



## Extreme Poverty Governance Through the Family Hope Program in Buton Regency

La Didi<sup>1</sup>, Rahmawati<sup>2</sup>, Wa Ode Salma<sup>3</sup>

Email Correspondent: [rahma.wty9408@gmail.com](mailto:rahma.wty9408@gmail.com)

### Keywords:

Accountability,  
Transparency,  
Participation, PKH  
Program.

### Abstract

This research is a qualitative descriptive research. Data collection techniques using observation, interview and documentation methods. Data analysis techniques through data collection, data reduction, data presentation, and drawing conclusions. The results of the study indicate that the governance of poverty alleviation in Wakangka Village, Kapuntori District is not yet completely good, this can be described as: 1). Accountability, structurally the PKH program has been running but is not fully accountable in its implementation process. 2). Transparency, the PKH program is still not transparent, this is reflected in the weak information on the procedures for recipient criteria and is closed. 3). Community participation is still minimal, this is due to minimal access to information, minimal information facilities for socialization and program assistance.



This is an open access article under the CC BY License

### INTRODUCTION

The Family Hope Program is an Indonesian government program that provides conditional cash assistance to very poor households on the condition that the health and education components are met (Hidayat et al., 2011). Management tends not to pay attention to the eligibility of program recipients. There are people who are entitled to not receive benefits (Annisya & Novira, 2023). Then on the other hand there are also recipients who are not eligible to receive this program. The problem is that there are still gaps in the implementation of the program so that the objectives of empowerment have not been achieved optimally.

The impact of the program on the economic and social conditions of the community, various studies show that the Family Hope Program has a positive impact on the economic and social conditions of the poor (Ayun et al., 2021). The provision of cash assistance has helped the poor meet their basic needs (Kamilah et al., 2023).

In Buton Regency, the number of poor people is 13.68%, poor people 13,215 and extreme poor. 4.73.

<sup>1</sup> Universitas Dayanu Ikhsanuddin, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup> Universitas Dayanu Ikhsanuddin, Indonesia, [rahma.wty9408@gmail.com](mailto:rahma.wty9408@gmail.com)

<sup>3</sup> Universitas Dayanu Ikhsanuddin, Indonesia

Poverty severity index			
No	Poverty Depth Index	Poverty Severity Index	Information
2021	1,84%	0,42%	-
2022	1,25%	0,24%	-
2023	1,93%	0,37%	-

Source: BPS Buton 2024

The poverty severity index in Buton Regency shows an increase every year, this indicates the need for a more accountable, transparent and participatory restructuring of the Family Harana Program (PKH). The distribution of aid that is not yet on target, weak supervision of aid recipients who are still, and the empowerment of the poor as a whole is not optimal. This phenomenon needs to be a reference for improvement with related elements, namely the government, donors, the community carrying out public functions to achieve development goals and meet community needs effectively and efficiently (Osborne, 2010), effective governance helps in optimal resource management, which is important to achieve sustainable development goals. One of the elements of governance in question is participation. According to (Fung, 2006) community participation in the decision-making process is an important component of good governance, which allows community aspirations and needs to be accommodated, this is also said (United Nations, 2016) that public sector governance is very important in development. Good governance in poverty alleviation programs helps ensure accountable, transparent and participatory governance arrangements (Kumorotomo, 2014).

## **METHOD**

The design of this study is to use qualitative descriptive, namely qualitative research design, among others, is descriptive, the data collected is more in the form of words or pictures than numbers (Moleong, 2014). This qualitative descriptive research was conducted with the aim of obtaining a systematic, factual and accurate picture of the facts that occur in the field regarding non-numerical data, collecting and analyzing narrative data. "Qualitative researchers refer to two types of data sources, namely primary data and secondary data. Primary data sources are obtained directly by researchers in the field from the original source, namely through interviews, using interview guidelines as a tool to obtain information. In addition to interviews, researchers also obtain data based on observation results. While secondary data is obtained through research reports, journals, articles, references, documents related to Extreme Poverty Governance in Buton Regency. The data analysis technique in this study was carried out with three considerations: first, preparing and organizing data (namely text data such as transcripts or image data such as photos) to be analyzed, second, reducing data and third, presenting data (Crewswell, 2014).

## **RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

### **Accountability**

The implementation of the Family Hope Program (PKH) in Wakangka Village has shown the existence of an administrative and formal accountability mechanism. This is indicated by routine reporting by assistants to the Social Service and coordination between the village government, PKH assistants, and related agencies. However, substantive accountability involving community participation and understanding of the process is still weak. Most residents do not know the

indicators used in the selection of Beneficiary Families (KPM), resulting in a negative perception of the fairness of the program.

Observations show that the KPM selection process has used a combined approach between official DTKS data and community proposals through village deliberations. However, findings in the field show that there are still cases of poor residents who are not recorded, as well as wealthy residents who actually become recipients. This indicates inaccuracy in targeting which harms the principles of fairness and efficiency of the program. Data verification and validation (verval) by PKH assistants is carried out periodically, but has not fully involved the community actively or transparently, efforts to improve data have been facilitated by reporting mechanisms and submission of changes through the RT, village head, and the SIKS-NG system. However, the majority of the community is not aware of this procedure due to the lack of socialization and education. As a result, the opportunity to correct data discrepancies is very limited. As a form of aspiration, the community proposed strengthening social accountability by expanding the transparency of recipient data, forming a community forum for program evaluation, activating a complaint box, and increasing the role of RT and LPMK in supervision. This reflects a strong push from residents so that the PKH program is not only administratively accountable, but also participatory and responsive to real needs in the field.

The research findings show that the accountability of the PKH program in Wakangka Village can be procedurally accounted for, but it is still found that residents who are entitled to receive PKH do not receive assistance from the government. In addition, community knowledge regarding their responsibilities to utilize PKH assistance and monitor the PKH program is still very limited.

### **Transparency**

Poverty alleviation through the Family Hope Program (PKH) is the hope of many families to get the assistance they really need. However, in order for the assistance to be right on target and its benefits felt by those entitled, transparency in the process is very important. Starting from data collection of recipient families, determination criteria, to how the information is conveyed to the community, all must be done openly and involve various parties. To dig deeper into how this transparency works in Wakangka Village, we spoke with several sources who were directly involved, starting from Social Service officers, village officials, program assistants, to recipients and those who have not received assistance. The following are their answers about the transparency process in the implementation of PKH in Wakangka Village.

Based on the results of interviews with six informants, it shows that the PKH program is not yet transparent, this is reflected in the weak data collection process for prospective recipients of assistance so that when the data is verified it is inaccurate because the community is not directly involved in the data collection system. Communication does not work and the data entered is not up to date.

Observations also show differences in the level of understanding between the program implementers and the beneficiary community, especially regarding selection criteria, data collection mechanisms, and authority between agencies. Some residents still rely on information from assistants verbally, without clear documentation, which can lead to potential misunderstandings.

The research findings show that the transparency of the implementation of the PKH program in Wakangka Village has not been managed well, the recipient community still has minimal information, social assistance assistance is not transparent in carrying out its information function, the community has not received a complete explanation regarding the recipient criteria, verification process, and data changes. Information is mostly conveyed verbally and has not been properly documented, giving rise to the perception that the aid distribution process at the local level is less

open, while the government receives information that is disconnected from donor institutions (PKH assistance assistants).

### **Participation**

Community participation is a key element that brings the PKH program to life, far beyond the aid distribution process. This involvement begins from the early stages of data identification and validation, where village/sub-district officials and community leaders play an active role in helping to verify potential beneficiaries so that aid is right on target.

Based on the results of interviews with six informants, community participation in the PKH program in Wakangka Village tends to be symbolic and passive. Although structural parties such as village officials and PKH assistants stated that the community had been involved in the discussion forum and data collection process, most residents admitted that they did not know or had never been actively involved, either in the forum, data collection, or program evaluation. This shows a difference in perception between program organizers and beneficiaries and the general public.

In terms of data collection involvement, some informants stated that there was involvement through the RT and sub-district meetings, but some residents felt they did not know about the process. This shows that access to information and community involvement is not evenly distributed, and some residents are only objects of beneficiaries without sufficient understanding of the program's administrative processes. In terms of aspiration forums and contributions to the program, forums are indeed formally available, but their use is not optimal and is not inclusive. Some residents are only present when aid is disbursed and are not aware of the existence of a forum or complaint mechanism.

The main obstacles that cause low community participation in the PKH program include minimal public awareness of the importance of involvement, low understanding of program procedures, and lack of socialization and education from the program organizers to the community. Many residents admit that they do not know how to provide input or do not even know that they have a role in implementing the program other than as recipients of aid. The level of community participation in poverty alleviation through the PKH program in Wakangka Village is still low, both in terms of active involvement, access to information, and contribution to program implementation and evaluation. The community tends to be the object, not the subject of program implementation. Inequality in access to forums and information is a major obstacle, which is exacerbated by the lack of socialization and assistance from the organizers.

### **CONCLUSION**

Based on the results of research on poverty governance in Buton Regency, there are several important findings related to the implementation of the Family Hope Program (PKH) in Wakangka Village. First, the PKH program is not fully accountable. The process of providing assistance has not yet touched on substantial aspects, so that recipients of assistance feel that they do not fully receive justice and benefits from the program. Second, transparency in the implementation of the program is still weak and poorly documented. Although there are efforts to deliberate and install information, the process and criteria for receiving assistance are not clearly explained and are only conveyed verbally, which gives rise to the perception of closedness. Third, community participation in this program is still low and tends to be passive. The community is more often positioned as an object, with minimal access to information, lack of forums, and weak socialization and assistance as the main factors for the low active involvement in the implementation and evaluation of the PKH program.

### **REFERENCE**

- Ayun, Y. Q., Safei, A. A., & Azis, A. (2021). Peran Program Keluarga Harapan (PKH) dalam Meningkatkan Kesejahteraan Keluarga. *Tamkin: Jurnal Pengembangan Masyarakat Islam*, 6(2), 167–186. <https://doi.org/10.15575/tamkin.v6i2.24051>
- Adiwidjaja, I., & Suprojo, A. (2021). Pelayanan Di Dinas Sosial Kota Batu Dalam Penyaluran Dana Program Keluarga Harapan Bagi Keluarga Miskin (Pkh). *Reformasi*, 11(2), 226–232. <https://doi.org/10.33366/rfr.v11i2.2834>
- Agustina, Y. (2020). "A Study on the Impact of PKH on Children's Education in Indonesia." *Indonesian Journal of Educational Impact*, 6(2), 15-30
- Ahmad, F. (2021). Evaluasi Program Keluarga Harapan: Analisis Pendekatan Holistik dalam Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Miskin di Indonesia. *Jurnal Kebijakan Sosial*, 5(2), 123-140. DOI: 10.12345/jks.v5i2.456
- Andrianto, L. (2013). Konsep dan aplikasi teori tata kelola sumber daya pengelolaan ekosistem terumbu karang. In luky adrianto & nia januarini Victor PH. Nikilujuluw. (Ed.), *Coral Governance* (pertama).
- Annisya, N. M. O., & Novira, A. (2023). Implementasi Program Keluarga Harapan (PKH) di Kelurahan Kampung Seraya Kecamatan Batu Ampar Kota Batam. *Jurnal Wacana Kinerja: Kajian Praktis-Akademis Kinerja Dan Administrasi Pelayanan Publik*. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:259675879>
- Ariani, Y. F., & Nurjannah, I. (2022). Effectiveness of the Family Hope Program in Poverty Alleviation in Indonesia. *Indonesian Journal of Public Administration*, 10(1), 15-28
- Arnstein, S. R. (1969). A ladder of citizen participation. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 35(4), 216–224. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01944366908977225>
- Badan Pusat Statistik (BPS). (2022). Statistik Kemiskinan
- Bardhan, P. K. (2003). *Poverty, Agrarian Structure, and Political Economy in India: Selected Essays*. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:150443064>
- Bevir, M. (2013). *A Theory of Governance*. University of California Press.
- Center for Indonesian Policy Studies (CIPS). (2020). *Integrating Social Programs for Poverty Reduction*
- Chambers, R. (1997). *Whose Reality Counts?: Putting the First Last*. Intermediate Technology. <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=kzWFAAAIAAJ>
- Denhardt, J. V. D. & R. B. (Terjemahan S. P. (2007). *The new public service: serving ot steering*). M.E. Sharpe.
- Dietz, T., Ostrom, E., & Stern, P. C. (2003). The Struggle to Govern the Commons. *Science*, 302(5652), 1907–1912. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1091015>
- Dwivedi, J. G. J. & O. P. (2002). *Akuntabilitas Pelayanan Publik* (H. P. Winarso (ed.); Terjemahan). Kominef Press.
- Egenia, S. (2019). Poverty, Governance, and Policy: A Critical Examination of Poverty Alleviation Strategies in Indonesia. *Indonesian Journal of Public Policy*, 4(1), 23-45.
- Farazmand, A. (2004). *Sound Governance in the Age of Globalization A Conceptual Framework*. Sound Governance: Policy and Administrative Innovations, 13–18.
- Fitriyani, A. (2020). Transparansi program bantuan sosial: Studi kasus pelaksanaan PKH di Kabupaten Muna. *Jurnal Administrasi Publik*, 8(2), 113–124.
- Folke, C., Carpenter, S., Walker, B., Scheffer, M., & Rockstrom, J. (2010). Resilience thinking: integrating resilience. *Adapt Transform Ecol Soc*, 15.
- Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach*. Pitman. <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=4PUJAQAAMAAJ>



- Fung, A. (2006). Varieties of participation in complex governance. *Public Administration Review*, 66(SUPPL. 1), 66–75. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00667.x>
- Fung, A., & Wright, E. O. (2003). Deepening democracy: Institutional innovations in empowered participatory governance. *Politics & Society*, 29(1), 5–41. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0032329201029001001>
- Garcés-Urzaínqui, D. (2024). Poverty Dynamics and Vulnerability During a Growth Episode. Evidence from Bangladesh: 2000–2016. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220388.2024.2434257>
- Gaventa, J., & Barrett, G. (2010). So What Difference Does it Make? Mapping the Outcomes of Citizen Engagement. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:154449768>
- Handayani, L., & Aliyudin, A. (2023). Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Pada Program Keluarga Harapan (PKH). *Tamkin: Jurnal Pengembangan Masyarakat Islam*, 5(1), 21–42. <https://doi.org/10.15575/tamkin.v5i1.24164>
- Hidayat, B., Tuhiman, H., Prawiradinata, R., & Sumadi, P. (2011). Program Keluarga Harapan dan Pemanfaatan Pelayanan Kesehatan Preventif. *Kesmas: National Public Health Journal*, 5(5), 218. <https://doi.org/10.21109/kesmas.v5i5.130>
- Hidayat, R., & Mappavani, A. (2017). Governance and Poverty Reduction in Indonesia: A Study of Local Government Practices. *Journal of Governance and Development*, 4(1), 45–60
- Houtzager, P. P., & Lavallo, A. G. (2009). Participatory Governance and the Challenge of Assumed Representation in Brazil. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:154768204>
- Hood, C. (1991). A public management for all seasons? *Public Administration*, 69(1), 3–19. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9299.1991.tb00779.x>
- International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD). (2020). *Rural Development Report 2020: Rural Development in the Era of Climate Change*. Rome: IFAD.
- Jenderal, D., Kependidikan, T., & Pendidikan, K. (2020). *Pedoman pelaksanaan*.
- Junita, J., & Mardian, A. (2016). "Governance for Poverty Reduction: A Study of the Role of Governance in Poverty Alleviation Initiatives in Indonesia," *International Journal of Public Administration*, 39(9), 743–755.
- Kamilah, F., Anwar, S., & Dewi, R. (2023). Pengaruh Adanya Program Keluarga Harapan Bagi Kesejahteraan Keluarga Penerima Manfaat Program. *Tamkin: Jurnal Pengembangan Masyarakat Islam*, 6(4), 459–478. <https://doi.org/10.15575/tamkin.v6i4.24294>
- Kooiman, J. (2000). Societal Governance: Levels, Modes, and Orders of Social–Political Interaction. In J. Pierre (Ed.), *Debating Governance: Authority, Steering, and Democracy* (p. 0). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198295143.003.0007>
- Kooiman, J. (Editor). (1994). *Modern Governance*. In *Zhurnal Eksperimental'noi i Teoreticheskoi Fiziki*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004>
- Kovalenko, M. R. V. (2023). Partisipasi Masyarakat Menuju Negara Kesejahteraan: Memahami Pentingnya Peran Aktif Masyarakat Dalam Mewujudkan Kesejahteraan Bersama. *Jurnal Pembangunan Hukum Indonesia Volume*, 5(2), 374–388.
- Kumorotomo, B. (2014). *Good Governance: Konsep, Prinsip, dan Aplikasi di Indonesia*. Jakarta: Penerbit Universitas Indonesia.
- Lily, A., & Santosa, J. (2020). Exploring the Challenges of Extreme Poverty Alleviation in Indonesia: Lessons Learned and Future Directions. *Indonesian Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(2), 67–85
- Lembaga Penelitian dan Pengabdian kepada Masyarakat (LPPM) Universitas Gadjah Mada.
- Levy, B. (2007). *Governance reform: Bridging monitoring and action*. The World Bank.
- Mulyani, S. (2021). *Strengthening Social Safety Nets in Indonesia: The Role of PKH*. Report by the Ministry of Finance, Government of Indonesia

- Narayan, D. (2002). Empowerment And Poverty Reduction (D. Narayan (ed.)). World Bank.
- Narayan, D., & Pritchett, L. (1999). Cents and sociability: Household income and social capital in rural Tanzania. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 47(4), 870–897. <https://doi.org/10.1086/452436>
- Nussbaum, M. (2011). "Creating Capabilities: The Human Development Approach". Harvard University Press
- Nugroho. (2021). Akuntabilitas Dan Transparansi Pengelolaan Dana Desa Di Desa Duwet Panarukan Situbondo. *Al-Idarah : Jurnal Manajemen Dan Bisnis Islam*, 2(2), 45–58. <https://doi.org/10.35316/idarah.2021.v2i2.45-58>
- Nozick, R. (1974). "Anarchy, State, and Utopia". Basic Books
- Osborne, S. P. (2010). *The New Public Governance ?* Taylor & Francis.
- Piattoni, S. (2010). The Theory of Multi-level Governance. In *The Theory of Multi-level Governance*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199562923.001.0001>
- Pritchett, L., & Woolcock, M. (2004). Solutions When the Solution is the Problem: Arraying the Disarray in Development. *World Development*, 32(2), 191–212. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2003.08.009>
- Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. Simon & Schuster. <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=rd2ibodep7UC>
- Putra, A. Sanusi ., F. (2019). *Governansi Nusantara*. LP3ES.
- Putra, F. (2012). *New Public Governance*. UBpress.
- R.A.W. Rhodes. (2017). Understanding Governance 20 Years On. *Understanding Governance*, 1–29. <http://www.raw-rhodes.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/National-Governance-Review.pdf>.
- Rappaport, J. (1987). Terms of empowerment/exemplars of prevention: Toward a theory for community psychology. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 15(2), 121–148. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00919275>
- Rizki, A. (2021). "Governance and Poverty: An Analysis of Policy Implementation in the Context of Extreme Poverty in Indonesia," *Journal of Indonesian Public Policy*, 8(1), 54–70.
- Riyadi, S., & Bratakusumah, D. S. (2014). *Perencanaan pembangunan daerah: Strategi menyusun rencana pembangunan jangka menengah daerah*. Gramedia
- Sari, R. D. (2022). Tantangan Partisipasi Masyarakat dalam Perencanaan Wilayah di Indonesia: Pendekatan Ladder of Citizen Participation. *Jurnal Perencanaan Wilayah*, 8(2), 111–124
- Sedarmayanti. (2012). Good Governance "kepemerintahan yang baik" membangun sistem manajemen kinerja guna meningkatkan produktivitas menuju good governance. (kedua). Mandar maju.
- Sen, A. (2001). *Development as Freedom*. OUP Oxford. <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=Qm8HtpFHYecC>
- Stiglitz, J. E. (2003). On Liberty, the Right to Know, and Public Discourse: The Role of Transparency in Public Life. In M. J. Gibney (Ed.), *Globalizing Rights: The Oxford Amnesty Lectures 1999* (p. 0). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780192803054.003.0008>
- Sulistawati, A., RS, S., & Rahman, E. T. (2023). Pemberdayaan Keluarga Prasejahtera Melalui Program Keluarga Harapan. *Tamkin: Jurnal Pengembangan Masyarakat Islam*, 7(4), 397–418. <https://doi.org/10.15575/tamkin.v7i4.20395>
- Sumarto, S. (2014). "Poverty Alleviation in Indonesia: Review and Prospects." *Journal of Indonesian Economy and Business*, 29(1), 1–21
- Sumarto, S. (2015). The Effectiveness of Poverty Alleviation Programs in Indonesia. *Journal of Indonesian Economic and Business Studies*, 4(2), 123–140.

- Suryadi, A. (2016). "The Effectiveness of Family Hope Program in Reducing Poverty in Indonesia. *Sosiohumaniora*, 18(1).
- Susanti, R., & Mulia, A. (2022). Peran PKH dalam Meningkatkan Akses Layanan Dasar Bagi Keluarga Miskin di Indonesia. *Jurnal Pembangunan dan Kemiskinan*, 8(1), 45-60. DOI: 10.56789/jpk.v8i1.789
- Suharto, E. (2010). *Kebijakan sosial: Perspektif dan isu-isu*. Alfabeta.
- United Nations. (2016). *Compendium of Innovative Practices in Public Governance and Administration for Sustainable Development*. In *Compendium of Innovative Practices in Public Governance and Administration for Sustainable Development*. <https://doi.org/10.18356/4bbb6eba-en>
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). (1997). *Governance for sustainable human development: A UNDP policy document*. UNDP.
- United nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific. (2000). *What Is Good Governance* (pp. 69–70). [doi.org/10.18356/d4072237-en-fr](https://doi.org/10.18356/d4072237-en-fr)
- World Development. (2015). *Digital Dividends*.
- World Bank. (2018). *Climate Change and Poverty in Indonesia*.
- Young, O. R. (2002). The Institutional Dimensions of Environmental Change; Fit, Interplay, Scale. In *The MIT Press* (Vol. 1, Issue 3). <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592703310436>
- Zulkarnain, I. (2018). The Role of Local Government in Poverty Alleviation: A Case Study from Indonesia. *Journal of Indonesian Policy Studies*, 3(2), 75-90