



Implementation of The Self-Help Assistance Program for Uninhabitable Houses (Bsrtlh) in Bintan Buyu Village, Bintan Regency, in 2025

Agung Catur Saputra^{1*}, Nazaki², Kustiawan³

¹⁻³ Universitas Maritim Raja Ali Haji

email: wwaguncatursaputra@gmail.com¹

Article Info :

Received:

20-07-2026

Revised:

02-08-2026

Accepted:

10-08-2026

Abstract

This study analyzes the implementation of the Self-Help Assistance Program for Uninhabitable Houses (BSRTLH) in Bintan Buyu Village, Teluk Bintan District, Bintan Regency, in 2025. The study employed a descriptive qualitative approach to examine policy implementation based on George C. Edward III's framework, encompassing communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure. Data were collected through in-depth interviews, documentation, and literature review involving government officials, Field Facilitators (TFL), village authorities, and beneficiary households. The findings indicate that communication was generally effective through socialization, coordination, and direct assistance, although some beneficiaries still misunderstood the stimulant nature of the program. Resources were relatively supportive through the availability of personnel, information, authority, and facilities, but administrative requirements, limited internet connectivity, and budget constraints remained challenges. Implementers demonstrated supportive dispositions through commitment, responsiveness, and active assistance to beneficiaries. Nevertheless, the allocation of six assistance units with only five realized, alongside the remaining housing needs, indicates that implementation has not fully addressed local demand. Strengthening communication, administrative assistance, resource allocation, digital infrastructure, and interinstitutional coordination is therefore necessary to improve program effectiveness and achieve more equitable access to adequate housing.

Keywords: BSRTLH, policy implementation, uninhabitable houses, housing assistance, local government.



©2026 Naira Andira. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial 4.0 International License.
(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

INTRODUCTION

Development is fundamentally a process aimed at improving community welfare through the fulfillment of basic needs and the enhancement of quality of life in a sustainable manner. One of the issues that remains a concern in regional development is poverty, which is not only associated with limited income but also with limited access to adequate housing. The existence of uninhabitable houses indicates that some communities, particularly low-income groups, continue to face difficulties in obtaining housing that is safe, healthy, and meets adequate living standards. This condition makes improving housing quality an important component of social development policies and efforts to improve community welfare (Desyra et al., 2021; R. S. Dewi & Purnamasari, 2024).

Housing does not merely function as a place of shelter but also constitutes an important element in creating a healthy, safe, and dignified living environment for communities. Housing conditions involving deficiencies in building safety, health, sanitation, and adequate space may affect the quality of life of the families who occupy them. Therefore, the provision and improvement of adequate housing has become one form of government intervention to reduce the social vulnerability of low-income communities. Previous studies have demonstrated that housing assistance programs can serve as policy instruments for improving physical housing conditions while supporting the fulfillment of communities' basic needs (Ardiansyah & Prabawati, 2023; Amelia, 2017).

Within the context of regional policy, the Government of Bintan Regency has implemented the Self-Help Assistance Program for Uninhabitable Houses (Bantuan Swadaya Rumah Tidak Layak Huni/BSRTLH) as an effort to improve the quality of housing for low-income communities. The program is based on Bintan Regent Regulation Number 26 of 2022 concerning the Guidelines for the Implementation of Self-Help Assistance for Uninhabitable Houses, which regulates the mechanism

for providing assistance to eligible communities. BSRTLH is provided as a stimulant assistance program to support housing improvement or construction through financial assistance that can be used to purchase building materials and pay construction labor. Through this mechanism, the program is not only directed toward improving the physical quality of houses but also toward encouraging community involvement in the construction process through self-help efforts (Bintan Regent Regulation, 2022).

The implementation of the BSRTLH Program constitutes part of Bintan Regency's regional development agenda, which places the improvement of settlement quality and community welfare among its development priorities. In the Regional Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJMD) of Bintan Regency for 2025–2029, improving settlement quality is incorporated into the government's efforts to improve community living conditions. In 2025, the Bintan Regency Government, through the Housing and Settlement Area Agency, allocated a budget of IDR 1.47 billion to assist 41 houses belonging to low-income communities across several areas. This level of government support demonstrates that the BSRTLH Program has a strategic position within regional policies aimed at improving access to adequate housing for low-income communities (Bintankab, 2025; Bintan Regency RPJMD, 2025–2029).

Although the program has received policy and budgetary support, its implementation at the local level continues to encounter issues that require more in-depth examination. Bintan Buyu Village, Teluk Bintan District, received an allocation of six BSRTLH assistance units in 2025, but only five units were realized, leaving one allocated assistance unit unrealized. This condition demonstrates a discrepancy between the planned target and the actual implementation in the field, while Bintan Buyu Village still has approximately 82 uninhabitable houses, indicating that the community's need for housing assistance remains relatively high. The gap between needs, allocations, and realization indicates the existence of implementation issues that need to be examined in terms of implementation processes, implementer capacity, communication, resources, and bureaucratic mechanisms.

Studies concerning housing assistance programs have previously been conducted by a number of researchers using diverse focuses and approaches. Mukhlis et al. (2023) evaluated the Self-Help Housing Stimulant Assistance Program (BSPS), emphasizing program achievement and its impact on beneficiaries, while Windriyana and Widowati (2025) analyzed the implementation of the Uninhabitable Houses (RTLH) Program in Warugunung Village using Riant Nugroho's policy implementation perspective. Hidayat (2016) examined the implementation of the Social Rehabilitation Program for Uninhabitable Houses in Karimun Regency, focusing on program implementation and its inhibiting factors, whereas Khairunisa and Hayati (2021) and Ulumudin et al. (2020) emphasized the evaluation of implementation and the achievement of housing assistance programs. These findings demonstrate that the success of housing assistance programs is determined not only by the availability of funding but also by the quality of implementation, coordination, implementer capacity, community participation, and the alignment between policies and conditions in the field (Khairunisa & Hayati, 2021; Mukhlis et al., 2023; Ulumudin et al., 2020).

Although research on BSPS, RTLH, and housing assistance programs has developed considerably, there remains a research gap concerning the implementation of the BSRTLH Program within the local context of Bintan Regency, particularly in Bintan Buyu Village. Previous studies have largely examined program effectiveness, evaluation, impacts, or achievements, whereas the discrepancy between the allocation and realization of assistance at the village level requires greater attention to the implementation process itself. This study employs the policy implementation perspective of George C. Edward III, which analyzes implementation through four principal variables: communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure. The application of this framework is expected to provide a more comprehensive understanding of how the BSRTLH Program is implemented, the factors that support or constrain its implementation, and the reasons why the assistance target has not been fully realized in Bintan Buyu Village.

An examination of the implementation of the BSRTLH Program in Bintan Buyu Village is important because the success of a housing assistance policy cannot be assessed solely on the basis of the existence of the program and the amount of funding provided, but also on the ability of implementers to translate the policy into targeted and effective actions. Administrative problems, budget limitations, the need for stronger coordination, and differences in community understanding of the assistance mechanism may affect the achievement of program objectives if they are not properly

addressed. Therefore, an implementation analysis is necessary to identify the actual conditions of program implementation while determining aspects that require improvement in the provision of adequate housing assistance for low-income communities. Based on these considerations, this study aims to analyze the implementation of the Self-Help Assistance Program for Uninhabitable Houses (BSRTLH) in Bintan Buyu Village, Teluk Bintan District, Bintan Regency, in 2025 using George C. Edward III's policy implementation theory as the analytical framework.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study employed a descriptive qualitative approach to examine the implementation of the Self-Help Assistance Program for Uninhabitable Houses (BSRTLH) in Bintan Buyu Village, Teluk Bintan District, Bintan Regency, in 2025. A qualitative design was selected to obtain an in-depth understanding of the policy implementation process by examining the experiences, perceptions, and practices of actors directly involved in the program. The study site was purposively selected because Bintan Buyu Village was one of the beneficiaries of the BSRTLH program in 2025 and exhibited a discrepancy between the number of housing assistance units allocated and those actually realized. Research informants were selected using purposive sampling and consisted of officials from the Bintan Regency Housing and Settlement Area Agency, the Head of the Housing Division, Field Facilitators (TFL), the Head of Bintan Buyu Village, and five BSRTLH beneficiary households.

Data were obtained from both primary and secondary sources. Primary data were collected through in-depth interviews with selected informants, while secondary data were obtained from official government documents, relevant regulations, reports from the Bintan Regency Housing and Settlement Area Agency, and scholarly literature related to housing assistance policy. Data collection employed three complementary techniques: interviews, documentation, and literature review, enabling the researchers to examine the implementation process from multiple sources. The collected data were analyzed using the Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña interactive model, consisting of data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing, while source triangulation was applied to strengthen the credibility of the findings; the analysis was guided by George C. Edward III's policy implementation framework, which comprises communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Communication in the Implementation of the BSRTLH Program

Communication constitutes a fundamental dimension in the implementation of the Self-Help Assistance Program for Uninhabitable Houses (BSRTLH) because the effectiveness of policy implementation depends substantially on whether policy information is transmitted accurately and understood consistently by all actors involved. In the context of Bintan Buyu Village, communication connects the Bintan Regency Housing and Settlement Area Agency, Field Facilitators (TFL), village government, and beneficiary households within a common implementation framework. The findings indicate that communication was established through direct socialization, formal notifications, coordination among implementing actors, and continuous assistance during the implementation process. This finding confirms that policy implementation cannot be separated from the capacity of implementing institutions to transform formal policy provisions into information that can be understood and acted upon by the target community.

The transmission of information represents the first important component of communication because policy objectives, eligibility requirements, implementation procedures, and forms of assistance must reach the actors responsible for executing the program. In Bintan Buyu Village, information concerning the BSRTLH Program was transmitted from the Housing and Settlement Area Agency to Field Facilitators, village officials, and prospective beneficiaries through socialization activities and official communication mechanisms. Field Facilitators subsequently functioned as an intermediary between government institutions and households by providing explanations, assisting administrative processes, and accompanying beneficiaries during the implementation stages. This multilayered transmission mechanism was important because the program involved actors operating at different institutional levels and possessing different degrees of understanding regarding government housing policy.

The findings further demonstrate that direct communication played a particularly important role in reaching beneficiaries. Socialization meetings provided opportunities for implementing agencies to explain the objectives of the BSRTLH Program, beneficiary requirements, implementation procedures, and the nature of the assistance provided. Direct interaction also allowed community members to ask questions and obtain clarification concerning issues that could not be adequately understood through written information alone. This approach is consistent with findings from Desyra et al. (2021), who demonstrated that the implementation of self-help housing assistance requires communication between government institutions, facilitators, village-level actors, and communities to ensure that the objectives and mechanisms of the program are properly understood.

The transmission process was also strengthened through coordination between the Housing and Settlement Area Agency, village government, and TFL. Rather than relying exclusively on one-way dissemination, information was communicated through a hierarchical and participatory process in which implementing actors could clarify information before it reached beneficiaries. The TFL played a particularly important role because their position allowed them to translate administrative and technical requirements into explanations that were more accessible to households. Such an intermediary role is important in housing assistance programs because beneficiaries may face administrative, technical, and informational barriers that affect their ability to participate effectively in the program.

The second dimension of communication concerns clarity, particularly whether information concerning the program can be understood without producing different interpretations among implementing actors and beneficiaries. The study found that information concerning administrative requirements, implementation procedures, and the stimulant nature of the assistance was generally communicated through socialization materials, formal implementation guidelines, direct meetings, and question-and-answer sessions. These mechanisms provided beneficiaries with multiple opportunities to understand the program before and during implementation. Nevertheless, the findings also indicate that not all beneficiaries possessed an equally comprehensive understanding of the program, particularly regarding the distinction between stimulant assistance and full government-funded house construction.

Table 1. Communication Dimensions in the Implementation of the Housing Assistance Program

Communication Component	Implementation Mechanism	Main Information Conveyed	Empirical Finding
Information transmission	Socialization, official notifications, TFL assistance	Program objectives, requirements, procedures	Information reached implementing actors and beneficiaries
Information clarity	Direct explanation, implementation guidelines, question-and-answer sessions	Eligibility, administrative requirements, form of assistance	Generally understood, although some beneficiaries misunderstood the stimulant nature of assistance
Information consistency	Coordination among agency, village government, and TFL	Uniform interpretation of program provisions	Substantive information remained consistent across implementing actors
Community assistance	Field facilitation and repeated explanation	Administrative and technical procedures	Assistance reduced misunderstanding but required continued strengthening

Source: Author's analysis based on interview and documentary findings, 2025–2026.

The table indicates that the communication mechanism was relatively comprehensive because transmission, clarity, consistency, and community assistance were implemented through interconnected channels. However, the existence of communication mechanisms does not automatically guarantee uniform understanding among beneficiaries. The finding that some residents perceived BSRTLH as a program that would finance the construction of a house in full indicates a gap between the information delivered by implementers and the interpretation formed by some community members. This distinction is important because misunderstanding concerning the form of assistance can influence beneficiary expectations and potentially create dissatisfaction during implementation.

The third component, namely consistency, was reflected in the relatively uniform information communicated by the Housing and Settlement Area Agency, village government, and TFL. The findings indicate that the implementing actors referred to the same program guidelines, thereby reducing the possibility of contradictory information concerning eligibility, procedures, and the form of assistance. When beneficiaries experienced uncertainty, implementing actors provided further explanations to ensure that the information received remained aligned with the applicable program provisions. This finding is relevant to the broader literature on housing assistance, in which implementation effectiveness is influenced by the consistency between formal policy provisions and their interpretation at the local level (Dewi & Purnamasari, 2024; Windriyana & Widowati, 2025).

The consistency of communication also contributed to coordination among the institutions involved in the program. The Housing and Settlement Area Agency operated at the policy and administrative level, the village government supported community-level communication, and TFL provided technical and procedural assistance. This division created a communication chain through which information could move from the policy-making level to the beneficiary level while allowing feedback from the community to return to the implementing institutions. Similar institutional coordination has been emphasized in studies of BSPS and RTLH programs, which show that the involvement of local government, facilitators, and beneficiary communities is necessary to translate housing assistance policies into practical interventions (Ardiansyah & Prabawati, 2023; Mukhlis et al., 2023).

Nevertheless, the communication findings also reveal that the principal challenge was not necessarily the absence of information but differences in the community's capacity to interpret and internalize that information. Some beneficiaries continued to perceive the program differently from its intended design, particularly regarding the extent of government assistance and the role of community self-help. This condition suggests that communication should not be evaluated solely on the basis of whether socialization activities have been conducted, but also on the basis of whether beneficiaries demonstrate an adequate understanding of the information provided. In this regard, Aini et al. (2024) emphasize the importance of community participation and self-help mechanisms in housing assistance programs, indicating that effective communication is closely connected to beneficiaries' understanding of their responsibilities within the program.

Overall, the communication dimension in the implementation of the BSRTLH Program in Bintan Buyu Village can be characterized as relatively effective but not yet fully optimal. Information transmission has reached the principal implementing actors and beneficiaries, direct socialization has provided opportunities for clarification, and coordination among the Housing and Settlement Area Agency, village government, and TFL has contributed to information consistency. However, differences in beneficiary understanding indicate that communication requires continued reinforcement through repeated socialization, more accessible explanations, and intensive assistance during the administrative and construction stages. This finding supports the argument that successful housing policy implementation requires not only formal policy guidelines but also continuous communication and community engagement, as demonstrated in previous studies of BSPS and RTLH implementation (Hidayat, 2016; Khairunisa & Hayati, 2021; Esariti et al., 2020).

Resources in the Implementation of the BSRTLH Program

Resources constitute a critical dimension in policy implementation because the availability and adequacy of human, informational, institutional, and material resources determine whether policy objectives can be translated into concrete actions. In the implementation of the Self-Help Assistance Program for Uninhabitable Houses (BSRTLH) in Bintan Buyu Village, resources were examined

through four dimensions: staff, information, authority, and facilities. The findings indicate that the program was supported by personnel from the Bintan Regency Housing and Settlement Area Agency, Field Facilitators (TFL), and the village government, each of whom performed different functions within the implementation process. This configuration indicates that the implementation capacity of BSRTLH was not dependent on a single institution but on the interaction and coordination of several implementing actors.

The availability of competent staff was particularly important because BSRTLH requires administrative verification, technical assessment, community facilitation, and supervision of housing improvement activities. The Housing and Settlement Area Agency functioned as the principal implementing institution responsible for policy direction and program targets, while technical officials coordinated field implementation. TFL played a more operational role by assisting beneficiaries with administrative procedures, verifying housing conditions, providing technical guidance, and facilitating communication between households and government institutions. The village government also contributed to beneficiary identification, data collection, and community assistance, thereby creating a multilayered implementation structure that supported program delivery.

The findings suggest that the division of responsibilities among implementing personnel was relatively clear. The agency operated at the policy and administrative level, technical officials managed implementation within their respective areas, TFL provided field-level technical assistance, and the village government supported the process at the community level. This distribution reduced the possibility of overlapping responsibilities and allowed each actor to focus on functions corresponding to their institutional position. Such an arrangement is consistent with the findings of Desyra et al. (2021), who emphasize the importance of coordination between implementing agencies, field facilitators, village-level actors, and beneficiary communities in the implementation of self-help housing programs.

Human resources were also important in overcoming practical difficulties experienced by beneficiaries. The study found that beneficiaries received direct assistance from village officials and TFL from the verification stage through the implementation of assistance. This support was particularly relevant because the program involved administrative and technical requirements that could be difficult for some households to complete independently. In this respect, the role of facilitators extends beyond technical supervision because they also function as institutional intermediaries who help transform government requirements into practical guidance for beneficiaries, a finding that is compatible with research on housing assistance implementation by Ardiansyah and Prabawati (2023).

Information constituted the second major resource in the implementation process. Accurate information was required to identify eligible beneficiaries and to ensure that assistance was directed toward households whose housing conditions and administrative status satisfied the program requirements. The study found that information management was conducted through beneficiary data collection, administrative verification, and direct assessment of housing conditions in the field. Information collected by TFL was subsequently recapitulated and reviewed by the technical team, creating a layered verification process intended to improve the accuracy of beneficiary data.

Table 2. Analysis of Resources Supporting BSRTLH Implementation

Resource Dimension	Main Actor	Implementing	Implementation Function	Empirical Condition
Staff	Housing Agency, TFL, village government		Policy implementation, technical assistance, administration, and community facilitation	Adequate and supported by clear task distribution
Information	TFL and technical team		Data collection, administrative verification, and housing-condition assessment	Systematically managed through field verification
Authority	Housing Agency, TFL,		Policy decisions,	Responsibilities were

	village government	recommendations, technical assistance, and implementation supervision	clearly differentiated
Facilities	Housing Agency, TFL, village government	Digital data collection, documentation, field verification, and budget support	Generally supportive, but internet and budget limitations remained

Source: Author's analysis based on field findings and documentary evidence, 2025–2026

The table demonstrates that the four resource dimensions generally supported the implementation of BSRTLH, although their adequacy was not absolute. Human resources were supported by a relatively clear division of tasks, information was processed through administrative and field verification, authority was distributed according to institutional responsibilities, and facilities supported data collection and documentation. However, the findings also reveal that resource availability should not be understood merely in terms of whether resources exist, but also in terms of whether they are sufficient to address the actual demands of implementation. This distinction is important because the program continued to encounter administrative barriers, technological limitations, and budgetary constraints despite having a functioning implementation structure.

Information management, in particular, contributed to the accuracy of beneficiary targeting. The verification process included checking housing conditions, beneficiary identity, and administrative requirements against the provisions of Bintan Regent Regulation Number 26 of 2022. This mechanism helped ensure that households receiving assistance met the established criteria. However, the study also identified administrative obstacles, including land-ownership legality and incomplete population documents, which could prevent otherwise eligible households from progressing through the assistance process; consequently, the availability of accurate program information was closely connected to beneficiaries' capacity to provide complete supporting documentation.

The authority dimension further strengthened the implementation process because each actor had a defined scope of responsibility. The Housing and Settlement Area Agency retained authority over policy direction, final verification, and beneficiary determination, while the village government provided recommendations based on local conditions and TFL performed technical facilitation, socialization, and field supervision. The findings indicate that implementing actors understood their respective boundaries and that the village government could not arbitrarily alter the beneficiary list after its formal determination. Clear authority arrangements are consistent with Edward III's proposition that implementation requires sufficient authority to enable officials to carry out their assigned responsibilities without creating unnecessary overlap or conflict.

Facilities also played a significant role in supporting program implementation, particularly through the use of digital tools for data collection and field documentation. The study found that geographic-coordinate-based documentation and digital data collection were used to strengthen the accuracy of field verification, while the local government continued to develop supporting facilities on an annual basis. Nevertheless, technological infrastructure was not equally accessible across all field locations, and limited internet connectivity sometimes constrained digital documentation activities. This finding illustrates that technological facilities can strengthen administrative accuracy while simultaneously creating new implementation dependencies when supporting infrastructure is uneven, an issue that should be considered alongside broader concerns regarding the capacity of local housing programs to reach low-income communities effectively (Amelia, 2017; Ulumudin et al., 2020).

The most significant resource constraint identified in the study concerned the availability of funding relative to the scale of housing needs. Although the Bintan Regency Government allocated Rp1.47 billion in 2025 to support 41 housing units across several areas, Bintan Buyu Village received six allocated units and realized only five, while approximately 82 uninhabitable houses remained in the village. This discrepancy illustrates that the existence of a dedicated budget does not necessarily imply that available resources are sufficient to address the full magnitude of housing needs. Similar concerns regarding the relationship between program resources, implementation capacity, and the

achievement of housing assistance objectives have been identified in previous studies of BPS and RTLH programs (Khairunisa & Hayati, 2021; Mukhlis et al., 2023; Sujarwani & Suhandri, 2021).

Overall, the resource dimension of BSRTLH implementation in Bintan Buyu Village can be assessed as relatively supportive but not entirely optimal. Human resources, information, authority, and facilities were available and generally enabled the program to operate, while the involvement of TFL and village officials strengthened assistance at the beneficiary level. However, administrative documentation problems, uneven internet connectivity, and limited budgetary capacity remained important constraints that could affect the expansion and effectiveness of assistance. These findings reinforce the argument that the success of housing assistance policies depends not merely on the formal availability of resources but on their adequacy, distribution, and capacity to respond to the conditions faced by low-income households (Hartono et al., 2025; Muhtadi, 2020).

Disposition of Implementing Actors in the BSRTLH Program

Disposition is a critical factor in policy implementation because the success of a policy depends not only on the availability of resources and clear procedures but also on the attitudes, commitment, and willingness of implementing actors to carry out their responsibilities. In George C. Edward III's framework, a supportive disposition among implementers enables policy objectives to be translated into consistent actions at the operational level. In the implementation of the Self-Help Assistance Program for Uninhabitable Houses (BSRTLH) in Bintan Buyu Village, disposition was examined through two indicators: the appointment of bureaucratic personnel and incentives. The findings indicate that the disposition of implementing actors generally supported program implementation through professional commitment, responsibility, and active assistance to beneficiaries.

The appointment of implementing personnel represents an important element because the competence and suitability of personnel influence their ability to perform policy-related tasks. The findings show that the appointment of Field Facilitators (TFL) was conducted through an established mechanism involving selection, fulfillment of administrative and technical requirements, and placement according to the assigned working area and number of beneficiaries. Such placement was intended to ensure that field assistance corresponded to the needs and characteristics of the implementation area. This finding indicates that personnel assignment was not conducted merely on the basis of institutional availability but was connected to the operational requirements of the BSRTLH Program.

The role of TFL illustrates how the disposition of individual implementers can influence the quality of policy delivery. TFL were responsible for socialization, data collection, verification, and assistance throughout the housing improvement process, requiring not only technical competence but also responsiveness to beneficiaries' needs. The findings demonstrate that TFL understood their responsibilities and actively provided explanations and assistance when beneficiaries encountered difficulties during implementation. This active involvement is consistent with the broader findings of Desyra et al. (2021), which emphasize the importance of field-level facilitation in ensuring that self-help housing programs can be implemented in accordance with their intended objectives.

The positive disposition of implementing actors was also reflected in coordination between TFL and the village government. Rather than operating independently, TFL worked with village officials to facilitate administrative procedures and address questions raised by beneficiaries. This relationship strengthened the operational capacity of the program because village officials were familiar with local community conditions, while TFL possessed the technical knowledge required for housing assistance implementation. Similar coordination between local government actors and technical facilitators has been identified as an important element in the implementation of housing assistance programs (Ardiansyah & Prabawati, 2023; Windriyana & Widowati, 2025).

Beneficiary perceptions further reinforce the finding that implementing actors demonstrated a supportive disposition. The beneficiaries reported that officers were active in providing assistance, explanations, and responses to questions or difficulties encountered during program implementation. Such responsiveness is particularly important in a self-help housing program because beneficiaries are not merely passive recipients but are expected to participate in housing improvement activities. Aini et al. (2024) similarly emphasize the importance of community participation and self-help in housing

assistance programs, indicating that implementers must be capable of encouraging beneficiaries to understand and fulfill their responsibilities within the program.

Table 3. Implementer Commitment, Institutional Support, and Beneficiary Assistance in BSRTLH Implementation

Disposition Indicator		Implementation Mechanism	Evidence from the Study	Assessment
Appointment of bureaucrats		Selection and placement of TFL according to administrative, technical, and territorial requirements	TFL understood their duties and provided assistance from socialization through housing implementation	Supportive
Implementer commitment		Active performance of socialization, verification, facilitation, and monitoring	Implementers demonstrated responsibility and responsiveness toward beneficiaries	Good
Institutional support		Coordination among the Housing Agency, village government, TFL, and community	Implementers received direction, supervision, and field support	Supportive
Incentives		Structural support, supervision, guidance, and community cooperation	Support was not limited to financial incentives but included institutional and operational assistance	Good
Beneficiary assistance		Direct guidance during administrative and construction processes	Beneficiaries received assistance in understanding procedures and implementing activities	Supportive

Source: Author's analysis based on interview and documentary findings, 2025–2026

The table demonstrates that the disposition dimension was supported by both personnel-related and institutional factors. The appointment of TFL according to competence and field requirements created a foundation for effective implementation, while continued coordination and assistance strengthened their capacity to perform their duties. The findings also show that incentives should be interpreted more broadly than direct financial compensation because institutional support, supervision, guidance, and community cooperation also contributed to implementer motivation. This broader understanding is relevant to policy implementation because commitment may emerge from organizational support and professional responsibility as well as from formal material incentives.

The second indicator of disposition, namely incentives, was reflected in various forms of support provided to implementing actors. The study found that incentives were not limited to financial compensation but also included policy support, supervision, assistance, and coordination from the local government, village government, and community. Such support created an environment in which implementers could continue performing their responsibilities despite administrative and operational challenges. The finding corresponds with Edward III's argument that appropriate incentives can strengthen implementers' motivation and commitment to carry out policy responsibilities.

Government commitment was particularly visible through the continued implementation of the BSRTLH Program and the provision of annual budgetary support despite existing challenges. At the technical level, implementers received direction, supervision, and direct assistance to ensure that program activities remained aligned with technical requirements. At the village level, coordination

among TFL, village government, RT/RW representatives, and community members supported identification, data collection, and implementation activities. This institutional support suggests that the disposition of individual implementers was reinforced by an organizational environment that encouraged them to maintain their commitment to program objectives.

The role of community support should also be considered because the BSRTLH Program is designed around a self-help mechanism rather than a fully government-funded housing construction model. Beneficiaries therefore need to understand their responsibilities and participate in the implementation process, while government actors provide facilitation and technical support. The study found that beneficiaries experienced practical benefits from the assistance provided by TFL, particularly in administrative procedures and housing construction activities. This relationship between implementer commitment and beneficiary participation supports previous research emphasizing that housing assistance programs require cooperation between government institutions and communities to achieve adequate housing outcomes (Esariti et al., 2020; Aini et al., 2024).

Overall, the disposition dimension in the implementation of the BSRTLH Program in Bintan Buyu Village can be categorized as good and supportive of policy implementation. Implementers were appointed according to relevant requirements, understood their respective responsibilities, demonstrated commitment, and actively assisted beneficiaries throughout the implementation process. Institutional support in the form of supervision, guidance, coordination, and community participation further strengthened the motivation of implementers to perform their duties. Nevertheless, maintaining this positive disposition requires continuous institutional support and coordination, particularly because administrative barriers, limited budgets, and differences in community understanding may still affect the implementation process; this is consistent with previous studies showing that successful housing assistance programs depend on the commitment of implementing actors as well as the institutional and community environment in which implementation takes place (Hidayat, 2016; Khairunisa & Hayati, 2021; Mukhlis et al., 2023).

CONCLUSION

The implementation of the Self-Help Assistance Program for Uninhabitable Houses (BSRTLH) in Bintan Buyu Village, Teluk Bintan District, Bintan Regency, in 2025 was generally supportive of the program's objectives, although several implementation constraints remained. Based on the four dimensions of George C. Edward III's policy implementation framework, communication was relatively effective through socialization, coordination, and field assistance, although differences in beneficiary understanding regarding the stimulant nature of assistance remained. Resources were generally available through the involvement of the Housing and Settlement Area Agency, Field Facilitators (TFL), and village government, but administrative requirements, limited internet connectivity, and budget constraints affected implementation capacity. The disposition of implementing actors was also supportive, as reflected in their commitment, responsiveness, task understanding, and active assistance to beneficiaries.

The findings indicate that the effectiveness of BSRTLH implementation depends not only on formal policy arrangements and budget availability but also on the capacity of implementing actors to communicate policy information, coordinate resources, maintain commitment, and provide continuous assistance to beneficiaries. The discrepancy between six allocated assistance units and five realized units, alongside the remaining number of uninhabitable houses in Bintan Buyu Village, demonstrates that the program has not yet fully addressed existing housing needs. Therefore, future implementation requires strengthened beneficiary communication, improved administrative assistance, more adequate resource allocation, enhanced digital infrastructure, and sustained coordination among the Housing and Settlement Area Agency, village government, TFL, and beneficiary communities. These improvements are important to ensure that the BSRTLH Program becomes more targeted, responsive, and effective in improving housing conditions and supporting the welfare of low-income communities.

REFERENCES

Aini, D. N., Huda, S., & Fitria, A. (2024). Partisipasi Masyarakat Dalam Program Bps Melalui Upaya Keswadayaan Demi Mewujudkan Rumah Layak Huni Di Desa Pucangombo. *El-Mal*:

- Jurnal Kajian Ekonomi & Bisnis Islam, 5(2), 569-581.
<https://doi.org/10.47467/Elmal.V5i2.4501>
- Amelia, S. (2017). Peningkatan Kualitas Rumah Atau Hunian Melalui Pemberian Bantuan Stimulan Perumahan Swadaya Di Provinsi Kalimantan Barat. *Jurnal Ilmiah Plano Krisna*, 13(1), 9-17.
<https://jurnalteknik.unkris.ac.id/index.php/plano/article/view/466>
- Ardiansyah, F., & Prabawati, I. (2023). Implementasi Program Bantuan Stimulan Perumahan Swadaya (Bsps) Dalam Rangka Peningkatan Rumah Layak Huni Di Kabupaten Sidoarjo. *Jurnal Publika*, 11(4), 2455-2464.
<https://doi.org/10.26740/publika.v11n4.p2455-2464>
- Bintankab. (2025). Kucurkan Anggaran Rp1,47 Miliar Bantuan Swadaya Rtlh Sasar 41 Unit Rumah Di Bintan.
- Desyra, T. E., Dengo, S., & Londa, V. (2021). Implementasi Program Bantuan Stimulan Perumahan Swadaya Dalam Penyediaan Rumah Layak Huni Di Desa Tolok Satu Kecamatan Tomposo Kabupaten Minahasa. *Jurnal Administrasi Publik*, 7(110), 35-45.
<https://ejournal.unsrat.ac.id/v3/index.php/jap/article/view/36273>
- Dewi, R. S., & Purnamasari, H. (2024). Implementasi Kebijakan Program Rumah Tidak Layak Huni (Rutilahu) Pada Desa Pasirjengkol Kabupaten Karawang. *Jurnal Administrasi Publik Dan Studi Kebijakan*, 6(2), 188-200. <https://doi.org/10.48093/jiask.v6i2.209>
- Esariti, L., Fauziah, F., & Artiningsih, A. (2020). Implementasi Pengarusutamaan Gender Dalam Upaya Peningkatan Kualitas Hunian Pada Program Bantuan Stimulan Perumahan Swadaya (Bsps) Di Kota Semarang. *Jurnal Permukiman*, 15(2), 107-116.
<https://doi.org/10.31815/jp.2020.15.107-116>
- Hardani. (2020). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif & Kuantitatif*.
- Hartono, Supri, And M. Kendry Widiyanto. "Upaya Untuk Meningkatkan Ketersediaan Hunian Layak Bagi Masyarakat Berpenghasilan Rendah Di Kota Surabaya Melalui Program Bantuan Stimulan Perumahan Swadaya (Bsps): Upaya Untuk Meningkatkan Ketersediaan Hunian Layak Bagi Masyarakat Berpenghasilan Rendah Di Kota Surabaya Melalui Program Bantuan Stimulan Perumahan Swadaya (Bsps)." *Praja Observer: Jurnal Penelitian Administrasi Publik* (E-Issn: 2797-0469) 5.01 (2025): 61-67.
- Hidayat, Z. (2016). Pelaksanaan Program Rehabilitasi Sosial Rumah Tidak Layak Huni (Rs-Rtlh) Oleh Dinas Sosial Di Kabupaten Karimun Provinsi Kepulauan Riau. *Jurnal Online Mahasiswa Fakultas Ilmu Sosial Dan Ilmu Politik*, 3(1), 1-7.
<https://jom.unri.ac.id/index.php/jomfsip/article/view/8783>
- Khairunisa, I., & Hayati, R. (2021). Evaluasi Program Bantuan Stimulan Perumahan Swadaya (Bsps) Di Desa Mangkusip Kecamatan Tanta Kabupaten Tabalong. *Jurnal Mahasiswa Administrasi Publik Dan Administrasi Bisnis*, 4(2), 1424-1435.
<https://jurnal.stiatabalong.ac.id/index.php/japb/article/view/524>
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J.
- Muhtadi, T. Y. (2020). Implementasi Kebijakan Program Penyediaan Rumah Layak Huni Bagi Masyarakat Berpenghasilan Rendah Di Kota Tangerang. *Pelita: Jurnal Penelitian Dan Karya Ilmiah*, 20(2), 188-197. <https://www.ejournal.unis.ac.id/index.php/pelita/index>
- Mukhlis, S., Siam, N. U., & Junidar. (2023). Evaluasi Program Bantuan Stimulan Perumahan Swadaya (Bsps) Pada Kelurahan Tanjung Unggat. *Jisipol (Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Ilmu Politik Raja Haji)*, 9(20), 71-83. <https://doi.org/10.56552/jisipol.v2i2.43>
- Peraturan Bupati Bintan Nomor 26 Tahun 2022 Tentang Petunjuk Pelaksanaan Bantuan Swadaya Rumah Tidak Layak Huni.
- Prabawati, I. (2023). Implementasi Program Bantuan Stimulan Perumahan Swadaya (Bsps) Dalam Rangka Peningkatan Rumah Layak Huni Di Kabupaten Sidoarjo. *Publika*, 2455-2464.
<https://doi.org/10.26740/publika.v11n4.p2455-2464>
- Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Daerah (Rpjmd) Kabupaten Bintan Tahun 2025-2029.
- Sugiyono. (2023). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif*.
- Ulumudin, A., Nurbudiwati, N., Karmila, M., & Amrilah, R. R. (2020). Evaluasi Pelaksanaan Program Bantuan Stimulan Perumahan Swadaya Di Kabupaten Garut. *Jurnal Pembangunan Dan Kebijakan Publik*, 11(2), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.36624/jpkp.v11i2.73>

- Windriyana, S. A., & Widowati, N. (2025). Implementasi Program Rumah Tidak Layak Huni (Rtlh) Di Desa Warugunung Kabupaten Rembang. Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi Publik, 2(1), 209–222.
https://doi.org/10.14710/Nova_Idea.49805