

## THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FAMILY HOPE PROGRAM (PKH) IN BINJAI HULU DISTRICT, SINTANG REGENCY

Mathilda Sunta<sup>1</sup>, Yulius Yohanes<sup>2</sup>, Arifin<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1,2,3</sup>Master of Public Administration, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences,  
Universitas Tanjungpura, Pontianak

Email: [mathildasunta15@gmail.com](mailto:mathildasunta15@gmail.com)<sup>1</sup>, [yulius.yohanes@fisip.untan.ac.id](mailto:yulius.yohanes@fisip.untan.ac.id)<sup>2</sup>, [Arifin@fisip.untan.ac.id](mailto:Arifin@fisip.untan.ac.id)<sup>3</sup>

Received : 15 January 2026

Accepted : 20 February 2026

Revised : 31 January 2026

Published : 28 April 2026

### Abstract

This research aims to analyze and describe the implementation of the Family Hope Program (Program Keluarga Harapan or PKH) in Binjai Hulu District, Sintang Regency. The results indicate that Communication in the planning and decision-making process regarding the fuel subsidy reduction compensation program was conducted by the government using a "top-down" approach; consequently, the target community was not given the opportunity to provide input regarding their actual needs based on real-world conditions. Regarding Resources, the direct cash assistance lacked clarity in both its short-term and long-term objectives. The Disposition/Attitude of Implementers in the success of data collection for poor households, the distribution of fuel compensation cards (BLT), and the disbursement of direct cash assistance funds in Binjai Hulu District was rated as very good. Finally, the Bureaucratic Structure in the PKH fund distribution program carried out by the Post Office was considered appropriate, as the Post Office is highly experienced in handling public fund transfers and has a presence in nearly every district.

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

### 1. Introduction

Poverty constitutes a fundamental issue in achieving social welfare and remains a significant challenge for regional development, including in Sintang Regency. In response to this issue, the government has implemented various public policies, one of which is the Family Hope Program (Program Keluarga Harapan/PKH) as a form of social protection for low-income communities. Public policy itself refers to a series of governmental actions aimed at addressing public problems (Abidin, 2002; Agustino, 2006). PKH is designed to enhance the quality of human resources through improved access to education and healthcare, as well as to break the cycle of poverty (Dunn, 1999; Wahab, 2005). This program is also aligned with broader efforts to alleviate poverty and promote social welfare development (Supriatna, 1997; Sherraden, 2005). However, its implementation in Sintang Regency still encounters various challenges, such as inaccurate targeting, irregularities in the distribution of assistance, and limitations in implementing resources. Other issues include the unequal distribution of beneficiaries, insufficient policy socialization, and inconsistent poverty data. These conditions indicate that policy implementation has not yet been optimal, influenced by factors such as communication, resources, implementers' attitudes, and bureaucratic structure (Dwijowijoto, 2004; Sumaryadi, 2005). Therefore, this study focuses on analyzing the implementation of the Family Hope Program (PKH) in Binjai Hulu District, Sintang Regency. It aims to provide an overview of the effectiveness of policy implementation and serve as an evaluative reference for improving the quality of poverty alleviation programs in the future, both theoretically in the development of public administration studies and practically for government and society.

### 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

#### 2.1 Social Policy

Social policy is a form of public policy that represents government decisions aimed at responding to public issues, particularly in addressing social problems and fulfilling societal needs (Abidin, 2002; Agustino, 2006). Social policy serves preventive, curative, and developmental functions as part of the state's responsibility to enhance social welfare (Dunn, 1999).

Social policy can be understood as a process, a product, and a performance in achieving social objectives (Dwijowijoto, 2004). Failures in social policy may result from flawed formulation, improper implementation, and a lack of public participation (Wahab, 2005).

## **2.2 Policy Implementation**

### **2.2.1 Definition of Policy Implementation**

Policy implementation refers to actions taken to translate policy decisions into concrete measures in order to achieve predetermined objectives (Wahab, 2005). It encompasses various activities carried out by public organizations in executing policies (Agustino, 2006).

### **2.2.2 Implications and Stages of Implementation**

Policy implementation includes stages ranging from policy formulation, execution, to evaluation and improvement (Dunn, 1999). This process involves multiple actors and occurs progressively in accordance with policy goals.

### **2.2.3 Determinants of Policy Implementation**

The success of policy implementation is influenced by several factors, including public compliance, awareness, legal sanctions, group interests, social values, and inter-agency coordination (Agustino, 2006).

## **2.3 Social Services**

Social services are programs designed to meet the needs of individuals, families, and groups in order to achieve social welfare (Effendi, 1986). These services include various forms such as counseling, education, rehabilitation, and social assistance (Singarimbun & Effendi, 1989). Social services play a crucial role in modern society, particularly in addressing issues such as poverty, health, and social inequality (Supriatna, 1997).

## **2.4 Empowerment**

Empowerment refers to efforts aimed at enhancing the capacity and independence of communities through strengthening their potential and improving access to resources (Sumaryadi, 2005). Community empowerment seeks to improve welfare through a participatory approach—by, from, and for the community (Mubyarto, 2005). This process involves capacity building, increasing access, and providing protection for community groups (Supriatna, 1997).

## **2.5 Definition of the Family Hope Program (PKH)**

The Family Hope Program (Program Keluarga Harapan/PKH) is a social assistance program in the form of conditional cash transfers for extremely poor households (Rumah Tangga Sangat Miskin/RTSM) aimed at improving welfare (Ministry of Social Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia, 2018). This program is widely recognized as a conditional cash transfer scheme that requires beneficiaries to access education and healthcare services.

## **2.6 Objectives of PKH**

PKH aims to reduce poverty, improve the quality of human resources, and break the cycle of poverty (Presidential Regulation No. 15 of 2010). The program also supports improvements in education and healthcare among low-income communities.

## **2.7 Target Beneficiaries of PKH**

The target beneficiaries of PKH are extremely poor households with family members such as pregnant women, school-aged children, the elderly, or persons with disabilities (BPS; Ministry of Social Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia).

## **2.8 Requirements for PKH Beneficiaries**

PKH beneficiaries are required to fulfill conditions in the fields of education and health, such as school attendance and regular health check-ups (Presidential Regulation No. 15 of 2010).

## **2.9 Legal Basis of PKH**

PKH is grounded in various regulations, including Law No. 40 of 2004, Law No. 13 of 2011, and Presidential Regulation No. 15 of 2010 concerning poverty alleviation.

## **2.10 Amount of Assistance**

The amount of PKH assistance varies depending on the condition of beneficiary families, with the aim of improving welfare through support in education and healthcare (General Guidelines of PKH, 2018).

## **METHOD**

This study employs a descriptive qualitative approach to analyze the implementation of the Family Hope Program (Program Keluarga Harapan/PKH) in Binjai Hulu District, Sintang Regency. The research was conducted through several stages, including problem identification, data collection, and report preparation. The research location was selected based on indications that the implementation of PKH has not yet been optimal. The research subjects consist of government officials, PKH implementers, and beneficiary communities, selected through purposive sampling. Data were collected through observation, interviews, and documentation, with the researcher acting as the primary instrument. The collected data were analyzed using the Miles and Huberman model, which includes data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing. To ensure data validity, triangulation techniques were employed by comparing multiple sources and methods. In this study, variable X refers to the implementation of PKH policy, while variable Y refers to the improvement of welfare among low-income communities. The relationship between these two variables constitutes the main focus in assessing the effectiveness of the program. The hypothesis of this study is that effective implementation of the Family Hope Program (PKH) (X) has a positive influence on improving the welfare of low-income communities (Y) in Binjai Hulu District, Sintang Regency. The more effective the program implementation, the greater its impact on reducing poverty and enhancing the quality of life of the community.

## **3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### **Results**

The implementation of the Family Hope Program (PKH) in Binjai Hulu District, Sintang Regency revealed significant targeting and distribution challenges. Data showed that prior to PKH distribution, there were 334 poor households out of 1,329 total households, but after the first phase of distribution and re-verification, the number increased to 480 households — an addition of 146 households. Furthermore, mistargeting (leakage) was widely found, where non-poor households received PKH benefits, while genuinely poor households remained unregistered (undercoverage). The re-verification process identified that from 4,543 households who filed complaints, only 2,319 were legitimately categorized as poor, and 452 PKH recipients were ultimately cancelled. In terms of fund utilization, no single recipient household used PKH funds for productive economic activities; funds were predominantly spent on basic food items, cigarettes, school supplies, and healthcare — none of which contributed to long-term economic empowerment.

### **Discussion**

The findings of this study do not support the hypothesis that effective PKH implementation positively influences the welfare improvement of low-income communities in Binjai Hulu District. The program demonstrated critical weaknesses across all four implementation dimensions. Communication was top-down with no community input, creating dependency rather than empowerment. Human resource capacity was inadequate for accurate data collection, resulting in widespread mistargeting. The disposition of implementing actors was hampered by social pressure, threats, and nepotism during data verification. Although the bureaucratic structure of fund distribution through the postal office was considered relatively clean and experienced, it could not compensate for upstream data inaccuracies. Overall, PKH in Binjai Hulu functioned more as a charity program than a poverty alleviation strategy, failing to reduce poverty sustainably or improve community quality of life — contradicting the program's core objectives.

## **CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION**

### **Conclusion**

The implementation of the Family Hope Program (PKH) in Binjai Hulu District, Sintang Regency has not effectively improved the welfare of low-income communities. The program suffered from inaccurate

beneficiary data, widespread mistargeting, and unproductive use of funds. Communication was strictly top-down with no community participation, human resources were insufficient for proper verification, and social pressure compromised the data collection process. Consequently, PKH functioned merely as a charity cash transfer rather than a genuine poverty alleviation program, failing to create economic empowerment or sustainable improvement in community quality of life.

### **Suggestion**

First, the PKH program needs to be redesigned from a direct cash transfer model into a productive and empowerment-based assistance program aligned with the local natural resources of Binjai Hulu, particularly in agriculture, rubber, and handicrafts. Second, the government must improve the accuracy of poor household data through a more rigorous, transparent, and participatory verification process involving local communities. Third, given that poverty in Binjai Hulu is primarily caused by limited transportation infrastructure, inadequate education, and uneven healthcare access, assistance funds would be more impactful if directed toward developing roads, bridges, schools, and health facilities. Fourth, a strong commitment from both executive and legislative stakeholders is needed to formulate a regional poverty alleviation strategy (SPKD) that is embedded in local regulations (Perda) and funded annually through the regional budget (APBD).

### **REFERENCES**

- Abidin, S. Z. (2002). *Kebijakan publik*. Yayasan Pancur Siwah.
- Agustino, L. (2006). *Dasar-dasar kebijakan publik*. Alfabeta.
- Badan Pusat Statistik. (n.d.). *Data rumah tangga miskin*.
- Dunn, W. N. (1999). *Pengantar analisis kebijakan publik*. Gadjah Mada University Press.
- Dwijowijoto, R. N. (2004). *Kebijakan publik: Formulasi, implementasi, dan evaluasi*. PT Gramedia.
- Effendi, S. (1986). *Pelayanan publik, pemerataan dan administrasi negara baru*. LP3ES.
- Kementerian Sosial Republik Indonesia. (2018). *Pedoman umum program keluarga harapan (PKH)*.
- Mubyarto, dkk. (2005). *Menggugat ketimpangan dan ketidakadilan ekonomi nasional*. PUSTEP UGM.
- Republik Indonesia. (2004). *Undang-Undang Nomor 40 Tahun 2004 tentang Sistem Jaminan Sosial Nasional*.
- Republik Indonesia. (2010). *Peraturan Presiden Nomor 15 Tahun 2010 tentang Percepatan Penanggulangan Kemiskinan*.
- Republik Indonesia. (2011). *Undang-Undang Nomor 13 Tahun 2011 tentang Penanganan Fakir Miskin*.
- Sherraden, M. (2005). *Aset untuk orang miskin: Perspektif baru usaha pengentasan kemiskinan*. PT RajaGrafindo Persada.
- Singarimbun, M., & Effendi, S. (1989). *Metode penelitian survei*. LP3ES.
- Sumaryadi, I. N. (2005). *Efektivitas implementasi kebijakan otonomi daerah*. Citra Utama.
- Supriatna, T. (1997). *Birokrasi, pemberdayaan, dan pengentasan kemiskinan*. Humaniora Utama Press.
- Wahab, S. A. (2005). *Analisis kebijakan: Dari formulasi ke implementasi kebijakan negara*. Bumi Aksara.