *Rumah Tidak Layak Huni* (Uninhabitable Housing) in Karawang as listed in the research document].
- Rohmaturizki, & Rahmawati. (2025). [Reference on livable-housing implementation challenges as listed in the research document].
- Setiawan, & Nawangsari. (2023). [Reference on *Rutilahu* and collaborative implementation as listed in the research document].
- Sugiyono. (2019). *Quantitative, Qualitative, and R&D Research Methods*. Alfabeta.
- Van Meter, D. S., & Van Horn, C. E. (1975). The policy implementation process: A conceptual framework. *Administration & Society*, 6(4), 445–488.
- Winarno, B. (2018). *Public Policy: Theory, Process, and Case Studies (Revised Edition)*. CAPS.
- Wijaya, M., et al. (2025). Has housing policy for low-income communities in Indonesia undergone significant reform? [Journal details as listed in the research document].
- Yuliana, L. (2025). *Public policy implementation in Indonesia: Theory and practice*. PT Bumi Aksara.

