

Strategy for Implementing the Sukabumi Village Entrepreneurship Center (Sukabumi Kece) Policy in Sukabumi City

by Aang Rahmatulloh

Submission date: 27-Jul-2023 10:04AM (UTC+0700)

Submission ID: 2137376575

File name: ntreprenurship_Center_Sukabumi_Kece_Policy_in_Sukabumi_City.pdf (169.29K)

Word count: 5457

Character count: 31612

Strategy for Implementing the Sukabumi Village Entrepreneurship Center (Sukabumi Kece) Policy in Sukabumi City

By

Aang Rahmatulloh

STISIP Syamsul Ulum, Sukabumi, Indonesia

Email: aangrahmatullah@yahoo.co.id

Iwan Satibi

Universitas Pasundan, Bandung, Indonesia

Kamal Alamsyah

Universitas Pasundan, Bandung, Indonesia

Abstract

The poverty rate in Sukabumi City is relatively tremendous; therefore, the Sukabumi City government launched a policy called Sukabumi Kece which stands for Sukabumi Kelurahan Entrepreneurship Center. However, the implementation of this policy has not yet been achieved optimally, and this can be seen in the high poverty rate and the low acceleration of poverty reduction in the city of Sukabumi. Therefore, this study aims to find the right strategy for implementing the Sukabumi Kece policy in poor areas in the city of Sukabumi. This research uses a qualitative approach with a descriptive method. The results showed that the implementation of the Sukabumi Entrepreneurship Center (Sukabumi Kece) Village policy in Sukabumi City followed the research focus related to the content and context of the policy as one of the factors in efforts to reduce poverty, strengthen institutions and improve welfare. The ineffective implementation of the Sukabumi Entrepreneurship Center Village (Sukabumi Kece) policy in Sukabumi City can be seen to be caused by the factor (a). The function of the Sukabumi Kece Team (TSK) is not working correctly (b). The institutional structure of the Sukabumi District Small Team (TSK) is not yet adequate (c) Perception of RAWU implementation is not following the affairs of community empowerment and poverty reduction (d). Approval of non-optimal budget sources (e). Clear targeting. The strategies the local government can implement to overcome the problems of implementing the more effective Sukabumi Urban Entrepreneurship Center (Sukabumi Kece) policy are (a). Core Strategy with the method of strengthening TSK institutions, completing planning documents, bridging planning and budgeting, publishing written guidelines on beneficiaries, and involving regional RAWUs in determining targets and action programs (b). Consequence Strategy (c). Customer Strategy (d). Control Strategy, and (e). Cultural Strategy.

Keywords: *Strategy, Policy Implementation, Poverty, Sukabumi Kelurahan Entrepreneurship Center (Sukabumi Kece).*

Introduction

Poverty is a worldwide issue that affects all developing and developing countries. Developing countries in Asia and Africa are addressing poverty alleviation initiatives (Ahluwalia et al., 1979; Barrientos et al., 2003; Van Heerde & Hudson, 2010). Meanwhile, wealthier countries are keen to discuss poverty since the conditions in emerging countries have an impact on their economic and political stability. Poverty is defined as a community's failure

to meet fundamental requirements such as food, clothing, shelter, education, and health (Omotola, 2008; Palmer, 2011; Groce et al., 2011). Poverty is also a state of existence in which a person or household is completely deprived, so that he is unable to meet his basic or necessary necessities (Townsend, 1979; Hulme & Shepherd, 2003; Commins, 2004).

The United Nations organized a high-level summit known as the Millennium Development Goals in the second millennium (MDGs). The MDGs' eight components are as follows: reducing poverty and hunger; achieving universal education; promoting gender equality and women's empowerment; reducing maternal mortality; improving maternal health; combating HIV/AIDS, Malaria, and other infectious diseases; ensuring environmental sustainability; and establishing global development partnerships (Braun et al., 2004; De Muro et al., 2011).

Poverty alleviation requires integration between program policies spread across various sectors. Implementing policies and programs must take sides and empower the community so that they do not place the poor solely as objects of development. Thus, poverty reduction efforts need to involve the poor more like subjects of development so that it is hoped that the poor will be empowered and able to carry out the development programs aimed at them (Schneider, 1999; Narayan-Parker, 2002; Banks & Hulme, 2012).

Regarding poverty reduction policies in Indonesia, the government has issued Presidential Decree No. 15 of 2010. The government has systematically divided poverty reduction programs according to the sector to be intervened. Meanwhile, at the central level, a Poverty Reduction Coordination Team (TKPK) has been formed, led by the Vice President as Chair, and a Regional Poverty Reduction Coordination Team (PRCT) led by Deputy Mayors/Deputy Regents throughout Indonesia. The hope that arises is that the existence of various poverty reduction programs that the government has set will have an impact on reducing the poverty rate in Indonesia, which is increasingly being achieved following the predetermined targets (Rakhmat & Fakhri, 2019; Alfisyahrin, 2021).

Top-down programs also have other flaws that are frequently seen in their implementation, such as mistargeting, officials'/officials' interests, and making the poor dependent on the support supplied (Putra, 2007; Noor, 2014; Wulan et al., 2019). Aside from that, other consequences of programs like these include a decline in community values such as the nature of cooperation, a sense of caring and togetherness, and the importance of local wisdom that resides in the community (Sutikno et al., 2015; Suntiana et al., 2015; Mahioborang, 2015). As a result, it is critical to have a thorough grasp of the poverty conditions in each location so that efforts can be more concentrated and effective. Community empowerment programs have an essential role in poverty reduction efforts. Through empowerment programs, poverty reduction efforts are not only limited to providing direct assistance to the poor (Yasa, 2008; Setiawan et al., 2015; Sari, 2017). This program also involves the poor in building their quality of life through potential development and strengthening the capacity of poor community groups to be involved as actors in development (Hadi, 2009; Soesanta, 2013; Habibullah, 2010).

Poverty data is divided into macro poverty data and micro poverty data. From a macro perspective, the approach used to measure poverty is the basic needs approach, so poverty is seen as an economic inability to meet basic food and non-food needs (Ravallion, 2012). Meanwhile, micro poverty is based on the characteristics of poor households. Because the concepts and methodologies are different, the uses of these 2 types of data are other (Bhinadi, 2017). Macro poverty data can be used for planning and evaluating poverty programs according

to their location. Because this data is macro, this data cannot detail the individuals and addresses of the population categorized as poor. Meanwhile, micro poverty data is obtained using the criteria of poor households so that this data can show low-income families directly (by name by address) and can be used for poverty eradication programs now, such as Direct Cash Assistance, Raskin, PKH and others (Solikatun & Masrurroh, 2014).

In connection with the above, a Poverty Line Table and Percentage of Poor Population in Sukabumi City is presented below.

Table 1 *Poverty Line and Percentage of Poor Population in Sukabumi City in 2016 and 2017*

Poverty 2016		Poverty 2017		Change (%)
PL	PO	PL	PO	PL
Rp/cap/month	%	Rp/cap/month	%	
370.633	8.42	411.523	8.05	11.03

The table above shows that the poverty line (PL) of Sukabumi City has increased, which means that meeting household needs is higher. Although the poverty line of Sukabumi City has increased, the Headcount Index (P0) calculation shows that the percentage of poor people has decreased from 8.42 per cent to 8.05 per cent. This means that the price increase does not affect the consumption pattern of the residents of Sukabumi City to meet their basic needs; there is even a decrease in the percentage of poor people. Poverty alleviation programs implemented by the Government, both Central and Sukabumi City, are believed to impact this decline significantly.

Following the mission that has been proclaimed, the Sukabumi City Government then issued the "Sukabumi Kece (Kelurahan Entrepreneurship Center)" program, which aims to encourage the growth of local entrepreneurs through the implementation of a new entrepreneurial model with a pattern of Education, Training, Assistance and Development at the village level which is prioritized for residents of Sukabumi City of productive age (aged 19-30 years). The Sukabumi Kece program is expected to reduce poverty and unemployment in Sukabumi City and can create new business fields that will absorb workers.

Employment issues in Sukabumi City stem from popular belief that everyone must work after finishing school. This is what leads to open unemployment. Another explanation for the rise in open unemployment is that the general public believes that being an entrepreneur is not a desirable career path owing to the uncertainty of the situation and the numerous problems that would be encountered while starting a new firm. Furthermore, the most typical challenges that prospective entrepreneurs face are difficulty in getting financing, finance, marketing, knowledge, and government policies, as well as a lack of confidence in addressing risks.

Method

Following the title of the research above, this research uses a qualitative approach, while the research method is descriptive. The descriptive method is based on the consideration that the descriptive method is used to describe a condition/symptom, system, or current event based on available data and information (Sugiyono, 2011). Data collection was carried out by the interview, observation and documentation department, while data analysis was carried out using the Miles and Huberman model.

Result and discussion

Policy Implementation

Public administration is a part of administrative science closely related to state activities, power and politics. Presthus & Pfifner (1975) stated in this context, "Public administration involves the implementation of public policy which representative political bodies have determined". Fredrickson's (1997) opinion on public administration says that the concept of public administration must include aspects of equity and social justice. He emphasized that the new public administration must change the mindset that has been hampering the creation of social justice. The development of public administration must work based on the principle of "social justice" so that the basic principle of public administration is "efficiency and social justice".

Social justice is essential for implementing public administration, which becomes a moral and ethical guide for bureaucratic behaviour (Setyoko, 2011) that the importance of social justice in public administration is also conveyed in the opinion of Fredrickson, Rosenbloom, Svava in Setyoko (2011) where social justice is a consideration in public policy and management.

This public administration develops over time which can be traced to the development of the paradigm of public administration science. Denhardt and Denhardt in Wirman Safri (2012) tried to divide the paradigm of public administration into three major groups: The Old Public Administration, The New Public Management and The New Public Service. Policy implementation includes a series of activities arising after adopting state policy guidelines. The literature review then determined the theory of policy implementation from Grindle, which was considered more suitable to be used in the research carried out. In this regard, Grindle (1980) suggests:

In general, the final implementation creates a relationship that permits public policy aims to be realized as outcomes of governmental activity. As a result, it entails. The establishment of a "policy delivery system" in which specific measures are devised and pursued in the hope of achieving specific goals. Thus, public policy board pronouncements of goals, objectives, and standards are converted into action programs aimed at achieving the policy's restrictions. As a result, it is obvious that different programs may be established in response to the same policy goals. Action programs can be further subdivided into more specific initiatives to be managed. Individual initiatives and action programs are intended to generate a change in the policy environment, a change that can be regarded an outcome of the program.

According to Parsons (1995), the latter implementation, in general, consists in the creation of a network that permits the political aims of public policy to be fulfilled as a result of government operations. This entails developing a "policy delivery system," which is often created and implemented with the expectation of eventually coming to an end. Thus, public policy contains a statement of goals, objectives, and means that are converted into a plan of action to attain the policy's stated goals. Various programs can be created to address the same policies and objectives (Brockerhoff & Brennan, 1998). The action program can be separated into projects that are more specific to the program's objectives and individual projects for changes in the policy environment. These modifications can be attributed to the program (Agustino, 2012).

Grindle (1980) defines the contrast between policies and programs as follows: "The

distinction between policy and program means that policy implementation is a function of program implementation and is dependent on its consequences." As a result, studying the process of policy implementation almost always entails investigating and analyzing concrete action programs aimed to achieve broader policy objectives.

The distinction between policy and program indicates that policy implementation is dependent on the outcome of program implementation. As a result, studying the policy implementation process nearly usually entails investigating and analyzing programs of action meant to attain broader policy objectives. According to Grindle (1980), such a clear distinction between policy and program is difficult to maintain in practice; however, it is obscured to some extent by the variety of levels at which the term "policy" is often used as a general statement that the government's agricultural policy is to increase productivity may be translated into a policy of providing government aid to commercially oriented small farms. Furthermore, because policy implementation is dependent on program outcomes, it is impossible to isolate policy fate from that of its constituent programs. Furthermore, claiming that policy implementation is dependent on program execution assumes that the programs are correctly tailored to attaining the policy's aims, which is not necessarily the case in practice.

Grindle (1980a) goes on to say that it is difficult to keep a clear separation between policies and programs in practice. This is complicated by the many degrees to which the term "policy" is frequently used/a general statement that the government's agricultural policy is to boost productivity can be translated into a policy of providing government aid to economically minded smallholders. This can then be converted into a policy of giving irrigation facilities to the population. Furthermore, because policy execution is dependent on program outcomes, it is difficult to distinguish the fate of those policies from the fate of their constituent programs. Furthermore, stating that policy implementation is dependent on program implementation, assuming that the program is properly oriented to meet the policy's objectives, is not necessarily correct in practice.

According to Grindle's (1980a) policy implementation model, the success of policy implementation is determined by the policy's content and context. In terms of policy content, Grindle (1980a) stated: Theodore Lowi has pointed out that the type of policy being developed will have a significant impact on the type of political action spurred by policymaking procedures. This insight is also applicable to the implementation process, promoting consideration of diverse 'implementation abilities.' There is also a contrast to be made between programs that provide communal advantages and foster categorical demand making, and those that provide invisible benefits and may generate more particularistic demands during the implementation stage.

According to Grindle in Wirman Syafrie (2012), two elements influence public policy implementation: According to Grindle, the success of public policy implementation is essentially defined by the degree of policy implementation itself, which consists of:

- a. Content of policy which includes:
 - 1) Interest affected (interested) claim affected the many attractions affected by policy execution. This indicator contends that a policy's performance must encompass a wide range of interests that influence its implementation; this is what we want to learn more about.
 - 2) Benefits include It seeks to demonstrate or explain that in a policy, there must be many types of gifts that offer the good influence caused by the policy's execution. People in

slums, for example, would rather get clean water or electrification programs than motorcycle loan programs.

- 3) The scope of the proposed modification (degree of change to be achieved) Each policy has a goal that it wishes to attain. The policy content that needs to be presented at this point is that the amount to which alterations from an approach are sought must have a defined scale. A program that tries to transform the target group's views and behavior is more difficult to administer than one that just provides credit or rice aid to the poor.
 - 4) Decision-making location (location of decision making) Because policy decision making is critical to policy implementation, it is crucial to clarify where policy decision making will be applied in this section. Is the precise position.
 - 5) Implementers of programs (program implementers). For a policy to be successful, it must be supported by skilled policy implementers. And whether a policy has specifically mentioned the implementor, this must be exposed or correctly recorded.
 - 6) Committed resources (resources used) Is a program supported by resources that support resources in order for its execution to be successful.
- b. Implementation environment (context of implementation) includes:
- 1) Power, interest, and strategy of the participants In a policy, it is also vital to evaluate the players' strength or influence, interests, and tactics for facilitating policy execution. If this is not thoroughly studied, the software that will be deployed will most likely fail to produce the desired results.
 - 2) Regime and Institution Specifications (characteristics of institutions and regimes currently in power). Because the context in which a policy is executed impacts its success, we wish to discuss the qualities of an institution that will also influence a policy in this part.
 - 3) Responsiveness and obedience (level of compliance and response from implementers). Compliance and response from implementers are also considered necessary in policy implementation, thus what will be addressed at this point is the level of compliance and response from implementers in reacting to a policy.

Sukabumi Kece Policy Implementation Strategy as Poverty Reduction in Sukabumi City.

The strategic analysis carried out by the Sukabumi City Government to achieve the Sukabumi Kece program was carried out using the theoretical basis of Osborne and Plastick, known as the five core strategy approach. The results and comprehensive discussion can be explained as follows:

Core Strategy

The core strategy is related to the core function of government, namely the directive function. This strategy separates the directive and implementation functions and service and rule enforcement procedures so that each organization can lead by creating new mechanisms to define goals and strategy. The strategic issue is to increase the institutional capacity and government funding in planning, implementing and controlling development.

To increase the effectiveness of the implementation of the Sukabumi Kelurahan Entrepreneurship Center policy to accelerate poverty reduction, the Sukabumi City government has taken several steps, namely forming a Sukabumi Kece Team according to the mandate of the mayor's regulation regarding the Sukabumi Kelurahan Entrepreneurship Center policy. The issuance of the policy has been socialized to the mayor's level regarding the Sukabumi policy. Kelurahan Entrepreneurship Center to all stakeholders. The following strategy that has been implemented to improve the capacity of the institution, especially in the effort to enhance

coordination, the Sukabumi Kece Team has been to conduct coordination meetings on the program, which have been carried out not periodically but are carried out to respond to issues that are developing with all members of the Sukabumi Kece Team.

Consequences Strategy

The strategy that has been implemented by the Sukabumi City Government to create conducive conditions for the development of development sectors **to improve the welfare of the community** through **the** Sukabumi Kece program is directed at increasing the capacity and capabilities of the community in various things, such as abilities and competencies through training and guidance.

The strategy that the Sukabumi City government has implemented is to **create** socio-cultural conditions that are conducive to the development of development sectors **to improve the welfare of the community through various** efforts such as social assistance **in the field of education, health** insurance programs for the poor at costs from the centre and APBD, specifically for the sector. Education and health budget support for these two sectors has flowed a lot with regulations that require the fulfilment of a health budget of at least 20% and a health budget of at least 10% of total regional spending. In other sectors, the existence of direct cash assistance programs to the community turned out to have side effects, as described in the previous section.

Customer Strategy

The Sukabumi City Government, in principle, is committed to prioritizing the satisfaction of the beneficiaries, especially the actors and the poor who are involved in the development; however, so far no survey has been conducted on whether the poor are well served or not.

The Sukabumi City Government has made efforts to ensure the availability of basic infrastructure and facilities that can satisfy the residents, namely by continuing to roll out central funds and funds from the APBD for essential services, especially education and health; there is also a large flow of funds in the form of financial assistance to the Kelurahan, but the implementation has not been appropriately managed. Especially concerning efforts to reduce poverty in Sukabumi City.

Efforts to ensure the convenience and transparency of administrative and technical services are carried out as part of a series of bureaucratic reform roadmaps, specifically with organizational and technical assistance for the poor. Benefit recipients. Efforts to facilitate administrative and technical services are often assisted by regional or local government apparatus.

In this strategy, community satisfaction should be the target in providing public services for every government organization. In contrast, in government organizations implementing the Sukabumi Kelurahan Entrepreneurship Center (Sukabumi Kece) policy to accelerate poverty reduction, accountability is realized in the form of accountability for performance through government performance accountability reports. Regional Apparatus Work Unit (RAWU) as an organization, as an individual, the responsibility for measuring the Performance Targets of SKP Employees is effective starting from 2014, while in the previous year, it was realized in the form of DP3.

Control Strategy

The Sukabumi City Government has not given considerable authority to the closest

institutions to the community, both to the regional RAWU and the Kelurahan government; on the other hand, the authority of the Sukabumi Kece Team, especially in the control aspect, has weaknesses because it does not have the authority to provide rewards and punishments as well as on the beneficiary side starting from the element of planning. The provision of a coordination meeting mechanism is part of the Sukabumi City government's policy implementation strategy to always coordinate in making decisions in implementing policies; however, in practice, coordination meetings are often not utilized optimally. Weak so that there is an inaccurate target of beneficiaries who are intervened by a program.

The problem that hinders the implementation of the Sukabumi Village Entrepreneurship Center policy from accelerating poverty alleviation in Sukabumi City is the function of the SUKABUMI KECE TEAM in implementing control functions that are not yet optimal. The strategy that can be done to improve the control function has been carried out with the core strategy above; in the control strategy, it can be done in different ways.

The strategy is carried out by shifting the form of control used from detailed rules and systems that create performance accountability, in this case, by building poverty as a joint priority among RAWU members of the Sukabumi Kece Team by first making the implementing agencies aware of the shared mission carried out to overcome poverty, with a shared mission that is realized that it will be carried out, a pattern of performance accountability that supports the mission will be able to be fulfilled.

This Control Strategy can be carried out by empowering employees by encouraging decision-making authority at a certain level, as in the case of field extension workers who are more aware of the actual situation in the field and are given the power to facilitate as well as assist and follow up including in terms of controlling action programs. The regional government, in this case, **the sub-district or village government**, is given **the** authority to respond to the poor and, at the same time, encourage them together with the community to solve problems within the scope of their authority.

Culture Strategy

The Sukabumi City Government has implemented a policy implementation strategy regarding Sukabumi Kelurahan Entrepreneurship (Sukabumi Kece) to reduce poverty by providing collective awareness with stakeholders in the form of directions given by leadership elements in coordination meetings, including recommendations for obeying the law and high discipline. For RAWU for action program actors, while the condition of the beneficiaries has also been conveyed directions to be able to follow the law and discipline carried out by extension workers or other officers on duty.

The Sukabumi City government's efforts to improve the ability to adapt to internal changes have been carried out by the Sukabumi Kece Team. However, it is limited to preparing program acceptance data; breakthroughs in science and technology such as poverty or management information systems have not been made.

There are cultural problems that hinder implementation in the section above that the weak culture impedes the government agency implementing the program and the beneficiary community. The cultural strategy that can be done is to build and direct the culture of all development stakeholders, including the community, in terms of the habit of working hard and being highly disciplined in all aspects of life, to avoid community reluctance in implementing development programs as happened in some areas of the city of Sukabumi due to the direct assistance program whether it's the poor who receive immediate cash assistance.

Conclusion

Implementing the Sukabumi Kece policy in the community empowerment cluster to improve the community's economy, accelerate poverty reduction, strengthen institutions, improve welfare and employment opportunities and increase community participation in decision-making related to policy content and context has not been fully implemented. The strategies that the local government has implemented to overcome the problems of implementing policies to accelerate poverty reduction to be more effective are: Core strategies that the Sukabumi City Government has implemented, namely forming a Kece Sukabumi Team, Socialization, Coordination Meetings, carrying out comparative studies to other regions, funding for supporting Sukabumi activities Kece in the form of an operational secretariat for the Kece Sukabumi Team every year; The Consequences strategy that the Sukabumi City Government has implemented is carried out by building Human Resources. The lowest of the seven sub-districts in the Sukabumi City area, but the policy was then discontinued in the following years, social assistance in the education sector and health insurance programs for the poor were also carried out; The customer strategy has been carried out by trying to ensure the availability of basic infrastructure and facilities that can satisfy residents by continuing to roll out empowerment programs, as part of the Sukabumi Kece Team, efforts to facilitate administrative and technical services are often assisted by RAWU or local government officials; The Control Strategy that has been implemented is the provision of a coordination meeting mechanism and the leadership provides direction during the Sukabumi Kece Team coordination meeting; and Culture Strategy, namely by raising awareness with Sukabumi Kece stakeholders in the form of advice given by the leadership elements, directions to be able to obey the law and discipline carried out by extension workers or other apparatus on duty, increasing the ability to adapt to changes in science and technology at least it has been done by the Sukabumi Kece Team, although it is limited to compiling data and targets.

References

- Agustinus, L. (2012). *Dasar-dasar Kebijakan Publik*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Ahluwalia, M. S., Carter, N. G., & Chenery, H. B. (1979). Growth and poverty in developing countries. *Journal of development economics*, 6(3), 299-341.
- Alfisyahrin, D. (2021). Optimalisasi Fungsi Tim Koordinasi Penanggulangan Kemiskinan Daerah (Tkpkd) Dalam Perspektif Diskresi Kebijakan Penanganan Kemiskinan Kota Semarang. *JURNAL MEDIA ADMINISTRASI*, 3(1), 86-99.
- Banks, N., & Hulme, D. (2012). The role of NGOs and civil society in development and poverty reduction. *Brooks World Poverty Institute Working Paper*, (171).
- Barrientos, A., Gorman, M., & Heslop, A. (2003). Old age poverty in developing countries: contributions and dependence in later life. *World Development*, 31(3), 555-570.
- Bhinadi, A. (2017). *Penanggulangan kemiskinan dan pemberdayaan masyarakat*. Deepublish.
- Braun, J., Swaminathan, M. S., & Rosegrant, M. W. (2004). Agriculture, food security, nutrition and the Millennium Development Goals.
- Brockerhoff, M., & Brennan, E. (1998). The poverty of cities in developing regions. *Population and Development Review*, 75-114.
- Commins, P. (2004). Poverty and social exclusion in rural areas: characteristics, processes and research issues. *Sociologia ruralis*, 44(1), 60-75.
- De Muro, P., Mazziotta, M., & Pareto, A. (2011). Composite indices of development and poverty: An application to MDGs. *Social indicators research*, 104(1), 1-18.
- Fredrickson, G. (1997). *The Spirit of Public Administration*. San Fransisco: Jossey Bass.

- Grindle, M. S. (1980a). *Politics and Implementation in The Third World*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Grindle, M. S. (1980b). *Public Choices and Policy Change: The Political Economy of Reform In Developing Countries*. London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Groce, N., Kett, M., Lang, R., & Trani, J. F. (2011). Disability and poverty: The need for a more nuanced understanding of development policy and practise implications. *Third World Quarterly*, 32(8), 1493-1513.
- Habibullah, A. (2010). Alternatif Model Kebijakan dalam Upaya Penanggulangan Kemiskinan di Indonesia. *Pamator Journal*, 3(1), 40-50.
- Hadi, A. P. (2009). Tinjauan terhadap berbagai program pemberdayaan masyarakat di Indonesia. *Yayasan Agribisnis/Pusat Pengembangan Masyarakat Agrikarya (PPMA)*.
- Hulme, D., & Shepherd, A. (2003). Conceptualizing chronic poverty. *World Development*, 31(3), 403-423.
- Mahioborang, A. (2015). Kebijakan pemerintah dalam penanggulangan kemiskinan masyarakat nelayan (suatu studi di kabupaten sangihe). *Politico: Jurnal Ilmu Politik*, 1(7), 1151.
- Narayan-Parker, D. (Ed.). (2002). *Empowerment and poverty reduction: A sourcebook*. World Bank Publications.
- Noor, M. (2014). Penanggulangan Kemiskinan Di Indonesia (Studi Tentang Program Nasional Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Mandiri Perkotaan Di Kota Semarang). *Serat Acitya*, 3(1), 130.
- Omotola, J. S. (2008). Combating poverty for sustainable human development in Nigeria: The continuing struggle. *Journal of poverty*, 12(4), 496-517.
- Palmer, M. (2011). Disability and poverty: A conceptual review. *Journal of Disability Policy Studies*, 21(4), 210-218.
- Parsons, W. (1995). Public policy. *Cheltenham, Northampton*.
- Pfiffner, J. M., & Presthus, R. V. (1953) *Public Administration, Third Edition*. New York: The Ronald Press Company.
- Putra, R. E. (2007). Analisis terhadap Program-program Penanggulangan Kemiskinan dan Pemberdayaan Masyarakat di Indonesia. *Jurnal Demokrasi*, 6(1).
- Rakhmat, R., & Fakih, F. (2019). Dinamika Implementasi Kebijakan Penanggulangan Kemiskinan di Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi dan Studi Kebijakan (JIASK)*, 1(2), 33-38.
- Ravallion, M. (2012). Benchmarking global poverty reduction. *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper*, (6205).
- Sari, P. (2017). Kelompok Usaha Bersama (KUBE) dalam Rangka Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Prasejahtera. *Moderat: Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Pemerintahan*, 3(2), 99-107.
- Schneider, H. (1999). Participatory governance for poverty reduction. *Journal of International Development: The Journal of the Development Studies Association*, 11(4), 521-534.
- Setiawan, A., Wisadirana, D., & Mu'adi, S. (2015). Rancangan Model Pemberdayaan Pelaku UKM Dalam Upaya Penanggulangan Kemiskinan Dengan Berbasis Zakat Produktif (Studi Kasus Implementasi Program Jatim Makmur Dari Badan Amil Zakat Nasional Provinsi Jawa Timur di Kelurahan Embong Kaliasin Surabaya). *Wacana Journal of Social and Humanity Studies*, 18(4).
- Setyoko, I. (2011). *Administrasi Negara dan Kebijakan Publik: Mewujudkan Keadilan Sosial Melalui Proses Deliberatif*. Purwokerto: Universitas Jenderal Soedirman.
- Soesanta, P. E. (2013). Penanggulangan Kemiskinan melalui Program Nasional Pemberdayaan Masyarakat (PNPM) Mandiri Perdesaan. *Jurnal Bina Praja: Journal of Home Affairs Governance*, 5(2), 73-78.

- Solikatun, S., & Masruroh, Y. (2014). Kemiskinan Dalam Pembangunan. *Jurnal Analisa Sosiologi*, 3(1).
- Sugiyono, P. (2011). *Metodologi penelitian kuantitatif kualitatif dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Suntiana, L., Kanto, S., & Soenyono, S. (2015). Rancangan model kebijakan penanggulangan kemiskinan dalam perspektif pemberdayaan perempuan (Kajian terhadap implementasi Program Keluarga Harapan di Kecamatan Sumberbaru Kabupaten Jember). *Wacana Journal of Social and Humanity Studies*, 18(3).
- Sutikno, S., Soedjono, E. S., Rumiati, A. T., & Trisunarno, L. (2015). Pemilihan program pengentasan kemiskinan melalui pengembangan model pemberdayaan masyarakat dengan pendekatan sistem. *Jurnal Ekonomi Pembangunan: Kajian Masalah Ekonomi dan Pembangunan*, 11(1), 135-147.
- Syafri, W. (2012). *Studi Tentang Administrasi Publik*. Jatinangor: Erlangga.
- Townsend, P. (1979). *Poverty in the United Kingdom: a survey of household resources and living standards*. Univ of California Press.
- Van Heerde, J., & Hudson, D. (2010). 'The righteous considereth the cause of the poor? Public attitudes towards poverty in developing countries. *Political Studies*, 58(3), 389-409.
- Wulan, Y. C., Ati, N. U., & Widodo, R. P. (2019). Implementasi Kebijakan Penanggulangan Kemiskinan Melalui Program Pemberdayaan Ekonomi Kelompok Usaha Bersama (KUBE) (Studi Tentang Program Pemberdayaan Ekonomi Kelompok Usaha Bersama (KUBE) di Kelurahan Pakistaji Kecamatan Wonoasih Kota Probolinggo, Jawa Timur). *Respon Publik*, 13(4), 104-109.
- Yasa, I. M. (2008). Penanggulangan kemiskinan berbasis partisipasi masyarakat di Provinsi Bali. *Input: Jurnal Ekonomi dan Sosial*, 1(2), 43814.

Strategy for Implementing the Sukabumi Village Entrepreneurship Center (Sukabumi Kece) Policy in Sukabumi City

ORIGINALITY REPORT

13%
SIMILARITY INDEX

11%
INTERNET SOURCES

4%
PUBLICATIONS

5%
STUDENT PAPERS

MATCH ALL SOURCES (ONLY SELECTED SOURCE PRINTED)

2%
★ repository.uin-malang.ac.id
Internet Source

Exclude quotes On
Exclude bibliography On

Exclude matches Off