

Housing Policy for Low-Income Communities in Indonesia and Its Reforms: An Overview

Ahmad Sururi

*Graduate Program in Public Administration, Universitas Serang Raya,
Jalan Raya Bandung Sumedang KM 21, Jatinangor 45363 Indonesia*

Budiman Rusli

*Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Social and Political Science
Universitas Padjadjaran,
Jalan Raya Bandung Sumedang KM 21, Jatinangor 45363 Indonesia*

Ida Widianingsih

*Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Social and Political Science
Universitas Padjadjaran,
Jalan Raya Bandung Sumedang KM 21, Jatinangor 45363 Indonesia*

Slamet Usman Ismanto

*Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Social and Political Science
Universitas Padjadjaran,
Jalan Raya Bandung Sumedang KM 21, Jatinangor 45363 Indonesia*

crossref<http://dx.doi.org/10.5755/j01.ppaa.21.1.30151>

Abstract. *This article aims at discussing the New Public Management (NPM) approach that has been implemented in housing policies for low-income communities (MBR) in Indonesia and specifically describes how the NPM approach has diametrical relevance to the post-NPM approach. This research method uses a review approach. The data collection technique is through searching various sources and literature, both from NPM theories, regulations and historical documents on housing policy in Indonesia. Data analysis used in this study uses several stages, i.e., first a brief description of the history of Indonesia's housing policy during the Old Order, New Order s provided; the second stage focuses on the new order or reform era and explains how the housing approach for MBR in Indonesia has adopted the NPM policy, and the final section presents the direction of the housing policy reform in Indonesia based on the post-NPM paradigm. The result of the study indicates that the NPM approach in the context of housing policy for low-income communities (MBR) in Indonesia has not been fully able to overcome housing problems for low-income communities (MBR) and in principle the NPM approach requires socio-cultural, economic and political adaptation of Indonesia. The main point of this article is to encourage the realisation of an ideal housing policy for low-income communities (MBR) in the future through the application of a post-NPM approach as a correction and evaluation instrument while at the same time encouraging the housing policy reform for low-income communities (MBR) in Indonesia.*

Keywords: *housing policy; Indonesia; New Public Management; Post New Public Management; low-income communities*

Raktažodžiai: *būsto politika; Indonezija; Naujoji viešoji vadyba; Naujasis viešasis valdymas; mažas pajamas gaunančios bendruomenės*

Introduction

The New Public Management (NPM) paradigm as one of the perspectives of contemporary public administration is constructed to provide qualified and satisfying public services (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2007) through the transformation of public services from traditional models (old public administration) which are unproductive, inefficient and of low quality to NPM models, such as

“reinventing the government” or “entrepreneurial government” (Osborne & Gaebler, 1993). It can be said that the process of changing NPM-based public services has occurred in almost all parts of the world and become a manifestation of a very influential fundamental transformation (Thompson, 1997 in McCourt, 2013). This shows that the NPM approach has provided a strong foundation for various public sectors to carry out effective management reforms which are dynamic and full of challenges in the global era.

One of the public sectors that shows transformation using the NPM approach in various proofs and forms is the housing sector. This can be seen from the characteristics of service changes through their dependence on private financial institutions in developing housing (Walker, 1998) privatisation policies through housing allowances for low-income communities (MBR), without reducing government accountability as policy holder (Bendaoud, 2019) and the idea about management changing with the main concepts of efficiency, downsizing, decentralisation, excellence and public services (Priemus et al., 1999).

However, in the practice of the housing policy, the NPM approach with a regulatory system, performance monitoring, and focus on service quality is counterproductive due to inefficient and uneconomical practices in handling housing rental problems (Sprigings, 2002) and on the other hand causes the reduced support and role of the state due to the housing market mechanism resulting in increased house rents and the number of evictions (Nedavaska, 2013) as well as sacrificing personal services and community welfare due to business-oriented housing policies as the main feature of the NPM approach (Walker, 2000).

The housing policy context in Indonesia empirically applies NPM approaches, such as decentralisation of public housing provision services through outsourcing and privatisation, deregulation of performance-based policies, results-based and profit-based housing business, orientation to housing market mechanisms and competition in housing service provision. However, in practice there are still various empirically problems that indicate the causes of the failure in implementation of the NPM approach, such as the unsynchronised regulation of low-income communities (MBR) handling and licensing, centralised bureaucratisation, low public participation, lack of capacity of local government apparatus, traditional social and cultural conditions of society, the large number of low-income communities (MBR) with low-income economic conditions, a government system that is still not effective in supporting housing policies as well as low public interest and response to housing programs.

In particular, the problems that should be the priority in housing policy for low-income communities (MBR) in Indonesia are the low level of protection for them as a group of people with low incomes and a lack of access to home ownership. We provide an initial conclusion that the current implementation of NPM in Indonesia is strongly influenced by the NPM paradigm; this can be seen from a number of regulations that change the institutional framework and mechanism of market function which are regulated through separate regulatory agencies. Furthermore, the characteristics of NPM that also influence housing policy for low-income communities (MBR) in Indonesia are housing development programs that are completely left to the private sector by reducing government intervention. In this case, the position and role of the government is only to ensure a conducive climate and regulations, legal certainty for national private investment and to control the social function of housing infrastructure for low-income communities (MBR) (Soegijoko et al., 2011). NPM with the characteristics of dominant distribution of economic resources is not a perfect mechanism because NPM is too focused on a single organisation, ignoring the wider horizontal inter-organisational context, causing partial service distribution chains, poor horizontal communication, lack of information and too narrowly defining the public as customers (Laffin, 2018).

Therefore, we suggest that the NPM approach is not appropriate to be applied in housing policies for low-income communities (MBR) and under certain conditions a difficult adaptation process must be carried out. This is relevant to what was stated by Hood (1991), namely, NPM as a concept and preference for public sector organisations in its implementation must make various adjustments to conditions such as the economy, government system, politics, ideology and socio-

cultural development of the country concerned. Importantly, we emphasise that it is very inappropriate if the MBR (low-income communities) group with low-income levels is defined as customers or consumers who must comply with market mechanisms, a strict and profit-oriented economic system as the NPM approach.

Furthermore, it is interesting to refer to a comparative study conducted by Sarker (2006). The study stresses that the results of NPM reform in two countries, Bangladesh and Singapore, show contradictory results. The failure to implement reform through the NPM in Bangladesh was due to an ineffective system of government and administration; on the other hand, thanks to its strong and effective government system Singapore was more successful in the NPM reform process. In addition, the results of research in Uganda showed that weak local government institutional capacity, such as the lack of apparatus competence, is a big challenge to implement qualified public services (Nannyonjo & Okot, 2013). Furthermore, Chinese research on the implementation of the NPM approach to the housing policy recommends financial support specifically in measuring government procurement, financial management and service content (Luo et al., 2020).

Some of the results of the studies mentioned above can serve as examples of how Indonesia should implement NPM through strengthening effective governance, administration systems and financial support since Indonesia shares almost identical social and cultural characteristics, especially as far as Bangladesh and Singapore are concerned. In addition, we believe that social traditions, organisational culture and political situations, especially in developing countries such as Indonesia, greatly influence the success of NPM. Likewise, the cultural and political traditions of a country will influence the extent to which reforms will support or weaken the results of NPM reforms (Martin & Spano, 2015; Pillay, 2008; Prowle, 2008), including many challenges faced by each country in realising good governance in an increasingly globally change (Ormond & Löffler, 1998).

According to Hughes (2003) there are a number of reasons why NPM is not properly implemented into a policy approach to public sector organisations: first, NPM is less relevant in understanding management issues of public sector organisations; second, the public sector is not identical with the business sector; therefore, the managerial application in the public sector is not appropriate; third, in essence NPM is neo-Taylorism, which has also drawn a lot of criticism; fourth, the application of NPM is to some extent a politicisation of bureaucracy; fifth, the application of NPM reduces accountability due to the concept of consumerism and sixth, there is no clear definition of NPM. And Hughes's argument shows that in the context of NPM-based housing policies implemented in Indonesia, such as privatisation, business orientation, housing market mechanisms, a number of reasons put forward by Hughes have become very relevant.

NPM with characteristics such as disaggregation, competition and incentives (Dunleavy et al., 2006) has now undergone a transformation and transition from NPM to post-NPM (Reiter & Klenk, 2019b). Moreover, Dunleavy et al. (2006) clearly state that the NPM era is dead and has turned into an era of long live digital governance. A condition that confirms that the application of NPM in various public sector organisations in developed and developing countries achieves undesirable results and requires a scientific explanation and research into how and why this can happen (Pillay & Kluvers, 2014; Prowle, M. J., Kalar, M., & Barrow, 2016).

The post-NPM approach is an interesting concept although it is not the only concept that states the end of NPM. Interestingly, we find that post-NPM is closely related to other concepts, such as 'whole government', 'joint government', 'Neo-Weberian states', 'New Public Governance' or 'digital age governance' (de Vries & Nemec, 2013; Pollit & Bouckaert, 2016; Reiter & Klenk, 2019a; Sahamies et al., 2022; Torfing et al., 2019). These concepts have been gaining more academic attention. In particular, the concepts of 'whole government' and 'unified government', are less successful in harnessing interest, whereas the concepts of 'neo-Weberian state' and 'digital age government' are significantly more popular in academic databases (Sahamies et al., 2022).

Our aim in this article is to shed light on the dynamics of the housing policy for low-income communities in Indonesia based on the NPM paradigm. To be more precise, we will answer the following three research questions: (1) What was describe as housing policy for low-income

communities (MBR) in Indonesia with the NPM paradigm? (2) What is the impact of the failure to implement the NPM approach to the housing policy for low-income communities? (3) What is the direction of the housing policy reform for low-income communities in Indonesia based on the post-NPM paradigm as an instrument to correct and evaluate the failure of the NPM paradigm?

Methodological Approach

This study uses a review approach. Review papers tend to include quantitative (meta-analytic, systematic reviews) and narrative or more qualitative components, together providing a platform for new conceptual frameworks, revealing inconsistencies in existing research, synthesising mixed results (Palmatier et al., 2018). First, we conducted a systematic literature review by collecting all the papers that included the terms 'NPM' and 'post-NPM'. In the field of social sciences, systematic literature reviews are directed by the requirement to identify all relevant literature regardless of theoretical background and study design (Arksey & O'Malley, 2005). The data collection technique is through searching various sources and literature, both from NPM theories, regulations and historical documents on the housing policy in Indonesia.

To be able to provide a complete picture of how important idea of transforming NPM to post-NPM is in the context of housing policy in Indonesia, the data analysis used in this study follows several stages, i.e., first a brief description of the history of Indonesia's housing policy during the Old Order, New Order, as well as the new order or reform era is provided. In this section, we describe various housing policies and programs that have been implemented in Indonesia. In addition, we also describe how the social, cultural and political situation in Indonesia is still closely related and influences the current condition of the housing policy for low-income communities.

Second, we explain how the housing approach to MBR in Indonesia has adopted the NPM policy, and in the third or final section we describe the direction of the housing policy reform in Indonesia based on the post-NPM paradigm.

The History of Housing Policy, Social Conditions, Organizational Culture and Politics

The history of Indonesian acculturation is framed in several periods, including pre, during, and post-colonial periods. In the pre-colonial period, before countries with the motto *Gold, Gospel and Glory*, such as the Portuguese, English, Dutch, and Japanese came to Indonesia, several indigenous tribes and kingdoms, including Javanese, Sundanese, Batak, Bugis and Makassar had already inhabited the archipelago (Silaen & Smark, 2006) which was characterised by a primordial system. The context and pattern of the settlement arrangement in the pre-colonial period were mostly marked by the establishment of palace buildings or the keraton (palace) as symbols of traditional bureaucracies that regulate the economic, social and production power (Makkelo, 2018). For example, it can be explained that the palace as a symbol is surrounded by housing complexes for nobles, royal officials, courtiers, a square as a community gathering place, a place of worship, and a market. Social and cultural values between the rulers or elites with the general public are practiced in a coercive relationship by applying rules that must be obeyed by the community; in this case it is described that the position of the royal nobility or elite is described as the superior party while the general public is positioned as the inferior party.

In the Dutch colonial era, the housing policy was focused on planning modern cities by referring to the model of cities in Europe to provide homes for Dutch and other European people who came to live in Indonesia. This goes together with acculturation processes such as animism and foreign cultures, including the influence of Hinduism, Buddhism, Christianity and Islam; colonialism is added as a factor that forms modern Indonesia (Robison, 1981). The Dutch East Indies government implemented two urban housing programs: 1) improvement of the kampongs, or *kampongs verbetering* and counseling about healthy homes; 2) control of bubonic plague, or *pest bestrijding* in slum areas, with the aim of creating a reciprocal relationship between workers working for Dutch-owned companies; and (3) stipulate the City Formation Act, or *Stadsvorming Ordonantie* (SVO) as

a policy regulation for the development of the Kebayoran Baru Jakarta area, a pioneer in Indonesia's housing development.

The Old Order era was a difficult period for housing development because the government had to focus and concentrate on development after the struggle for independence. However, during the Old Order era, an important phase of the housing policy in Indonesia began with the housing congress held in Bandung on August 25-30, 1950, with the aim to prepare the development plan after the damage caused by the war of independence. In this era, the mandate of the housing development program pays more attention to the realisation of healthy, durable and inexpensive houses. For the first time, the Basic Housing (Government Regulation Number 62 Of, 1962), which contains government policies in the housing development and housing arrangements for the poor, was followed by the establishment of Government Regulation Number 17 Of 1963.

In subsequent developments, the community began to develop kampong housing groups independently; housing was built specifically for agency employees and official housing needs; housing was built by private developers to be marketed (Silas, 2005). At this stage, the historical context of Indonesia's housing policy is seen through the characteristics of colonial heritage buildings that are still found in Indonesia and are a feature of the process of cultural acculturation (Silaen & Smark, 2006). Apart from the issue that the Netherlands once colonised Indonesia, the Netherlands has introduced a housing policy and implemented several policies that regulate regional planning issues, such as *wijkenstelsel* (ethnic-based settlements), *decentraliewet* (government decentralisation), *stadvorming ordonantie* (urban development) (Wihardyanto & Ikaputra, 2019); however, in some aspects the policy creates marginalisation of traditional settlements.

The next era was the Suharto government or the New Order regime. In this era the dominant factor in the housing policy was centralised or known as Java or Jakarta centric. This is because experts, especially in the fields of economics and development, who supported the New Order government, used the Neo-Keynesian model approach in formulating various development policies that did require centralisation (Hidayat, 2002). As a result, the city of Jakarta as the capital city of Indonesia has a high population growth rate and did not allow housing development (Cahyadi & Ketut, 2009). In addition, the Suharto government placed itself as the main actor and became an accelerator of development in various provinces, regencies and cities with the main instruments being the Broad guidelines of State Policy (GBHN) and the Five-Year Development Plan (Repelita).

One important phase of the housing policy in the Suharto era was the formation of the National Urban Development Corporation (Perum Perumnas) in collaboration with the State Savings Bank (BTN) financial institution as a financial partner to facilitate Household Loan Credit (KPR) by providing convenience for state civil servants and the military to obtain cheap housing by way of subsidies. The important reason for the New Order government to implement facilities for state civil servants and the military was to gain political support while at the same time strengthening the position of the party of Functional Groups (Golkar Party) and Suharto in every general election (Raditya, 2018). Therefore, cheap houses in the New Order era could only be enjoyed by social groups who had access to and fully supported the Suharto government politically, while the general public, especially those with low incomes and limited access to financial support, did not get the opportunity to get subsidised cheap houses.

Apart from Perumnas (national housing), several housing programs carried out during the Suharto era included the Village Housing and Settlement Restoration Program (P3D) and the Kampong Improvement Program (KIP) as national projects. Although the Kampong Improvement Program (KIP) in several aspects provided benefits for low-income communities in urban areas (Tunas & Peresthu, 2010), but the complexity of the problem of land tenure which is only controlled by a small number of community groups or entrepreneurs and housing development, which was oriented to the middle group upwards, continued to occur, causing the 1998 economic crisis (Winarso & Firman, 2002) and an imbalance between population growth and housing needs due to the large impact of social and economic inequality. This condition was very relevant as stated by Dixon &

Macarov (1998) because socio-economic factors can be used as an instrument to determine the ability of the population to gain access to basic service needs, such as decent housing.

The fulfilment of housing needs for low-income people were very limited in the Suharto era. It was an indirect impact of the strengthening of a centralised culture of Corruption, Collusion and Nepotism (KKN) and various development projects which were only dominated by certain groups, such as investors and businessmen who had to provide sums of money for 'additional' fees and they knew which people they will need to bribe (Indonesia-Investments, 2017). The impact of these conditions caused the situation in which housing that should have been the right of low-income communities could only be enjoyed by a small number of communities. In addition to KKN and the domination of certain groups, during the Suharto era, a rigid, convoluted bureaucratic culture of government organisations grew, hampering the difficulty of administrative licensing and land acquisition for housing, especially in various regions.

The reform era was a new chapter of the Indonesian government after the old and new orders. In 2007, during the Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono era, efforts to provide housing for low-income communities were carried out through the Thousand Tower Simple Flats program aimed at people with a maximum income of Rp 5.5 million a month; however, due to regulatory barriers, lack of incentives, low affordability of low-income communities, the subsidised flats program no longer attracts the interest of housing developers and therefore cannot be continued.

Furthermore, in the reform era, various housing subsidy financing policies for low-income communities (MBR) were implemented through the Housing Financing Liquidity Facilitation (FLPP) program, Help Stimulant self-help housing (BSPS) and the A Million Houses Program, which was launched on April 29, 2015, and became the flagship program of the Joko Widodo Government. Until 2020, the achievement of the A Million Houses Program had reached 215.662 units. However, the journey of the housing policy for low-income communities has not undergone significant changes and there are still several important issues that need to be prioritised to be resolved, including the large gap between people's purchasing power and unaffordable house prices and the housing backlog which is still very high.

Theoretical Framework

New Public Management

The historical development of public administration began with the traditional model proposed by Weber, Wilson and Taylor as a paradigm (Hughes, 2003) and Weber's theory of bureaucracy which is in line with the traditional theory of public administration both in form and method (Ostrom, 1989), so that it can be said that the legacy of the intellectual property of the current public administration paradigm stems from the thinking and writing of Woodrow Wilson, Frederick Winslow Taylor and Max Weber (Behn, 1998). On the other hand, NPM is a term created to denote the reform process in public administration during the 1980s as a critique of the Weberian bureaucratic model (du Gay, 2000 in Gaus et al., 2017) and this opinion is reinforced by statements by Barzelay (2001) that New Public Management (NPM) as a concept originated from scientific analysis and ideas with the aim of carrying out organisational change agendas in a number of countries (e.g., the UK and Australia) in the 1980s.

The term NPM was first developed and received attention from various international circles, both governmental bureaucrats and scholars (Osborne & Gaebler, 1992). In developed countries, such as the Netherlands, Germany, Norway, UK, America and Canada, the NPM paradigm has been applied in terms of the characteristics of marketing, specialisation, single purpose organisation, competition in governance. Developed countries have played a role as pioneers of the NPM approach that affects developing countries in Southeast Asia and East Asia (Ferlie et al., 2008). On the other hand, NPM, which emerged in 1980 and 1990, has contributed to the characteristics and development of public administration (Widianingsih, 2005) by shifting the concept of the classical Weberian model in the administrative reform through increasing the externalisation of public services and anti-politicisation policies (Lane, 2013). This era also marks the beginning of a paradigm that reduces the

domination of the government in dealing with public affairs and gives authority to the private sector to play a role in government tasks. This phenomenon was described by Rusli (2014) as a shift from public administration to administration for the public.

NPM can be characterised by privatisation, managerialism, performance measurement and accountability (Tolofari, 2005); in this case, the strategy through short-term contracts is carried out to strengthen the position of bureaucracy in relation to public services by implementing 1) Outsourcing; 2) Tournaments; 3) Auctions; 4) Incorporation (Lane, 2013). In this case, the position and role of the government in the application of NPM only serves to provide regulations, regulate institutions, regulate procedural matters, conduct audits and management by providing space for an open market mechanism (Olssen & Peters, 2005). In other words, the government is only present within certain limits to ensure processes and activities are in accordance with the rules by emphasising the measurement of results and performance (Lorenz, 2012).

In particular, NPM is an idea derived from neo-liberalism and characterised as a 'Homo economicus' economy and free markets (Lorenz, 2012), so that it democratically emphasises community participation by minimising bureaucratic functions, customer orientation, competition and rigid hierarchies (Barzelay, M., & Armajani, 1992; Drechsler, 2014; Dunn & Miller, 2007). Therefore, NPM can be considered as a form of management reform that is predominantly based on an economic approach and is rationally related to the public choice theory. Hood (1991) and Olssen & Peters (2005) has a considerable influence in sustaining the post-bureaucratic model (O'Flynn, 2010) and focus on technical activities rather than political activities and less bureaucratic public service organisations (Deem & Brehony, 2005).

Thus, it can be emphasised that every individual and group in the NPM approach has an interest in supporting the growth of public services (Dalingwater, 2014). This is because NPM seeks to dismantle the pillars of the traditional Weberian public administration bureaucracy and comes with a large and multipurpose hierarchical bureaucracy, a lean organisational structure, autonomous and controlled by a very strict central leadership (Stoker, 2006).

According to Pollitt (2007), as a theory and practice, NPM focuses on several components: 1) performance mainly through output measurement; 2) slim, flat, small, specialised and multi-functional organisational forms; 3) coordination and hierarchical tools by using contract mechanisms; 4) market mechanisms including competition and performance-based incentives; 5) put consumers as customers. The consequences of these five components have resulted in public sector organisations having to make changes in leadership governance, human resource management, changes in targets, productivity and changes in organisational structure. This is because the important goal and substance of the NPM approach is to encourage cultural change in the organisation, the rearrangement of basic stakeholder values and ways of interacting with the public sphere (Schein & Schein, 2017).

Finally, this theoretical framework will describe the NPM approach, which includes seven characteristics that are compatible with housing policies for low-income communities (MBR) in Indonesia: 1) Professional management in the public sector; 2) The existence of performance standards and performance measures; 3) Greater emphasis on aspects of controlling output and outcome; 4) The breakdown of work units in the public sector; 5) Creating competition in the public sector; 6) Adoption of management style in the business sector into the public sector; 7) Emphasis on discipline and greater savings in using resources (Hood, 1991).

New Public Management Approach in the Housing Policy for Low-Income Communities in Indonesia

The global reform movement in public management has been very dynamic since the 1980s. This is indicated by the reform of government management in various countries with the aim of restoring the role of the state and the pattern of relations between citizens (Hughes, 2003). On the other hand, the success of NPM in building the competitiveness of public administration is undeniable and has been largely accepted by governments with modern democratic systems (Paquet, 2001). In

addition, NPM is able to make changes, such as flexibility, innovation, problem-solving, entrepreneurship and productivity, to new management cultures (Galnoor et al., 1998).

NPM is a difficult concept to define (Dalingwater, 2014); however, Clark (1996) provides a comprehensive explanation through three main concepts of NPM, namely: 1) marketisation, which encourages market competition in public services; 2) disaggregation, which strengthens the strategic capacity of the central government by separating policies and executive functions; 3) incentives, which encourages greater entrepreneurship, results-oriented, maximising efficiency and performance indicators. In this case, NPM seeks to leave traditional ways through the legitimacy of the public bureaucracy by implementing strict procedural policies and encouraging the growth of trust in market mechanisms and business approaches (Hood, 1995).

In simple terms, NPM is an understanding that the government evaluates individuals based on their competencies and role in the market structures and processes. The public choice not only provides an elegant and attractive model of government for some people but also serves as an intellectual roadmap and practical effort to reduce the role of government (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2007). This confirms the main principle of NPM, i.e., 'all human behaviour is dominated by personal interests' and has become a new paradigm of government management with effective accountability characteristics (Kamensky, 1996). In addition, NPM views the importance of management and production manipulation in public services, which are often associated with economic rationality (Hood, 1991; Pollit, 1993).

Some of the main elements in implementing the NPM model of public administration system include the decentralisation of public service powers, including outsourcing and privatisation; rationalisation, deregulation, and increased capacity for government agency staff; result-oriented (performance); accountability of employees based on performance contracts; business-style management; cost recovery; the principle of entrepreneurship (performance bonus), competition in the provision of public services; and a management culture that is customer-oriented and public accountability based on performance (Pollit & Bouchaert, 2011). Notably, the NPM approach emphasises the importance of several key values such as responsiveness to citizens as clients or customers, higher levels of accountability and transparency, innovation and renewal of old bureaucratic structures and processes, and an increased emphasis on performance. The achievement of these goals is often evaluated in a measurable manner in public sector organisations by creating clear performance indicators and more effective control functions (Hartley, 2005).

The housing policy context for the low-income community (MBR) in Indonesia has adopted several NPM approaches such as the implementation of decentralisation of public housing provision services through outsourcing and privatisation, deregulation of performance-based policies, results-based and profit-based housing business orientation, orientation to the housing market mechanism and competition in the provision of housing services. Table 1 summarises the compatibility between housing policies for low-income communities (MBR) in Indonesia and the NPM approach as proposed by Hood (1991), which includes: 1) professional management; 2) performance standards and measures; 3) greater emphasis on results or outputs; 4) disaggregation of units in the public sector; 5) public sector competition; 6) private sector management style; and 7) discipline and savings in the use of resources.

Table 1. Congruence between the NPM Approach and NPM-based Housing Policy in Indonesia

New Public Management Approach	Housing Policy for Low-Income Communities (MBR) in Indonesia based on NPM
Focus on aspects of professional management in the public sector	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Management and handling of housing by sharing authority between the central and local governments - Performance-based housing policy deregulation
Explicit standards and performance measures with indicators of objectives, outputs and outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The government's assessment in determining the selection of housing developers based on performance - Housing budget for MBR (low-income communities) based on performance (performance-based budgeting)

New Public Management Approach	Housing Policy for Low-Income Communities (MBR) in Indonesia based on NPM
Greater emphasis on output control, meaning that resource allocation and rewards are linked to measured performance	Housing targets for MBR (low-income communities) are oriented on results and quantitative data rather than process
Shift to disaggregation of units in the public sector	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Decentralisation of public services which providing housing through outsourcing and privatisation - Establishment of Certain Non-Vertical Work Units (SNVT) for the provision of housing in each province as representatives of the central government in the regions
Stress on private-sector styles of management practice and competition as the key to lower costs and more efficient standards	Competition mechanism between private developers and housing developers through contracts and tenders
Private sector-based management practice style	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Government cooperation with private business entities through privatisation and providing housing for MBR (low income communities) - Housing market mechanism
Stress on greater discipline and savings in the use of resources	Result and profit-based housing business orientation

Source: authors.

Table 1 shows that the housing policy for low-income households in Indonesia has adopted the NPM policy and its main objective is to measure the productivity of housing provision and the achievement of housing development targets, as shown in the NPM approach proposed by Hood (1991). However, the adoption of the NPM policy in various aspects still causes several problems and tends to fail. One of the causes of this failure is the lack of synchronisation of the authority of the housing policy between the central and local governments; for example, there is still a regulatory conflict between Law Number 1 of 2011 concerning Housing and Settlement Areas and Law Number 9 of 2015 concerning Regional Government. Specifically, the two regulations have different points of view on the authority over low-income communities (MBR) policy in the regions if Law Number 1 of 2011 states that the central and regional governments have equal policy authority over low-income communities (MBR) in the regions while Law Number 9 of 2015 states that the central government is the only one party that has the authority over low-income communities (MBR) policy in the regions. The consequence of the two contradictory regulations is the occurrence of a less harmonious relationship pattern between the central and local governments so that the handling of low-income communities (MBR) in the regions becomes hampered and less effective.

Next, as described in Table 1, the characteristics of NPM of the housing policy for low-income communities (MBR) in Indonesia in determining the selection of housing provider developers are carried out based on performance measurement and budgeting indicators (performance-based budgeting). These indicators have been successful in several aspects, but the pattern of determining developers has led to unfair competition. In Indonesia, housing provider developers have different budget resources, so it is almost certain that housing provider developers with high performance are those supported by very high budget resources, while housing provider developers with small-budget resources do not have the opportunity to participate in the provision of housing for low-income communities (MBR) in Indonesia. The impact of the policy on determining the housing provider developers in the long term can lead to the government depending on only housing provider developers who have substantial resources and create a gap between developers.

The next impact of the government's dependence on developers who provide housing with substantial resources is that the housing targets to be achieved are more oriented towards quantitative results, while the level of achievement of the backlog and the ratio of household loan credit (KPR) is still very low. Indonesia is still facing a housing backlog problem based on ownership of 11.4 million people and a residential backlog of 7.6 million people (Grya Sejahtera, 2020); in addition, the achievement of household loan credit in Indonesia ratio to Gross Domestic Product is only around

2.9 per cent or the lowest among Southeast Asian countries, compared to Singapore at 44.8 per cent, Malaysia at 38.4 per cent, Thailand at 22.3 per cent and the Philippines at 3.8 per cent.

Furthermore, the implementation of decentralisation of housing provision services through outsourcing and privatisation based on the NPM approach has clearly changed the pattern and relationship of housing institutions between the central government, local governments and housing developers, thus creating an ineffective monitoring mechanism. Although private investment in the provision of housing can reduce the burden on the state budget and increase economic growth, the supervisory function of the government as a form of public accountability cannot be ignored. This includes the placement of Certain Non-Vertical Work Units (SNVT) in the regions as supervisory agencies for housing provision as well as representatives of the central government. This clearly shows the characteristics of a centralised bureaucracy and causes decentralisation to be less effective.

Furthermore, the housing market mechanism developed by the NPM approach, which positions low-income communities (MBR) as customers or consumers and must comply with a strict and profit-oriented economic system, is not appropriate. This is because low-income communities (MBR) is a group of people who have low economic income and very limited access to homeownership. This actually causes problems with the increasing backlog of housing and increasing economic inequality in the community.

Thus, we suggest that although the housing policy in Indonesia has implemented the NPM approach, it does not mean that the entire NPM ideology is put into practice. The NPM principles adopted must still adapt to the socio-cultural, economic and political conditions of Indonesia. This is because not all aspects of housing for low-income communities (MBR) in Indonesia can face and align with the NPM paradigm; therefore, the presence of the state in housing policies for low-income communities (MBR) is still important and necessary to regulate and manage policies with strong ethics and norms, supported by appropriate regulations which take the side of low-income communities (MBR) so that the goal to facilitate the access of all low-income communities (MBR) in Indonesia to housing can be reached.

Reasonable limits that can be understood are due to the fact that NPM has not been able to guarantee a developing country such as Indonesia to be strong and advanced in facing various challenges; therefore, as described in the introduction, there is now a new paradigm as an antithesis to NPM and hegemony which are characterised by process of transformation and transition from NPM to post-NPM. With the slogan of the NPM era that has died and has turned into an era of long live digital governance, a condition that is motivated by some evidence that the application of NPM in the housing policy in Indonesia and various other developing and developed countries has not achieved the expected results.

Directions of the Housing Policy Reform for Low-Income Communities in Indonesia: Post-NPM

In this section, we describe the direction of the housing policy reform for low-income communities (MBR) in Indonesia based on the NPM approach and illustrate the post-NPM as an instrument for correcting and evaluating the implementation of NPM failures in Indonesia.

The housing policy context for low-income communities (MBR) in Indonesia begins with the debate over political institutions and social ecosystems, and cultural values. When comparing government reforms in various countries in the world, an important consideration and need to be analysed in depth are the cultural aspects and values inherent in society (Wang & Christensen, 2017). The output of each government reform will be influenced by various multi-factor components, e.g., institutional, political and bureaucratic environmental factors as well as post-NPM reforms focused on public service values (Bhatta, 2003; Healy & Ramanna, 2013; Wihantoro et al., 2015).

As described in the previous section, the values of social traditions, culture, economic conditions and political situations in developing countries such as Indonesia greatly determine the level of success of the application of NPM. A country's socio-cultural and political traditions will influence to what extent the reform will support or weaken the outcomes of the NPM reform (Martin

& Spano, 2015; Pillay, 2008; Prowle, M. J., Kalar, M., & Barrow, 2016; Wihantoro et al., 2015). In particular, Prowle, M. J., Kalar, M., & Barrow (2016) state that organisational culture is the main trigger of the performance and concept of a country's organisational culture with reference to the central values, beliefs and assumptions and how people can articulate these aspects differently from other cultural groups (Pillay, 2008).

Furthermore, in the following section, we will briefly describe how the NPM approach has diametrical relevance to the post-NPM approach as an instrument of correction and evaluation of the failure to implement the NPM in housing policies for low-income communities in Indonesia, which is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Some of the Main Ideas of NPM-based Housing Policy for MBR and Directions for the Housing Policy Reform in Indonesia in the Post-NPM Perspective

The main idea of the NPM-based Housing Policy	Implementation of the Direction of the Housing Policy Reform for MBR in a Post-NPM Perspective
Limitation of main tasks and performance-based policies	Strengthening the capacity of the central government with a monitoring and evaluation function that ensures transparency and ensures changes in pro-low income communities (MBR) regulations
Housing developer assessment and MBR budget based on performance	Strengthening local housing developers and budgeting based on needs and accountability
Result-oriented rather than process-oriented low-income communities (MBR) housing target	Changes in low-income communities (MBR) targets and objectives with an emphasis on sustainable processes
Decentralisation of public services through outsourcing and privatisation	Proportional decentralisation through increased control and coordination within and across administrative systems
Developer competition mechanism based on contracts and tenders	Structuring regulations by prioritising cooperation between housing actors both at the centre and the regions
Housing market mechanism	A balance between the housing sector and focus on efficient housing provision in pro-low-income communities (MBR) economic market situation
Results and profit-based housing business orientation	Changes in the orientation of benefit-based equity for low-income communities (MBR)

Source: authors.

Table 2 describes the main ideas of the NPM and how to adapt the direction of the housing policy reform for low-income communities (MBR) in Indonesia using the post-NPM approach.

First, strengthening the capacity of the central government is possible to achieve through monitoring and supervision functions that ensure transparency and ensure regulatory changes, including strengthening the basic post-NPM objectives, i.e., rearranging regulations to improve dysfunctional aspects of the NPM, strengthening government capacity, improving control and coordination in within and across the political-administrative system (Karatias, 2019). An important objective of strengthening this capacity lies in the creation of structural reforms of housing institutions for low-income communities (MBR) that provide clarity on the roles and responsibilities of central and local government policy actors and can solve the overlapping problem and authorities both at the level of ministries/central government agencies and institutions. Therefore, it is necessary to encourage the reform in the housing institutional bureaucracy through strengthening institutional instruments to ensure the integrity and performance of the apparatus. Importantly, the government can act as a companion and monitor how institutional quality is improved (Prayitno et al., 2012).

Second, it is also important to strengthen local housing developers and prepare budgets based on public needs and accountability. This context encourages collaboration between public institutions and local-level housing investors, which is in line with the accountability-based private, public partnership concept. This argument is based on the fact that the accountability context is still low as one of the criticisms of the implementation of the NPM, such as changes in the organisation of the public service sector or private institutions (Christensen & Lægheid, 2007).

Third, changes in the targets and objectives of low-income communities (MBR) should be encouraged by emphasising a sustainable process. We argue that results orientation is not effective in housing policies for low-income communities (MBR), but orientation towards sustainable processes determines the quality and effectiveness for low-income communities (MBR).

Fourth, proportional decentralisation of public services through increased control and coordination within and across the administrative system becomes the next post-NPM policy direction. This is based on the NPM approach, which is unable to anticipate each other's clarity, as criticised by post-NPM and described as the occurrence of fragmentation and ambiguity of roles as a result of structural devolution; expansion of single-purpose organisations and vertical specialisation; discontinuity and non-linear; and undermined political control (Jun, 2009). Therefore, believe that proportional decentralisation by providing space for the creation of opportunities and chances for all stakeholders is a necessity.

Fifth, regulations should be structured by prioritising cooperation between housing actors both at the central and regional levels. One of the post-NPM criticisms of the NPM approach is that it ignores the factor of cooperation between actors and the occurrence of excessive management autonomy (Jun, 2009), and this is why we see local capacity, including the local government and local developers, as a housing policy choice at the local level. The shift of keywords from competition to collaboration becomes a necessity in building each of these local capacities.

Sixth, a balance between the housing sector and a focus on efficient housing provision in an economic market situation in pro-low-income communities (MBR) should be achieved through strengthening the capacity of central and local governments in order to be affordable for low-income communities' purchasing power. As stated by Chen et al. (2017), the imbalance between the housing sector and socio-economic development is largely due to the insufficient and inefficient housing provision by the state in a fast-growing market situation where income inequality is growing rapidly. The affordability aspect of low-income communities (MBR) clearly contradicts the concept of a market mechanism, a strict and profit-oriented economic system as stated by Hood (1991) and the NPM market mechanism as a victim of the global financial crisis (Levy, 2010) is not appropriate to be implemented for MBR.

Lastly, the change in the orientation of benefit-based equity for low-income communities (MBR) indicates that the government's attention to social and cultural approaches is in line with the unique and distinctive dynamics and characteristics of low-income communities (MBR) by developing a social housing system managed by local communities to build, rent and manage housing in collaboration with the government and in this way social integration can be created.

Conclusions

The implementation of housing policies for low-income communities in Indonesia has implemented decentralisation of public housing services through outsourcing and privatisation, deregulation of performance-based policies, results-based and profit-based housing business orientation, orientation to the housing market mechanism and competition in the provision of housing services. In general, it can be seen that these principles have similarities with the NPM doctrine, which focuses on aspects of professional management in the public sector; 1) implementation of performance standards and measures; 2) greater emphasis on control over outputs and outcomes; 3) breakdown of work units in the public sector; 4) creating competition in the public sector; 5) adoption of the business sector management style into the public sector; and 6) emphasis on discipline and frugal use of resources.

The Indonesian government's efforts to carry out various housing policies for low-income communities (MBR) are the right steps in the midst of conditions of values, norms and ethics that are still strong and a culture that is still a challenge and obstacle to the housing policy. However, the housing policy for low-income communities (MBR) has so far been regulated through an institutional framework and market mechanisms. Various housing provision programs that are handed over to the private sector, target-based housing development and productivity, performance-based measurements

of state civil servants and good housing bureaucratic management, business-oriented approaches such as the NPM approach are still not effective in overcoming various problems. This results in the lack of capacity of local housing developers due to limited resources, not achieving the backlog and housing loan (KPR) targets, changes in housing patterns and institutional relations between the central government, local governments and housing provider developers, thus creating ineffective monitoring mechanisms and increasing community economic disparities. Thus, we conclude that Indonesia's socio-cultural, economic and political conditions are not always aligned and able to follow the NPM pattern and paradigm. Therefore, the presence of the state in housing policies for low-income communities (MBR) remains essential and indispensable. Some special conditions, such as the specialisation of the public sector apparatus, unemployment, poverty, competence and coordination between public sectors that occur in Indonesia, will not quickly adapt to the NPM approach.

The direction of the housing policy reform for low-income communities in Indonesia is based on the post-NPM paradigm as an instrument of correction and evaluation of the failure of the NPM paradigm. It has corrected and evaluated some of the shortcomings of the NPM approach in Indonesia. Therefore, several important ideas that can be carried out to realise the idea of NPM transformation, such as strengthening the central government's capacity with supervisory and supervisory functions, changes, regulatory arrangements, and structural reforms of housing institutions for low-income communities, are first steps. Solutions to overcome the problem of overlapping authorities both at the regional level and at the level of ministries/agencies of central and local government are being searched for. This is expected to increase the role and cooperation of local housing developers as part of efforts to strengthen local capacity.

In addition, efforts to strengthen local housing developers are accompanied by budgeting based on needs and public accountability in encouraging changes in MBR's targets in a sustainable and consistent manner towards the implementation of proportional decentralisation of public services to provide clarity of roles, duties and responsibilities for housing policy actors for the poor.

Another important idea is to strike a balance between the housing sector that focuses on providing efficient housing in a pro-MBR economic market situation which is characterised by the affordability of purchasing power and availability of housing, while still adopting a compatible social and cultural approach towards the dynamics and characteristics of MBR in Indonesia.

The implication of this study is that, in general, the socio-cultural, economic and political conditions of Indonesia are not always in harmony and are able to follow the pattern and paradigm of NPM. Therefore, the presence of the state in housing policies for low-income communities (MBR) remains important and indispensable. Some special conditions, such as the specialisation of the public sector apparatus, unemployment, poverty, competence and coordination between public sectors that occur in Indonesia, will not easily adapt to the NPM approach. The implications of this article are expected to provide benefits for housing policy actors for low-income communities (MBR) in Indonesia to make changes according to the post-NPM approach that is adapted to the social, cultural, economic and political dynamics of Indonesia.

This study has several limitations in terms of secondary data instruments for data collection and limited variables to explore the NPM paradigm. The ideas of this study still require further in-depth research, which will look into them from different perspectives.

References

1. Barzelay, M., & Armajani, B. (1992). *Breaking through Bureaucracy*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
2. Barzelay, M. (2001). *The New Public Management: Improving Research and Policy Dialogue*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
3. Behn, R. D. (1998). The New Public Management Paradigm and the Search for Democratic Accountability. *International Public Management Journal*, 1(2), 131–164. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1096-7494\(99\)80088-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1096-7494(99)80088-9)
4. Bendaoud, M. (2019). The Privatisation of Housing Assistance: Are Housing Allowances Eroding Government Accountability? *Canadian Public Administration*, 62(2), 312–332. <https://doi.org/10.1111/capa.12318>
5. Bhatta, G. (2003). *Post-NPM Themes In Public Sector Governance*. <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Post-NPM-Themes-In-Public-Sector-Governance-Bhatta/620ca957e4920738663b3942391d7a0b5d4d451b>

6. Cahyadi, R., & Ketut, A. (2009). Penduduk dan Pembangunan Perumahan di Jabodetabek : Tantangan Pengembangan Megapolitan Jakarta. *Kependudukan Indonesia*, IV(1), 55–72. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/316716890%0A>
7. Chen, J., Yang, Z., & Wang, Y. P. (2017). The New Chinese Model of Public Housing : A Step Forward or Backward ? The New Chinese Model of Public Housing : A Step Forward or Backward ? In *Housing Studies* (Vol. 29, Issue 4, p. 4). Taylor & Francis. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02673037.2013.873392>
8. Christensen, T., & Læg Reid, P. (2007). Post New Public Management Reforms Empirical Tendencies and Scholarly Challenges. *Gestion y Política Pública*, 16(2), 539–564.
9. Clark, D. (1996). Open government in Britain: Discourse and practice. *Public Money and Management*, 16(1), 23–30. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540969609387905>
10. Dalingwater, L. (2014). Post-New Public Management (NPM) and the Reconfiguration of Health Services in England. *Observatoire de La Société Britannique*, 16, 51–64. <https://doi.org/10.4000/osb.1714>
11. de Vries, M., & Nemeč, J. (2013). Public sector reform: an overview of recent literature and research on NPM and alternative paths. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 26(1), 4–16. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513551311293408>
12. Deem, R., & Brehony, K. J. (2005). Management as ideology: The case of “new managerialism” in higher education. *Oxford Review of Education*, 31(2), 217–235. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03054980500117827>
13. Denhardt, J. V., & Denhardt, R. B. (2007). *The New Public Service, Expanded Edition. Serving, Not Steering*. M.E Sharpe, Inc.
14. Dixon, J., & Macarov, D. (1998). *Poverty: A Persistent Global Reality*, Routledge.
15. Drechsler, W. (2014). The rise and demise of the New Public Management: Lessons and opportunities for South East Europe. *Central European Public Administration Review*, 7(3), 7–27. <https://doi.org/10.17573/cepar.v7i3.131>
16. Dunleavy, P., Margetts, H., Bastow, S., & Tinkler, J. (2006). New Public Management is Dead - Long Live Digital-Era Governance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 16(3), 467–494. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mui057>
17. Dunn, W. N., & Miller, D. Y. (2007). A Critique of the New Public Management and the Neo-Weberian State: Advancing a Critical Theory of Administrative reform. *Public Organization Review*, 7(4), 345–358. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11115-007-0042-3>
18. Ferlie, E., Musselin, C., & Andresani, G. (2008). The Steering of Higher Education Systems: A Public Management Perspective. *Higher Education*, 56(3), 325–348. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-008-9125-5>
19. Galnoor, I., Rosenbloom, D. H., & Yaroni, A. (1998). Creating New Public Management Reforms. *Administration & Society*, 30(4), 393–420. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0095399798304004>
20. Gaus, N., Sultan, S., & Basri, M. (2017). State Bureaucracy in Indonesia and its Reforms: An Overview. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 40(8), 658–669. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2016.1186179>
21. Grya Sejahtera. (2020). Sektor Perumahan Tantangan dan Peluang. *Buletin Griya Sejahtera Pusat Pengelolaan Dana Dan Pembiayaan Perumahan*, 5, 1–40.
22. Hartley, J. (2005). Innovation in Governance and Public Services : Past and Present. *Public Money & Management*, February 2005. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9302.2005.00447.x>
23. Healy, P. M., & Ramanna, K. (2013). *When the crowd fights corruption*. <https://hbr.org/2013/01/when-the-crowd-fights-corruption>
24. Hidayat, S. (2002). *Refleksi Realitas Otonomi Daerah dan Tantangan Ke Depan*. PT Pustaka Quantum.
25. Hood. (1991). A Public Management for All Seasons? *Public Administration*, 69(1), 3–19. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9299.1991.tb00779.x>
26. Hood, C. (1995). The “New Public Management” in the 1980s: Variations on a Theme. *Accounting, Organisations and Society*, 20(2–3), 93–109. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0361-3682\(93\)E0001-W](https://doi.org/10.1016/0361-3682(93)E0001-W)
27. Hughes, O. E. (2003). Public Management and Administration. In *Public Management and Administration* (Third). Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-137-00305-8>
28. Indonesia-Investments. (2017). *Korupsi di Indonesia*. Retrieved from. <https://www.indonesia-investments.com/id/bisnis/risiko/korupsi/item235>
29. J Silas. (2005). *Perjalanan panjang perumahan Indonesia dalam dan sekitar abad XX dalam: Kota Lama Kota Baru Sejarah Kota-Kota di 2005*.
30. Jun, J. S. (2009). *The Limits of Post – New Public Management and Beyond*. Public Administration Review.
31. Kamensky, J. M. (1996). Role of the Government” “R ~ einvening Movement in Federal Management. *Public Administration Review*, 56(3), 247–255.
32. Karatas, A. (2019). Post-New Public Management Paradigm and Its Effects on Public Administration. *Social Mentality and Research Thinkers Journal*, 5(26), 1796–1805. <https://doi.org/10.31576/smryj.392>
33. Laffin, M. (2018). Explaining reforms: post-New Public Management myths or political realities? Social housing delivery in England and France 1. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 85(1), 45–61. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852317746223>
34. Lane, J.-E. (2013). The Principal-Agent Approach to Politics: Policy Implementation and Public Policy-Making. *Open Journal of Political Science*, 03(02), 85–89. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojps.2013.32012>
35. Levy, R. (2010). New Public Management: End of an Era? *Public Policy and Administration*, 25(2), 234–240.

- <https://doi.org/10.1177/0952076709357152>
36. Lorenz, C. (2012). If you're So Smart, Why Are you under Surveillance? Universities, Neoliberalism, and New Public Management. *Critical Inquiry*, 38(3), 599–629. <https://doi.org/10.1086/664553>
 37. Luo, D., van der Heijden, H., & Boelhouwer, P. J. (2020). Policy design and implementation of a new public rental housing management scheme in China: A step forward or an uncertain fate? *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 12(15). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12156090>
 38. Makkelo, I. D. (2018). Sejarah Perkotaan: Sebuah Tinjauan Historiografis Dan Tematis. *Lensa Budaya: Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu-Ilmu Budaya*, 12(2), 83–101. <https://doi.org/10.34050/JLB.V12I2.3052>
 39. Martin, J., & Spano, A. (2015). From Performance Management to Strategic Local Government Leadership: Lessons from Different Cultural Settings. *Public Money and Management*, 35(4), 303–310. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540962.2015.1047276>
 40. McCourt, W. (2013). Models of Public Service Reform: A Problem-Solving Approach. In *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper* (Issue 6428). <http://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=2258956>
 41. Nannyonjo, J., & Okot, N. (2013). Decentralisation, Local Government Capacity and Efficiency of Health Service Delivery in Uganda. *African Development*, 15(1), 125–158.
 42. Nedavaska, I. (2013). *Swedish Housing Policies and Homelessness*. Lund University.
 43. O'Flynn, J. (2010). *The Post Bureaucratic Model: Principles, Practices, Premises*. 1–18.
 44. Olssen, M., & Peters, M. A. (2005). Neoliberalism, Higher Education and the Knowledge economy: From the Free Market to Knowledge Capitalism. *Journal of Education Policy*, 20(3), 313–345. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680930500108718>
 45. Ormond, D., & Löffler, E. (1998). New Public Management: What to Take and Want to Leave. *III Congreso Internacional Del CLAD Sobre La Reforma Del Estado y de La Administración Pública*, 14–17. <http://old.clad.org/congresos/congresos-antiores/iii-madrid-1998/new-public-management-what-to-take-and-what-to-leave>
 46. Osborne, D., & Gaebler, T. (1993). *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector*. Plume. <https://www.amazon.com/Reinventing-Government-Entrepreneurial-Spirit-Transforming/dp/0452269423>
 47. Osborne, & Gaebler, T. (1992). *Reinventing Government: How the entrepreneurial Government is Transforming the Public Sector*. New York, NY: Plume.
 48. Ostrom, V. (1989). *The Intellectual Crisis in American Public Administration*. Second Edition (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press).
 49. Palmatier, R. W., Houston, M. B., & Hulland, J. (2018). Review articles: purpose, process, and structure. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 46(1), 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-017-0563-4>
 50. Paquet, G. (2001). *Governance in the 21st Century, The New Governance, Subsidiarity and the Strategic State*.
 51. Government Regulation Number 62 of, Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia Nomor 26 Tahun 1985 Tentang Jalan 1 (1962). <https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=2ahUKEwjWxrKeif7eAhVYfysKHcHWAOWQFjAAegQICRAC&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.ojk.go.id%2Ffid%2Fkanal%2Fpasar-modal%2Fregulasi%2Fundang-undang%2FDocuments%2FPages%2Fundang-undang-nomo>
 52. Government Regulation Number 17 of, 1 (1963).
 53. Pillay, S. (2008). A cultural ecology of New Public Management. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 74(3), 373–394. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852308095949>
 54. Pillay, S., & Kluvers, R. (2014). An Institutional Theory Perspective on Corruption: The Case of a Developing Democracy. *Financial Accountability and Management*, 30(1), 95–119. <https://doi.org/10.1111/faam.12029>
 55. Pollit, C. (1993). *Managerialism and the Public Services: Cuts or Cultural Change in the 1990s?*, 2nd edn. Cambridge, MA : Basil Blackwell.
 56. Pollit, C., & Bouckaert, G. (2011). *Public Management Reform, Third Edition, A Comparative Analysis New Public Management, Governance, and the Neo Weberian State*. Oxford University Press. <http://eprints.uanl.mx/5481/1/1020149995.PDF>
 57. Pollit, C., & Bouckaert, G. (2016). *Public Management Reform. A Comparative Analysis New Public Management Governance, and the Neo Weberian State* (Third Edit, Issue July). Oxford : University Press.
 58. Pollitt, C. (2007). The new public management: an overview of its current status. *Administratie Si Management Public*, 8, 110.
 59. Prayitno, B., Fenat, A. S., & Paramita, M. (2012). *Kesejahteraan Rakyat atas Papan-Akselerasi Pemenuhan Kebutuhan Papan*. Kedeputusan Bidang Koordinasi Perlindungan Sosial dan Perumahan Rakyat - Universitas Gadjah Mada.
 60. Priemus, H., Dieleman, F., & Clapham, D. (1999). Current Developments in Social Housing Management. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 14(3), 211–223. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02496678>
 61. Prowle, M. J., Kalar, M., & Barrow, L. (2016). Developing. contestability in the delivery of public services. *Public Money & Management*, 28(4).
 62. Prowle, M. J. (2008). New Development: Developing Contestability in the Delivery of Public Services. *Public Money and Management*, 28(4), 255–260. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9302.2008.00652.x>

63. Raditya, I. (2018, July 18). Taktik Orde Baru Pikat PNS dan Rakyat Lewat Perumnas. *Tirto.Id*. Retrieved From. <https://tirto.id/taktik-orde-baru-pikat-pns-dan-rakyat-lewat-perumnas-cPIN>
64. Reiter, R., & Klenk, T. (2019a). The manifold meanings of 'post-New Public Management' – a systematic literature review. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 85(1), 11–27. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852318759736>
65. Reiter, R., & Klenk, T. (2019b). The Manifold Meanings of 'Post-New Public Management' – a Systematic Literature Review. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 85(1), 11–27. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852318759736>
66. Robison, R. (1981). Culture, Politics, and Economy in the Political History of the New Order. *Indonesia*, 31(31), 1. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3351013>
67. Rusli, B. (2014). *Isu-isu Krusial Administrasi Publik Komtemporer*. Lepsindo Bandung Indonesia.
68. Sahamies, K., Haveri, A., & Anttiroiko, A.-V. (2022). Local Governance Platforms: Roles and Relations of City Governments, Citizens, and Businesses. *Administration & Society*, 0(00), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00953997211072531>
69. Sarker, A. E. (2006). New Public Management in Developing Countries: An analysis of success and failure with particular reference to Singapore and Bangladesh. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 19(2), 180–203. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513550610650437>
70. Schein, E. H., & Schein, W. P. (2017). *Organisational Culture and Leadership* (5th Editio). Wiley.
71. Silaen, P., & Smark, C. (2006). The "Culture System" in Dutch Indonesia 1830-1870: How Rawls's Original Position Ethics were Violated. *The Business Review, Cambridge*, 6(2), 45–50. <http://search.proquest.com/docview/197307762?accountid=14549%5Cnhttp://hl5yy6xn2p.search.serialssolutions.com/?genre=article&sid=ProQ:&atitle=The+%22Culture+System%22+in+Dutch+Indonesia+1830-1870:+How+Rawls's+Original+Position+Ethics+were+Violated&title=T>
72. Soegijoko, B. T. S., Pratiwi, N. A. H., & Aris Choirun Anwar. (2011). *Bunga Rampai Pembangunan Kota Indonesia dalam Abad 21, Konsep dan Pendekatan Pembangunan Perkotaan di Indonesia* (Edisi 2). Urban and Regional Development Institute (URDI) dan Yayasan Sugijanto Soegijoko bekerjasama dengan Lembaga Penerbit Fakultas Ekonomi Universitas Indonesia. <https://opac.perpusnas.go.id/DetailOpac.aspx?id=545411#>
73. Springs, N. (2002). Delivering Public Services—Mechanisms and Consequences: Delivering Public Services Under the New Public Management: The Case of Public Housing. *Public Money and Management*, 22(4), 11–17. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9302.00324>
74. Stoker, G. (2006). Public value management: A new narrative for networked governance? *American Review of Public Administration*, 36(1), 41–57. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074005282583>
75. Tolofari, S. (2005). New Public Management and Education. *Policy Futures in Education*. <https://doi.org/10.2304/pfie.2005.3.1.11>
76. Torfing, J., Sørensen, E., & Røiseland, A. (2019). Transforming the Public Sector Into an Arena for Co-Creation: Barriers, Drivers, Benefits, and Ways Forward. *Administration and Society*, 51(5), 795–825. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0095399716680057>
77. Tunas, D., & Peresthu, A. (2010). The self-help housing in Indonesia: The only option for the poor? *Habitat International*, 34(3), 315–322. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.habitatint.2009.11.007>
78. Walker, R. (1998). New Public Management and Housing Associations: From comfort to competition. *Policy and Politics*, 26(1), 71–87. <https://doi.org/10.1332/030557398782018266>
79. Walker, R. (2000). The Changing Management of Social Housing: The Impact of Externalisation and Managerialisation. *Housing Studies*, 15(2), 281–299. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02673030082397>
80. Wang, B., & Christensen, T. (2017). The Open Public Value Account and Comprehensive Social Development: An Assessment of China and the United States. *Administration and Society*, 49(6), 852–881. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0095399715587522>
81. Widianingsih, I. (2005). *Workshop on Enlarging Citizen Participation and Increasing Local Autonomy in Achieving Societal Harmony Workshop Local Governance , Decentralization and Participatory Planning in Indonesia : Seeking a New Path to a Harmonious Society*. December, 5–7.
82. Wihantoro, Y., Lowe, A., Cooper, S., & Manochin, M. (2015). Bureaucratic reform in post-Asian Crisis Indonesia: The Directorate General of Tax. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 31, 44–63. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpa.2015.04.002>
83. Wihardyanto, D., & Ikaputra, I. (2019). Pembangunan Permukiman Kolonial Belanda Di Jawa : Sebuah Tinjauan Teori. *Nature: National Academic Journal of Architecture*, 6(2), 146. <https://doi.org/10.24252/nature.v6i2a5>
84. Winarso, H., & Firman, T. (2002). Residential land development in Jabotabek, Indonesia: Triggering economic crisis? *Habitat International*, 26(4), 487–506. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0197-3975\(02\)00023-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0197-3975(02)00023-1)

Ahman Sururi, Budiman Rusli, Ida Widianingsih, Slamet Usman Ismanto
Būsto politika mažas pajamas gaunančiose bendruomenėse Indonezijoje ir jos reformos:
Apžvalga
Anotacija

Šio straipsnio tikslas – aptarti naujojo viešojo valdymo (NVV) būsto politikos metodą, kuris yra įgyvendinamas Indonezijoje mažų pajamų bendruomenėse Indonezijoje, ir konkrečiai aprašyti, kaip NVV metodas yra susijęs su po-NVV metodu. Šiame tyrime taikomas apžvalgos metodas. Duomenys renkami ieškant įvairių šaltinių ir literatūros, tiek NVV teorijų, tiek reglamentų, tiek istorinių dokumentų apie būsto politiką Indonezijoje. Šiame tyrime naudojama kelių etapų duomenų analizė, t. y. pirmiausia trumpai aprašoma Indonezijos būsto politikos istorija senosios tvarkos, naujosios tvarkos ir reformų epochos laikotarpiais, taip pat paaiškinama, kaip būsto požiūris į MBR Indonezijoje perėmė NVV politiką, o trečiajame skyriuje aprašoma būsto politikos reformos Indonezijoje kryptis, pagrįsta po-NVV paradigma. Tyrimo rezultatai rodo, kad būsto politikos NVV požiūris į mažas pajamas gaunančias bendruomenes Indonezijoje nepadėjo iki galo išspręsti būsto problemų mažas pajamas gaunančioms bendruomenėms, todėl iš esmės NVV požiūris reikalauja Indonezijos socialinio, kultūrinio, ekonominio ir politinio prisitaikymo. Šis straipsnis pabrėžia, kaip svarbu ateityje įgyvendinti idealią būsto politiką mažas pajamas gaunančioms bendruomenėms, taikant po-NVV požiūrį kaip korekcijos ir vertinimo priemonę, kartu skatinant būsto politikos reformą mažas pajamas gaunančioms bendruomenėms Indonezijoje.

Ahmad Sururi, Doctorate student at the Graduate Program in Public Administration, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Padjadjaran and Lecturer at Universitas Serang Raya
E-mail: ahmad17029@mail.unpad.ac.id

Budiman Rusli, Professor, Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Social and Political Science, Universitas Padjadjaran
E-mail: budiman.rusli@unpad.ac.id

Ida Widianingsih, Vice Dean for Learning, Student & Research Affairs, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Social and Political Science, Universitas Padjadjaran
E-mail: ida.widianingsih@unpad.ac.id

Slamet Usman Ismanto, Lecturer, Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Social and Political Science, Universitas Padjadjaran
E-mail: slamet.ismanto@unpad.ac.id

Ahmad Sururi, doktorantas, Socialinių ir politikos mokslų fakultetas, Padjadjaran universitetas
El. paštas: ahmad17029@mail.unpad.ac.id

Budiman Rusli, profesorius, Viešojo administravimo katedra, Socialinių ir politikos mokslų fakultetas, Padjadjaran universitetas
El. paštas: budiman.rusli@unpad.ac.id

Ida Widianingsih, profesorė ir prorektorė, Viešojo administravimo katedra, Socialinių ir politikos mokslų fakultetas, Padjadjaran universitetas
El. paštas: ida.widianingsih@unpad.ac.id

Slamet Usman Ismanto, lektorius, Viešojo administravimo katedra, Socialinių ir politikos mokslų fakultetas, Padjadjaran universitetas
El. paštas: slamet.ismanto@unpad.ac.id

