

EVALUATION OF POVERTY AND POVERTY PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION YOGYAKARTA YEAR 2016

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to analyze and explain the results of the implementation of programs and activities of poverty reduction in the city of Yogyakarta in 2016. This research uses descriptive qualitative research type which is expected able to explain every process and result from from program implementation and poverty reduction activities. Data collection was done by interview, documentation and obsevation technique which then analyzed by triangulation technique through three stages: data requirement classification, data presentation and drawing conclusion. In 2016, poverty alleviation programs are carried out by empowering KUBE (Joint Business Group) empowerment, empowerment is also done on improving facilities and infrastructure in some orphanages and nursing homes. Seeing from the number of city poverty figures decreased from 2015.

Keywords: *Public Policy, Evaluation, Poverty Reduction*

Introduction

To discuss about poverty also means to discuss the old problems which are generally experienced by almost all developing countries, particularly in densely populated country such as Indonesia. The countermeasure of poverty is one of the agenda and national development priorities. Various policies, strategies and programs as well as both of direct and indirect countermeasures of poverty have been done in national and local scale.

Poverty is a social problem which always be existed in the citizen's life, especially in the developing countries. This poverty has constantly become an interesting topic both in academics and practitioners. There are theories and concepts which are developed to define and solve this problem. Poverty is one of the social problems existed for years and has given its impact towards the citizen's life. Poverty is basically a situation where human cannot fulfill their basic needs in a day and even for the food. Therefore the role of the government is very important to produce policies on the countermeasure of poverty for the poor citizen particularly to meet their needs for meal.

Hamdani and Sudantoko (2009; 43) explain that in order to understand more about the definition of poverty itself, it can be divided into three categories namely relative poverty, absolute poverty, structural poverty and cultural. Relative poverty is a citizen condition caused by the government policy in the development which cannot

reach all layers in the society and so that creates unequal distribution of income. Absolute poverty is determined based on the incapability to fulfill the minimum basic needs. Structural poverty and cultural is a kind of poverty caused by the structural condition and factor of cultural custom from a particular region which handcuff the people there.

Poverty is a multidimensional and multi sector problem with various characteristics which need to be overcome because it concerns the praise, dignity, and human rights also could hamper the efforts to achieve commonweal as the purpose of establishment of the Republic of Indonesia.

The facts show that development has been implemented. However, it still cannot eradicate the number of poor citizen in the world today, developing countries in particular. So far the poverty tends to be related with the dimension of economic sector due to its easiness to be observed, measured, and compared. According to the World Development Report (2008), aside from observing the income sector, poverty also needs to be observed from the other dimension such as social dimension, health dimension, educations dimension, access to the clear water dimension, housing and others.

Poverty is an integrated concept with five dimensions, which are: 1) proper, 2) powerless, 3) state of emergency, 4) dependence, and 5) isolation both geographically and sociological (Suryawati, 2005). According to BPS (2007),

Various policies and programs have been implemented by the government to tackle the poverty such as Inpres Desa Ters (IDT), the countermeasures in overcoming the impact of economic crisis, poor rice (*raskin*), direct cash assistance (BLT) and many more but up until nowadays still cannot maximally mitigate the problem of poverty in Indonesia. These all happens due to the condition of the programs which only emphasized to a single dimension from the poverty symptoms such as politics, economy, and social which cannot touch the root cause of the poverty itself. For example, the direct cash assistance (BLT) is not effective because it is often misdirected. That even creates the misuse of fund and causes social conflict in several regions.

It is the effort from the government to increase the food security and give protection to the poor family. The purpose of poor rice program is to mitigate the expense burden of the targeted household (RTS) through the fulfillment of basic food needs in the form of rice and prevent the low energy consumption and protein. Besides the poor rice also has the aim to uplift the family access to food through selling the rice to the families given the benefit with the predetermined amount.

According to the Local Regulation of Yogyakarta Number 23 Year 2009 about The Countermeasures of Poverty in the City of Yogyakarta, the program of poverty countermeasures is the action implemented by the Government, Local Government, entrepreneurs, and the citizen through the assistance and social

security, society empowerment and the small microeconomic businesses.

The poverty countermeasure has also become one of the agendas from the Government of Yogyakarta. This is published by one of the printed media (Republika.co.id) that the government of Yogyakarta has targeted to be able to press the number of poverty into 8.6 percent until 2016 and maximum 3 percent until 2025. In order to mitigate the poverty, the government of Yogyakarta created a Coordination Team for Poverty Countermeasure (TKPK) in the city of Yogyakarta. The team was created to the level of sub-district.

Generally the level of citizen welfare in the city of Yogyakarta is good. The welfare level and the low of unequal income do not necessarily mean that there is no poverty in the city of Yogyakarta, data from BPS shows that there are still four of the poverty pocket namely at the district of Danurejan, Jetis, Mergangsan, and Gedongtengen. These four are still above 20% (RKPD Yogyakarta Year 2006).

As mentioned on the Document of Regional Development Work Plan of Yogyakarta Year 2016, the handling of poverty problem in Yogyakarta was implemented through the program called Card to Prosperity (KMS) which given to the poor families with some particular parameters based on the Mayor Regulation of Yogyakarta Number 24/KEP/2012 about the Establishment of Parameter of Population Data Collection and Targeted Families of Social Protection Security in the City of Yogyakarta.

Through the establishment of the parameter, we are able to obtain the accurate data of the poor family by name and by address with the stratifications from very poor, poor, and almost poor which can be use for the program of education security, health, and the mitigation of unemployment as well as training for the poor citizen, and other program to eradicate poverty.

According to the new parameter and the data for 2013, there are 20,481 targeted families for the social protection security with the number of targeted people is 64,699 individuals. Aside from it, through the program of poor rice also has delivered rice to the poor household with much cheaper price compare to the common market which is IDR1,600 (one thousand and six hundreds rupiah) per kilogram and strengthening the organizational of the Coordination Team of Poverty Countermeasure (TKPK) in the sub-district level to fasten the handling of the poverty itself.

Poverty is one of the big problems which have not been solved up to today. The government policies are also seems limited and failed in the countermeasure, so there is no one point of certainty when will the number of poverty in Indonesia be decreased. Poverty is an absolute lacking situation to survive.

Poverty is a multidimensional problem in the strategic plan that the dimension of poverty includes four main issues namely the lack of opportunity, low skill, lack of security and powerless. Poverty could also be defined as the lack of capability to fulfill the commodity needs in layman which

is the limitation towards a set of commodity selection (suyanto 1995).

World Bank Institute (2002), gave the wider concept of poverty which is "poverty is pronounced deprivation in well-being" the retraction of rights to the welfare including the rights to economy which can be measured by the wealth owned, health, food, education, asset, housing, and the specific rights in the society such as the rights of free speech.

According to the Central Bureau of Statistic, poverty is a condition in life which is deprived experienced by a person or a household, so it is unable to fulfill the proper minimum needs. Poverty in a more complete meaning in accordance with the fact and conceptually clear was explained by Chamber (1978).

Yogyakarta, behind the gigantism city and the mesmerizing charm is secretly keeping a serious population problem. The poverty level of Yogyakarta is the highest in Java Island. The fact is, although it holds the status as a Special Region, the latest statistic number (BPS) in September 2013 shows that the percentage of poor citizen in the city and villages of Yogyakarta is around 15.03%.

The number is lower than the same period in 2012. However, the poverty level in Yogyakarta is still the highest among all the provinces in Java. As a portrayal, Jakarta which has been well known as having many poor citizens has the poor percentage of 3.72%, meanwhile Banten which has been known as an underdeveloped region has the poor percentage of 5.89%. Yogyakarta is also included in the top

10 list of the poorest province in Indonesia (www.kompasiana.com).

From the background above is the reason why the author is interested to write and do the research because Yogyakarta is the poorest city in Java. Yogyakarta is a special region and is one of the tourism cities in Indonesia, but it still has a lot of poor citizen. Therefore the author intends to evaluate the program and the countermeasure action of poverty in the city of Yogyakarta year 2016, in order to get to know the result of the program and action itself. Whether or not it is success and what percentage it can press down the poverty level in 2016.

Methods

Type of Research

The type of research uses the qualitative descriptive approach and there are several definitions about it, Bogdan and Taylor in Lexy (2011:4) explained that the qualitative methodology as a research procedure which is resulting the descriptive data in the form of written words or verbal from the people and observed-able behavior, where the method stresses on the searching process of data / information until it is enough to create an interpretation.

The descriptive research aims to describe in details about particular social phenomenon which is related to the problem and to be examined.

Research Location

The research takes place in the Social Service of Yogyakarta. So that in the object of this problem, the author tries to describe and analyze further

how does the Social Service of Yogyakarta implement the actions to tackle the poverty in the city of Yogyakarta.

Unit of Data Analysis

The Unit of Data Analysis in this research is the Government of Social Service in Yogyakarta, namely:

1. The Head of Social Service of Yogyakarta
2. The Head of Social Development Department of Social Service of Yogyakarta
3. The Section of the Poor Empowerment in Social Service of Yogyakarta
4. The Benefit Recipients (poor citizen)
5. **Data, Instrument, and the Technique of Data Collection**
6. Interview is a type of conversation with particular purposes done by two parties which are the interviewer as the person who deliver the questions and the interviewee as the person who give the answers for those questions (Basrowi and Suwandi, 2008: 12). The interview uses as the technique of data collection and if the researcher intends to do the introductory study to find the problems which want to be analyzed, but is also willing to get to know deeper things from the respondent (Sugiyono, 2011: 316).
7. The method of documentation is a method uses to search for the data related to the things or variables which is possible in the form of records, transcripts, books, newspapers, magazines,

inscriptions, notes, meetings, agendas, et cetera (Suharsimi Arikunto, 2002: 206).

Technique of Data Analysis

The primary and secondary data were obtained by the researcher about the evaluation of program policies and action in the countermeasure of the poverty in the city of Yogyakarta. According to Moh Nasir (2009: 124), data analysis is grouping, making a sequence, manipulating as well as brushing the data to be able to easily read. In line with what is delivered by Spradley in Sugiono (2011: 244) that the analysis in every type of researches is about the way of thinking.

This is related to the systematical testing towards something to determine sections, relations between sections, and the relations with the whole or meaning that the analysis is implemented to find the pattern.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

A good policy must be based on the content of the policy itself. The good content of a policy must create impact towards the citizen, expected to give the good output for the society. There must be also the feedback from the citizen later on. The Social Service of Yogyakarta is a government institution which very concerns about the countermeasure of the poverty in the city of Yogyakarta.

The policy is to develop and empower the citizen economy through the enhancement of services, infrastructures, and government assistances which are adequate to press

down the poverty percentage in the city of Yogyakarta. The accompaniment is done by the establishment of delivering assistance actions such as RASKIN, KUR, and BSM.

The Copenhagen Declaration explains the absolute poverty as “a condition which is characterized by the severe lacking of the basic needs of human being, including food, clear water to drink, sanitation facility, health, housing, education, and information.

The countermeasure of the poverty percentage has become one of the government policy priorities both in national level and the local government such as provinces, cities or regencies. In this case, the countermeasure of the poverty percentage is implemented by the city government of Yogyakarta through many programs and actions. In the working process, the Social Service of the city of Yogyakarta refers to the Mayor of Yogyakarta Decision Number 77 Year 2016 about the rice allocation for the low income citizen in Yogyakarta at the year of 2016, Local Regulation of Yogyakarta Number 4 Year 2011 about the small and middle microeconomic business, Mayor of Yogyakarta Decision Number 217 Year 2016 about the giving of education security for the students who hold the towards-healthy-and-prosperous card, dropout students, residents of private orphanage, arrears of the education cost, merit scholarships, and the college students who hold the towards-prosperous-and-excellent card in the city of Yogyakarta at the year of 2016.

The task and function of Social Service will be well operated if there is a

good collaboration among the apparatus inside the Social Service of Yogyakarta itself. Then the cooperation with the external parties of the Social Service will ease the task and function of the departments in the Social Service of Yogyakarta. In its task and function before the Social Service composes a program, the Social Service party should do the pre-survey and check the condition of the poor citizen in order to see which poor citizens must be and have the rights to receive the assistance from the government.

The Effectiveness of Poverty Countermeasure Program

Discussing effectiveness means that the author explains whether or not an effort is able to meet the expectation. Yogi in the journal of JAKPP (Analytical Journal on Policies and Public Services) Volume 2 Number 1 of June 2016, the World Bank defines the absolute poverty as a life with the income under USD 1 per day and the middle poverty is for the income under USD 2 per day. By this definition, it is estimated that in 2001 there will be 1.1 billion of people in the world whose income under USD 1 per day and 2.7 billion of people in the world whose income under USD 2 per day (The World Bank, 2007, Understanding Poverty).

The research result done by Yogi in the Analytical Journal on Policies and Public Services Volume 2 Number 1 of June 2016 explains that the effort to tackle the poverty is failed in Bandung due to several reasons: (1) there was a missed coordination between the Private Sectors, Committee, and the

Government, (2) most of the micro credits given to the poor citizen does not use to run a business, but for the daily consumption only (mainly for the education cost of their children and to buy the daily foods), (3) the poor citizen in Bandung does not get the proper training to operate a good business. After the proposal is approved by the government, there was no consultation between the government and the poor citizen, so that the poor remain blank on the idea of how to run a business from the beginning, (4) there is a kind of culture to be poor in Indonesia, which can be seen from how the poor citizen used the government cash only to be spent, with the principle of "the government's money is the citizen's money), (5) the other research finds that the poor citizen in Bandung show the post-populist cultural symptom emulated the rich (hedonism) by spending the money for the things out of the basic needs. For instance, there are several respondents who bought a motorcycle using the cash from P2KP because the person desires to be look like a rich.

Various countermeasure efforts for the poverty have been implemented by the government. According to the Appendix II of the Social Minister Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 129/HUK/2008 about the technique of minimum standard in the social fields and the Labor Minister Regulation and the Transmigration Number 15/MEN/X/2010 about SPM in the field of employment which must be established by the government of the regencies and cities are:

(1) The percentage of PMKS in the city scale which obtains the social empowerment program through the group of joint ventures (KUBE) or other akin social groups with the indicator target of 520 populations get the KUBE, the realization for this indicator has reached 650 populations at the year of 2016.

(2) The percentage of social homes in the city which provide the social services infrastructure in 2016 is realized with 13 numbers of 13 targeted homes, from the result of this realization then the gains will be 100%. The success of the indicators cannot be separated from the big amount of budget of the city government of Yogyakarta. However, this achievement is still lower compare to the realization in the previous year.

(3) The percentage of PMKS gotten the social assistance for the fulfillment of the basic needs. From 3,529 PMKS recipients of the social assistance could be realized 3,558 of PMKS citizen. Seeing the target comparison and the realization hence the gains indicator at the year of 2016 is 101%. This high gains indicator cannot be separated by the actions such as: PMKS rehabilitation, PMKS service, abandoned kids in the Wiloso Projo children homes, homeless service and beggar in the workshop and abandoned elderly in the Budhi Dharma nursing homes.

(4) The percentage of city scale disaster victim who obtain the social assistance during the emergency period. In 2016 this indicator targeted 1,642 KK. At the end of 2016 this indicator can be fully realized with the gains indicator of 100 percent.

(5) The percentage of physical and mental disable, as well as elderly is not potential for those who already received the social security. In 2016, this indicator targeted 1,460 citizens. At the end of 2016 this indicator can be realized 2,585 with the gains indicator of 177 percent.

(6) The percentage of the total of poor citizen. In 2016 this indicator targeted 18.44%. At the end of 2016 this indicator can realized 8.6% with the gains indicator of 102 percent. Seeing the high achievement of the gain indicator surely cannot be separated from several programs of the national government which was delivered to the government of Yogyakarta.

Aside from it, whether effective or not the programs were also measured by the high number of PDRB per capita in the city of Yogyakarta compare to the regencies in Yogyakarta as explained by the picture below.

The Efficiency of Poverty Countermeasure Program

Efficiency means that the author involves with the number of efforts needed to produce the desired level of effectiveness. The evaluation of poverty-mitigation policies with the sub-focus of efficiency in the implementation explains that the policies are efficient in the matter of time, resources, and budget. According to the research result on the time efficiency is able to explain that the poverty countermeasure program needs a quite long time particularly in the identification of poverty problems, the existed kind of poverty, the to-be-implemented handling pattern, steps in the handling itself, et cetera.

In the implementation of several actions aim to press down the number of poverty in the city of Yogyakarta, the efficiency can be seen by the use of budget and the gains indicator as follows:

(1) The rehabilitation for people with social welfare problem using the performance indicator of PMKS percentage in the scale of city which obtain the social empowerment program through the joint ventures group (KUBE) or other akin social groups. The budget use of this action is IDR 389,435,865 from the total determined budget of IDR 413,869,300 with the uptake percentage of 94%. From the realized budget itself, the gains indicator is able to exceed the gains target of 25 percent from the determined target.

(2) The enhancement of service and accompaniment for social welfare in the nursing homes. The budget use for this action is IDR 99,485,000 from the total budget of IDR 101,885,000 with the percentage of budget uptake 97.64%. Seeing the budget realization in this action is very efficient compare to the gains which fulfills the target of 100 percent.

(3) The service for people with social welfare problem. The enhancement of service and accompaniment is for social welfare inside the nursing houses. The budget uses for this action is IDR 502,429,922.36 from the total determined budget of IDR 508,716,100 with the percentage of budget uptake 101%. Seeing the budget realization in this action is very efficient compare to the gains which is able to

exceed the target of 1 percent of the determined target.

(4) The coordination of social assistance service. The budget uses for this action is IDR 602,565,303.68 from the determined total budget of IDR 709,311,126 with the percentage of budget uptake 84.90%. Seeing the budget realization in this action is very effective compare to the gains which is able to meet 100% of the determined target.

(5) The data collection of PMKS and PSKS. The budget uses for this action is IDR 938,573,299.30 from the determined total budget of IDR 953,685,084 with the percentage of budget uptake 92.92%. Seeing the budget realization in this action is very efficient compare to the gains which is able to exceed 77 percent of the determined target.

(6) The empowerment for the poor. The budget uses in this action is IDR 267,043,950 from the determined total budget of IDR 271,329,000 with the percentage of budget uptake 98.40%. Seeing the budget realization in this action is very efficient compare to the gains which is able to exceed 2 percent of the determined target.

(7) The accompaniment and enhancement of the potential social welfare quality. The realization of budget uses for this action is IDR 757,202,595 from the determined total budget of IDR 768,205,850 with the percentage of budget uptake 98.56%. Seeing the realization of budget in this action is very efficient compare to the gains which is able to exceed 100 percent of the determined target.

Sufficiency of the Poverty Countermeasure Program

Scientific Journal of Administration Volume VII, Number 02, September 2015 Juli Panglima Saragih explains since the fiscal year of 1999, the government of Yogyakarta has created a Project for Countermeasure the Urban Poverty (PPKP) in Yogyakarta through the P2KP Program care formed into three which are first, the Unit of Environmental Management (UPL); second, the Unit of Financial Management (UPK); and third, the Unit of Social Management (UPS). One of the excellences of PPKP is the involvement of citizen as the main agent (community based program). In the P2KP program, the role of bureaucracy and facilitator need to be minimized. Otherwise, the Citizen Self-Reliance Body (BKM) in Yogyakarta is the representative of the local community institution is empowered as possible. The most prominent PPKP program is the revolving fund for the poor business group or joint venture (KUBE). The system built inside the revolving fund is joint responsibility. Hence every individual in the group has the responsibility to return the loan which later on revolves for the other poor business group. The initial capital for this revolving fund was budgeted by the government of Yogyakarta in the APBD.

Seeing the gains indicator so far, all of the poverty countermeasure indicators are able to be fully achieved 100 percent even exceed the target. That shows the level of adequacy for the actions component is one of the

supporters for the success of the action performance indicator.

Actions	Performance Indicators	Action Components
Rehabilitation of people with social welfare problem	Percentage of PMKS in the city scale obtained social empowerment program through the joint venture group (KUBE) or other akin social group	- Poor citizen empowerment
Enhancement of the service and accompaniment for the social welfare in the nursing homes	Percentage of the social houses in the city scale which provide infrastructure for the social service	- Selection of the nursing homes resident candidate - Creativity forum of the orphanage in Yogyakarta - Monitoring of the nursing homes - KIE forum for the social houses - Recreational service for the elderly in Yogyakarta
Service for the people with social welfare problem	PMKS percentage obtained the social assistance for the basic needs fulfillment	- PMKS rehabilitation - PMKS service - Service for the abandoned children at Wiloso Projo orphanage - Service for the homeless and beggar in the workshop and - Service for the abandoned elderly at the Budhi Dharma nursing home
Coordination for the service of social assistance	Percentage of city scale disaster victim obtained the social assistance during the emergency period	- Social assistance distribution
Data collection	Percentage of the	- Service and protection and

Actions	Performance Indicators	Action Components
of PMKS and PSKS	people with physical and mental disability, and the non-potential elderly obtained the social security	the social rehabilitation - Social accompaniment
Empowerment for the poor	Percentage of the poor citizen	- Development of the creative business through the joint venture group (KUBE) - Development of the Micro Economy Institution (LKM) – KUBE
Guidance and enhancement for the quality of social welfare resources	Percentage of the community based social welfare rides (WKSBM) provided the infrastructure for the social welfare service	- Guidance and capacity enhancement of WKSBM with the WKSBM component development

The table above can explain that each action has minimum 1 (one) activity implemented to boost the success of performance indicator. Hence in 2016 the monthly income per capita reached IDR 401,193 compare to the

previous year as shown in table 5.4 below:

Poverty Variables	Poverty in the City of Yogyakarta	
	2015	2016
Poverty Line (IDR/Capita/Month)	383.966	401.193
Total of Poor Citizen (in 000)	36	32.06
Percentage of Poor Citizen	8.75	7.70

The table above can explain that the percentage of poor citizen in the year of 2016 is 7.70 percent which also shows the significant decline compare to the year of 2015 and the previous years

Equalizing of the Poverty Countermeasure Program

Equalizing in the implementation of poverty countermeasure program has become very important. Government must have the accurate data which will be the basis of the policy making. There is a dilemma occurred in the field, related to the determination of the total poor citizen in every region. The identification process of the poor citizen held by the Statistic Centre always creates internal conflict in the community.

The data produced by BPS (Central Bureau of Statistic) cannot be the reference for the poverty countermeasure program due to the very doubtful data accuracy. There are many factors which cause the unusable

BPS data, including the not-maximum data collection process and the absence of coordination with the sub-district party.

With that condition, the city government (Social Service) takes a very creative step which is trying to re-identified the poor citizen existed in the city of Yogyakarta. From this step, the city government obtains the more accurate data compare to the BPS ones. In the process of data collection, Social Service involves various elements in the community, so that they can have a high control over the program implementation later on.

Related with the equalization to the policy benefit distribution, according to the interview with Mr. Irianto Edi Purnomo in the previous discussion, the author concludes that the distribution of poverty countermeasure program does not only targeted the poor citizen but also to the other community circle with the social welfare problem.

It can be seen from 7 (seven) actions as follows, the layers of the community targeted in 2016 are:

- (1) Orphanage
- (2) The poor
- (3) People with disability
- (4) Nursing homes
- (5) Abandoned children
- (6) and other PMKS.

To press down the poverty, government does not only focus into the poverty itself, but also the other categories which are the component composed the poverty level and also the concurrent focus of attention. Aside from it, the equal program implementation in the poverty

countermeasure policies can also be proven by the decline of total poor citizen as shown in the table below:

Poverty	Poverty in the City of Yogyakarta	
	2015	2016
Jumlah Penduduk Miskin (dalam 000)	36	32,06

Source: Processed from BPS data

From the table above, the author explains that the percentage of poor citizen in 2016 has decreased significantly around 3.94 from the year of 2015. This decline proves that the poverty countermeasure program has been implemented in accordance with the target. Yet on the other side, the budget allocation for the poverty especially the one sourced from APBN has not been equal yet. This is caused by the existence of total and distribution data of the poor citizen which has not been touched optimally by the national program policy.

Responsiveness of the Poverty Countermeasure Program

The responsiveness in the concept of policy evaluation is to answer whether or not the result of the policy has been satisfying the objective needs of the program, whether or not it is able to answer the basic needs of the citizen, could enhance the quality of community's life, as well as able to lift up the asset and access for the poor

citizen, and could increase the independency of the people et cetera. In this evaluation step, the most important elements is the feedback from the program recipients. Statement, stance, and behavior of the program recipients is the reflection of the responsiveness. The similar case was analyzed by Asna Aneta in the Public Administration Journal Volume 1 Year 2010 which has been done by the government of Makassar in the poverty countermeasure program. However the program initiated is the national program namely P2KP. It is explained in the journal that the government responsiveness can be seen from the response of the government on the needs of the citizen, the capability of the government apparatus to recognize the needs of the citizen, and not less important is how far the government being responsible in the implementation of the whole steps in P2KP. The following shows that the consistency of the government of Gorontalo in supporting the implementation of P2KP particularly about the APBD as the sharing fund or matching fund for the implementation of the whole actions steps of P2KP in the city of Gorontalo.

According to the analysis towards the interview result supported by the data and the relevant documents, it is confirmed that the responsiveness or the response from the government of Gorontalo towards the implementation of P2KP policy can be seen from the government concern to the needs and interest of the citizen particularly the government commitment in allocating the sharing fund through APBD of Gorontalo every year, amount 50

percent of the P2KP total budget from the central government.

The thing is different with what has been done by the government of Yogyakarta in the poverty countermeasure. The National Program of Independent Citizen Empowerment is a notion created to increase the active participation of the citizen in the attempts to eradicate the poverty. It is started from the improvement of physical environment, empowerment and excavation of the community potential to the handling of the social problems, such as education and health.

Related to the responsiveness, in this case the author explains on how far a policy could satisfy the needs, preferences, or the values of the targeted citizen groups.

Aside from it, there are still other attempts other than implementing the national program. As explained in the previous indicator, the government is very responsive in pressing down the poverty in the city using various methods including giving the training for the joint venture groups which are allocated from the city APBD fund.

Accuracy of the Poverty Countermeasure Program

In the Urban Poverty Journal URBAN POVERTY PHENOMENON IN YOGYAKARTA: A STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS AND POLICY RESPONSE Aula Ahmad Hafidh and others spells out that the poor citizen in general does not only characterized by the low economy factor but also by the incapability of the citizen in things such as: Poor citizen is known by the

powerlessness / incapability in: (1) fulfilling the basic needs; (2) doing the productive business activity; (3) reaching the access towards the social and economy resources; (4) determining their own fate and constantly experience discriminative treatment, having the feeling of fear and suspicion, as well as apathy and fatalistic behavior; and (5) liberating from the mental and culture to be poor also holding firm the low dignity and pride. This powerlessness / incapability grow the poor behavior which leads to the absence of independence to fight for and enjoy the welfare in dignity.

In accordance with the long term regional development plan 2005 – 2025, the vision of development in the city of Yogyakarta in 2012 – 2016 is “the realization of Yogyakarta as a qualified education city, characterized and inclusive, cultural based tourism and centre of services which is environmentally minded and populist economy. The social service of the labor and transmigration is later composing it in its third and fourth missions: “the realization of community empowerment with *segoro amarto*, and strong competitiveness.” In order to possess the strong competitiveness then it needs the independent citizen. This independency will later be born from the process of the welfare enhancement of the citizen in Yogyakarta.

The high level of welfare in the city of Yogyakarta is characterized by the high people’s income per capita per year and the low level of poverty in the city of Yogyakarta. As explained before in the previous indicator, that the percentage of urban poverty in

Yogyakarta at the year of 2016 is only 7.70 percent from the previous year in 8.57 percent. This fact then shows that the determined strategic target line is parallel with the objectives in 2016.

In 2016 the Social Service of Labor and Transmigration has 3 (three) strategic targets which are: (a) Enhancing the resource potential for the social welfare (b) Increasing the rehabilitation for the people with social welfare problems (PMKS) (c) Uplifting the quality of the labors in accordance with the market needs as well as giving protection.

From those three strategic targets above, it emerges the actions from social rehabilitation program such as: (1) Rehabilitation activity for the people with social welfare problem (2) Enhancement activity of the service and development of the social welfare in the social houses (3) Service activity for the PMKS (4) Service activity for the abandoned children in Wiloso Projo orphanage (5) Service activity in the abandoned elderly in Budhi Dharma nursing homes (6) Service activity for the homeless people (7) Data collection activity of PMKS and PSKS (8) Distribution activity of the social assistance (9) Empowerment activity for the poor. Out of those nine actions, the author rates felicitously with the average gains indicator 100 percent. As portrayed in the graphic below:

From the graphic above, the author explains that the percentage of gains indicator is above 100 percent is higher than 57 percent. It means that the accuracy between the actions

implemented and the desired expectation has been well synchronized.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Conclusion

According to the discussion in the previous chapter, in this part the author concludes that the result of the program evaluation and the urban poverty countermeasure activity in the city of Yogyakarta at the year of 2016 as follows:

1. The achievement of 7 (seven) performance indicators of the poverty countermeasure in 2016 are all reached 100 percent. Even several indicators are above.
2. The achievement of budget uptake performance in the 7 poverty countermeasures activities. The financial performance of all the actions reached 100 percent.
3. Aside from the government program, the success of Yogyakarta to press down the poverty cannot be separated from the numbers of programs from the central government distributed through the government in the city.
4. The countermeasure of poverty is not only targeting the poor citizen, but also to the other circle of PMKS such as: orphanage, nursing homes, people with disability, et cetera.
5. There is suitability between the program and the activities with the vision – mission of the development shows that the policies implementation by the government in mitigating the poverty has been appropriate.

Suggestion can be in the form of input for the next researcher, as well as the implicative recommendation from the research findings.

References

- A.Hoogerwerf. 1979. *Politologie*, Alphen aan den Rijn,
- Abbot, John. 1996. *Sharing the City:Community Participation in Urban. Management.* London: Earthscan Publication
- Abdul Wahab, Solichin. 2008. *Analisis Kebijakan : Dari Formulasi ke. Implementasi Kebijakan Negara.* Edisi Kedua. Bandung. Bumi Aksara
- Agustino, Leo. 2008. *Dasar- dasar Kebijakan Publik.* Bandung. Alfabeta.
- Arikunto, Suharsimi. 2002. *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan dan Praktek.* Jakarta: Rineka Cipta
- Basrowi & Suwandi. 2008. *Memahami Penelitian Kualitatif.* Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Dunn, William N. (2003). *Analisis Kebijakan Publik.* Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press
- Dye, Thomas R. (1981) *Understanding Public Policy.* Englewood, Cliff: Prentice-
- Ismawan, Bambang. 2003. *Keuangan Mikro dalam Penanggulangan Kemiskinan dan Pemberdayaan Ekonomi Rakyat.* Jakarta: BKKBN.
- Koentjaraningrat. 2009. *Pengantar Ilmu Antropologi.* Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Lukman, Ali, dkk 1996, *Kemiskinan dan Strategi Memerangi Kemiskinan.* Yogyakarta: Liberty.

Moleong, L.J. 2011. Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif Edisi Revisi. Bandung: PT. Remaja Rosdakarya

Mukhtar. 2013. Metode Penelitian Deskriptif Kualitatif. Jakarta : GP Press Group

Nazir, Moh. 2009. Metode Penelitian. Jakarta: Ghalia Indonesia

Nugroho, Riant, 2009, Public Policy (edisi revisi), Jakarta, PT. Elex Media

Nugroho, Riant. 2003. Kebijakan Publik, Formulasi, Implementasi dan Evaluasi, Jakarta: Gramedia,

RC. Chandler & JC Plano. 1998 The public Administration Dictionary, CA ABC CLIO Inc, Santa Barbara,

Sharp, A.M., Register, C.A., Grimes , P.W. (2000), Economics of Social Issues 14th edition, New York: Irwin/McGraw-Hill.

Soehartono, Irawan. 2004. Metode Penelitian Sosial. Bandung: PT. Remaja Rosdakarya

Soeprapto.2000. Evaluasi Kebijakan. Rineka Cipta. Jakarta.

Sugiyono. 2011. Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R&D, Bandung : Alfabeta.

Suharno. 2008. Prinsip-Prinsip Dasar Kebijakan Publik. Yogyakarta: UNY Press.

Suharto, Edi. 2012. Analisis Kebijakan Publik. Alfabeta. Bandung.

Suryawati. 2004. Teori Ekonomi Mikro. UPP. AMP YKPN. Yogyakarta

Syafie, Inu Kencana. 1999. Ilmu Administrasi Publik, Jakarta: Rineka Cipta

Winarno, Budi. 2002. Teori dan Proses Kebijakan Publik. Yogyakarta: Media Pressindo.

Winarno, Budi. 2007. Kebijakan Publik :Teori dan Proses. Yogyakarta : Med. Press (Anggota IKAPI)