

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ‘HOPE FAMILY PROGRAM’ POLICY AT PURABAYA DISTRICT, SUKABUMI, WEST JAVA

Ijang Ruswandi¹, Erry Sunarya², Darmo H Suwiry³

¹)Master of Administration Science, Muhammadiyah University, Sukabumi

^{2,3})Lecture Muhammadiyah University, Sukabumi

Correspondence : ijangruswandi90@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Poverty is one of the problems currently being faced by the Indonesian state. In 2007 the government implemented a conditional cash transfer program known as the Family Hope Program (PKH). One of PKH's goals is to improve the standard of living of beneficiary families. The problem that will be answered in this thesis is how to implement the Family Hope Program (PKH) in Purabaya District, Sukabumi Regency.

This type of research is a field research research (field research). This research is a descriptive qualitative research. Sources of data in this study are primary data and secondary data. Where the data collection uses interview techniques, observation and documentation. To analyze the data, the authors used a triangulation descriptive analysis of the data collected by the researcher.

Based on the results of research in the field, the implementation of PKH is measured through indicators of Communication, Resources, Disposition and Bureaucratic Structures in Purabaya District. This can be seen from the uneven distribution of aid recipients from the poor in Purabaya District and the limited quota of beneficiaries from the Ministry of Social Affairs.

Keywords: Implementation of the Hope Family Program Policy

INTRODUCTION

Poverty is a complex problem faced by the global community, including in Indonesia and is a major problem that must be faced because poverty is an obstacle in the development process of the Indonesian state. The problem of poverty is an urgent problem that must get serious attention and handling from the government. Several factors cause poverty, namely the low level of health and education levels of the poor. This is due to their lack of knowledge about the quality of nutrition, nutrition, environmental hygiene as well as their lack of knowledge about the importance of education for them and their children, this problem becomes even more serious with the obstruction of the poor from getting access to health facilities and educational facilities. that has been provided by the government.

The fields of education and health are important factors in building quality human resources, with the realization of good health and education for the community to support success and increase productivity and increase economic growth. The back and forth of a country's economy lies in the progress or failure of education in that country, this proves that education is one of the economic foundations. The low economic capacity of a very poor household (RTSM) has a negative impact on the poor quality of nutrition and nutrition, and causes many children to not continue their studies in school. Some of them have to work hard to help earn a living for their families and some are forced to become street children. The

increasing number of school age children who are unable to obtain proper education will worsen social, economic and political conditions in the future and result in a very high social burden on the State.

Development is a set of planned and directed efforts to improve the welfare of human life which demands social, economic and cultural changes, economic development must be supported by human resource development. The government has made various poverty alleviation policies, especially in the education sector, including school operational assistance (BOS), assistance for poor students (BSM), and others. Poverty alleviation requires continuous efforts due to the complexity of the problems and limited resources faced by the poor. Poverty reduction measures cannot be handled by one particular sector but must involve all sectors or multisectoral.

In 2007, during the reign of Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono, the government made policies to address poverty, lack of education, and the weak economy in society by establishing the Family Hope Program (PKH). The Family Hope Program was formed by the Ministry of Social Affairs which adopted a program from abroad that was trying to be implemented in Indonesia. The aim of the program is towards education and health. Therefore, in establishing the development of the Family Hope Program in each district / city government, the education office and local health office must be involved.

The implementation of the Family Hope Program (PKH) in Purabaya District has received a lot of positive and negative responses from the community. The positive response from the community is that they are greatly helped by the Family Hope Program (PKH) and a slight reduction in the burden on the community in meeting their basic needs and they also gain knowledge about health and the importance of education for the welfare of their families in the future that they did not know before. Negative responses were also given by the community, especially those who did not receive PKH assistance, who said that this program was unfair because there were still many other poor people who did not get PKH assistance while they should also have the right to get it from the government, causing social jealousy. Public opinion also says that the Family Hope Program (PKH) only has a lazy effect on the community so that people become complacent about getting money without having to work.

The implementation of the Family of Hope Program (PKH) in Purabaya Subdistrict also finds obstacles related to education, namely many Very Poor Households (RTSM) in Purabaya that have not yet benefited from the Family Hope Program (PKH). There are still participants / beneficiaries of the Family Hope Program (PKH) who are not aware of how to fulfill their obligations / commitments as participants / beneficiaries. Community participation in the implementation has not yet obtained optimal results, where Very Poor Households (RTSM) PKH Participants are still apathetic, do not care, do not comply with the rules and provisions contained in the program's technical guidelines. And regarding the role of PKH facilitators to RTSM PKH participants in coaching, motivation, education by providing information and explanations about the Family Hope Program (PKH), PKH Participants need to be able to empower the community with an awareness system so that they can change their mindset. and the behavior of Very Poor Households (RTSM) who receive PKH assistance is getting better and hopes to break the chain of poverty in Sungai Purabaya District. From the previous description, several problems can be identified are : (1) How is the implementation of the Family Hope Program (PKH) in Purabaya District, (2) What are the obstacles in the implementation of the Family Hope Program (PKH) in Purabaya District?

THEORITICAL FRAMEWORK

Definition of Poverty

Poverty according to Mubiyarto poverty is a situation of all shortages of the population which is manifested in the form of low income, which is caused by low skills, productivity, income, weak production exchange rates and limited opportunities to participate in development. Poverty according to Sajogyo in Hadi Prayitno and Lincoln Aryadi (2006: 7) states that poverty is a level of life that is below the stipulated minimum standard of living needs. According to BAPENAS, poverty is a situation of all deficiency due to circumstances that cannot be avoided by a person with the power he has. The conclusion based on the theory above poverty is a condition of economic inability of a person in an effort to meet the needs of an average standard of living in the form of proper clothing, food and shelter.

Definition of Public Policy Implementation

We can define public policy after we understand the general understanding of policy implementation can be obtained and its advocates. Pressman and Wildavsky as the first generation are represented by studies that focus on how decisions of a single authority are implemented or not implemented. The results acknowledge the complex nature or nature of implementation. The second generation is focused on determining the success of policy implementation. A conceptual model of the implementation process model is developed and tested in a variety of different areas. The two dominant approaches are the top-down approach and the top-down approach. A representative study of this period was made by Carl Van Horn and Donald Van Meter and Daniel Mazmanian and Paul Sabatier. The third generation focused on the synthesis and development of a policy implementation approach with a locus (multilevel) and a more complex focus as a dynamic process. (Ann O'M Bowman in Rabin, 2005).

Meanwhile, according to Edward (in Winarno, 2012: 125) policy implementation is a policy-making stage between policy formation and the consequences of policies for the people it affects. If a policy is not appropriate or does not reduce the problem that is the target of the policy, then that policy may fail even though a brilliant policy may also fail if the policy is not implemented properly by policy implementers. Implementation is the most crucial stage in the public policy process. A policy program must be implemented so that it has the desired impact and objectives.

According to Wiliam. N. Dun (2000: 24-25) suggests that at every stage of the public policy process, including the stage of policy implementation, it is important to analyze. The analysis is not identical with evaluation because from the agenda-setting stage to the policy evaluation, an analysis must be carried out. The reason why policy implementation is needed refers to the views of experts, in this case Edwar III's opinion, explaining that every policy that has been made must be implemented. Therefore, policy implementation is needed for various reasons or perspectives. From the perspective of policy problems, policy implementation is needed because there are policy problems that need to be resolved and resolved. Edwards III introduced an approach to implementation problems by questioning what factors support and hinder the successful implementation of policies. Based on these rhetorical questions, four factors were formulated as sources of problems as well as preconditions for the success of the implementation process, namely communication, resources, the attitude of the bureaucracy or executor, and the organizational structure

including the bureaucratic work flow. These four factors are criteria that need to be in the implementation of a policy.

According to Nakamura and Smit in T. B. Smith's book, they admit that when the policy has been made, the policy must be implemented and the results are as expected by the policy maker. If visualized, it will be seen that a policy has clear objectives as a form of policy value orientation. The objectives of policy implementation are formulated into specific programs of action and projects that are designed and financed. The program is implemented according to plan. The implementation of policies or programs - in broad terms - is influenced by the content of the policy and the context of implementation. Overall policy implementation is evaluated by measuring program output based on policy objectives. The output of the program is seen through its impact on the intended targets, both individuals and groups as well as the community. The output of policy implementation is change and acceptance of change by the target group.

Another reason that underlies the need for policy implementation can be understood from the statements of Grindle (1980: 10) and Quade (1984: 310) who expect to show the configuration and synergy of the three variables that determine the success of policy implementation, namely the triangular relationship of policy variables, organization, and the policy environment. This hope needs to be realized so that through the selection of the right policies the public can participate in making an optimal contribution to achieving the stated goals. Furthermore, when the selected policy has been found, it needs to be accommodated by the implementing organization, because within the organization there are authorities and various types of resources that support the implementation of the policy or program.

According to Mazmanian and Sabatier (2016: 136) the meaning of policy implementation is the executor of basic policy decisions, usually in the form of laws. But it can also take the form of important executive orders or decisions. With regard to the factors that influence the implementation of a program's policy based on Sobir's opinion (Subarsono 2017: 101) There is a conceptual framework that can be used to analyze the implementation of decentralized government programs. There are four groups of variables that can affect the performance and impact of a program, namely:

(1) environmental conditions;

The first thing that needs to be considered in order to assess the performance of public implementation from the perspective offered by van Metter & van Horn is the extent to which the external environment contributes to the success of the established public policies. The environment in question includes the social, economic and political environment. And an environment that is not conducive to being the culprit for the failure of the performance of policy implementation. Therefore, efforts to implement policies must also pay attention to the conducive conditions of the external environment.

(2) relationships between organizations;

Coordination is a mechanism as well as the main condition in determining the success of policy implementation. The better the coordination and communication between the parties involved in an implementation process, the less mistakes will be made; and vice versa.

(3) organizational resources;

Resources to implement a policy are available, or policy implementers know what should be done, and have the desire to implement a policy, it is possible that the policy cannot be implemented or realized because there are weaknesses in the bureaucratic structure. Policies that are so complex require the cooperation of many people, when the bureaucratic structure

is not conducive to the available policies, this will result in ineffective and unmotivated resources, thus hindering the running of policies.

(4) characteristics and abilities of program implementers in the field.

Two characteristics, according to Edward III, that can boost the performance of the bureaucratic or organizational structure in a better direction are: (1) Making Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) more flexible; SOPs are routine planned procedures or activities that allow employees (or implementers of policies such as apparatus, administrators, or bureaucrats) to carry out their activities on a daily basis (days-todays politics) in accordance with predetermined standards (or the minimum standard required citizens), (2) Carry out fragmentation, the aim is to spread the responsibilities of various activities, activities, or programs to several work units in accordance with their respective fields. With the fragmentation of the bureaucratic structure, implementation will be more effective because it is carried out by a competent and capable organization.

Definition of Family Hope

Family Hope Program, hereinafter referred to as PKH, is a program for providing conditional social assistance to Beneficiary Families (KPM) who are designated as PKH beneficiary families. As an effort to accelerate poverty reduction, since 2007 the Government of Indonesia has implemented PKH. The Social Protection Program, which is also known internationally as Conditional Cash Transfers (CCT). As a conditional social assistance program, PKH opens access to poor families, especially pregnant women and children, to take advantage of the various health service facilities (faskes) and educational service facilities (fasdik) available around them. The benefits of PKH have also begun to be encouraged to cover people with disabilities and the elderly by maintaining the level of social welfare in accordance with the mandate of the constitution and the President's Nawacita.

Through PKH, KPM is encouraged to have access to and take advantage of basic social services for health, education, food and nutrition, care and assistance, including access to various other social protection programs which are complementary programs on a sustainable basis. PKH is directed to become the backbone of poverty alleviation that synergizes various national social protection and empowerment programs. This national priority program, as the most cost-effective program to reduce poverty and reduce the gap between the poor, is also the program that has the highest level of effectiveness in reducing the Gini coefficient. Various other studies have shown that PKH is able to lift beneficiaries out of poverty, increase family consumption, even on a broader scale able to encourage stakeholders at the central and regional levels to make improvements to health and education infrastructure.

PKH is strengthened by improving business processes, expanding targets, and strengthening complementary programs. It must be ensured that PKH beneficiary families (KPM) receive BPNT subsidies, KIS social security, KIP, Rutilahu assistance, empowerment through KUBE including various other social protection and empowerment programs, so that poor families can quickly get out of poverty and be more prosperous. PKH's great mission in reducing poverty is increasingly apparent considering the number of poor people in Indonesia in 2017 there was a reduction in poverty from 10.64% in 2017 to 10.12% in September 2017 of the total population or 27,771,220 people in the month of 2017. March to 26,582,990 inhabitants in September with a total decline in the number of poor as much as 1,188,230 or a decrease in the number of poor people by 0.58% (BPS, 2017).

The PKH targets are poor and vulnerable families registered in the Integrated Data for the Management of the Poor, which have a health component with the criteria for pregnant / nursing mothers, children aged zero to six years. Education component with the criteria for SD / MI or equivalent children, SMA / MTs or equivalent, SMA / MA or equivalent, and children aged six to 21 who have not completed the 12 year compulsory education. Since 2016 there has been an addition of a social welfare component with the criteria for elderly people to be prioritized starting from 60 (sixty) years, and persons with disabilities are prioritized for people with severe disabilities.

Previous Research

The previous research on the Implementation of the Hope Family Program Policy is as follows : (1) Slamet Riyadi's Thesis, University of Lampung Bandar Lampung The Master of Government Science Study Program conducted a research entitled Analysis of the Implementation of the Hope Family Program for Poor Families Receiving Assistance (a study in Gunung Singgih District, Central Lampung Regency). The results of this study explain that implementation in Gunung Singgih year 2011-2014 which includes the input aspect in the form of determining target households, the process aspect in the form of group formation and the output aspect in the form of commitment verification,

(2) Tri Ramadhan's Thesis, Gadjah Mada University Master Program in Policy Studies, conducted a research entitled Implementation of the Hope Family Program in Empowering the Poor in Kelapa Gading District, North Jakarta Municipality. The results of this study explain that PKH has a significant impact on increasing capability to increase human resources, (3) Risna Resnawati, in the Research Gate the research was about the Family Hope Program Between Social Protection and Poverty Alleviation. The results of his research explain that the Family Hope Program is a social protection program and also a poverty alleviation program.

From the research above, there are similarities and differences used in literature review and research, so the authors are very interested in conducting research in the Purabaya sub-district, Sukabumi Regency with the title of this research Policy Implementation of the Hope Family Program in Purabaya District, Sukabumi Regency.

METHODS

The research method used in this research is to use a descriptive form with a qualitative approach. The reason researchers use qualitative research is because the problems that occur are not yet clear, dynamic and the researcher wants to understand the social situation more deeply so that in the end they find a new theory. The main characteristic of descriptive research is to focus attention on problems that exist when the research is being carried out (currently) or problems that are actual and describe the facts about the problem being investigated as they are and are accompanied by rational interpretations (Nawawi, 2003: 40)

In the qualitative research tradition, the process of research and science is not as simple as what happens in quantitative research, because before the results of qualitative research contribute to science, the stages of qualitative research go beyond the various stages of critical-scientific thinking, in which a researcher begins to think in a way. inductive, namely capturing various facts or social phenomena, through observations in the field, then analyzing them and then trying to carry out theorization based on what is observed (Bungin, 2007: 6). With this qualitative descriptive form it is expected to provide a clear picture of the

above understanding, this study describes the reality of the poor who receive assistance, namely Very Poor Households (RTSM) in the Family Hope Program (PKH) in Purabaya District based on data and facts on the ground.

Based on Edward III's theory of implementation in Agustino (2015: 149) there are four things that really determine the success of implementing a policy, namely as follows

1. Communication

There are three indicators that can be used (or used) in measuring the success of the communication above, namely: (1) Transmission; good communication channeling will be able to produce a good implementation as well. Often what happens in the distribution of communication is a misunderstanding (miscommunication), this is because communication has gone through several levels of the bureaucracy so that what is expected is distorted on the way, (2) Clarity; communication received by policy implementers (street-level-bureuacrats) must be clear and not confusing (not ambiguous). The ambiguity of policy messages does not always hinder implementation, at a certain level, but implementers need clarity of information in implementing policies so that the goals to be achieved can be achieved in accordance with the content of the policy, (3) Consistency; orders given in the implementation of a communication must be consistent (to be applied and executed). This is because if the orders given change frequently, it can cause confusion for the implementers in the field.

2. Resources

The resource indicators consist of several elements, namely: (1) Staff; the main resource in policy implementation is staff or human resources (HR), (2) Information; In policy implementation, information takes two forms, namely: (i) information relating to how to implement policies. Implementers must know what to do when they are instructed to take action. And (ii) information regarding compliance data from the implementers to the established government regulations and regulations, (3) Authority; in general, authority must be formal in order for orders to be carried out, (4) Facilities; Physical facilities are also an important factor in policy implementation.

3. Disposition.

Important things that need to be considered at disposition, according to Edward III, are : (1) Disposition Effects; the disposition or attitude of the implementers will cause real obstacles to policy implementation if the existing personnel do not carry out the policies desired by high-ranking officials, (2) Conducting Bureaucracy Arrangements (stffing the bureaucracy); In this context, Edward III requires that policy implementation must also be seen in terms of bureaucratic arrangements. This refers to the appointment and appointment of staff in the bureaucracy according to their abilities, capabilities and competencies, (3) Incentives; Edward III stated that one of the techniques suggested to overcome the problem of implementers' propensity is to manipulate incentives.

4. Bureaucratic structure.

Policies that are so complex require the cooperation of many people, when the bureaucratic structure is not conducive to the available policies, this will result in ineffective and unmotivated resources, thus hindering the running of policies. The bureaucracy as the implementer of a policy must be able to support policies

Informant Analysis and Settings Unit

According to Suprayogo and Tobroni (2001: 48), the unit of analysis is something related to the focus / component under study. The analysis unit of a study can be in the form of individuals, groups, organizations, objects, and a certain time according to the focus of the

problem, the analysis unit in the form of an institution or organization can be a small / limited scale organization. In this study, the focus or components studied were people related to the Family Hope Program starting from PKH Facilitators to PKH Recipients and people who were closely related or coordinated in the program's activities.

Informant Settings

According to Suyanto (2005: 171) qualitative research is not intended to make generalizations from research results, therefore in qualitative research there is no known population or sample. The subjects of this research become informants who will provide various information needed during the research process. An informant is someone who really knows a particular problem or problem, which can obtain clear, accurate, and reliable information in the form of questions, information or data that can help in meeting the problem or problem. According to Moleong (2006: 135), informants are people who are used to provide information about situations and conditions about the research background. Suyanto (2005: 172) also states that informants can be said as follows: (1). Key informants (key informants) are those who know and have various basic information needed in research, (2). The main informants are those who are directly involved in the social interactions studied, (3). Additional informants are those who can provide information even though they are not directly involved in the social interactions studied.

Data Collection Techniques

In this study, researchers used data collection techniques in 2 (two) ways, namely:

1. Primary data collection techniques, namely data obtained through direct activities to the research location to find complete data related to the problem under study. This is done by:
(a). The interview method, namely by means of in-depth interviews to obtain complete and in-depth data from key informants. This method is done by asking questions directly and openly to informants or related parties and have relevance to problems related to research,
(b). The questionnaire (questionnaire) is used as a companion in collecting data. The list of questions is made semi-openly to the main informant or respondent who gives the answers and provides the explanations needed by the researcher.
2. Secondary data collection techniques, namely data collection carried out indirectly which is processed to complement primary data, namely by: (a). Library study, namely the collection of data obtained by examining written records, both from documents and archives concerning the problem under study, (b). Documentation study, namely data collection techniques using notes or documents at the research location such as implementation guidelines, technical guidelines, and other sources relevant to the object of research.

Data validity

Source triangulation means comparing double-checking the degree of confidence of information obtained through different sources. For example comparing observations with interviews, comparing what is said to be general and what is said to be private, comparing interviews with existing documents (Bachtar. 2010: 56). Continuing Sugiyono (2012: 327) states that technical triangulation means using different data collection to get data from the same data source. Researchers used participatory observation, in-depth interviews, and documentation for the same data source simultaneously. Source triangulation means, to get data from different sources with the same technique. According to Sugiono (2008: 127) "... in order to test the credibility of the data, it can be done by checking by interview, by observation, or other techniques in a different time or situation." So time affects the data collection process.

Data Analysis

The data analysis technique used in this research is technical qualitative analysis. This means that the data obtained is processed systematically, by collecting data and facts about research studies to then be described in the form of interpretation of the data obtained. The technical analysis in this study uses the following data analysis techniques: (1). Data Reduction. Data reduction is defined as the process of selecting, focusing attention on simplifying, abstracting and transforming "rough" data that emerge from written notes in the field. Data reduction is a form of analysis that sharpens, classifies, directs, removes unnecessary and organizes data in such a way that the final conclusions can be drawn and verified. This data reduction continues after field research, until the final report is complete, (2). Presentation of Data. Presentation is limited as a compiled collection of information that gives the possibility of drawing conclusions and taking action. With these presentations, it will be possible to understand what happened and what to do, analyze or take action based on the understanding gained from these presentations, (3). Conclusion withdrawal (verification) Conclusions are verified during the study, the meanings that emerge from the existing data are tested for truth, robustness and suitability, which are their validity, so that clear conclusions will be obtained.

This research is located in Purabaya District, Sukabumi Regency, West Java Province. Field research was carried out for 3 (months) months (May - July 2020) in order to collect primary data and secondary data in the implementation of the Family Hope Program (PKH) in Purabaya District, Sukabumi Regency.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Implementation of Family Hope Program Policy

Implementation is the most important stage in a policy, without the implementation of a policy it cannot run. Policy is a set of goal-oriented actions and is not a single decision, but consists of several options to achieve certain goals for the benefit of the people at large. Policy implementation is the stage of the policy process immediately after enactment of a law. Implementation is seen broadly as having the meaning of implementing laws in which various factors, namely organization, procedures, and techniques work together to carry out policies in an effort to achieve policy or program objectives. Implementation on the other hand is a complex phenomenon that may be understood as a process, a series of decisions and actions aimed at making decisions accepted by the legislature can be implemented. Implementation is also defined in the context of outputs, or the extent to which objectives have been planned to receive support such as the level of spending on a program.

Finally, the impact of implementation means that there have been changes that can be measured in terms of broad issues related to programs, public laws and judicial decisions. According to Webster's dictionary in Wahab (1997: 64), the definition of implementation is formulated in short, namely "to implementation" means "to provide means for carrying out; to give practical effect to" (presenting a tool to implement; causing an impact / having an effect on something.). In public policy studies, it is said that implementation is not only related to the mechanism of translating political decisions into routine procedures through bureaucratic channels, but more than that implementation is related to problems of conflict, decisions and who gets what from a policy. . Therefore it is not wrong to say that policy implementation is a very important aspect of the entire policy process.

A very simple definition of implementation is as expressed by Charles O. Jones in Tachjan (2006: 20), where implementation is defined as "getting the job done" and "doing it".

This understanding is a very simple understanding. But behind the simplicity of such formulation means that policy implementation is a policy process that can be carried out easily. However, the implementation, according to Jones, requires conditions which include: the existence of people or executors, money and organizational capabilities or what is often referred to as resources. Furthermore, Jones formulated implementation boundaries as a process of receiving additional resources, so that he could consider what should be done. These actions, at one point or another, seek to transform decisions into operational patterns, and continue these efforts to achieve the changes, large and small, mandated by policy decisions ”.

From the above understanding, it can be said that the policy implementation stage will not start before the goals and objectives are set (which is carried out by policy formulation). In other words, the policy implementation stage occurs only after the law is enacted and funds are made available to finance the implementation of the policy. Typically a public policy identifies the problem to be solved, states explicitly the goals / objectives to be achieved, and various ways to regulate the implementation process. This process takes place after going through a number of certain stages, usually starting with the stage of enactment of a law, then output of policies in the form of implementation of decisions by implementing agencies / agencies, willingness to implement these decisions by target groups, real impact either desired or expected. not from the output, and finally improvements to the laws / regulations concerned.

By referring to this opinion, it can be taken the notion that the resources to achieve the goals previously set by policy makers, include: people, funds, and organizational capabilities, which are carried out by both the government and the private sector (individuals or groups). Furthermore, Mazmanian and Sabatier (1983: 20) explain more about the concept of policy implementation as follows: "Understanding what actually happens after the program is declared effective or formulated is the focus of attention to policy implementation, namely events or activities that arise after the adoption of state policy guidelines, which includes both efforts to administer it and to have a real impact / impact on society. or events. "

Based on the above opinion, it appears that policy implementation is not only limited to the actions or behavior of alternative bodies or bureaucratic units that are responsible for implementing programs and causing compliance with target groups, but more than that it also continues with a network of political, socio-economic forces that influence the behavior of all parties involved and in the end have an impact on the expected and unexpected results. Public policies are made to respond to concrete problems or needs developing in society. This set of actions is summarized in Government decisions that are contained in the laws or regulations of the government concerned.

The Family of Hope Program (PKH) is a form of substantive public policy. Substantive policies are policies that put pressure on the subject meter of what citizens need. So, PKH is said to be a substantive policy because PKH responds to the problem of poverty in the community and seeks to improve the welfare of the poor in an area through the education and health sectors. This is stated in Appendix I of the Presidential Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 18 of 2007 concerning the Government Work Plan of 2008. In this Presidential Regulation the Family Hope Program is the focus of 5 point (e) in the priority of increasing the effectiveness of poverty reduction, where the Family of Hope Program is outlined in activities of providing cash assistance for very poor families that meet the requirements (maternal pregnancy checks, immunization, and routine examinations for toddlers, ensuring the existence of school-age children in SD / MI and SMP / MTs, and

reducing child labor. Family Hope (PKH) is a conditional cash assistance that is not provided free of charge, but there are obligations that PKH participants must fulfill, namely having to send their children to school, have their wombs checked, and bring babies or toddlers to Posyandu for routine health checks.

PKH assistance is also not given forever, but has a certain period of time, namely consecutively until December. Assistance will automatically stop when the family's economic situation has improved and the child has completed his education at the high school / equivalent level. This is in accordance with the statement of the PKH Facilitator of the Purabaya District who said that: "For this stage PKH assistance is given until December consecutively every month. If the child has graduated from high school, the assistance will automatically be reduced. Well, if there are no children from elementary school to high school age, pregnant women, toddlers who don't need to be immunized again, PKH assistance will be stopped. Because it is still in the early stages, and it can still be said that as long as it is covered for additional assistance now, if this PKH is successful, then its coverage will be expanded, and data will be recycled "

PKH assistance has a certain grace period for very poor families, so PKH assistance must be used as best as possible by PKH participants to improve their families' welfare. In general, the provision of services can be seen through the disbursement of PKH funds in Purabaya District which is located at ATM ATMs, BNI or BRILINK Agents in Purabaya District, the PKH Assistance Team in Purabaya District, which coordinates with these parties as PKH implementers, has a very important role in disbursing this assistance. regardless of technical capacity in regulating disbursement of funds.

Policy implementation must display the effectiveness of the policy itself. According to George Edward III (2016) in the Top Down Theory, there are 4 (four) that need to be fulfilled in terms of the effectiveness of policy implementation, namely:

1. Is the communication correct. The accuracy of this communication is judged by the extent to which the existing communication has been done to socialize the Family Hope Program.
2. Right from Resources, actors implementing policies are not only the government but there are Resources, namely as policy implementers or in this case called PKH assistants who were recruited by the Ministry of Social Affairs.
3. Right disposition, accuracy with respect to three things. First, whether the target that was intervened was as planned, did it not overlap with other interventions, or did it not conflict with other policy interventions. Second, whether the target is ready for intervention or not. Third, whether the policy implementation intervention is new or updates the previous policy implementation.
4. Appropriate Bureaucratic Structure. In this case the PKH facilitator is a sub-district partner and besides that PKH facilitator has a direct supervisor, namely the district coordinator who is in the district PPKH. The precise communication can be seen from whether the existing policies that have been made have been communicated with the parties that touch and have an interest in it, whether the policies have been formulated according to the character of the problem to be solved, and made by an institution that has the authority over the problem to be solved. The PKH policy is a policy that aims to reduce poverty through improving the quality of RTSM in terms of health and education made by the Ministry of Social Affairs in collaboration with the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Health so that from this point of view the PKH policy is in accordance with its formulation.

Right Resource; The actors involved are not only the government but cooperation between the public and the private sector. What happens in the implementation of PKH in the

field has not yet involved all relevant stakeholders, strategic activities are centralized in the social services and UPPKH districts / cities respectively while other actors only play a technical role. As a poverty reduction policy, PKH has not been able to empower its people. The community was treated as an object in the recipient of assistance so that when an interview session was conducted with RTSM it was conveyed that if this program was terminated, they admitted that it would be very difficult to send their children to school and provide health services because this program was only cash assistance even though there was assistance.

Right disposition; the definition of disposition is not only right on target but what is going to be explained is whether the target is in accordance with what was planned and does not overlap with other policies. Second, the readiness of targets physically and psychologically, and whether this policy can also be supported by the involvement of related parties, for example BPS, PKH facilitators as well as sub-district government in conducting surveys or even cutting off PKH funds if the RTSM conditions have experienced an increase in socio-economic conditions so that they can be replaced with another RTSM.

Right bureaucratic structure; There are two most decisive environments, namely the policy environment and the external policy environment. The policy environment is the interaction between policy formulating and implementing agencies and other related institutions. PKH policy makers are the National Development Planning Agency, the Ministry of Social Affairs, the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of National Education, the Ministry of Religion, the Ministry of Communication and Information Technology and the Central Bureau of Statistics while at the Regency / City and Sub-district levels it is these that are directly in contact with the recipient. According to the PKH facilitator, this interaction is carried out routinely every time the disbursement period discusses the evaluation of the implementation of the program and examines the problems and solutions in solving problems, what happens is that the solution has not been able to run optimally. Second, the external environment is related to public acceptance from the recipients of this program, namely the District government and figures as opinion leaders in order to support the success of this program.

Barriers to Implementing the Family Hope Program Policy

The implementation of the Harapan family program, of course in its journey, there must be obstacles in breaking the poverty chain carried out by the resources or executors of the Family Hope Program, Purabaya District, Sukabumi Regency, researchers refer to four indicators of policy implementation in the implementation of the Harapan Family Program, but there are indicators that have not gone well so that find obstacles. Based on the results of field research in the form of observations, there are obstacles in the Implementation of the Harappan Family Program (PKH) in breaking the poverty chain by the implementing powers of the Family Hope Program in Purabaya District, Sukabumi Regency, as follows:

1. Lack of socialization, lack of communication resulting in unclear socialization of the community resulting in the Family Hope Program which has the goal of reducing the burden on the community with the education and health criteria or requirements that exist in the components of the family that will get assistance but there are people who want to get assistance but do not have these components.
2. Lack of precise implementing resources, implementing resources in mentoring the family hope program should have the latest education as a prerequisite for social welfare strata but what happens is that there are various kinds of multidisciplinary education that are owned by the implementer, which results in the delivery and assistance to the community is not optimal.

3. Unclear disposition, poverty data collection is an activity carried out by BPS. This data is used by the social ministry for beneficiary data. In the implementation of the data field, sometimes the data is not updated, for example people who are already rich but are still registered as poor families, and this results in PKH facilitators not being able to change the recipient data because the data that must be used is data from BPS.
4. The bureaucratic structure is unclear, PKH Facilitators are recruited by the Ministry of Social Affairs, PKH Facilitators as implementers at the lower level must coordinate with the district coordinators at the district level, in this case it results in every activity being planned by the Ministry of Social Affairs delivered by the district office

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the results of research and discussion, researchers can draw the following conclusions: (1). The Family Hope Program (PKH) in the implementation of its policy in terms of communication, it is not appropriate to see from the incomplete socialization of the people of Purabaya Subdistrict, knowing the program, in terms of resources it is still not optimal. assistance, in terms of disposition is still not optimal because the poverty data used is the result of BPS officers and PKH Facilitators unable to record people entitled to assistance, in terms of bureaucratic structures it is still unclear because PKH assistants are placed in sub-districts and village villages but coordinate directly to the district coordinator and sub-district parties only as partners with the recruitment of employees from the Ministry of Social Affairs, (2). Obstacles to the Family Hope Program in Purabaya District in terms of policy implementation is still lack of socialization by PKH facilitators, inaccurate resources can be seen from the perspective of the companion's latest education that is less relevant to mentoring, unclear disposition or unclear things in terms of data collection poverty that must be implemented by BPS but PKH facilitators implement poverty data, bureaucratic structures that are not clear from the status of PKH assistants.

Based on the above conclusions, there are several suggestions recommended by researchers as evaluation materials and input for both the development and enrichment of theory and practical needs to support the PKH program in Purabaya District, Sukabumi Regency, which are as follows: (1). The problem of lack of communication can be corrected by increasing the socialization that is included in village activities, in the case of inappropriate resources, it can be added with training and education and training that can add quality in mentoring to the community, in terms of disposition there must be clear coordination between PKH facilitators and BPS officers, and for matters of unclear bureaucratic structures, there must be intensive coordination from PKH facilitators to district coordinators, (2). It is necessary to update the data correctly by routinely the activities of the Kemiskina Musdes in each village in order to obtain data that is in accordance with the expected poverty criteria so far, (3) There needs to be an evaluation of the companion's performance in order to carry out the main duties and functions of the companion correctly in accordance with the duties formulated by the Ministry of Social Affairs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abdul, Wahab S. 2005. Analysis of Policy From Formulation to Implementation of State Policy. Issue 2, imprint 5. Earth Literacy.
- Agostiono. 2006. Implementation of the Van Meter and Van Horn Model Public Policy, [http // kertyawitaradya.wordpress ss](http://kertyawitaradya.wordpress.com), accessed February 2, 2020.
- Agusta, Ivanovic, Discourse, power and practice of Poverty in rural areas, Bogor: Pustaka Obor Indonesia, 2017.
- Abidin, Said Zainal. 2004. Public Policy. Jakarta: Pancur Siwah Foundation.
- Aini, Wasiatul and Novi, Hendrika Jaya Putra and Syuplahan, Family Programs as Poverty Alleviation Programs, Yogya: Gumay. 2012.
- Arikunto Suharsimi,, Communication Research Management, Revised Edition, Publisher PT. Andi Mahasatya, Jakarta, 2015.
- Central Bureau of Statistics and Ministry of Social Affairs, 2016, The Poor Indonesia, BPS, Jakarta Indonesia
- Bagong Suyanto, 2015, Social Research Methods with Various Alternative Approaches, Prenada Media, Jakarta.
- Central Bureau of Statistics, Poverty Profile in Indonesia March 2019, (Online) available at: https://www.bps.go.id/website/brs_ind/brsInd-0160718115446.pdf, (accessed on, Monday, 20 January 2020).
- Directorate of Family Social Security, General Guidelines for the Family Hope Program (PKH), Jakarta: Ministry of Social RI, 2017.
- Fahrudin, Adi, Introduction to Social Welfare, Bandung: Refika Aditama, 2012.
- Ginandjar Kartasasmita. 1996. Development for the people, growth and equity. Jakarta Pustaka Cedesindo
- Irfan, Islamy M ,. 2004. Principles of State Policy Formulation. Issue 2, Prints 13. Earth Literacy. Jakarta
- Kunarjo, 1992. Planning and development financing. UI Press Jakarta
- Lexey, Moleong. 2002 Qualitative Research Methodology. Bandung .: Youth Rosdakaria
- Mefi Hermawanti and Hesti Rinandari, 2003. Strengthening and Development of the Social Capital of Indigenous Peoples. Institute For Research And Empowerment (IRE). Yogyakarta
- Pupu Saeful Rahmat, 2008. Fostering Local Institutions and Social Capital in Community Life. Economic Education Study Program-AP FKIP, Kuningan Sholichin University
- Hadi, Isbandi Rukminto, Social Welfare, Jakarta: Rajawali Grafindo Persada, 2015.
- <https://id.wikipedia.org/wiki/kemiskian> accessed on Monday, 20 January 2020 at 19:23.
- [https:// id.climate-data.org/location/26742](https://id.climate-data.org/location/26742) (accessed Monday, 20 January 2020).
- Khomsan, Ali et al., Indicators of Poverty and Misclassification of the Poor, Jakarta: Yayasan Pustaka Obor Indonesia, 2015.
- Kontjaraningrat, Community Research Methods, Jakarta: Gramedia, 2010.
- Meleong, Revised edition of Qualitative Research Methods, Bandung: PT. Rosdakarya, 2017.
- Nasdian, Fredian Tonny, Community Development, Jakarta: Yayasan Pustaka Obor Indonesia, 2014.
- Notowidagdo, Rohiman, Introduction to Social Welfare, Jakarta: Amzah, 2016.
- Soetomo, Community Empowerment, Yogyakarta: Student Library, 2011.
- Suharsaputra, Uhar, Quantitative Research Methods, Qualitative and Action, Bandung: PT. Refika Aditama, 2012.
- Suharto, Edi, Building a Community Empowering People, Bandung: Refika Aditama, 2014.

Todaro, Michael P. and Stephen Smith, Eleventh Edition of Economic Development Volume I, Jakarta: Erlangga, 2011.

Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 13 of 2011 concerning Handling of the Poor.