



Procedurally Compliant but Educationally Incomplete: Implementation of the Education Component of Indonesia's Family Hope Program in a Rural Village of Mukomuko Regency

Mini Puspita Sari^{1*}; Nopriyeni¹; Adi Asmara¹

1 Master of Pedagogy Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Muhammadiyah Bengkulu, Bengkulu, Indonesia

Email: minipuspitasaki6@gmail.com; [email Dr. Nopriyeni]; adiaasmara@umb.ac.id

*Corresponding author: minipuspitasaki6@gmail.com |

Received	Revised	Accepted	Published
[10-08-2026]	[13-09-2026]	[16-09-2026]	[01-10-2026]

Abstract: Indonesia's Family Hope Program (Program Keluarga Harapan, PKH) is a conditional cash transfer that requires beneficiary families to keep school-age children enrolled with at least 85% attendance, yet irregular attendance and dropout persist among beneficiary children. This study analysed the implementation of the PKH education component in Tunggal Jaya Village, Mukomuko Regency, Bengkulu, and identified why its education targets were not fully achieved. A descriptive qualitative case study was conducted from February to March 2026. Data came from semi-structured in-depth interviews with purposively selected village officials, PKH facilitators, a PKH group leader, school staff, parents, and children from beneficiary families, supported by observation and document analysis, and were analysed interactively with source, method, and time triangulation. Administratively, the programme followed procedure: quarterly disbursement through the post office, monthly family development sessions, and monitoring by facilitators. The assistance eased school costs and raised parental awareness. Substantively, however, of 25 beneficiary students at the local junior secondary school, two had dropped out and several attended irregularly. Contributing factors were economic hardship, children's involvement in family work, limited parental supervision, distance to school, delayed disbursement, incomplete understanding of programme obligations, weak facilitator-village coordination, and inaccurate beneficiary data. PKH implementation was procedurally adequate but not yet effective in sustaining children's education.

Keywords: conditional cash transfer; Family Hope Program; policy implementation; school attendance; school dropout

Abstrak: Program Keluarga Harapan (PKH) merupakan bantuan sosial bersyarat yang mewajibkan keluarga penerima manfaat (KPM) memastikan anak usia sekolah tetap bersekolah dengan kehadiran minimal 85%, namun ketidakteraturan kehadiran dan putus sekolah masih ditemukan pada anak KPM. Penelitian ini menganalisis implementasi komponen pendidikan PKH di Desa Tunggal Jaya, Kabupaten Mukomuko, Bengkulu, serta mengidentifikasi penyebab belum tercapainya target pendidikan. Penelitian menggunakan studi kasus kualitatif deskriptif yang dilaksanakan pada Februari-Maret 2026. Data dikumpulkan melalui wawancara mendalam semi-terstruktur dengan informan yang dipilih secara purposif, yaitu aparatur desa, pendamping PKH, ketua kelompok PKH, pihak sekolah, orang tua, dan anak KPM, didukung observasi dan dokumentasi, lalu dianalisis secara interaktif dengan triangulasi sumber, metode, dan waktu. Secara administratif, program berjalan sesuai prosedur: penyaluran bantuan per triwulan melalui Kantor Pos, pertemuan peningkatan kemampuan keluarga setiap bulan, dan pemantauan oleh pendamping. Bantuan meringankan biaya sekolah dan meningkatkan kesadaran orang tua. Namun secara substantif, dari 25 siswa KPM di SMP setempat, dua siswa putus sekolah dan beberapa siswa tidak hadir secara teratur. Faktor penyebabnya meliputi keterbatasan ekonomi, keterlibatan anak dalam pekerjaan keluarga, lemahnya pengawasan orang tua, jarak sekolah, keterlambatan pencairan, pemahaman kewajiban program yang belum utuh, lemahnya koordinasi pendamping dengan pemerintah desa, serta data penerima yang belum akurat. Implementasi PKH telah memadai secara prosedural, tetapi belum efektif menjamin keberlanjutan pendidikan anak.

Kata kunci: bantuan sosial bersyarat; implementasi kebijakan; kehadiran sekolah; Program Keluarga Harapan; putus sekolah

CITATION:	Sari, M. P., Nopriyeni, & Asmara, A. ([2026]). Procedurally Compliant but Educationally Incomplete: Implementation of the Education Component of Indonesia's Family Hope Program in a Rural Village of Mukomuko Regency. <i>Edumaspul: Jurnal Pendidikan</i> , [10]([2]), [2026]. https://doi.org/10.33487/edumaspul.v10i2.514 .
------------------	---

COPYRIGHT:

© [2026] Sari, M. P., Nopriyeni, & Asmara, A (s). Open access under the [Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License](#) (CC BY-SA 4.0).

Introduction

Education is widely regarded as one of the most effective routes out of poverty, yet children from poor households remain the most likely to attend school irregularly or leave it early. Poverty in Indonesia has declined but remains substantial: in March 2025, 8.47% of the population, or 23.85 million people, lived below the national poverty line, and the rate in rural areas (11.03%) was markedly higher than in urban areas (6.73%) (Badan Pusat Statistik [BPS], 2025). Conditional cash transfers (CCTs) address this link by paying poor households on condition that they invest in their children's health and education, thereby combining short-term income support with long-term human capital formation (Fiszbein & Schady, 2009). Indonesia's version, the Family Hope Program (*Program Keluarga Harapan*, PKH), has operated since 2007. Its education component requires beneficiary families (*Keluarga Penerima Manfaat*, KPM) to keep children of primary and secondary school age enrolled with a minimum attendance of 85%, and it is supported by social facilitators who verify compliance and run monthly family development sessions (*Pertemuan Peningkatan Kemampuan Keluarga*, P2K2) (Kementerian Sosial RI, 2018, 2021).

Evidence on PKH's educational effects is encouraging but uneven. A large randomised evaluation found that the programme produced cumulative gains in health and education outcomes over six years (Cahyadi et al., 2020), and domestic studies report that PKH supports school participation among children of beneficiary families (Martsha, 2024; Pangestu & Fedryansyah, 2022) and contributes to household welfare (Artati, 2024; Zahran, 2025). The same literature, however, documents persistent implementation problems: inaccurate beneficiary data, with more than one fifth of recipients in one provincial study not classified as poor (Sofianto, 2020); consumptive use of assistance (Subagtio, 2020); heavy facilitator workloads that limit continuous guidance (Prasetyo, 2021); low financial literacy and weak social support for children's education (Wardani et al., 2023); and limited success in sustaining education beyond the basic level (Khoiriyah et al., 2025). Evaluations of social protection policy therefore caution that procedural delivery does not guarantee that programme objectives are met (Wahyuni et al., 2023).

These tensions are visible in Mukomuko Regency, Bengkulu Province. Provincial statistics

recorded 220 school dropouts in the regency in 2024, all at the junior secondary (119) and senior secondary (101) levels, suggesting that the transition after primary school is a point of particular vulnerability (BPS Provinsi Bengkulu, 2024). Preliminary observation in Tunggal Jaya Village, a rural agricultural village in the regency, indicated that some children of beneficiary families preferred helping with household or daily paid work to attending school full-time, lacked basic study facilities at home, and received little academic support from their parents. Such conditions raise the question of why a programme that conditions cash on school attendance does not consistently secure that attendance.

Policy implementation theory offers a lens for this question. Implementation outcomes depend not only on a policy's content—its objectives, benefits, and rules—but also on its context, including the interests and capacities of the actors involved and the conditions of the target group (Grindle, 1980). Implementation is shaped by the interaction between formal rules and the operational realities in which frontline actors work (Hill & Hupe, 2022), and frontline workers such as social facilitators exercise considerable discretion under resource constraints (Lipsky, 2010). Most PKH studies, however, assess welfare effects, targeting accuracy, or aggregate school participation, often at district or provincial level. Fewer studies examine, at village level and from the perspectives of all actors involved—including children—how the education conditionality is enforced in practice and why it fails for some families. This study addresses that gap by distinguishing between the procedural and the substantive dimensions of implementation.

Accordingly, the study asked two questions: (1) How is the education component of PKH implemented in Tunggal Jaya Village, Teras Terunjam District, Mukomuko Regency? (2) What factors explain why the education targets for beneficiary families have not been fully achieved? The findings are intended to inform facilitators, village governments, and schools seeking to strengthen PKH as an instrument for breaking the intergenerational transmission of poverty through education.

Method

Research Design and Setting

This study used a descriptive qualitative case study design to understand the implementation of PKH as it occurs naturally in its local setting, without testing hypotheses. The case was the education component of PKH in Tunggal Jaya Village, Teras

Terunjam District, Mukomuko Regency, Bengkulu Province, Indonesia. The village is rural, and most residents work in agriculture, particularly oil palm and rubber plantations. Programme documentation recorded 30 beneficiary families in the village in 2024. Children from these families who attend junior secondary school are enrolled mainly at SMP Negeri 08 Mukomuko, which was therefore included as a data source. Fieldwork took place from February to March 2026. The study focused on the education component only; the health and social welfare components of PKH were not examined.

Participants, Sample, or Data Sources

Informants were selected purposively according to their direct involvement in, or experience of, the education component of PKH (Table 1). They comprised the village head and village officials responsible for administration and supervision, two PKH facilitators at village and subdistrict level who carry out verification, facilitation, and monitoring, the leader of the local PKH group, the homeroom teacher and principal of SMP Negeri 08 Mukomuko, parents from beneficiary families with children of primary to secondary school age, and children from beneficiary families. This composition allowed the perspectives of policy implementers, intermediaries, schools, and target households to be compared. Documentary data included the 2024 PKH guidelines, beneficiary records, school attendance and participation records, programme implementation reports, and photographs of facilitation activities.

Table 1. Research informants

Informant group	n	Information sought
Village head, section heads, and affairs heads	7	Village involvement in data collection, supervision, and support
PKH facilitators (village and subdistrict)	2	Disbursement, P2K2, verification, and monitoring of education
PKH group leader	1	Communication with beneficiary families
Homeroom teacher and principal, SMP Negeri 08 Mukomuko	2	Attendance, motivation, and dropout of beneficiary students
Parents from beneficiary families	11	Use of assistance, compliance, and constraints
Children from beneficiary families	9	Schooling experience and barriers

Note. P2K2 = *Pertemuan Peningkatan Kemampuan Keluarga* (family development sessions). Informants are identified by initials in the Results.

Instruments and Measures

Following the qualitative tradition, the first author served as the key instrument, supported by three tools. A semi-structured interview guide covered disbursement mechanisms, facilitators'

roles, targeting and data verification, families' compliance with education obligations, the use of assistance, and perceived effects on children's schooling, while allowing follow-up questions as new information emerged. An observation sheet recorded children's school attendance, parental involvement in learning, household economic conditions, and the use of assistance for educational needs. A documentation checklist guided the review of programme and school records. The education component was operationalised through three indicators drawn from programme rules: attendance of at least 85%, active enrolment at primary, junior secondary, or senior secondary level, and use of assistance for educational needs such as uniforms, stationery, and transport.

Procedure and Research Ethics

The study proceeded in four stages. In the preparation stage, the location and informants were determined, research permits were obtained, and the interview, observation, and documentation instruments were prepared. In the data collection stage, the researcher conducted in-depth interviews, observed beneficiary households and facilitators' activities at village and subdistrict level, visited the school to confirm the attendance of beneficiary students, and collected supporting documents. Interviews were conducted in Javanese, the everyday language of most informants; excerpts were translated into Indonesian by the researcher and are presented in English in this article. Data analysis took place concurrently with data collection, followed by conclusion drawing. Informants are identified only by initials to protect their identities.

Data Analysis

Data were analysed using the interactive model of data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing and verification (Miles et al., 2014). Interview transcripts, field notes, and documents were reduced by summarising and coding passages relevant to the research questions; the coded data were organised into themes on programme mechanisms, fulfilment of the education component, effects on children's education, and supporting and inhibiting factors; and conclusions were drawn and verified against the full data set. Trustworthiness was established through source triangulation (comparing facilitators, beneficiary families, village officials, and school staff), method triangulation (comparing interview, observation, and documentary data), and time triangulation (collecting data on different occasions to check the consistency of information).

Results and Discussion

Results

Programme mechanisms. Facilitators reported that assistance was disbursed in four stages each year. Information on disbursement passed from the

facilitator to the group leader and then to beneficiary families, and payments were made at the post office. As facilitator AN explained, “disbursement normally takes place four times a year; once there is news from the centre, I pass it to the group leader, who passes it on to the recipients, and payments are now made at the post office so there are no further deductions.” Facilitators also acted as intermediaries between the government and beneficiary families. Facilitator SR described holding monthly meetings, delivering P2K2 material, monitoring the schooling of beneficiary children, and validating data.

Coordination with the village government, however, was limited. Village official HD stated that “the village government has not been much involved; sometimes the data already exist, but we do not know how the recipients were determined.” Targeting problems followed from this. Parent RA reported that neighbours who were eligible had not been registered and that she did not know how to propose them, while HD noted that some households whose economic situation had improved remained registered because the data had not been updated. Facilitator AN confirmed that data updating took place but did not fully involve the village government because the main data came directly from the centre.

Fulfilment of the education component. Most beneficiary families sought to keep their children in school. According to SR, “many parents have tried to keep their children in school, but some children still do not attend regularly because of economic conditions and distance to school.” School records and staff confirmed this mixed picture. The homeroom teacher, DW, reported that about 25 students at SMP Negeri 08 Mukomuko came from beneficiary families; most attended regularly, but several were frequently absent and two had left school. The principal, MN, stated that the assistance helped students meet school needs such as uniforms, books, and other learning equipment. Parent RA described trying to keep her child in school because education mattered for the child’s future and using the assistance for school needs. Facilitator AN, however, observed that not all families fully understood their education obligations and that some spent more of the assistance on daily needs than on their children’s education. HD added that some students had to help their parents work and therefore could not attend school regularly.

Effects on children’s education. Informants agreed that PKH had eased the cost of schooling and helped children stay enrolled. RA explained that the assistance paid for uniforms, books, and learning materials so that her child could remain in school, and DW observed an increase in the number of students continuing their schooling, although some still dropped out or were often absent. SR noted that parents had become more attentive to their children’s education after receiving assistance, which

in turn raised children’s enthusiasm for learning. Gains in academic achievement, however, were uneven: according to HD, some children who still had to help their parents could not concentrate fully on learning. Interviews with children showed similar variation. Some reported greater motivation because their school needs were met, whereas others described obstacles such as work for the family, distance to school, and poor physical condition. Parents of children who had dropped out generally valued education but cited economic constraints and limited time to supervise their children because of work.

Supporting and inhibiting factors. Table 2 summarises the factors that supported and hindered the education component. Routine facilitation, village support, growing parental awareness, and the availability of nearby schools supported implementation. Delayed disbursement, incomplete understanding of programme rules, distance to school, economic hardship and child work, limited parental supervision, and inaccurate data hindered it. As RA put it, “sometimes the assistance is late, so we have to wait longer to meet our children’s school needs.”

Table 2. Factors supporting and inhibiting the PKH education component in Tunggal Jaya Village

Factor	Main evidence
<i>Supporting factors</i>	
Routine facilitation and monitoring of children’s education by facilitators	Facilitators (AN, SR); observation
Moral and administrative support from the village government	Village official (HD)
Growing parental awareness of the value of education	Parent (RA); facilitator (SR)
Primary and secondary schools available near the village	Observation; documents
<i>Inhibiting factors</i>	
Economic hardship and children’s involvement in family work	Village official (HD); parents; children
Limited parental supervision of learning and attendance	Parents; homeroom teacher (DW)
Distance to school	Village official (HD); facilitator (SR); children
Delayed disbursement of assistance	Parent (RA)
Incomplete understanding of obligations; assistance used for daily needs	Facilitators (AN, SR)
Weak facilitator–village coordination and outdated beneficiary data	Village official (HD); facilitator (AN); parent (RA)

Note. Factors were identified through source and method triangulation across interviews, observation, and documents.

Discussion

The first research question concerned how the education component is implemented. The findings show a programme that is procedurally compliant: disbursement follows the prescribed schedule and channel, facilitators hold P2K2 sessions and monitor schooling, and families broadly know that schooling is a condition of support. Judged by process, implementation is adequate. Judged by substance, it is incomplete, because the core education condition—regular attendance and continued enrolment—is not met by all beneficiary children. This divergence between administrative delivery and substantive outcomes mirrors earlier findings that PKH can run well administratively while still missing its targets (Sofianto, 2020; Wahyuni et al., 2023). In Grindle's (1980) terms, the problem lies less in the content of the policy, whose rules and benefits are clear, than in its context: the economic conditions of target households and the relationships among the actors responsible for delivery.

Facilitators emerged as the pivotal actors. They operate as frontline workers who translate national rules into local practice (Lipsky, 2010), and their routine meetings and monitoring were the main supporting factor. Their room for action is nonetheless limited: beneficiary data arrive from the centre, the village government is only partly involved, and facilitators' workloads constrain continuous guidance (Prasetyo, 2021). The result is the targeting error reported by informants—eligible families excluded and better-off families retained—which echoes the data problems documented elsewhere (Sofianto, 2020). Implementation research suggests that such gaps arise where formal rules meet the operational realities of multi-actor governance (Hill & Hupe, 2022); here, the missing link is a routine mechanism through which village knowledge can correct central data.

The second research question concerned why education targets are not fully achieved. The evidence points to a cluster of household-level constraints. The assistance clearly eased the direct costs of schooling, consistent with studies reporting positive effects of PKH on school participation (Artati, 2024; Martsha, 2024; Pangestu & Fedryansyah, 2022) and with experimental evidence of cumulative educational gains (Cahyadi et al., 2020). However, it did not fully offset the opportunity cost of children's labour in agricultural households, a well-known limitation when transfer amounts are small relative to the value of children's work (Fiszbein & Schady, 2009). The concentration of absenteeism and dropout at junior secondary level is consistent with the observation that PKH helps more at the basic level than in sustaining education into secondary school (Khoiriyah et al., 2025) and

with the regency's dropout profile (BPS Provinsi Bengkulu, 2024). The use of assistance for daily needs and limited parental supervision further weaken compliance, in line with reports of consumptive use and low financial literacy among beneficiaries (Subagtio, 2020; Wardani et al., 2023).

A practical implication concerns attendance monitoring. Teachers described frequent absence as an early signal of eventual dropout, yet in this case attendance information functioned mainly as a compliance check rather than as a trigger for support. Linking school attendance records, facilitator visits, and village follow-up would allow at-risk children to be identified early, and P2K2 sessions could focus more explicitly on education planning and on managing household economic pressures without withdrawing children from school (Umasugi, 2023). Village governments could also be given a defined role in updating beneficiary data so that assistance reaches the children who need it most.

This study has limitations. It examined one village and one junior secondary school over a short fieldwork period, relied mainly on informants' accounts, and did not systematically analyse attendance records over time. Its findings are therefore context-specific and not statistically generalisable. Future research could combine village-level case studies with longitudinal attendance and enrolment data across several districts and examine psychological, cultural, and policy factors that shape the education outcomes of PKH beneficiaries.

Conclusion

The education component of PKH in Tunggal Jaya Village has been implemented in line with programme procedures: assistance is disbursed regularly through the post office, facilitators conduct P2K2 sessions and monitor schooling, and the assistance has eased school costs and raised parental awareness of education. The programme has not, however, fully achieved its education targets, as shown by irregular attendance and dropout among beneficiary students at junior secondary level. The main causes are household economic hardship and children's involvement in family work, limited parental supervision, distance to school, delayed disbursement, incomplete understanding of programme obligations, weak coordination between facilitators and the village government, and inaccurate beneficiary data. PKH implementation is thus procedurally adequate but not yet substantively effective. Strengthening early attendance monitoring among schools, facilitators, and village governments, involving villages in data updating, and focusing family development sessions on education would help the programme sustain the schooling of children from poor families.

Acknowledgment

The authors thank the village government of Tungal Jaya, the PKH facilitators of Teras Terunjam District, the principal and teachers of SMP Negeri 08 Mukomuko, and the families and children who participated in this study.

Funding

This research received no external funding.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Author Contributions

Mini Puspita Sari: conceptualization, methodology, investigation, data curation, formal analysis, writing—original draft. Nopriyeni: methodology, supervision, writing—review and editing. Adi Asmara: conceptualization, supervision, writing—review and editing.

Generative AI Disclosure

Generative AI (Claude, Anthropic) was used to assist in restructuring the thesis into article format, translating it into English, and editing the language. The authors reviewed and verified all content, data, and references and take full responsibility for the final manuscript.

References

- Artati, Y. (2024). Efektivitas bantuan Program Keluarga Harapan (PKH) terhadap kesejahteraan masyarakat di Kecamatan Kajang. *Journal of Education Sciences: Fondation & Application*, 3(2), 47–57. <https://doi.org/10.56959/jesfa.v3i2.95>
- Badan Pusat Statistik. (2025, July 25). *Persentase penduduk miskin Maret 2025 turun menjadi 8,47 persen* [Press release]. <https://www.bps.go.id/id/pressrelease/2025/07/25/2518/persentase-penduduk-miskin-maret-2025-turun-menjadi-8-47-persen-.html>
- BPS Provinsi Bengkulu. (2024). *Provinsi Bengkulu dalam angka 2024*. BPS Provinsi Bengkulu.
- Cahyadi, N., Hanna, R., Olken, B. A., Prima, R. A., Satriawan, E., & Syamsulhakim, E. (2020). Cumulative impacts of conditional cash transfer programs: Experimental evidence from Indonesia. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, 12(4), 88–110. <https://doi.org/10.1257/pol.20190245>
- Fiszbein, A., & Schady, N. (2009). *Conditional cash transfers: Reducing present and future poverty*. World Bank. <https://doi.org/10.1596/978-0-8213-7352-1>
- Grindle, M. S. (Ed.). (1980). *Politics and policy implementation in the Third World*. Princeton University Press.
- Hill, M., & Hupe, P. (2022). *Implementing public policy: An introduction to the study of operational governance* (4th ed.). SAGE.
- Kementerian Sosial RI. (2018). *Peraturan Menteri Sosial Republik Indonesia Nomor 1 Tahun 2018 tentang Program Keluarga Harapan*. Kementerian Sosial RI.

- Kementerian Sosial RI. (2021). *Pedoman pelaksanaan Program Keluarga Harapan tahun 2021*. Kementerian Sosial RI.
- Khoiriyah, A., Rizky, R., Kartika, V., Helmy, I., & Sukmawati, E. (2025). Evaluasi pelaksanaan Program Keluarga Harapan (PKH) dalam meningkatkan graduasi mandiri keluarga penerima manfaat. *Arus Jurnal Sosial dan Humaniora*, 5(2), 946–954. <https://doi.org/10.57250/ajsh.v5i2.1287>
- Lipsky, M. (2010). *Street-level bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the individual in public services* (30th anniversary expanded ed.). Russell Sage Foundation.
- Martsha, F. (2024). Pengaruh bantuan sosial bersyarat Program Keluarga Harapan terhadap partisipasi anak usia sekolah di Indonesia. *Jurnal Pendidikan Ekonomi Indonesia*, 6(2), 105–118. <https://doi.org/10.17509/jpei.v6i2.75867>
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). SAGE.
- Pangestu, S. D., & Fedryansyah, M. (2022). Efektivitas PKH bidang pendidikan dalam partisipasi pendidikan anak KPM di era industri 4.0 dan society 5.0. *Focus: Jurnal Pekerjaan Sosial*, 5(2), 137–146. <https://doi.org/10.24198/focus.v5i2.39232>
- Prasetyo, H. (2021). Pola komunikasi pendamping dalam peningkatan pemahaman keluarga penerima manfaat Program Keluarga Harapan terhadap pengasuhan dan pendidikan anak. *Jurnal Komunikasi dan Budaya*, 1(2), 76–90. <https://journal.unbara.ac.id/index.php/JKB/index>
- Sofianto, A. (2020). Implementasi Program Keluarga Harapan (PKH) di Provinsi Jawa Tengah. *Sosio Konsepsia*, 10(1), 14–31. <https://doi.org/10.33007/ska.v10i1.2091>
- Subagtio, M. E. (2020). Pola hidup konsumtif masyarakat penerima bantuan Program Keluarga Harapan (PKH): Studi kasus Desa Mojodeso, Kecamatan Kapas, Kabupaten Bojonegoro. *Jurnal Ilmiah Administrasi Publik dan Pembangunan*, 11(2), 115–128.
- Umasugi, M. (2023). Implementasi Pertemuan Peningkatan Kemampuan Keluarga (P2K2) melalui Program Keluarga Harapan (PKH) di Kecamatan Pulau Hiri. *Al Qalam: Jurnal Ilmiah Keagamaan dan Kemasyarakatan*, 17(3), 1512–1527. <https://doi.org/10.35931/aq.v17i3.2111>
- Wahyuni, W., Dwiarto, R., Suwarno, R. S., & Giyanto, B. (2023). Evaluasi kebijakan perlindungan sosial dan pengentasan kemiskinan melalui Program Keluarga Harapan (PKH). *Jurnal Pembangunan dan Administrasi Publik*, 11–22. <https://jurnal.stialan.ac.id/index.php/jpap/article/view/688>
- Wardani, W. A., Ismail, M., Kurniawansyah, E., & Sawaludin, S. (2023). Implementasi Program Keluarga Harapan (PKH) di Desa Tenga Kecamatan Woha Kabupaten Bima. *Jurnal Ilmiah Profesi Pendidikan*, 8(4), 2189–2196. <https://doi.org/10.29303/jipp.v8i4.1706>
- Zahran, W. S. (2025). Efektivitas Program Keluarga Harapan (PKH) dalam meningkatkan kesejahteraan rumah tangga miskin di Kabupaten Bekasi. *Jurnal Riset Rumpun Ilmu Sosial, Politik dan Humaniora*, 4(2), 102–112. <https://doi.org/10.55606/jurrissh.v4i2.4468>