

## **IMPLEMENTATION OF FAMILY HOPE PROGRAM IN SELUMA SUB-DISTRICT, YOUR TEAM, SELUMA REGENCY IN 2021**

**Suci Kusuma Ningrum, Achmad Aminudin, Kahar Hakim**

Universitas Bengkulu, Bengkulu, Indonesia

Email: Kusumasuci851@Gmail.Com, achmadaminudin.unib@gmail.com,

drs.kahar.msi@gmail.com

### **Abstract**

This study aims to know, obtain data, and describe the implementation of the Family Hope Program in East Seluma District, Seluma Regency, this study uses a descriptive qualitative method, which clearly describes the data and facts found in the field, when this research was carried out from November 1 to December 30, 2022, the data collection technique used in this study adopted Tachjan's theory based on implementation guidelines Family Hope Program in 2021 which refers to the Regulation of the Minister of Social Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia No. 1 of 2018. This study found that the implementation of the family hope program in East Seluma District has not been successful, because there are still some PKH recipients in the use of PKH assistance for daily needs by several recipients, there is no awareness of PKH recipients to get out of assistance, PKH assistants do not communicate with village and village government officials, there is no communication and socialization carried out to village and village governments In terms of data collection, then there are still poor people who have not received PKH assistance.

**Keywords:** Program implementation, PKH, East Seluma District

**This article is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/)**



### **INTRODUCTION**

The problem of poverty is a national concern and its handling needs to be carried out in an integrated manner involving various sectors both at the central and regional levels. That makes the government need to make efforts to overcome these problems into the Government Work Plan program. According to Parnamian, (2010) the problem of poverty occurs where people experience a low quality of life such as problems with education, health, nutrition and other sources of life.

Important topics that are of concern to the government in an effort to improve the Indonesian economy, one of which is poverty (Moeliodihardjo et al., 2012). This is because one of the goals of development is to create welfare for the people of Indonesia. As the result of the declaration of The Sustainable Development Goals (SDG's) in 2015 on sustainability from the declaration of The Mikkenium Development Goals (MDG's)

in 2000 at the world level. So to achieve this goal, the Indonesian government needs to allocate expenditures to finance various development programs and activities every year in poverty alleviation.

The 2021 PKH implementation guidelines state that PKH recipients can be divided into health, education, and social welfare components. Health is one of the components in PKH (KHARISMA, 2021). Health problems are so complex, which is one of the effects of poverty. Low income causes poor families to be unable to meet health and education needs, even to a minimal level. If pregnant women do not get adequate health services, then this will result in poor health conditions and nutritional intake of the baby in the mother's womb and of course affect the health of the baby at birth (McGushin et al., 2023).

Health services during pregnancy. Childbirth and postpartum are very important for the survival of mothers and babies. The existence of PKH assistance to encourage mothers to access health facilities, involving professional medical personnel in labor and postpartum is very important to continue to reduce maternal and infant mortality.

Based on the 2021 PKH guidelines, the health of toddlers is also a special concern in PKH (Hia et al., 2021). Based on Riskesdas data conducted in 2007. In 2013 and 2018 there was an improvement in the nutritional status of children aged toddlers (0-59 months) in several indicators related to nutrition. However, there was also a decline in several other indicators. Such as toddlers with malnutrition and short toddlers. The results of the 2018 Riskesdas monitoring showed that undernourished and undernourished toddlers in 2018 amounted to 17.7% nationally. while the 2019 RPJMN targets this figure to be reduced to 17%. In addition, the problem of stunting (toddlers with short and very short nutritional status) is currently also a national concern. From the explanation in the 2021 PKH Guidelines, the early childhood health component is also one of the important focuses to be achieved in PKH policy (Sitti Patimah, 2021).

Education is a component of PKH, based on data from the Center for Data and Information Technology (Pusdatin) of the Ministry of Education and Culture and Technology, the dropout rate is still relatively high. The number of school dropouts in 2019/2020 was 157,166 , consisting of 59,443 elementary levels, 38,464 junior high schools and 26,864 high schools, and 32,395 vocational schools. Then in the 2020/2021 school year, the dropout rate was only 4,916 children, consisting of 2,790 elementary schools, 976 junior high schools, 541 high schools and 609 vocational schools. The largest number was in the 2018/2019 school year with a total of 301,127. They consist of 57,426 elementary levels, 85,545 junior high schools, 52,142 high schools and 106,014 vocational schools (Hakim, 2020).

Similarly, statistical data released by BPS, that at the provincial and district levels show that there are certain groups of children who are most vulnerable, most of whom come from poor families so they are unable to continue their education to the next level (Handayani & Shomedran, 2022)

In addition to health and education components, social protection must be able to cover the entire life cycle, including the elderly (elderly) and people with disabilities. PKH assistance is also provided to people with disabilities and the elderly in the family. PKH helps ease the burden on beneficiary families who care for the elderly and disabled

Not all people can get PKH assistance, the selection of PKH participants is carried out in several stages including, surveys at the program location to obtain data on poor households, selection of Poor Households (RTM) from all households surveyed as prospective PKH participants, then prospective participants sign commitments as PKH

participants, the survey is conducted by BPS with basic data taken from the list data of BLT recipients in the Very Poor and Poor categories, and other supporting data and in conducting surveys, officers consist of BPS and Supervisory elements (PKH Implementation Guidelines 2021).

After the data is available, it is then filtered again based on the requirements for PKH membership which must have criteria, namely in the health component of having pregnant, postpartum, breastfeeding and toddler women, having children aged 0-6 years who have not entered basic education. Furthermore, the education component is for children aged SD/MI/package A/SDLB (aged 7-12 years), junior high school / MTS / Package B children (aged 12-15 years), high school / MA children (18-21 years), children 7-21 years who have not completed 12 years of education. Finally, for the social welfare component, people with severe disabilities, and the elderly aged 70 years and over (PKH Implementation Guidelines 2021).

If 6 consecutive months do not fulfill the commitment to attend health and education service facilities in accordance with the protocols applicable in each service facility, they will be permanently excluded from PKH membership, even though they still meet the PKH criteria (PKH Implementation Guidelines 2021) (Utami et al., 2021).

PKH in 2021 is allocated to 10 million beneficiary families. Assistance is carried out within a year. Meanwhile, assistance is carried out quarterly, namely January, April, July, and October. MOSA limits PKH assistance if there are pregnant women, students, the elderly, or disabilities in a family (Li & Hua, 2023). The calculation of PKH social assistance is limited to a maximum of four people in one family. This limitation of calculation is contained in the Decree of the Director of Family Social Security on the Social Assistance Index. (Indonesiabaik.id, 2021)

Furthermore, the poor recipients of Family Hope Program (PKH) funds in Bengkulu Province, in 2021 were 78,172 people or equivalent to a nominal value of IDR 56 billion. Of these, spread in North Bengkulu Regency as many as 14,072 people, Bengkulu City 10,728 people, Rejang Lebong 10,668 people, Seluma 8,650 people, South Bengkulu 6,953 people, Mukomuko 6,482 people, Kaur 5,945 people, Central Bengkulu 5,181 people, Kepahiang 5,003 people and Lebong 4,490 people. (Ewartaco, 2021).

The problem in the field of education is that there are still PKH participants who get reprimands for the lack of activeness/participation of children in schools and the lack of early childhood education. Educational facilities can be said to spread in almost every village although there are still some villages that do not have educational facilities. PKH participants are also less active in participating in monthly meetings.

Furthermore, a number of lists of PKH beneficiaries in 2019 in Talang Tinggi Village, West Seluma District, this triggered social jealousy. This is after being judged not right on target from a number of recipients using old data. He hopes that the Social Service and related parties in the future can distribute PKH assistance on target with valid data collection and involving the community. Don't just shoot and use old data, verify the data every year so that PKH recipients are really right on target (Algo News, 2019) (McGushin et al., 2023).

Then a similar case occurred based on data (Bengkulu Ekspres, 2019) of a number of names of recipients of the Family Hope Program (PKH) in Napalan Village, Talo District, according to PKH recipient residents are the village head's family, the village secretary's family and the village apparatus family, even though there are still many residents who really need it than them. In addition, BPS has never been involved in PKH programs and BPS itself does not know which residents can get PKH and other social

assistance programs. Furthermore, Social Service officials said that the beneficiaries were proposed and then verified by the National Team for the Acceleration of Poverty Reduction (TNP2K). Furthermore, the Social Service only receives notification letters from residents who get PKH.

Based on the data above, the Family Hope Program is one of the programs aimed at the welfare of the community. The program is intended for RTSMs that meet predetermined requirements. But besides that, the implementation of the program still has various kinds of problems

Table 1  
PKH Beneficiary Families  
East Seluma District in 2021

<b>NO</b>	<b>Vilage</b>	<b>Total KPM PKH</b>
1.	Kelurahan Bungamas	56
2.	Kelurahan Sembayat	57
3.	Kelurahan Selebar	25
4.	Desa Kota Agung	60
5.	Desa Talang Sali	97
6.	Desa Tenangan	49
7.	Desa Kunduran	33
8.	Desa Rawa Sari	29
<b>Total</b>		<b>406</b>

One of the sub-districts in Seluma Regency is East Seluma District. In East Seluma District there are 8 villages and sub-districts including, Bungamas, Selebar, Sembayat, Kota Agung, Kunduran, Talang Sali and Rawa Sari and Tenangan. Based on the results of the pre-research, the number of PKH recipients based on BPS 2021 data is 406 Beneficiary Families.

The data is also supported by the statement of the East Seluma District Coordinator, who conveyed a total of 406 PKH KPMs.

"PKH recipients in East Seluma sub-district are 406 KPM based on BPS data divided into 8 villages/kelurahan. If for the village of bungamas in lakuka in September 2013." (Pre-Research Results, May 2022)

In addition to PKH KPM data, the pre-research results also found data on PKH recipient components in East Seluma District, Seluma Regency. These components are based on the 2021 PKH Implementation Guidelines, namely, the health component and the education component, as well as the social welfare component.

Meanwhile, the Family Hope Program in East Seluma District still has several problems such as poor people who cannot get assistance, as expressed by Budi, PKH Coordinator of East Seluma District.

"Masiah ado People who have to get PKH assistance but in fact yo nido can, we as coordinators and companions of PKH nido pacag make dio-dio kareno data tu lah jak central." (Pre-Research Results, May 2022)

Meanwhile, for Tenangan Village, which is one of the villages in East Seluma District, there is also a similar problem. This was revealed by Adis, a companion of PKH Tenangan Village.

"Kalu in Tenangan ru, still ado whose standard of living o lah improved but the enlisted yo nido endak let go of the aid." (Pre-Research Results, May 2022)

Statement by the PKH Coordinator of East Seluma District, precisely in Bungamas Village, there are still people who are classified as entitled but have not received assistance from the Family Hope Program. Meanwhile, still in the exact same sub-district of Tenangan Village, another problem arises. For example, recipients who already have an improved standard of living, but do not want to give up PKH assistance. Interestingly, the Bungamas Village in East Seluma District expressed the same opinion, as expressed by the Head of the Bunga Mas Village Subdistrict.

"Nyo, we know, there is still ado nyo community has not received assistance even though in our opinion nyo ru is entitled to the assistance, udim tu jak jugo nido nian village is involved and nido ado socialization about PKH assistance, so we nido tau menau" (Pre-Research Results, May 2022)

The statement of Bunga Mas Village Head is that there are still people who are entitled to assistance but have not received Family Hope Program assistance, and the Village does not know about the Family Hope Program due to the lack of socialization about the program. The purpose of this study is to know, obtain data and describe the Implementation of the Family Hope Program in East Seluma District, Seluma Regency

### **RESEARCH METHODS**

This study does not test / use hypotheses, but only describes the information as it is in accordance with aspects of the study (Ahmadi & Rose, 2014). Descriptive research methods are used to obtain a picture of a situation that is unfolding at the present moment. The implementation of descriptive research is more structured, systematic, and controlled because the research starts with a clear subject and conducts research on the population or sample of existing subjects to describe it accurately. This research method was carried out using data collection steps, data classification and making conclusions with the aim of making a real and objective picture of a situation regarding the implementation of the Family Hope Program in East Seluma District, Seluma Regency. The focus of this study is on the Implementation of the Family Hope Program in East Seluma District, Seluma Regency.

### **RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

Based on Makinde's theory in Erwan Agus (2015: 85) failure in the implementation process is based on the cause among them, the target group is not involved in program implementation, the program implemented does not consider social, economic and political environmental conditions, the existence of corruption, human resources with low capacity and the absence of coordination and monitoring.

Based on this theory after conducting field research, researchers concluded that the implementation of the family hope program in East Seluma District was still unsuccessful. This is evidenced by the information data obtained by researchers from interviews related to the three existing aspects. For more details, it will be presented one by one based on aspects that have been previously determined.

First, it is seen from the aspect of implementing policies. PKH assistants in East Seluma District have not fully carried out their duties and obligations in accordance with the provisions. This is marked by one of the PKH companion duties contained in the PKH Institutional Operational Guidelines and reported on the [sdmpkh.kemensos.go.id](http://sdmpkh.kemensos.go.id) website,

namely coordinating with local village / village government officials. Based on the results of the study, one of these tasks has not been carried out properly. In addition, according to Makinde's implementation theory in Erwan & Dyah, (2015) failure in the implementation process is based on causes, one of which is the absence of coordination. Based on the theory and Operational Guidelines of PKH Institutions, researchers see that the implementation of PKH in East Seluma District has not been successful because most village/village governments feel that there is no good coordination between program implementers and local government officials.

The next aspect is the program implemented, when viewed from the perspective of PKH recipients, an initial meeting has been held in the form of socialization, but according to five Village and Village Governments in East Seluma District, socialization has not been carried out. The five village and village governments in East Seluma sub-district stated that they were not involved in the community data collection process and were completely ignorant of the program, the amount of funding received, the target groups and others. Even though the local government knows best how the condition of the community.

Furthermore, based on the Regulation of the Minister of Social Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia No. 1 of 2018 article 62 that the community can supervise the implementation of PKH. The community here, can be called the local government, as one of the components that play an active role in the implementation of the Village / Village. From the findings of the researchers that five villages and villages in East Seluma District did not know or take part in the family hope program. It can be seen that there is no good coordination in the PKH implementation process in East Seluma District (Li & Hua, 2023).

The majority of beneficiaries do not know how to determine the target group. Especially from the point of view of the village or village government and poor people who do not receive assistance, consider that there are still people who deserve assistance but do not receive. Based on the findings of the researcher that the data collection process of PKH recipients has not been fully successful or on target of the program, due to lack of coordination with the local government.

Furthermore, in terms of fund distribution, beneficiaries do not know the mechanism of fund distribution, they only wait for information from the companion when the aid has been disbursed. Then the PKH companion in East Seluma District said that currently the aid distribution process is carried out at the POS which previously could be taken at BRI Link. This is because there was fraud by the BRI Link provider

According to Tachjan's theory in the previous theoretical foundation chapter in analyzing PKH implementation to see aspects of the program implemented. That the program is a comprehensive plan that already describes the resources to be used and integrated in one unit. In addition, Suliadini et al., (2021) explained that the success of a policy to be implemented must be clear and to obtain this clarity, it is important for all parties involved to directly or indirectly know about the program.

Based on these two theories, the researcher then concluded that for the aspects of the program implemented related, the implementation of the Family Hope Program in East Seluma District could not be said to be successful. This is because not all parties, be it community elements or most Village and Village Governments in East Seluma District where the program is held, know about the program. This shows that communication and coordination between the parties involved directly or indirectly have not run well,

resulting in the implementation of the family hope program ultimately cannot succeed as expected.

Finally, the target group. The results of research on the amount of assistance are in accordance with applicable regulations. However, KPM complained that the disbursement was hampered in several stages. Evidenced by the statement of WI as a recipient of PKH assistance in Kota Agung Village, as follows:

"If we in this family get o 600 thousand kareno ado children after elementary and junior high school every four months, biaso yo companion o who carry out the ruani amo that's the liquid. But ado the events of the duo stages are put together. For example, stage 3 liquid nido, mengko pas liquid in stage four kelo can o 1,200,000. Amun used to be gambiak at BRI Link, but finally at the POS Office," (Research Results, December 2022).

In Indonesian the results of interviews with WI as PKH beneficiaries, the assistance received was six hundred thousand rupiah every three months with four stages for one year. However, WI when late disbursement will usually get the amount of assistance for two stages.

When viewed from the suitability of the use of assistance, KPM usually uses funds to meet the needs in accordance with each component. However, most PKH recipients are still used to meet daily needs or urgent circumstances, but still prioritize the needs of the listed components.

In terms of benefits, the PKH program has been felt to help the burden of the poor but has not been able to make PKH recipients out of the poverty chain. Based on the results of interviews with PKH assistants, it was said that most PKH recipients in East Seluma District felt comfortable getting assistance, so that the purpose of PKH contained in the Regulation of the Minister of Social Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia No. 1 of 2018 article 2 has not succeeded in implementing the program in East Seluma District. This is marked by a slight change in behavior and independence of PKH recipients.

## **CONCLUSION**

Based on the purpose of the study, namely knowing and describing how the implementation of the Family Hope Program in East Seluma, as well as seeing the results of research and discussion that have been discussed in the previous chapter V, the author concludes that:

In terms of policy implementers, out of eight villages/kelurahan, five village/kelurahan governments argued that PKH assistants did not coordinate with local government officials. This is evidenced by several opinions from the village and village that there is not the slightest information obtained regarding the implementation of the family hope program. Regarding the targets and objectives of the program, the majority of informants, namely PKH assistants, assume that those who receive assistance are those contained in the components in the regulations or guidelines on PKH.

In terms of the program implemented, almost all stages carried out by the implementing party, both in determining the target group and the mechanism in distributing aid are unknown to PKH recipients and government apartments in the five villages and villages where the program is implemented. According to the Lurah and Village Head consisting of Bunga Mas Village, Sembayat Village, Selebar Village, Kota Agung Village and Talang Sali Village, the lack of coordination and communication makes it difficult to achieve the implementation of PKH. In addition, according to five village/village governments and the poor that the process of collecting PKH recipients is still not good, because there are still poor people who are entitled to the PKH program



but do not get it. Then in terms of disbursement of funds, several PKH recipients claimed to experience delays in disbursement, as well as admin fees from BRI Link providers that were quite large. However, currently the disbursement process will be carried out by PT Pos Indonesia.

In the case of target groups or target groups, PKH beneficiaries argue that they are helped by the PKH assistance. However, according to them, PKH assistance has not been able to optimally achieve its goals as contained in the Decree of the Minister of Social Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia No. 1 of 2018. According to PKH recipients, the aid has not been able to improve their standard of living. Furthermore, according to PKH assistants, beneficiaries do not have the awareness to get out of the poverty chain, such as the program objectives contained in the Decree of the Minister of Social Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia No. 1 of 2018 article 2, namely creating behavior change and independence of Beneficiary Families. Then in terms of the use of assistance, some recipients who already feel they have met the needs of each component use the funds to meet their daily needs.

### **REFERENCES**

- Ahmadi, R., & Rose, K. R. (2014). *Metodologi penelitian kualitatif*.
- Erwan, A. P., & Dyah, S. R. (2015). Implementasi Kebijakan Publik. *Yogyakarta: Penerbit Gava Media*.
- Hakim, A. (2020). Faktor Penyebab Anak Putus Sekolah. *Jurnal Pendidikan, 21*(2), 122–132.
- Handayani, W., & Shomedran, S. (2022). Drop-Out School Phenomenon from Social Perspective at Gunung Batu Village, Pulau Beringin Sub-District, South Oku District. *SPEKTRUM: Jurnal Pendidikan Luar Sekolah (PLS), 10*(3), 373–378.
- Hia, E. N., Siagian, M., & Achmad, N. (2021). Implementasi Family Development Session Program Keluarga Harapan. *PERSPEKTIF, 10*(1), 128–139.
- KHARISMA, E. K. A. (2021). *Peran Program Keluarga Harapan (PKH) dalam Mengentaskan Kemiskinan di Nagari Balimbing*.
- Li, W., & Hua, X. (2023). The value of family social capital in informal financial markets: Evidence from China. *Pacific-Basin Finance Journal, 77*, 101922. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pacfin.2022.101922>
- McGushin, A., de Barros, E. F., Floss, M., Mohammad, Y., Ndikum, A. E., Ngendahayo, C., Oduor, P. A., Sultana, S., Wong, R., & Abelsohn, A. (2023). The World Organization of Family Doctors Air Health Train the Trainer Program: lessons learned and implications for planetary health education. *The Lancet Planetary Health, 7*(1), e55–e63. [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S2542-5196\(22\)00218-2](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S2542-5196(22)00218-2)
- Moeliodihardjo, B. Y., Soemardi, B. W., Brodjonegoro, S. S., & Hatakenaka, S. (2012). University, industry, and government partnership: Its present and future challenges in Indonesia. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 52*, 307–316.
- Parnamian, J. (2010). Efektivitas Komunikasi antara Rumah Tangga Sangat Miskin Penerima Bantuan Tunai dan Pendamping Program Keluarga Harapan. *Institut Pertanian Bogor, Bogor*.
- Sitti Patimah, S. K. M. (2021). *Stunting Mengancam Human Capital*. Deepublish.
- Suliatini, N. M. S., Wirata, G., & Sriwidnyani, I. A. P. (2021). Implementasi Peraturan Bupati Gianyar Nomor 50 Tahun 2018 Tentang Gerakan Masyarakat Hidup Sehat Di Kabupaten Gianyar. *Jurnal Widya Publika, 9*(2), 126–137.



**Suci Kusuma Ningrum**

Utami, I. P., Rangga, K. K., Yanfika, H., & Mutolib, A. (2021). Kinerja Pendamping Program Keluarga Harapan (PKH) Di Kota Bandar Lampung. *JSHP: Jurnal Sosial Humaniora Dan Pendidikan*, 5(1), 19–25.

---

**Copyright holders:  
Suci Kusuma Ningrum (2023)**

**First publication right:  
AJEMB – American Journal of Economic and Management Business**

---