INCOME JOURNAL OF ECONOMICS DEVELOPMENT
Volume 7, No. 1, January 2027, pp. 17-32
e-ISSN: 3025-3225, DOI : 10.54065/ijed.7.1.2027.712

Analysis of the Implementation of the Family Hope Program (PKH) Policy for Poverty Alleviation

Maria Ainin Zulfah [1*], Chusnul Khotimah [2], Indah Prabawati [3], Firre An Suprapto [4]
[1, 2, 3, 4] Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Indonesia
email: 25040674259@mhs.unesa.ac.i, 25040674255@mhs.unesa.ac.id, indahprabawati@unesa.ac.id, firresuprapto@unesa.ac.id

Article Info

Corresponding Author:
Maria Ainin Zulfah, Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Indonesia

Keywords: *Family Hope Program (PKH), Policy Implementation, Poverty*

Abstract

Poverty remains a multidimensional socioeconomic challenge in Indonesia, characterized by limited income, unequal access to education and healthcare, and restricted economic opportunities. This study aims to analyze the implementation of the Family Hope Program (PKH) as a poverty alleviation policy, identify implementation challenges, and formulate recommendations for improving program effectiveness. The study employs a qualitative descriptive approach using a literature review method, with secondary data collected from scientific journals, research articles, and relevant policy documents. Data were analyzed thematically using George C. Edwards III's policy implementation framework, which encompasses four dimensions: communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure. The findings indicate that PKH contributes to reducing household economic vulnerability and improving access to essential social services. However, its implementation continues to face several challenges, including inaccurate beneficiary data, limited facilitator capacity, inconsistent information dissemination, and inadequate institutional coordination. These challenges demonstrate that program effectiveness depends not only on financial assistance but also on the quality of policy implementation and administrative governance. This study highlights the importance of strengthening beneficiary data management, improving facilitator competencies, enhancing inter-agency coordination, and establishing continuous monitoring and evaluation mechanisms. Integrating PKH with community-based economic empowerment initiatives is also recommended to promote sustainable household independence. The study concludes that improvements in institutional governance and coordinated policy implementation are essential for enhancing the effectiveness, accountability, and sustainability of PKH in supporting poverty alleviation in Indonesia.

How to Cite:
Zulfah, M. A., Khotimah, C., Prabawati, I., & Suprapto, F. A. (2027). Analysis of the implementation of the Family Hope Program (PKH) policy for poverty alleviation. Income Journal of Economics Development, 7(1), 17-32. https://doi.org/10.54065/ijed.7.1.2027.712

1. Introduction

Poverty remains one of the most persistent socioeconomic challenges affecting sustainable development in Indonesia. This issue extends beyond insufficient household income and encompasses limited access to education, healthcare, employment opportunities, and essential public services. These interconnected forms of deprivation can undermine human capital development, restrict social mobility, and perpetuate socioeconomic inequality across communities. Furthermore, poverty should be understood as a multidimensional condition influenced by structural inequalities, unequal resource distribution, and limited opportunities for economic participation. Addressing these challenges requires comprehensive development policies that integrate economic interventions with social protection and improvements in public service accessibility (Anggrasari & Hanri, 2025; Choiriyah et al., 2026). The multidimensional characteristics of poverty also contribute to the intergenerational transmission of socioeconomic disadvantages. Families experiencing persistent poverty often

encounter difficulties in providing adequate education, nutrition, healthcare, and developmental opportunities for their children.

Consequently, children from disadvantaged households may face structural barriers that limit their future economic prospects and increase their vulnerability to poverty in adulthood. Recent research emphasizes that social assistance programs can contribute to breaking intergenerational poverty cycles; however, their effectiveness depends on the extent to which financial support is accompanied by meaningful improvements in human capital and socioeconomic opportunities. Sustainable poverty reduction therefore requires interventions that address both immediate household vulnerabilities and the structural determinants of long-term economic exclusion (Anggrasari & Hanri, 2025; Karyono et al., 2026).

As part of its poverty alleviation strategy, the Indonesian government has implemented various social protection policies, including the Family Hope Program (*Program Keluarga Harapan*, PKH). PKH is a conditional cash transfer program designed to reduce the financial burden on poor and vulnerable households while encouraging investments in education, healthcare, and social welfare. Through this program, eligible beneficiary families receive financial assistance linked to specific conditions, particularly children's school participation and the utilization of maternal and child healthcare services. These conditions are intended to strengthen household welfare in the short term while supporting human capital accumulation and reducing intergenerational poverty over the longer term. Consequently, PKH represents an important component of Indonesia's social protection system and broader poverty reduction framework (Cahyadi et al., 2020; Hudang et al., 2024).

Empirical research has demonstrated that PKH can generate positive outcomes for beneficiary households, although the magnitude and consistency of its impacts vary across development indicators. A longitudinal experimental evaluation identified improvements in school participation, maternal healthcare utilization, and child nutritional outcomes, demonstrating the potential contribution of conditional cash transfers to human capital development. Nevertheless, subsequent research reported significant improvements in household food consumption without corresponding statistically significant improvements in educational attainment or prenatal healthcare utilization. More recent evidence also indicates that PKH has not consistently improved children's cognitive test scores, although modest positive effects have been observed in selected indicators of early language and cognitive development. These findings suggest that financial assistance alone may be insufficient to produce comprehensive improvements in human development without complementary investments in education, healthcare, and community services (Cahyadi et al., 2020; Dillianti & Qibthiyyah, 2026; Hudang et al., 2024).

Despite its potential benefits, the implementation of PKH continues to encounter administrative, institutional, and operational challenges. One of the most significant concerns involves inaccuracies in beneficiary identification, which may result in assistance being provided to households that no longer meet eligibility requirements while excluding other families experiencing socioeconomic vulnerability. Inaccurate beneficiary records, insufficient coordination among implementing institutions, and limitations in administrative monitoring can reduce the effectiveness of social assistance distribution. Furthermore, differences in administrative capacity and access to financial infrastructure may create additional implementation difficulties across regions. These conditions indicate that the success of poverty alleviation programs depends not only on the allocation of financial resources but also on reliable beneficiary information, institutional accountability, and effective program governance (Andika et al., 2026; Pertiwi et al., 2025).

The accuracy and integration of socioeconomic databases have therefore become increasingly important in strengthening social protection governance. Indonesia's transition from the Integrated Social Welfare Data (*Data Terpadu Kesejahteraan Sosial*, DTKS) to the National Socioeconomic Single Data (*Data Tunggal Sosial dan Ekonomi Nasional*, DTSEN) reflects an institutional effort to improve beneficiary targeting through more integrated socioeconomic information. This reform is intended to strengthen data consistency, improve the identification of eligible beneficiaries, and support more transparent and accountable social assistance distribution.

Nevertheless, the effectiveness of integrated data management remains dependent on continuous verification, technological infrastructure, administrative capacity, and coordination between central and local government institutions. Consequently, improving the quality of socioeconomic databases represents an essential component of evidence-based poverty alleviation policies (Setiadi & Nurcahyo, 2026).

The urgency of evaluating PKH implementation is further reinforced by the need to ensure that social protection policies operate effectively across different administrative and socioeconomic contexts. Although national policies establish the general objectives and operational requirements of the program, implementation outcomes are substantially influenced by the capacity of local government institutions and frontline personnel. Differences in administrative resources, beneficiary characteristics, communication mechanisms, and institutional coordination may contribute to variations in program effectiveness. Previous studies have identified limited facilitator capacity, inadequate information dissemination, and bureaucratic constraints as important factors affecting the implementation of conditional cash transfer programs. Therefore, examining implementation processes is essential for understanding why similar policies may produce different outcomes across communities (Andika et al., 2026; Rosadi et al., 2025).

To examine these implementation challenges systematically, this study adopts the policy implementation framework developed by George C. Edwards III. The framework identifies four interrelated dimensions that influence the implementation of public policies: communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure. Communication refers to the clarity, consistency, and transmission of policy information among implementing institutions and target populations. Resources include the availability of personnel, financial support, technical infrastructure, and administrative information required for effective implementation. Disposition reflects the commitment, attitudes, and responsiveness of policy implementers, whereas bureaucratic structure concerns organizational procedures, responsibility distribution, and institutional coordination. Recent studies applying this framework to PKH demonstrate its relevance for identifying operational barriers and evaluating institutional performance in poverty alleviation programs (Andika et al., 2026; Rosadi et al., 2025).

Communication and resource availability represent two fundamental dimensions of effective PKH implementation. Clear communication enables beneficiary households to understand program objectives, eligibility requirements, assistance procedures, and their responsibilities regarding education and healthcare participation. Conversely, inadequate socialization and inconsistent information may generate misunderstandings and weaken beneficiary engagement. Resource availability is equally important because implementing institutions require competent facilitators, sufficient operational funding, reliable information systems, and adequate administrative support. Research on PKH implementation has highlighted the importance of facilitator competence in improving the effectiveness of social assistance utilization, while limited staffing capacity and administrative workloads can constrain service quality. Strengthening communication strategies and institutional resources is therefore necessary to improve program accessibility, responsiveness, and implementation consistency (Andika et al., 2026; Rojak & Sahyono, 2025).

In addition to communication and resources, implementer disposition and bureaucratic structure significantly influence the quality of program administration. Implementer disposition encompasses professional commitment, responsibility, integrity, and responsiveness to beneficiary needs. Facilitators and administrative personnel who demonstrate strong commitment may contribute to more effective monitoring, problem resolution, and compliance with program requirements. Meanwhile, bureaucratic structure determines how responsibilities are distributed, operational procedures are implemented, and coordination occurs among government institutions. Ineffective organizational arrangements, centralized administrative constraints, and fragmented coordination mechanisms may delay beneficiary verification and assistance distribution. Accordingly, improvements in institutional accountability, operational procedures, and inter-agency collaboration are essential for ensuring that program implementation remains consistent

with established policy objectives (Pertiwi et al., 2025; Rosadi et al., 2025).

Beyond administrative effectiveness, the sustainability of PKH also depends on its capacity to promote economic independence among beneficiary households. Conditional cash transfers can temporarily reduce financial vulnerability; however, persistent dependence on assistance may reflect broader structural limitations involving education, employment opportunities, financial literacy, and access to productive resources. Research concerning economic empowerment among PKH beneficiaries emphasizes the importance of skills development, entrepreneurial assistance, and sustainable mentoring in supporting household economic independence. Additionally, qualitative evidence suggests that beneficiaries' decisions regarding program participation and withdrawal are influenced by complex socioeconomic circumstances rather than economic conditions alone. These findings indicate that effective poverty alleviation requires the integration of financial assistance with household empowerment, employment development, and context-sensitive social support (Damayanti et al., 2025; Habibullah et al., 2024).

The implementation of sustainable poverty reduction policies also requires collaboration among government institutions, community organizations, private-sector actors, and other relevant stakeholders. Local governments play an important role in coordinating social assistance programs, improving service accessibility, and integrating poverty alleviation initiatives with regional development priorities. Multi-stakeholder collaboration can strengthen program coverage, facilitate resource mobilization, and promote socioeconomic empowerment among vulnerable communities. Evidence from Indonesian regional development studies highlights the importance of institutional synergy, transparent socioeconomic information, and collaborative governance in addressing structural poverty. Moreover, research on PKH during periods of socioeconomic crisis indicates that social protection may contribute to household resilience when supported by accessible services and adaptive institutional arrangements. These perspectives reinforce the need to evaluate PKH as an integrated governance process rather than merely a mechanism for distributing financial assistance (Choiriyah et al., 2026; Komarawati et al., 2025).

Although previous studies have examined PKH outcomes, beneficiary experiences, economic empowerment, and local implementation barriers, the findings remain distributed across different analytical perspectives and institutional contexts. This creates a need for an integrated examination of how communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure jointly shape the implementation of PKH as a poverty alleviation policy, particularly in the context of evolving beneficiary data governance and institutional coordination. Accordingly, this study aims to analyze the implementation of PKH through the four dimensions of Edwards III's policy implementation framework, identify the principal institutional and operational obstacles, and formulate recommendations for improving program effectiveness. Using a qualitative literature review approach, the study systematically synthesizes relevant empirical findings to provide an analytical understanding of PKH implementation and its implications for poverty reduction. The findings are expected to contribute to public policy scholarship and inform improvements in beneficiary targeting, facilitator capacity, inter-agency coordination, administrative accountability, and sustainable household empowerment (Andika et al., 2026; Karyono et al., 2026; Pertiwi et al., 2025).

2. Literature Review

2.1 The Concept of Poverty

Poverty is a multidimensional socioeconomic problem that extends beyond insufficient household income to include limited access to education, healthcare, employment opportunities, and social protection. From a development perspective, poverty reflects the inability of individuals or households to fulfill essential needs and achieve adequate living standards. Economic deprivation is frequently associated with structural inequalities, unequal resource distribution, and limited opportunities for socioeconomic participation. Consequently, poverty reduction requires integrated policy interventions that address both economic vulnerability and inequalities in access to basic public services (Anggrasari & Hanri, 2025; Choiriyah et al., 2026).

Poverty is also closely associated with limited human capital development. Households experiencing persistent economic hardship often encounter difficulties in

financing children's education, meeting nutritional requirements, accessing healthcare, and participating in productive economic activities. These conditions may contribute to intergenerational poverty, in which socioeconomic disadvantages experienced by parents are transmitted to their children through unequal access to essential resources and development opportunities. Therefore, poverty alleviation strategies should extend beyond temporary financial assistance and prioritize long-term improvements in education, healthcare, and household economic capabilities (Anggrasari & Hanri, 2025; Karyono et al., 2026).

An additional perspective emphasizes the importance of institutional capacity and social protection governance in addressing multidimensional poverty. Poverty reduction outcomes are influenced not only by household socioeconomic characteristics but also by the effectiveness of government institutions in identifying vulnerable populations, distributing assistance, and providing accessible public services. Inaccurate beneficiary information, insufficient institutional coordination, and unequal service availability may undermine the effectiveness of social assistance programs. Accordingly, comprehensive poverty alleviation policies should combine targeted financial assistance, integrated socioeconomic information, institutional collaboration, and sustainable economic empowerment initiatives to improve the welfare of disadvantaged populations (Choiriyah et al., 2026; Pertiwi et al., 2025).

2.2 Family Hope Program as a Social Protection Policy

The Family Hope Program (*Program Keluarga Harapan*, PKH) is one of Indonesia's major social protection initiatives designed to reduce poverty through conditional cash transfers. The program provides financial assistance to eligible poor and vulnerable households while encouraging beneficiaries to access essential education, healthcare, and social welfare services. Its target groups include households with pregnant women, young children, school-age children, older persons, and persons with disabilities, subject to applicable eligibility criteria. Through these provisions, PKH seeks to alleviate immediate household financial constraints while strengthening human capital development and reducing long-term socioeconomic vulnerability (Cahyadi et al., 2020; Hudang et al., 2024).

As a conditional cash transfer program, PKH differs from unconditional financial assistance because beneficiaries are expected to fulfill specified responsibilities related to education and healthcare. These responsibilities include supporting children's school attendance, utilizing maternal and child healthcare services, and participating in relevant social welfare activities. The conditional approach is intended to encourage households to invest in human capital while reducing financial barriers to essential services. Evidence from longitudinal evaluations indicates that conditional cash transfers can improve selected educational, healthcare, and nutritional outcomes, although their effects on long-term household economic transformation remain limited (Cahyadi et al., 2020; Karyono et al., 2026).

However, the effectiveness of PKH depends substantially on beneficiary targeting accuracy, administrative accountability, facilitator performance, and coordination among implementing institutions. Inaccurate socioeconomic records may result in assistance being distributed to households that no longer satisfy eligibility requirements while excluding vulnerable families requiring support. Furthermore, weaknesses in administrative verification, communication, and institutional coordination may reduce the effectiveness of program implementation. These challenges demonstrate that successful social protection policies require reliable beneficiary databases, transparent distribution mechanisms, and continuous monitoring and evaluation rather than financial assistance alone (Andika et al., 2026; Pertiwi et al., 2025).

Beyond immediate poverty reduction, PKH also has the potential to support sustainable household empowerment and economic independence. Financial assistance may reduce short-term vulnerability, but long-term improvements in welfare require complementary interventions such as skills development, entrepreneurship support, financial literacy, and access to productive economic opportunities. Research concerning PKH beneficiaries highlights the relevance of economic empowerment in strengthening household independence, while broader evaluations indicate that conditional cash transfers alone cannot fully overcome structural inequalities and restricted socioeconomic mobility. Therefore, integrating

PKH with community-based economic empowerment and sustainable livelihood development programs is essential for reducing long-term dependence on social assistance (Damayanti et al., 2025; Habibullah et al., 2024; Karyono et al., 2026).

2.3 George C. Edwards III's Policy Implementation Theory

Policy implementation is a fundamental stage of the public policy process because it determines how policy objectives are translated into operational activities and measurable outcomes. George C. Edwards III's policy implementation framework identifies four interconnected dimensions that influence implementation performance: communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure. These dimensions explain how information is transmitted, institutional capacities are mobilized, implementers demonstrate commitment, and administrative procedures support policy execution. Recent studies applying this framework to PKH have demonstrated its relevance for examining implementation barriers and identifying areas requiring institutional improvement (Andika et al., 2026; Rosadi et al., 2025).

Communication represents an essential dimension of policy implementation because it facilitates the transmission of information between policymakers, implementing institutions, and target populations. In the context of PKH, effective communication includes program socialization, clarification of eligibility requirements, explanation of beneficiaries' rights and responsibilities, and coordination among government agencies and program facilitators. Inadequate communication may cause misunderstandings regarding program objectives, reduce beneficiary participation, and weaken compliance with assistance requirements. Consequently, consistent information dissemination and effective communication channels are necessary to improve program transparency and implementation effectiveness (Andika et al., 2026; Rosadi et al., 2025).

Resources constitute another important determinant of successful policy implementation. Government programs require sufficient human resources, operational budgets, administrative facilities, technological infrastructure, and reliable information systems to achieve their intended objectives. Within PKH implementation, these resources include program facilitators, administrative personnel, beneficiary databases, transportation facilities, and institutional funding. Resource limitations may constrain beneficiary verification, reduce the quality of monitoring activities, and delay assistance distribution. Research has identified excessive administrative workloads and limited facilitator capacity as significant operational challenges that can reduce the effectiveness of PKH implementation (Andika et al., 2026; Rosadi et al., 2025).

Disposition refers to the attitudes, commitment, integrity, responsiveness, and responsibility of policy implementers. Implementers who demonstrate professional commitment are more likely to perform their responsibilities consistently, provide adequate information, and respond effectively to problems encountered by beneficiaries. In PKH implementation, disposition can be observed through the willingness of facilitators and administrative personnel to conduct program socialization, verify beneficiary information, monitor program participation, and resolve implementation difficulties. Conversely, limited commitment and insufficient responsiveness may reduce administrative effectiveness and weaken the relationship between program institutions and beneficiary households (Andika et al., 2026; Rosadi et al., 2025).

Bureaucratic structure concerns the organizational arrangements, operational procedures, responsibility distribution, and coordination mechanisms established to implement public policies. An effective bureaucratic structure provides clear administrative responsibilities, standardized implementation procedures, and coordination mechanisms between institutions. In PKH, bureaucratic arrangements influence beneficiary registration, eligibility verification, assistance distribution, reporting, and program evaluation. Complex administrative procedures, fragmented institutional responsibilities, and insufficient coordination may delay implementation and reduce accountability. Therefore, strengthening organizational coordination and simplifying administrative mechanisms are important strategies for improving the effectiveness of social protection programs (Pertiwi et al., 2025; Rosadi et al., 2025).

The four dimensions of Edwards III's framework should be understood as interdependent components rather than isolated administrative factors. Effective

communication may improve beneficiary understanding, but its contribution can be constrained when implementing institutions lack sufficient personnel, operational resources, or administrative authority. Similarly, strong implementer commitment may not produce optimal outcomes when bureaucratic procedures remain inefficient or beneficiary information is inaccurate. An integrated assessment of communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure therefore provides a more comprehensive understanding of the institutional conditions that support or hinder PKH implementation. This perspective is particularly relevant for identifying interconnected administrative weaknesses and developing evidence-based policy improvements (Andika et al., 2026; Rosadi et al., 2025).

2.4 Empirical Studies of Previous Research

Previous empirical studies have examined the contribution of PKH to household welfare, education, healthcare utilization, and poverty alleviation. A longitudinal experimental evaluation demonstrated that the program contributed to improvements in selected human development indicators, including school participation, skilled birth attendance, and child nutritional outcomes. However, the study also indicated that improvements in human capital indicators did not necessarily translate into substantial changes in household economic circumstances. These findings demonstrate the importance of evaluating both the immediate and long-term outcomes of conditional cash transfer programs (Cahyadi et al., 2020).

Other studies have reported variations in PKH outcomes across different welfare indicators and beneficiary characteristics. Research examining household consumption and human capital outcomes identified a positive effect on food consumption expenditure, whereas improvements in children's educational attainment and prenatal healthcare utilization were not statistically significant. More recent evidence concerning cognitive development among children in disadvantaged rural households similarly found no statistically significant improvement in cognitive test scores, although modest improvements were identified in selected early developmental indicators. These findings indicate that financial assistance should be accompanied by improvements in education quality, healthcare accessibility, and household development resources (Dillianti & Qibthiyyah, 2026; Hudang et al., 2024).

Empirical investigations of program implementation have also identified institutional and administrative challenges affecting PKH effectiveness. Studies involving government officials, program facilitators, and beneficiary households have highlighted constraints related to inaccurate targeting, insufficient facilitator capacity, inadequate communication, and complex bureaucratic procedures. These limitations may reduce the efficiency of assistance distribution and weaken beneficiary understanding of program responsibilities. Furthermore, institutional arrangements and administrative workload distribution have been identified as important factors influencing the ability of implementing agencies to provide consistent services. Consequently, improvements in information management, facilitator competence, and inter-agency coordination are necessary to strengthen program implementation (Andika et al., 2026; Rosadi et al., 2025).

Recent research further emphasizes the importance of linking social protection programs with community empowerment and collaborative poverty governance. Studies concerning economic assistance for PKH beneficiary households have highlighted the relevance of empowerment-oriented approaches to strengthening economic independence. Research on structural poverty reduction has also demonstrated the importance of collaboration between local governments, private institutions, academic organizations, and civil society in expanding access to socioeconomic development opportunities. Taken together, these studies suggest that sustainable poverty alleviation requires an integrated approach combining effective social assistance administration, institutional collaboration, and long-term economic empowerment. However, further analysis is necessary to explain how the four dimensions of policy implementation interact in shaping the effectiveness of PKH as a poverty alleviation instrument (Choiriyah et al., 2026; Damayanti et al., 2025; Karyono et al., 2026).

2.5 Research Framework of Thought

Based on the theoretical perspectives and empirical findings presented above, this study considers the effectiveness of PKH implementation to be influenced by institutional and administrative conditions. The analysis adopts Edwards III's policy

implementation framework, which consists of communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure. Communication is examined through the effectiveness of information dissemination and program socialization. Resources are assessed through the availability of personnel, operational support, administrative information, and implementation facilities. Disposition is evaluated through the commitment and responsiveness of implementers, whereas bureaucratic structure is examined through administrative procedures, institutional responsibilities, and coordination mechanisms. These dimensions provide the analytical foundation for understanding the implementation of PKH within Indonesia's poverty alleviation framework (Andika et al., 2026; Rosadi et al., 2025).

This study conceptualizes PKH not merely as a financial assistance program but as a public policy instrument intended to improve household welfare, increase access to essential services, and reduce socioeconomic vulnerability. Effective communication, adequate resources, positive implementer disposition, and coordinated bureaucratic arrangements are expected to support more accurate beneficiary targeting and consistent program delivery. Conversely, deficiencies in these dimensions may undermine implementation effectiveness and limit the contribution of PKH to sustainable poverty reduction. Previous evaluations indicate that improvements in program governance should be complemented by broader structural interventions addressing human capital development and household economic opportunities (Karyono et al., 2026; Pertiwi et al., 2025).

The conceptual framework establishes a systematic relationship between policy implementation dimensions, operational effectiveness, and the intended outcomes of poverty alleviation. Communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure are positioned as the principal analytical dimensions through which implementation performance is assessed. Their contributions are examined in relation to beneficiary targeting accuracy, assistance distribution, program accessibility, administrative accountability, and institutional coordination. These operational aspects are subsequently interpreted in relation to the broader objectives of improving household welfare and supporting sustainable poverty reduction. Because this research employs a qualitative literature review approach, the relationships are examined through thematic synthesis and interpretation of existing empirical evidence rather than statistical causal estimation (Andika et al., 2026; Pertiwi et al., 2025; Rosadi et al., 2025).

2.6 Research Hypotheses or Assumptions

Considering the qualitative nature of this study, formal statistical hypotheses are not required. Instead, the analysis is guided by the assumption that the effectiveness of PKH implementation is influenced by four interconnected dimensions of Edwards III's policy implementation framework: communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure. The study assumes that effective communication, adequate institutional resources, strong implementer commitment, and efficient bureaucratic coordination contribute to more consistent program delivery and improved administrative performance. This assumption is supported by empirical studies identifying information dissemination, facilitator capacity, administrative accountability, and institutional coordination as important determinants of PKH implementation effectiveness (Andika et al., 2026; Rosadi et al., 2025).

Furthermore, this study assumes that improvements in policy implementation contribute to more accurate beneficiary targeting, greater accessibility of social assistance, and stronger institutional responsiveness to the needs of vulnerable households. Nevertheless, effective administration alone may not be sufficient to achieve sustainable poverty alleviation when structural inequalities, limited employment opportunities, and inadequate public services remain unresolved. Therefore, the analysis also considers the relationship between administrative effectiveness and broader socioeconomic conditions that influence the long-term outcomes of PKH. These assumptions guide the interpretation of literature findings and the formulation of recommendations for strengthening social protection governance and sustainable poverty reduction (Karyono et al., 2026; Pertiwi et al., 2025).

3. Research Methods

This research uses a qualitative approach with literature study methods or literature research. The design of research activities is carried out through several stages, namely

determining the focus of the study, collecting relevant literature sources, selecting documents that are in accordance with the research topic, analyzing the content of the literature, and drawing conclusions based on the results of the study. The type of research used is qualitative descriptive, because this study aims to describe and analyze the implementation of the Family Hope Program as a systematic poverty alleviation effort based on secondary data.

The scope of this research focuses on the implementation of the Family Hope Program policies in an effort to reduce poverty. The object of the research is the implementation of PKH which is analyzed using the theory of policy implementation of George C. Edward III, which includes aspects of communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure. This research was not carried out through direct observation in the field, but through a study of various documents and literature sources related to PKH policies, social protection, and poverty alleviation.

The main materials in this study are in the form of secondary data obtained from books, scientific journals, research articles, government regulations, policy documents, and reports related to the implementation of the Family Hope Program. The main tools used in this study are document review guidelines, literature notes, and reference tracing support tools. Because this research is a literature study, the research place is not limited to a specific physical location, but is carried out through the search and analysis of literature sources that are relevant to the research topic.

Data collection techniques are carried out through document analysis or literature analysis. The data collection stage begins with looking for references that are relevant to the theme of PKH and poverty alleviation, then selecting sources based on the suitability of the content, relevance to policy implementation theory, and relevance to research problems. The literature that has been collected is then classified based on themes, namely the concept of poverty, social protection policies, the Family Hope Program, policy implementation theory, and obstacles to the implementation of PKH.

The operational definition in this study is prepared based on the policy implementation theory of George C. Edward III. The communication aspect is interpreted as the process of delivering information, socialization, and coordination between program implementers and beneficiary communities. The resource aspect includes the availability of implementing personnel, budget, beneficiary data, facilities, and infrastructure to support the implementation of PKH. The disposition aspect refers to the attitude, commitment, responsibility, and seriousness of policy implementers in carrying out the program. Meanwhile, aspects of the bureaucratic structure are related to work procedures, division of tasks, coordination mechanisms, and the flow of PKH implementation.

Data analysis techniques are carried out in a qualitative descriptive manner by reading, understanding, grouping, and interpreting data from various literature sources. The data that has been collected is analyzed by linking the findings of the literature to four indicators of George C. Edward III policy implementation. This analysis is used to describe how the implementation of PKH is implemented, identify obstacles that arise in the implementation of the program, and formulate recommendations for improvement so that the implementation of PKH can run more effectively and on target in overcoming poverty.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. Poverty Conditions and the Role of the Family Hope Program in Poverty Alleviation

The findings of the literature review indicate that poverty in Indonesia remains a multidimensional socioeconomic problem characterized by insufficient household income, limited employment opportunities, unequal access to education and healthcare, and restricted participation in productive economic activities. Poverty may be examined through absolute and relative deprivation, while social and institutional conditions further influence household vulnerability. These interconnected factors demonstrate that poverty cannot be adequately addressed through income-based interventions alone. Evidence from Indonesian districts and municipalities indicates that the effectiveness of government poverty reduction interventions varies according to regional socioeconomic conditions, development characteristics, and the types of policy instruments implemented (Priambodo & Djirimu, 2024).

The review further indicates that economic growth and social assistance contribute differently to poverty reduction depending on local development conditions. Government interventions involving social

assistance, village funds, credit programs, and regional economic development may support poverty reduction, although their effectiveness varies across regions. This suggests that poverty alleviation policies require differentiated approaches that consider household vulnerability, local economic opportunities, institutional capacity, and the accessibility of basic public services. Accordingly, social protection policies should be integrated with broader development strategies to address both immediate economic deprivation and structural socioeconomic inequality (Choiriyah et al., 2026; Priambodo & Djirimu, 2024).

Within this context, the Family Hope Program (PKH) represents an important social protection instrument designed to reduce household economic vulnerability while encouraging investments in education and healthcare. The program provides conditional cash transfers to eligible households with the intention of reducing short-term financial constraints and strengthening long-term human capital development. A longitudinal experimental evaluation in Indonesia identified improvements in selected indicators of school participation, maternal healthcare utilization, and child nutritional outcomes. However, the evaluation did not establish transformative changes in the economic circumstances of beneficiary households, indicating that improvements in human capital do not necessarily result in immediate economic independence (Cahyadi et al., 2020).

Other empirical findings suggest that the benefits of PKH vary across household welfare indicators. Evidence from Indonesian household survey data indicates that PKH positively affects food consumption expenditure, while statistically significant improvements were not identified for children's educational attainment or prenatal healthcare visits in that analysis. Similarly, a recent evaluation of children's cognitive outcomes found no statistically significant overall effect on cognitive test scores, although limited positive effects were observed in selected early developmental indicators. These findings indicate that PKH can help alleviate household economic constraints, but its contribution to long-term human development depends on the availability and quality of complementary education, healthcare, and socioeconomic services (Dillianti & Qibthiyyah, 2026; Hudang et al., 2024).

4.2. Communication in the Implementation of the Family Hope Program

The literature synthesis identifies communication as an important dimension influencing the implementation of PKH. Communication encompasses the transmission of program objectives, eligibility requirements, beneficiary responsibilities, assistance procedures, and relevant policy changes between implementing institutions and beneficiary households. Effective communication helps ensure that beneficiaries understand the purpose of conditional assistance and the importance of utilizing educational, healthcare, and social welfare services. Conversely, inadequate information dissemination may create misunderstandings regarding program requirements and weaken beneficiary participation. Previous qualitative research has identified communication gaps as an operational barrier affecting beneficiaries' understanding of conditional cash transfer requirements (Rosadi et al., 2025).

Communication within PKH implementation occurs through both vertical and horizontal coordination mechanisms. Vertical communication involves the transmission of information between central authorities, regional government institutions, program coordinators, and facilitators. Horizontal communication involves coordination among local government offices, village administrators, program facilitators, and community representatives. Research conducted in Cirebon Regency illustrates the role of coordination forums and facilitator interactions in supporting program delivery and resolving beneficiary-related issues. Nevertheless, the existence of formal communication mechanisms does not automatically guarantee that information is consistently understood or effectively implemented by all stakeholders (Andika et al., 2026).

The findings suggest that communication effectiveness should be evaluated not only through the frequency of socialization activities but also through beneficiaries' understanding of program requirements and the consistency of information across administrative levels. Communication strategies should therefore involve accessible explanations of program conditions, regular beneficiary education, opportunities for clarification, and responsive complaint-handling mechanisms. Strengthening communication between

institutions and beneficiaries may improve transparency, reduce administrative misunderstandings, and support more consistent implementation. These improvements are particularly relevant in areas where socioeconomic vulnerability and differences in access to information may affect beneficiaries' ability to engage with social assistance programs (Andika et al., 2026; Rosadi et al., 2025).

4.3. Resources in the Implementation of the Family Hope Program

Resources constitute a fundamental requirement for effective PKH implementation because program activities depend on the availability of qualified personnel, operational funding, administrative facilities, technological infrastructure, and reliable beneficiary information. Program facilitators play a central role in conducting socialization, supporting beneficiary verification, monitoring compliance, and assisting households in addressing administrative difficulties. However, the literature identifies limitations in facilitator capacity and the concentration of administrative responsibilities as recurring implementation challenges. These constraints may reduce the time available for direct beneficiary assistance and weaken the responsiveness of program services (Andika et al., 2026; Rosadi et al., 2025).

Human resource competence is particularly important because PKH facilitators require both administrative knowledge and interpersonal skills to provide effective assistance. Their responsibilities extend beyond distributing information to include understanding household socioeconomic conditions, identifying beneficiary difficulties, and encouraging appropriate utilization of financial assistance. A quantitative study involving 50 beneficiary households found that facilitator competence had a positive and statistically significant association with the effectiveness of PKH assistance utilization. This finding indicates that strengthening facilitators' knowledge, technical skills, and professional attitudes may contribute to improved program implementation and beneficiary support (Rojak & Sahyono, 2025).

In addition to personnel, reliable socioeconomic information systems are essential for identifying eligible households and maintaining accurate beneficiary records. Administrative data inconsistencies may contribute to inclusion and exclusion errors, potentially reducing the fairness and effectiveness of social assistance distribution. Indonesia's development of the National Socioeconomic Single Data system (*Data Tunggal Sosial dan Ekonomi Nasional*, DTSEN) reflects an effort to strengthen social protection governance through more integrated socioeconomic information. However, improvements in data integration must be accompanied by verification procedures, administrative coordination, and adequate technological support to ensure that beneficiary information remains accurate and responsive to changing household conditions (Pertiwi et al., 2025; Setiadi & Nurcahyo, 2026).

The findings therefore suggest that strengthening PKH resources requires more than increasing the number of facilitators or expanding administrative infrastructure. Institutional improvements should also include competency-based training, balanced workload distribution, responsive technical assistance, and accessible digital information systems. Furthermore, operational planning should consider the geographical distribution of beneficiaries, particularly in areas where transportation difficulties and limited access to administrative facilities may complicate program monitoring. Such measures may improve institutional capacity and strengthen the consistency of assistance delivery across different implementation contexts (Andika et al., 2026; Rojak & Sahyono, 2025).

4.4. Disposition of Policy Implementers in the Family Hope Program

Disposition refers to the commitment, integrity, responsiveness, and professional responsibility demonstrated by individuals responsible for implementing public policies. Within PKH, disposition is reflected in the willingness of program facilitators and administrative personnel to perform their responsibilities consistently, respond to beneficiary concerns, and support the achievement of program objectives. Implementers with strong professional commitment are expected to provide effective assistance, communicate program requirements clearly, and encourage beneficiaries to utilize assistance in accordance with its intended purposes. Nevertheless, positive implementer attitudes must be supported by appropriate institutional resources and operational procedures to produce effective program outcomes (Andika et al., 2026; Rosadi et al., 2025).

The literature indicates that facilitator commitment and competence are important for supporting beneficiary participation and the responsible utilization of assistance. Facilitators contribute to the implementation process by providing information, monitoring beneficiary conditions, and supporting households in fulfilling program responsibilities. However, excessive administrative workloads, limited technical capacity, and insufficient institutional support may constrain their ability to provide continuous assistance. Consequently, disposition should not be evaluated solely through individual motivation but also through the institutional conditions that enable implementers to perform their responsibilities effectively (Andika et al., 2026; Rojak & Sahyono, 2025).

Beneficiary behavior must also be considered when examining the implementation of conditional cash transfer policies. A qualitative investigation of long-standing PKH recipients demonstrated that decisions regarding continued participation or voluntary withdrawal were influenced by complex socioeconomic circumstances, including household financial vulnerability and dependence on informal borrowing arrangements. These findings suggest that continued participation in social assistance should not automatically be interpreted as unwillingness to achieve economic independence. Instead, effective program implementation requires a comprehensive understanding of household conditions and responsive assistance mechanisms that acknowledge the structural limitations experienced by vulnerable populations (Habibullah et al., 2024).

The synthesis suggests that improving implementer disposition requires professional development, institutional accountability, supportive supervision, and clear performance expectations. Facilitators should receive adequate training to strengthen their capacity to communicate with beneficiaries, identify implementation problems, and provide appropriate assistance. At the same time, beneficiary support should emphasize empowerment rather than administrative compliance alone. A responsive and professionally committed implementation system may improve beneficiary trust, strengthen program accountability, and contribute to the broader objectives of poverty alleviation (Habibullah et al., 2024; Rosadi et al., 2025).

4.5. Bureaucratic Structure in the Implementation of the Family Hope Program

Bureaucratic structure is another important dimension affecting PKH implementation because it determines how administrative responsibilities, operational procedures, institutional authority, and coordination mechanisms are organized. Program implementation involves multiple administrative levels responsible for beneficiary registration, verification, assistance distribution, monitoring, reporting, and evaluation. Clear organizational arrangements can facilitate consistent implementation, while fragmented responsibilities and complex administrative procedures may create delays and reduce institutional responsiveness. Previous research has identified bureaucratic centralization and procedural rigidity as important challenges affecting the effectiveness of PKH implementation at the local level (Andika et al., 2026; Rosadi et al., 2025).

The findings indicate that beneficiary data management represents a particularly important aspect of bureaucratic performance. Inaccurate or outdated socioeconomic information may create discrepancies between households requiring assistance and those recorded as eligible beneficiaries. A national study on social assistance distribution identified inaccurate targeting information and insufficient stakeholder coordination among the major barriers affecting policy effectiveness. These findings demonstrate that administrative effectiveness depends on both reliable information systems and coordinated institutional procedures that allow beneficiary data to be verified and updated appropriately (Pertiwi et al., 2025).

Administrative digitalization may improve efficiency and transparency, but it can also introduce operational difficulties when information systems are insufficiently flexible or inadequately integrated with local implementation mechanisms. Research on PKH implementation in Cirebon Regency identified rigid digital procedures and the concentration of administrative responsibilities among facilitators as important implementation constraints. These findings suggest that digital governance should provide not only standardized procedures but also accessible mechanisms for verifying disputed information, resolving technical errors, and responding to beneficiary complaints. Without such

mechanisms, administrative requirements may unintentionally create additional barriers for vulnerable households (Andika et al., 2026).

The synthesis therefore emphasizes the importance of strengthening institutional coordination, simplifying administrative procedures, and improving accountability across implementation levels. Regular coordination meetings, transparent beneficiary verification, responsive complaint-handling mechanisms, and systematic monitoring may support more effective program governance. Furthermore, collaboration between government institutions, local communities, and relevant stakeholders may contribute to more inclusive and context-sensitive poverty alleviation strategies. These measures are consistent with recent research highlighting the importance of multi-stakeholder coordination, integrated socioeconomic information, and evidence-based decision-making in addressing structural poverty (Choiriyah et al., 2026; Pertiwi et al., 2025).

4.6. Synthesis of the Main Implementation Findings and Challenges

The analysis of the four dimensions of policy implementation indicates that PKH possesses institutional mechanisms supporting beneficiary assistance, social protection delivery, and administrative monitoring. However, the literature also identifies persistent challenges involving communication gaps, limitations in facilitator capacity, insufficient beneficiary data accuracy, and bureaucratic coordination difficulties. These challenges are interconnected because weaknesses in one implementation dimension may influence the performance of the others. For example, inadequate resources may reduce the effectiveness of communication, while rigid administrative procedures may limit facilitators' capacity to resolve beneficiary problems. Consequently, the effectiveness of PKH should be examined through an integrated assessment of its operational and institutional dimensions (Andika et al., 2026; Rosadi et al., 2025).

Table 1. Synthesis of PKH Implementation Findings Based on Edwards III's Policy Implementation Framework

Implementation Dimension	Findings from Literature	Main Challenges	Recommended Improvements
Communication	Program socialization, coordination, and beneficiary education support the transmission of PKH requirements.	Uneven understanding of program conditions and inconsistent information dissemination.	Strengthen regular socialization, communication channels, and beneficiary feedback mechanisms.
Resources	Facilitators, operational support, and information systems enable program administration and household assistance.	Limited facilitator capacity, concentrated workloads, and beneficiary data inaccuracies.	Improve facilitator competencies, workload distribution, data verification, and technical infrastructure.
Disposition	Implementer commitment and responsiveness support monitoring, guidance, and assistance utilization.	Administrative demands may constrain facilitator responsiveness and beneficiary empowerment.	Strengthen professional training, supportive supervision, and beneficiary-centered assistance.
Bureaucratic Structure	Established procedures support registration, verification, distribution, monitoring, and evaluation.	Procedural rigidity, fragmented coordination, and insufficiently responsive administrative systems.	Simplify administrative procedures, strengthen institutional coordination, and improve grievance resolution.

Note. The table presents a thematic synthesis of findings reported in previous studies. It does not represent newly collected field observations or independently measured program outcomes (Andika et al., 2026; Pertiwi et al., 2025; Rojak & Sahyono, 2025; Rosadi et al., 2025).

As presented in Table 1, communication-related challenges concern the consistency and accessibility of information provided to beneficiaries. These challenges may affect household understanding of program conditions and assistance procedures. Resource-related problems primarily involve facilitator competence, administrative capacity, and reliable beneficiary information. Disposition-related challenges concern the ability of implementers to maintain responsive and beneficiary-oriented assistance under operational constraints. Meanwhile, bureaucratic challenges involve coordination mechanisms, procedural flexibility, and the responsiveness of administrative systems. The interdependence of these dimensions indicates that isolated institutional improvements may be insufficient to address complex implementation

problems (Andika et al., 2026; Rosadi et al., 2025).

Beneficiary data accuracy emerges as a cross-cutting issue because it directly affects the fairness and efficiency of assistance distribution. Inclusion errors may result in assistance being provided to households that do not satisfy program requirements, while exclusion errors may prevent eligible vulnerable households from receiving support. Addressing these problems requires continuous verification, integration of socioeconomic databases, and coordinated information exchange among relevant institutions. Strengthening data governance may therefore improve the transparency, accountability, and effectiveness of social assistance distribution (Pertiwi et al., 2025; Setiadi & Nurcahyo, 2026).

Another important challenge concerns the sustainability of beneficiary welfare improvements. Although conditional cash transfers may reduce immediate financial constraints, sustained poverty reduction requires opportunities for employment, economic participation, financial capability development, and access to productive resources. Research on the evolution of PKH suggests that the program has provided important protection against economic vulnerability but has faced persistent limitations in generating transformative socioeconomic mobility. Consequently, social assistance implementation should be linked with broader economic development and community empowerment strategies to strengthen long-term outcomes (Habibullah et al., 2024; Karyono et al., 2026).

4.7. Evaluation of Program Effectiveness and Policy Improvement Strategies

The effectiveness of PKH can be evaluated through three complementary perspectives: effectiveness, efficiency, and adequacy. Effectiveness concerns the extent to which program implementation contributes to its intended objectives, including reducing household vulnerability and improving access to education, healthcare, and social welfare. Efficiency relates to the appropriate utilization of administrative resources, timely assistance distribution, and the accuracy of beneficiary targeting. Adequacy concerns whether the financial and nonfinancial support provided is sufficient to address the needs of vulnerable households. These dimensions are relevant because the successful distribution of assistance does not necessarily demonstrate that poverty alleviation objectives have been achieved (Cahyadi et al., 2020; Pertiwi et al., 2025).

The reviewed evidence suggests that PKH has produced positive outcomes in selected dimensions of household welfare and human capital development, but its impacts are not uniform across indicators or evaluation periods. Experimental evidence demonstrated improvements in school participation, maternal healthcare, and child nutrition, whereas other evaluations reported more limited effects on educational attainment, prenatal healthcare utilization, and cognitive development. These differences should not be interpreted as contradictory evidence of overall program success or failure because the studies examined different populations, time periods, and outcome measures. Rather, they highlight the importance of evaluating PKH through multiple welfare indicators and considering the institutional conditions that influence program outcomes (Cahyadi et al., 2020; Dillianti & Qibthiyyah, 2026; Hudang et al., 2024).

From an implementation perspective, improving PKH effectiveness requires strengthening institutional capacities across all four dimensions of Edwards III's framework. Communication improvements should prioritize clear program information and accessible beneficiary feedback mechanisms. Resource improvements should focus on facilitator competencies, operational support, and accurate socioeconomic databases. Disposition-related improvements should emphasize professional accountability and responsive household assistance, while bureaucratic reforms should strengthen coordination and simplify administrative procedures. These priorities are supported by evidence identifying data accuracy, facilitator capacity, and institutional responsiveness as important factors affecting the implementation of social protection policies (Andika et al., 2026; Pertiwi et al., 2025; Rojak & Sahyono, 2025).

Beyond institutional improvements, sustainable poverty alleviation requires integrating PKH with economic empowerment and community development initiatives. Skills training, entrepreneurship development, financial literacy, access to productive resources, and continuing assistance may provide opportunities for beneficiary households to strengthen their economic independence. Research examining empowerment among PKH beneficiaries in Bandung emphasizes the potential contribution

of skills development and business mentoring, while research on structural poverty highlights the importance of collaboration among government institutions, private-sector actors, academic organizations, and civil society. Such integration may help strengthen the relationship between short-term social protection and long-term economic resilience (Choiriyah et al., 2026; Damayanti et al., 2025).

Overall, the literature synthesis indicates that PKH constitutes an important component of Indonesia's poverty alleviation strategy, but its contribution is influenced by the quality of policy implementation and the broader socioeconomic environment. Communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure provide a systematic framework for identifying institutional strengths and implementation constraints. Improving beneficiary data accuracy, strengthening facilitator capacity, promoting inter-agency coordination, and integrating assistance with economic empowerment programs represent important priorities for policy improvement. These measures may contribute to more transparent, accountable, inclusive, and sustainable social protection governance. Nevertheless, because this study is based on qualitative literature analysis, its conclusions should be interpreted as a synthesis of existing evidence rather than a direct causal assessment of PKH implementation or poverty reduction outcomes (Andika et al., 2026; Karyono et al., 2026; Pertiwi et al., 2025).

5. Closing

This study concludes that the Family Hope Program (PKH) plays an important role in poverty alleviation in Indonesia by providing conditional financial assistance and improving access to education, healthcare, and social welfare services. Based on George C. Edwards III's policy implementation framework, four interrelated dimensions influence program implementation: communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure. The findings indicate that PKH contributes to reducing household economic vulnerability, although its effectiveness remains constrained by inaccurate beneficiary data, limited facilitator capacity, inadequate information dissemination, and weak institutional coordination.

Theoretically, this study reinforces the relevance of Edwards III's framework in analyzing the institutional and administrative challenges of social protection policies. Practically, the findings emphasize the importance of improving beneficiary targeting through integrated socioeconomic databases, strengthening facilitator competencies, enhancing inter-agency coordination, and establishing transparent monitoring and evaluation mechanisms. Integrating PKH with vocational training and economic empowerment initiatives may further promote sustainable household independence.

This study is limited by its reliance on secondary data from previous publications without direct field observations or interviews. Differences in geographical contexts and research methodologies across the reviewed studies may also limit the generalizability of the findings. Furthermore, the qualitative approach does not establish statistical or causal relationships between policy implementation dimensions and poverty reduction outcomes.

Future research should employ quantitative or mixed-methods approaches to evaluate PKH implementation across different regions. Longitudinal studies are also recommended to examine the program's sustained effects on household income, education, healthcare utilization, and economic independence. Further investigation into digital governance, beneficiary data integration, and community-based empowerment could support more effective, inclusive, and sustainable poverty alleviation policies.

References

Achmad Fahim. (2020). *Efektivitas Pelaksanaan Program Keluarga Harapan (PKH) Dalam Upaya Pengentasan Kemiskinan Di Desa Randuboto, Kecamatan Sidayu Dalam Persfektif Ekonomi Islam. 8*(2), 120–139.

Arundinasari, I., Ap, S., Pa, M., Shafiya, N. P., & Harsen, R. L. (2023). *Evaluasi Program Keluarga Harapan (PKH) Dalam Memberdayakan Masyarakat Miskin Di Desa Sirnoboyo*. 1–10.

Boediono. (2014). *Ekonomi mikro*. BPFE.

Edwards III, G. C. (1980). *Implementing public policy*. Congressional Quarterly Press.

Fahim, A. (2022). Efektivitas pelaksanaan Program Keluarga Harapan (PKH) dalam upaya pengentasan kemiskinan di Desa Randuboto, Kecamatan Sidayu dalam perspektif ekonomi Islam. *Jurnal QIEMA (Qomaruddin Islamic Economy Magazine), 8*(2), 120–139. https://doi.org/10.36835/qiema.v8i2.39

44

Pamungkas, V. C., Muflikhah, L., & Wihandika, R. C. (2019). Klasifikasi Penerimaan Program Keluarga Harapan (PKH) Menggunakan Metode Learning Vector Quantization (Studi Kasus Desa Kedungjati). *Jurnal Pengembangan Teknologi Informasi Dan Ilmu Komputer*, *3*(3), 2659–2666.

Papilaya, J. (2020). Kebijakan Publik Dalam Pengentasan Kemiskinan. *Jurnal Bimbingan Dan Konseling Terapan*, *04*(01), 77–91.

Pratama, Y. C. (2015). Analisis Faktor-Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Kemiskinan Di Indonesia. *Esensi*, *4*(2), 45–53. Https://Doi.Org/10.15408/Ess.V4i2.1966

Tlonaen, Y. B. S., Hardiyanto, W. T., & Diahloka, C. (2014). Implementasi Program Keluarga Harapan (PKH) untuk meningkatkan kesejahteraan masyarakat miskin. *JISIP: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik, 3*(1), 29–37.

Yudid B.S.Tlonaen, Hardianto, W. T., & Diahloka, C. (2012). Implementasi Program Keluarga Harapan (PKH) Untuk Meningkatkan Kesejahteraan Masyarakat Miskin. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Ilmu Politik*, *3*(5), 1443–1452. Https://Doi.Org/10.59141/Comserva.V4i5.2162

Zainab, Farida, N., Al'asqolaini, M. Z., Tofan, A., & Resdiana, E. (2023). Harapan Kemandirian Masyarakat Melalui Program Keluarga Harapan (PKH). *Abhakte Jurnal Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat*, *1*(2), 88–93. Https://Doi.Org/10.24929/Abhakte.V1i2.3060

Zevira, E. C., & Pertiwi, V. I. (2024). *Inklusif Untuk Lansia Disabilitas Di Kabupaten Gresik*. *6*(2), 112–120