

COLLABORATION BETWEEN GOVERNMENT AND COMMUNITY IN OVERCOMING DOMESTIC VIOLENCE: A THEORY ANALYSIS OF COLLABORATION WITH A SYSTEMIC APPROACH AND FACE TO FACE DIALOGUE

Muhammad Aldi Rahmandika & Rira Nuradhawati*
Universitas Jenderal Achmad Yani, Cimahi, Indonesia
*Email: rira.nuradhawati@lecture.unjani.ac.id**

Article History

Received: 8 January 2026

Accepted: 8 February 2026

Published: 9 April 2026

Abstract

This article examines the implementation of collaboration between the government and the community in addressing domestic violence (DV) in Indonesia through an integrated collaboration theory framework. By combining Ansell and Gash's collaborative governance theory, which emphasizes face-to-face dialogue, Parsons' structural functionalism theory, which examines social systems, and Pfeffer and Salancik's resource dependence theory, which analyzes resource dependency, this study analyzes the architecture, processes, and power dynamics in collaborative efforts to address domestic violence. Using a critical literature review method of policy documents, official reports, and recent scientific works, this study identifies that formal collaborations such as the Integrated Service Unit (UPT PPA) have not been able to create structural transformation due to systemic communication distortions and entrenched power asymmetries. The findings indicate that despite the formality of collaboration, the dialogue that occurs is still instrumental and has not reached a deliberative level capable of deconstructing patriarchal norms. The study's conclusion emphasizes that effective collaboration requires a systemic approach that integrates institutional reform, restructuring power relations, and the creation of a truly egalitarian dialogue space.

Keywords: Domestic Violence, Collaboration, Face-to-Face Dialogue, Systems Theory, Resource Dependence, Patriarchal Structure.

A. INTRODUCTION

Domestic violence (DV) in Indonesia has long been a complex and multidimensional social phenomenon, not merely a private legal issue but also a public issue requiring a collective response from various stakeholders. As a "wicked problem," domestic violence is characterized by a high degree of causal interdependence, which precludes definitive solutions, and a profound value conflict between entrenched patriarchal norms and progressive gender equality principles. In this context, a collaborative approach between the government and civil society is not only a strategic choice but an unavoidable structural imperative.

Normatively, the foundation for collaboration has been established through Law Number 23 of 2004 concerning the Elimination of Domestic Violence, which explicitly recognizes community participation in prevention and response efforts. However, as Suryaningsih points out, there is a significant gap between the participatory mandate in the legal text and its implementation at the operational level. Collaboration is often reduced to merely procedural

administrative coordination, without addressing the transformative dimension necessary to change the social structures and norms that perpetuate violence.

To understand this complexity, this article develops an integrative analytical framework that combines three theoretical perspectives. First, Ansell and Gash's theory of collaborative governance emphasizes face-to-face dialogue as the core of effective collaboration processes. Dialogue, in this context, is not simply face-to-face communication, but rather deliberative interaction that fosters shared understanding between actors with differing interests and perspectives. Second, Parsons's structural-functionalist perspective allows for an analysis of the functions and dysfunctions of collaborative systems in maintaining social equilibrium. Third, Pfeffer and Salancik's resource dependency theory provides a lens for analyzing the power dynamics arising from resource dependencies between actors in collaboration.

Using this theoretical framework, this study argues that the effectiveness of collaboration in addressing domestic violence depends not only on formal institutional design but, more fundamentally, on the quality of communicative interactions between actors and the collaborative system's ability to equitably manage resource dependencies. Without transformation at the dialogical and relational levels, collaboration will become trapped in the reproduction of existing power structures, thus failing to create substantive social change.

B. LITERATURE REVIEW

Collaborative Governance and Face-to-Face Dialogue

The concept of collaborative governance has evolved in response to the limitations of hierarchical and market approaches in addressing complex public problems. Ansell and Gash define collaborative governance as "a governance arrangement in which one or more public institutions engage non-governmental stakeholders in a formal, consensus-oriented, and deliberative collective decision-making process." This concept emphasizes the importance of face-to-face dialogue as a primary mechanism for building trust, facilitating shared learning, and reaching consensus.

In the context of addressing domestic violence, deliberative dialogue is crucial for several reasons. First, domestic violence involves sensitive issues laden with values and emotions, thus requiring a safe space for the expression of diverse experiences and perspectives. Second, the effectiveness of interventions depends on close coordination between various services (legal, medical, psychosocial), which requires intensive and ongoing communication. Third, transforming social norms that perpetuate domestic violence requires dialogue capable of collectively articulating and reconstructing values.

However, implementing face-to-face dialogue in the Indonesian context faces significant structural challenges. As Indrawan identified, a hierarchical and formalistic bureaucratic culture often hinders egalitarian and deliberative dialogue. Dialogue tends to follow a one-way, top-down communication pattern, with limited room for substantive participation from non-governmental actors.

Structural-Functionalism and Collaborative Systems Analysis

Parsons' structural-functionalism perspective offers a framework for analyzing collaborative systems as a whole consisting of interrelated subsystems. According to Parsons, an optimally functioning social system must fulfill four imperative functions, or the AGIL scheme: Adaptation (adaptation to the environment), Goal attainment (achievement of goals), Integration (integration of subsystems), and Latency (pattern maintenance).

In the context of collaborative domestic violence management, the UPT PPA model can be analyzed as a social system that must fulfill these four functions. The adaptation function is reflected in the system's ability to integrate various services and respond to the complexity of victims' needs. The goal attainment function is evident in targets for case handling and

prevention of recurrent violence. The integration function concerns coordination and cooperation between various actors and agencies. The latency function relates to maintaining norms and values that support collaboration.

However, research by Hidayat shows that many UPT PPA experience dysfunctional integration. Functional fragmentation occurs due to the persistent sectoral logic among government agencies, the lack of effective integration mechanisms between formal and informal subsystems, and wide variations in institutional capacity across regions. This dysfunction hinders the effectiveness of the overall collaboration system.

Resource Dependence and Power Dynamics in Collaboration

Pfeffer and Salancik's resource dependence theory provides a lens for analyzing power dynamics in collaboration based on resource dependencies between actors. This theory argues that organizations rely on the external environment for resources necessary for survival, and this dependency creates power relationships that influence organizational behavior.

In the context of collaboration in addressing domestic violence, there is a reciprocal dependency between government and civil society. The government relies on civil society for social legitimacy, access to communities, and specific knowledge of local dynamics. Conversely, civil society relies on the government for financial resources, legal authority, and access to formal systems. However, this dependency is asymmetrical, with the government having greater control over strategic resources.

This asymmetry, as analyzed by Fatiyah, affects collaboration dynamics in several ways. First, agenda setting tends to be dominated by the government. Second, performance evaluation is typically conducted using government-determined indicators. Third, strategic decision-making often remains within the control of the government bureaucracy. This power asymmetry can hinder equitable and participatory collaboration, which in turn affects the quality of face-to-face dialogue and system integration described in the previous theory.

The Context of Domestic Violence and Collaboration in Indonesia

The context of collaboration in addressing domestic violence in Indonesia cannot be separated from the existing legal framework. Law No. 23 of 2004 concerning the Elimination of Domestic Violence and Law No. 12 of 2022 concerning Criminal Acts of Sexual Violence (TPKS) provide the legal basis for community participation. Its implementation is realized in the form of the Integrated Service Unit for the Protection of Women and Children (UPT PPA), which is regulated in the Integrated Service Guidelines. Data from the National Commission on Violence Against Women shows a continuing trend of cases, indicating the need for an in-depth evaluation of the effectiveness of existing collaborative models. Civil society, through organizations such as the National Commission on Violence Against Women and various NGOs, has demonstrated a crucial role in victim assistance and policy advocacy.

C. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research employed a systematic literature review with a qualitative, interpretive-critical approach. The analytical framework was developed integratively by combining three primary theoretical perspectives: (1) collaborative governance, focusing on Ansell's face-to-face dialogue; and (2) structural-functionalism, analyzing the function of collaborative systems. The integration of these three theories allows for a holistic analysis that simultaneously examines institutional aspects, communication processes, and power relations.

Data sources were collected through a critical review of three primary corpora:

- Policy and Regulatory Documents: Analysis of the Domestic Violence Law, the Women's Empowerment and Child Protection Law, and various implementing

regulations and technical guidelines, such as the Integrated Service Guidelines, with a focus on the discursive construction of participation and collaboration.

- Official Documents and Reports: An in-depth review of the National Commission on Violence Against Women's Annual Report (2019-2023), evaluation reports of the Women's Empowerment and Child Protection Unit (UPT PPA) programs from various regions, and case studies of collaboration in regions with varying performance.
- Academic Literature: A critical analysis of theoretical and empirical works related to collaboration, governance, and handling of domestic violence from a multidisciplinary perspective, both nationally and internationally.

Data analysis was conducted through three integrative stages aligned with the theoretical framework: (1) Textual analysis of the conceptual construction of collaboration in policy documents to identify official narratives; (2) Structural-functional analysis using Parsons' AGIL scheme to diagnose the functions and dysfunctions of the UPT PPA collaboration system; (3) Critical analysis of the dynamics of power and resource dependency between actors in collaboration practices. Triangulation between theoretical perspectives and data sources was conducted to obtain a comprehensive and valid understanding.

D. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Formal Collaborative Architecture: Fragile Structural Integration in Functional Analysis

Analysis of the UPT PPA system, using Parsons' structural-functionalism lens, reveals an integrated yet fragile structural design in fulfilling its imperative functions. Formally, the UPT PPA is designed to fulfill the four AGIL functions: Adaptation through multi-sectoral services, Goal attainment through case handling, Integration through inter-agency coordination, and Latency through the dissemination of anti-violence norms.

However, document and report analysis findings reveal significant dysfunction, particularly in the Integration function. Hidayat's research confirms that in practice, acute functional fragmentation occurs. The sectoral logic of ministries/agencies (police, hospitals, social services) remains stronger than the logic of integrated services, forcing victims to navigate separate bureaucracies. Integration mechanisms between formal (government) and informal (NGOs, indigenous communities) subsystems are also ineffective. Many UPT PPA only symbolically involve civil society in coordination forums, without providing space for substantive decision-making. Variations in institutional capacity across regions exacerbate this dysfunction, creating unequal access to services for victims.

This failure of the Integration function has a direct impact on other functions. Fragmented systems struggle to adapt quickly to complex victim needs (goal attainment is hampered), and anti-violence norm messages become inconsistent (latency is disrupted). Thus, structural-functional analysis demonstrates that weaknesses in one subsystem (integration) can lead to dysfunction in the collaborative system as a whole.

Systemic Communication Distortion: Face-to-Face Dialogue in the Grip of Bureaucracy and Patriarchy

An analysis using Ansell and Gash's collaborative governance theory reveals the root of this integration dysfunction: systemic communication distortions that hinder face-to-face deliberative dialogue. The UPT PPA coordination forum, which should be an arena for dialogue, often becomes a reproduction of existing power structures.

First, the bureaucratic hierarchical structure dictates communication patterns. As reported in a study in Bandung, discussions in the UPT PPA forum tend to be dominated by government officials as chairs, while NGO or community representatives do more listening and reporting. This creates what Habermas calls a "non-ideal speech situation," where not all

participants have the freedom and equality to express their arguments. The dialogue becomes instructional, rather than deliberative.

Second, an epistemic asymmetry occurs, where the technical-legal knowledge of officials is considered more valid than the experiential knowledge of victims or the cultural knowledge of local communities. Victim narratives, as Setyawati observed, are often reduced to case data in assessment forms, rather than sources of insight into root causes and solutions. As a result, dialogue fails to provide the shared learning essential for effective collaboration.

Third, the limited space and time for dialogue in fast-paced formal meetings precludes the development of trust, a key prerequisite for collaboration. Without trust, dialogue will not reach the level of deliberation necessary to resolve deep-seated value conflicts, such as the patriarchal norms underlying domestic violence.

Asymmetric Power Dynamics: Unraveling Resource Dependence in Collaboration

Analysis using Pfeffer and Salancik's resource dependence theory provides a structural explanation for why this communication distortion occurs and is difficult to overcome: it is due to the asymmetry of power born of an unequal pattern of resource dependence. The government and civil society are indeed interdependent, but the government holds control over more critical and scarce resources: the state budget and formal legal authority.

This asymmetrical dependence manifests itself in several operational patterns that undermine collaboration. Agenda setting within the UPT PPA is almost entirely determined by the programs and performance indicators (IK) of the central/regional government. Evaluation of collaboration success is measured by the achievement of these IK, which are often quantitative (the number of cases handled) and ignore qualitative outcomes such as victim empowerment or changes in community norms. Consequently, as Pfeffer and Salancik argue, the more dependent organization (in this case, the NGO) will tend to adapt its behavior to the wishes of the resource provider (the government). NGOs may choose programs that are easily measured and funded, rather than risky but more necessary long-term, transformative approaches.

However, the analysis also found civil society strategies to manage this dependency, such as building strong coalition networks (e.g., between the National Commission on Violence Against Women, LBH Apik, and religious organizations) to increase collective bargaining power, and developing specialized expertise (such as trauma counseling) that makes them difficult to replace. These strategies demonstrate that power relations within collaboration are dynamic and negotiable.

Integrative Synthesis: Toward Deliberative and Transformational Collaboration

Based on an integrative analysis of the three perspectives, it is clear that the three challenges of structural integration dysfunction, distorted dialogue, and power asymmetry are interconnected and mutually reinforcing. Hierarchical bureaucratic structures (structural-functional analysis) create unequal dialogue spaces (collaborative governance analysis), which are exacerbated by asymmetric resource dependency (resource dependence analysis). Collaboration is thus trapped in a vicious cycle: functioning solely as a technical coordination tool that serves existing institutional goals, rather than as a vehicle for social transformation to eradicate the roots of domestic violence.

Therefore, transformation towards effective collaboration requires simultaneous intervention at all three levels:

- a. At the structural-functional level, it is necessary to restructure the UPT PPA model into a more organic and networked system, reducing hierarchy and creating flexible integration mechanisms between state and non-state actors.
- b. At the dialogue process level, it is necessary to create a deliberative dialogue space separate from routine administrative forums. This space should be facilitated

neutrally, adopt protocols that guarantee equal voice, and be specifically designed to address conflicts of values and norms, not just technical coordination.

- c. At the power relations level, it is necessary to encourage reform of the funding system that grants greater autonomy to civil society organizations (for example, through endowments or block grants), as well as a real division of decision-making authority throughout the program cycle, from planning to evaluation.

E. CONCLUSION

An integrative analysis combining the perspectives of collaborative governance, structural-functionalism, and resource dependence theory reveals the profound complexity and challenges of collaborative domestic violence management in Indonesia. Although a formal collaborative architecture has been developed through the UPT PPA model, its effectiveness is limited by several critical interrelated factors: (1) functional fragmentation within the collaborative system that hinders integration (structural-functional analysis); (2) systemic communication distortions that prevent face-to-face deliberative and transformative dialogue (collaborative governance analysis); and (3) power asymmetries arising from unequal resource dependence (resource dependence analysis). Existing collaboration tends to be instrumental and procedural, focusing more on coordinating services than on transforming the social relations and cultural norms that perpetuate domestic violence. Without intervention at the structural and relational levels, collaboration risks becoming merely a formal legitimacy for practices that do not substantively address the root causes of domestic violence.

Based on the research findings, the following are strategic recommendations for strengthening collaborative domestic violence management:

Reform the Collaborative Architecture: Develop a more integrated and adaptive collaboration model, with: (a) more flexible and less hierarchical coordination mechanisms; (b) an incentive system that supports cross-sector collaboration; (c) strengthening institutional capacity at the local level for effective implementation. **Transforming Dialogue Practices:** Encouraging a shift from instrumental communication to deliberative dialogue through: (a) training competent and neutral dialogue facilitators; (b) developing dialogue protocols that ensure inclusiveness and equality of participation; (c) creating safe dialogue spaces for the articulation of victims' experiences and knowledge. **Restructuring Power Relations:** Addressing power asymmetries through: (a) reforming the funding system to provide greater autonomy to civil society organizations; (b) a more concrete and equitable distribution of decision-making authority; (c) strengthening civil society's advocacy and negotiation capacity.

Developing Learning Systems: Building adaptive capacity within collaborative systems through: (a) participatory monitoring and evaluation mechanisms involving all stakeholders; (b) effective documentation and learning sharing systems; (c) flexibility in program design and implementation to respond to local contexts. **Integration of Systemic Approaches:** Developing approaches that integrate interventions at multiple system levels, from macro policy reform to transformation of cultural norms at the community level, with the recognition that sustainable change requires simultaneous and coordinated interventions at all levels of the social system.

REFERENCES

Abdul Haris, F. 2019. *Reformasi Hukum dan Perlindungan Perempuan*. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika.

- Agranoff, R., & McGuire, M. 2003. *Collaborative Public Management: New Strategies for Local Governments*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Ansell, C., & Gash, A. 2008. Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(4), 543-571.
- Bryson, J. M., Crosby, B. C., & Stone, M. M. 2006. The Design and Implementation of Cross-Sector Collaborations: Propositions from the Literature. *Public Administration Review*, 66(s1), 44-55.
- Christensen, T., & Lægreid, P. 2007. The Whole-of-Government Approach to Public Sector Reform. *Public Administration Review*, 67(6), 1059-1066.
- Emerson, K., Nabatchi, T., & Balogh, S. 2012. An Integrative Framework for Collaborative Governance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 22(1), 1-29.
- Fatihah, F. 2017. Peran Strategis LSM dalam Penegakan Hukum KDRT. *Jurnal Hukum*, 15(2), 98-112.
- Gray, B. 1989. *Collaborating: Finding Common Ground for Multiparty Problems*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Habermas, J. 1984. *The Theory of Communicative Action, Volume 1: Reason and the Rationalization of Society*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Hidayat, R. 2021. *Integrasi Layanan dalam Penanganan KDRT*. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika.
- Imperial, M. T. 2005. Using Collaboration as a Governance Strategy: Lessons from Six Watershed Management Programs. *Administration & Society*, 37(3), 281-320.
- Indrawan, W. 2019. Mediasi Adat dalam Kasus KDRT. *Jurnal Sosiologi Hukum*, 12(2), 60-75.
- Innes, J. E., & Booher, D. E. 2010. *Planning with Complexity: An Introduction to Collaborative Rationality for Public Policy*. London: Routledge.
- Jurnal Hukum dan Kebijakan Publik. 2018. Model Kolaborasi dalam Penanganan KDRT di Kota Bandung. *Jurnal Hukum dan Kebijakan Publik*, 5(1), 15-30.
- Kania, J., & Kramer, M. 2011. Collective Impact. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 9(1), 36-41.
- Kemen PPPA. 2020. *Pedoman Pelayanan Terpadu dalam Penanganan Kasus Kekerasan terhadap Perempuan dan Anak*. Jakarta: Kementerian Pemberdayaan Perempuan dan Perlindungan Anak.
- Komnas Perempuan. 2023. *Catatan Tahunan Kekerasan terhadap Perempuan*. Jakarta: Komnas Perempuan.
- Kooiman, J. 2003. *Governing as Governance*. London: Sage Publications.
- Lasker, R. D., Weiss, E. S., & Miller, R. 2001. Partnership Synergy: A Practical Framework for Studying and Strengthening the Collaborative Advantage. *The Milbank Quarterly*, 79(2), 179-205.
- Milward, H. B., & Provan, K. G. 2000. Governing the Hollow State. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 10(2), 359-380.
- Morse, R. S. 2010. Integrative Public Leadership: Catalyzing Collaboration to Create Public Value. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21(2), 231-245.
- O'Leary, R., & Bingham, L. B. (Eds.). 2009. *The Collaborative Public Manager: New Ideas for the Twenty-first Century*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Parsons, T. 1951. *The Social System*. New York: Free Press.
- Peters, B. G. 1998. Managing Horizontal Government: The Politics of Co-ordination. *Public Administration*, 76(2), 295-311.
- Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. R. 1978. *The External Control of Organizations: A Resource Dependence Perspective*. New York: Harper & Row.

- Rittel, H. W., & Webber, M. M. 1973. *Dilemmas in a General Theory of Planning*. *Policy Sciences*, 4(2), 155-169.
- Saptari, R. 2023. *Hukum dan Perlindungan Korban Kekerasan Seksual*. Jakarta: Pustaka Utama.
- Setyawati, R. 2021. *Tantangan Aktivisme Akar Rumput dalam Menangani KDRT*. Jakarta: Pustaka Ilmu.
- Stoker, G. 2006. Public Value Management: A New Narrative for Networked Governance? *The American Review of Public Administration*, 36(1), 41-57.
- Susanto, I. 2022. Integrasi Layanan Terpadu bagi Korban KDRT. *Jurnal Sosial dan Kemanusiaan*, 15(3), 70-85.
- Suryaningsih, Y. 2018. *Perlindungan Hukum terhadap Korban Kekerasan dalam Rumah Tangga*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Thomson, A. M., & Perry, J. L. 2006. Collaboration Processes: Inside the Black Box. *Public Administration Review*, 66(s1), 20-32.
- Torfin, J., Peters, B. G., Pierre, J., & Sørensen, E. 2012. *Interactive Governance: Advancing the Paradigm*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Vangen, S., & Huxham, C. 2003. Nurturing Collaborative Relations: Building Trust in Interorganizational Collaboration. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 39(1), 5-31.
- Wulandari, A. 2020. Tantangan Implementasi Kebijakan Perlindungan Anak di Tingkat Daerah. *Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi*, 10(1), 52-65.
- Wood, D. J., & Gray, B. 1991. Toward a Comprehensive Theory of Collaboration. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 27(2), 139-162.
- Republik Indonesia. 2004. *Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 23 Tahun 2004 tentang Penghapusan Kekerasan dalam Rumah Tangga*. Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2004 Nomor 95.
- Republik Indonesia. 2022. *Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 12 Tahun 2022 tentang Tindak Pidana Kekerasan Seksual*. Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2022 Nomor 134.
- Bappenas. 2020. *Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Nasional (RPJMN) 2020-2024*. Jakarta: Kementerian PPN/Bappenas.
- Putri, D. A., & Mulyani, S. 2020. Efektivitas Layanan Terpadu bagi Korban KDRT di Kota Surabaya. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik*, 24(1), 33-50.
- Sihaloho, M. J. (2019). *Pemberdayaan Perempuan Korban KDRT melalui Pendekatan Sosio-Legal*. Bandung: Refika Aditama.
- Nurhayati, S. 2022. Peran Masyarakat dalam Pencegahan KDRT di Era Digital. *Jurnal Studi Gender dan Anak*, 9(2), 89-104.
- Kusumawardhani, A. 2021. *Modal Sosial dan Jaringan Kolaborasi dalam Penanganan Masalah Kesehatan Reproduksi Perempuan*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.