

Kelompok Usaha Bersama (KUBE) And Poverty Level Performance In Sulawesi and Kalimantan Areas

1stAsrudi

*Economic Development
Musamus University*

Mopah lama merauke Indonesia
Email, Asrudi_fekon@unmus.ac.id

2ndTamsil Jayadi

*Compiler of program material on director
general of social Services*

*Kementrian social RI, Jakarta. indonesia
Email,jayaditamsil@gmail.com*

3rdWayrohi Meilvidiri

*Economic Development
Musamus University*

Mopah lama merauke Indonesia
Email, melvpiran@gmail.com

Abstract-Poverty is a nightmare that is very scary for the world's population and one of the global issues in every country that is developing and growing and poverty is where a person has a condition that is not memiliki sufficient resources and income, so the lack of basic necessities such as clothing, shelter, nutritious meals, clean water, and health care. To address the issue of poverty government programs have been rolled out to the poor one of which is a program addressing poverty through the Ministry of Social Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia kelompok usaha bersama (KUBE). Article aims to determine the effect of directly or indirectly variable budgets, experience, old school and the facilitation of the provincial poverty rate in the region of Sulawesi and Borneo islands through increased revenue. This study uses data regarding the number of members of KUBE budget recipients, Experience, Old School, Facilitation and Revenue KUBE members, to determine the independent variables (Budget, Experience, Old School and Facilitation) and intervening variables (income) and the dependent variable (Poverty). Budgets are directly variable (X1), Experience (X2), Old School (X3), Facilitation (X4) significantly affect poverty (Y2). While it indirectly through the variable income (Y1), budget variables influence significantly to poverty. While the experience variable, Old School, Facilitation no significant effect on poverty (Y2). It was concluded that Influence the Budget directly to poverty and significant positive effect but indirectly influence the budget to poverty through income positive and significant impact. While the influence of experience, old school, and facilitation directly to poverty have a significant negative effect whereas the effect of indirectly Old School to poverty through income had no significant effect.

Key words - budget, income, poverty

I. INTRODUCTION

Poverty is a very scary nightmare for the people of the world and one of the global issues in every country that is growing and developing. [5] also defines poverty that is there is inequality of opportunity to accumulate a base of social power, as well as the proposed [13] explains that the problem of poverty is one condition which can not access or enjoy a wide range of options

and opportunities meet their daily needs can not meet decent living standards, health, freedom, dignity.

No country can develop if most of the people in these countries are poor and unhappy is reinforced by the theory of Adam Smith explained in his book "An Inquiry into the Wealth of Nations". [12] describes the main issues is the development of inequality and poverty is. [2] First, to see that poverty is not only the characteristics of the poor are static, but can be viewed in a dynamic that has business relations and the ability of communities or individuals in responding to poverty. As for the second, in calculating the poverty rate is not a single good idea, but using analysis indicators family or household composites. Third, the concept of social skills (social capabilities) visits fuller compared the concept of revenue (income) in the condition of poverty dynamics that occur at the same time. Fourth, poor families can be measured social skills focused on some key indicators (key indicators) which encompasses the ability to obtain a livelihood (livelihood capabilities) poor families.

[3] said the terms of the social, economic and political terms the government's handling related to community development, programs or government or strategies that have been implemented to encourage the economic development of society. The program was conducted by the respective ministries and institutions. Example of Ministry of Forestry, Ministry of Public Works, Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Social Affairs, of Ministry of National Education, of Ministry of Health and others. Some of the programs that have been implemented for example: School Operational Assistance (BOS), Health Insurance for the Poor (ASKESKIN), Compensation Program Direct Cash Assistance (BLT), (Raskin), the Social Safety Net (SSN), PEMP, LUEB P2PK and others,

The purpose of this research is how the program addressing poverty is kelompok usaha bersama (KUBE) awarded Ministry of Social Affairs in the form of budgets, experience, old school and facilitation influence directly and indirectly to poverty through income in the region of Sulawesi and Borneo.

II. MATERIALS AND METHODS

A. Research sites:

Research conducted in the region of Sulawesi and Borneo namely West Sulawesi, North Sulawesi, Gorontalo Province, South Sulawesi, Southeast Sulawesi Province Central Sulawesi, West Kalimantan, Central Kalimantan Province, South Kalimantan and East Kalimantan Province,

B. Research Variable

Variable that used in this study Budget (X1), Experience (X2), Old School (X3), Facilitation (X4), Revenue (Y1), poverty (Y2).

C. Population and Sample

Population and sample in this study are provinces in Region Sulawesi and Borneo, which is supported KUBE budget years 2010 to 2015.

D. Data Analysis

The analysis of the data used in solving problems of this research is Structural Equation Model (SEM). Structural Equation Model (SEM) is a statistical technique that can be tested simultaneously and relatively complex.

III. RESULT

TABLE 1 ANALYSIS OF RELATIONSHIP OF DIRECT BUDGET, EXPERIENCES, OLD SCHOOL, FACILITATION AGAINST INCOME AND POVERTY

| | | | Standardized | Unstandardized | S.E. | C.R. | P |
|---------|----|--------------|--------------|----------------|-------|---------|-------------------|
| income | <- | budget | 0.435 | 1.08 | .290 | 3.713 | *** |
| income | <- | experience | 0.000 | 0.01 | 1.806 | .004 | .997 ^a |
| income | <- | Old school | -0.031 | -0.55 | 2.056 | -.268 | .789 ^a |
| income | <- | facilitation | -0.039 | -0.09 | .281 | -.335 | .738 ^a |
| poverty | <- | facilitation | -0.266 | -75.41 | .398 | 189.682 | *** |
| poverty | <- | Old school | -0.134 | -277.85 | 2.910 | 95.490 | *** |
| poverty | <- | P experience | -0.050 | -90.91 | 2.555 | 35.587 | *** |

| | | | Standardized | Unstandardized | S.E. | C.R. | P |
|---------|----|--------|--------------|----------------|------|---------|-----|
| poverty | <- | budget | 0.447 | 131.130 | .456 | 287.519 | *** |
| poverty | <- | income | 0.659 | 78.02 | .184 | 423.761 | *** |

Source: Testing Model Amos 5.

Table 1. Display a direct link budget (X1) to Revenue (Y1) showed significant positive effect while the direct effect of the Budget (X1) against Poverty (Y2) showed a significant positive effect. The direct effect of experience (X2) against Poverty (Y2) showed a significant negative effect. Then the direct influence of the Old School (X3) against Poverty (Y2) showed a significant negative effect. The direct effect Facilitation (X4) against poverty (Y2) showed a significant negative effect. While the direct effect of Income (X2) against Poverty (Y2) showed a significant positive effect.

IV. DISCUSSION

Budget impact on poverty either directly or indirectly has a significant positive effect. These findings are not consistent with the hypothesis at the beginning stating that the budget directly affects negatively and significantly to poverty. It shows the results of research that poverty is still increasing despite a budget increase because many people who claim poor so that they get help budget KUBE, then there are most KUBE dead or does not operate by reason of goods in production can not sell and marketing to lose competitiveness with employers the greater one.

In line with the theory of Sharp et al in [8] assess the causes of poverty can be seen from an economic standpoint. First, the differences in the pattern of ownership of resources will result in an uneven distribution of income. Second, the low quality of human resources have low productivity along with low wages. Third, the rise of poverty in the causes differences in access to capital. If the Capital here interpreted as granting the budget then it should increase the capital can help poor people to earn income and avoid poverty, but the results showed that with the addition of KUBE budget keeps them poor. According to research results [7] The same thing about KUBE analysis related to addressing poverty. Explains there are aspects of the context: Reference implementation of programs, mentoring and community built it hard to understand that the achievement of KUBE in the hope the maximum and yet can not reduce poverty optimally. This is in accordance with the opinion [11]. In the implementation guide that is not easy to implement. In addition

the Ministry of Social Affairs sectoral ego internal and external causes KUBE program implementation is not maximized.

Experience direct effect on poverty and had a significant negative effect. This finding is consistent with the above hypothesis that explains that the experience has a direct influence negative and significant poverty. This means that the increased experience can also increase revenue, in line with [9] that the work experience is a measure of the length of service and length of time taken by someone and can understand the duties of a job that has executed so well that they earn income and wealth, In line with [6] are just a few factors that affect work experience is one of them seen from his personal background that includes education, work experience,

While indirect experience has shown significant positive effect on poverty through income. These results are not in line with initial hypothesis that explains that the experience of having an indirect influence in a negative and significant impact on poverty. This is because although the experience they are growing but the workings or the work ethic in the region of Sulawesi and Kalimantan low so that the experience does not reduce poverty despite KUBE members' income increases, but poverty is still increasing. This is in line with research [11] who said that the selection process in accordance with the companion KUBE not expected, because in addition to the lack of working experience in managing KUBE groups, in addition to the proposal submitted does not match the existing potential in the region, plus the lack of delivery of programs through socialization. Monitoring and evaluation program that has not done well, but there is no follow-up evaluation in order to program it unclear resulting in poverty is still increasing and there is no follow-up evaluation so that the program is not clear. So that poverty is still increasing.

Old School influence on poverty either directly or indirectly have a significant negative effect. This finding is consistent with the above hypothesis that explains that the negative influence of the old school directly and indirectly to poverty through income. [4] says that the increase in the number of years of study is a prerequisite for economic development stage is visible from the side of education. the quality of human resources will also be good if the higher one's education, as well as affect your productivity. When the increase in productivity will increase revenue or income earned will also increase, will help people out of poverty.

It was discovered by researchers that the old school / education taken effect on poverty levels and income. Any individual who does not have a good education levels and adequate doomed to poor condition and do not have much income, and quality of the resources will be bad. This is in line with the view of [1] which says that the people who want to advance, and in spite of the poverty of education is a necessity. Same with housing needs, clothing, and food. In fact, education is the main requirement.

Next [10] explains that the average length of the school community can reduce the level of poverty in Indonesia, where highly educated people who have the skills and expertise to increase productivity. And increased productivity can increase output, increasing labor costs, so it can increase people's purchasing power and reduce poverty.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusion The analysis of the study conducted by researchers drew the conclusion that the Budget Allocation positive effect on poverty levels significantly, both directly and indirectly. Experience negative effect on poverty levels significantly directly whereas experience against poverty through significant positive revenue indirectly. Old School negative effect on poverty levels significantly, both directly and indirectly. Facilitation negative effect on poverty levels significantly, both directly and indirectly.

Suggestions from researchers that the aid budget reassessing KUBE necessary because the results showed that the increase in the budget add to increased poverty. Meaning of the Ministry of Social Affairs to see and photograph the poverty firsthand. Experience is the quantity and quality of work that should have been classified in accordance with the KUBE group work experience each resulting in the implementation of more effective and optimal KUBE. Old School and education related KUBE members who mostly graduated from elementary schools, provision of job training tailored to the level of education that have been obtained in order to improve their resources. Facilitation escort or facilitator should have experience and knowledge of competence according to the type of business and group activities KUBE they facilitation, in other words designated facilitator should be in accordance with their expertise. Besides scheduled visits or assistance KUBE groups must comply with the schedule that has been set. To reduce

poverty the government represented by the Ministry of Social can use variables Budget, Experiences, Old School and Fasilitasi.

REFERENCE

- [1] Ahmad, Khairil. "Solusi kemiskinan", (online), ([http://sahabatbaru.blogspot.com/solusi kemiskinan, html](http://sahabatbaru.blogspot.com/solusi_kemiskinan_html), diakses 22 juli 2019), 2009.
- [2] Agussalim., "Mereduksi Kemiskinan Sebuah Proposal Baru untuk Indonesia". Makassar : Nala Cipta Litera, 2009.
- [3] Ala, B. Andre, "Kemiskinan dan Strategi Memerangi Kemiskinan", Liberti Offset, 1996.
- [4] Frankel Ernst, G, "Port Planning and Development". New York, John Wiley & Sons, 1997.
- [5] Freidmean, "Empowerment (The Politics of Alternatif Development)". USA : Blackwell Publisher the Cambridge Center USA, 1993.
- [6] Handoko, T. Hani, "Manajemen Edisi 2". BPFE : Yogyakarta : Jakarta. 1984.
- [7] Mujiadi, dkk, "Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Miskin, studi evaluasi penanggulangan Kemiskinan di lima Provinsi" Badan Pendidikan dan Penelitian Kesejahteraan Sosial. Jakarta : P3KS Press, 2009.
- [8] Mudrajad Kuncoro, "Ekonomika Pembangunan, Teori, Masalah, dan Kebijakan". Yogyakarta: UPP AMP YKPN, 2006.
- [9] Ranupandojo. (1984). Metode dan Tehnik Pengalaman Kerja. Yogyakarta.
- [10] Suparno. (2010). "Analisis Pertumbuhan Ekonomi dan Pengurangan Kemiskinan", 2010.
- [11] Suradi dkk., "Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Miskin, studi Evaluasi Penanggulangan Kemiskinan di lima Provinsi, Pusat Penelitian dan Pengembangan Kesejahteraan Sosial. Badan Pendidikan dan Penelitian Kesejahteraan Sosial" Kementerian Sosial Republik Indonesia. Jakarta. P3KS Press, 2007.
- [12] Todaro, Michael P. (2000). "Pembangunan Ekonomi Dunia Ketiga", Edisi ketujuh. Jakarta, 2000.
- [13] World Bank., World Development Report 2004. "Making Better Services for the Poor" Oxford University Press, 2004.