



Poverty Alleviation Through the Cash for Work Program:

A Case Study on the Implementation of Good Enough Governance in Nanga Pamolontian Village and Mekar Mulya Village of Lamandau Regency, Central Kalimantan

Triadi Eka Asi Jayadiputera^(✉), Sumartono Sumartono, Mohammad Nuh, and Sujarwoto Sujarwoto

Department of Public Administration, Universitas Brawijaya, Malang, Indonesia
ejtriadi@gmail.com

Abstract. Good governance has been expected to solve poverty in developing countries, yet it faces many challenges. Criticism has been addressed by the new concept known as Good Enough Governance (GEG), believing that developing countries must only focus on the resources they have to solve problems; they do not need to do everything at once. Cash for Work, representing good governance, faces problems when implemented without considering each village's readiness and characteristics. We analyzed characteristics of the policy arena, institutions and interests, actions, and choices supporting GEG principles in Cash for Work. The study was a qualitative case study in Nanga Pamolontian and Mekar Mulya Village of Lamandau Regency, Central Kalimantan, employing pattern match for data analysis. Findings confirmed that Mekar Mulya was more ready for Cash for Work than Nanga Pamolontian due to their different cultures. However, Cash for Work did not alleviate poverty because the poor were not involved in the program. Lack of technical guidance, training, and stakeholder support affected the program's success. We propose government interventions in the policy arena, institutions and interests, actions, and choices like policy champions to alleviate poverty; it takes the political will, guidance, supervision, and delegation from the regency government to village governments based on each village's characteristics.

Keywords: Good Enough Governance · Cash For Work · Poverty Alleviation

1 Introduction

Good Governance (GG), which was previously designed to alleviate poverty, has not been able to answer all challenges in developing countries. Indonesia, as one of the developing countries, has prepared a program for rural areas named Cash for Work (CFW). CFW was planned during the era of GG to alleviate poverty, increase purchasing power, and improve the economy. However, CFW has not been able to reach its goals and turned problematic.

© The Author(s) 2023

F. Hidayati et al. (Eds.): ICoPAG 2022, ASSEHR 761, pp. 401–416, 2023.

https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-082-4_36

During the reformation era, changes were made related to rural governments with the issuance of Law Number 6 of 2014 concerning Village, in which normative decentralization could encourage GG because it aims to get the government closer to the people and improve community participation in village affairs to realize transparency, accountability, and responsiveness of village governments [1]. One reformation form related to villages is the transfer of authority from the local governments to village governments and the village structure; the most significant change during the reformation era for villages has been village funds (*Dana Desa*), regulated in Government Regulation Number 60 of 2014 concerning Village Funds from the State Budget.

Village Funds are transferred from the local governments to village governments to be included in Village Budgets. As stated in the Village Budget, villages must provide goods and services to the people as part of their commitment to community empowerment and development. Article 1 Number 12 of Regulation of the Head of the Institution for Government Goods and Services Procurement Number 12 of 2019 concerning Guidelines for Preparation of Goods and Services in the Village states that the Procurement of Village Goods and Services, hereinafter referred to as Procurement, is an activity to obtain goods and by the Village Government through self-management and/or providers of goods and services.

Article 5 Paragraph 1 mentions that Procurement prioritizes community participation through self-management efforts by maximizing existing resources through cooperation to open job opportunities and community empowerment for villagers. Article 1 Paragraph 19 also mentions that self-management efforts refer to the procurement of goods and services by the village community or a team appointed to do the procurement.

Self-management efforts were made in 2018 through a Cash for Work (CFW) Model, as mentioned by the Ministry of Finance. As the President of the Republic of Indonesia mandates, self-management efforts aim to improve people's purchasing power, especially the poor. Therefore, from the mandate, the term CFW appeared.

CFW has good goals accompanied by a large sum of funds. Unfortunately, the program was implemented without considering the readiness and characteristic of each village. In fact, not all villages were ready for CFW. Developed villages have found CFW easy to implement, yet the case is different for developing and underdeveloped villages.

CFW, according to the 2018 CFW Guideline, refers to village community empowerment, especially for the poor and marginalized, that is productive and emphasizes the use of local resources, labor, and technology to create additional wage or income, reduce poverty, and improve the welfare. The objectives of CFW can be elaborated as follows: (a) creating employment through self-management development programs; (b) increasing togetherness and community participation; (c) improving the quality and quantity of community empowerment programs; (d) opening access for the poor, women, children, and the marginalized to primary education and health services; (e) increasing the people's income; and (f) generating social and economic activities in villages.

The 2018 CFW Guideline mentions the following groups as its targets: (a) unemployed (residents, men and women, but not children, without jobs, losing jobs, and looking for jobs); (b) disguised unemployment (residents working less than the average number of regular working hours or < 35 h per week) and farmers facing famine or

are waiting for the planting time and harvesting; (c) the poor (residents with an average monthly per capita below the poverty line); and (d) stunting (residents who have under-five with nutritional problems).

CFW can cover the following activities: (a) development and/or rehabilitation of facilities and infrastructure under the village authority, including improvement of river channels and irrigation, development and/or improvement of roads and bridges under the village authority, and boat tiers; (b) Land utilization to increase productivity, including forest areas, for agriculture, forestry, plantation, farm, and fisheries; (c) other productive activities, including the development of tourist villages, creative economy, local economic development through entrepreneurship, management of agricultural products; management of service businesses and small industries; (d) community empowerment, including waste management, residential environmental management, renewable energy development, provision and distribution of additional food for children (infants and toddlers); and (e) other activities. In addition, activities that are not directly related to the completion of the physical work of the building but support the success of the physical work, for example, driving a vehicle for transporting materials and work tools, are also encouraged. Thus, CFW is the central government's policy to empower the village community to alleviate poverty; however, many CFW activities focus on the physical development of buildings, roads, bridges, and others.

However, unprepared human resources and lack of technical guidance, training, and stakeholder support have hindered CFW from achieving its goals. As a result, the program was recklessly implemented, opening chances for fraud and corruption. There have been cases of village officials put in jail for misappropriation of funds, as happened to village officials from Kina and Kujan Village [2].

If this continues, CFW can become a boomerang for villages, and poverty alleviation becomes impossible; the government must take action to stop this. GG has not been able to solve the problems of countries in unstable conditions, such as countries in the post-conflict stage or developing countries. The one-size-fits-for-all principle proposed by GG is not suitable for all the different conditions each country faces since countries have different roots of problems.

Countries facing unstable conditions will find it hard to implement GG since it will take a long winding road [3]. Thus, developing countries are encouraged to implement what is needed following a development priority based on the country's characteristics; in other words, there is no need to implement all GG principles. This led to the emergence of Good Enough Governance (GEG). GEG is an intervention effort the government does by changing the policy and institutions following the country's characteristics under the minimum required conditions for economic and political development.

GEG is a minimum condition for acceptable government performance and civil society involvement that does not significantly hinder economic and political development and allows poverty alleviation initiatives to progress [3, 4]. Therefore, GEG also discusses governance interventions, especially in policy reform. GEG suggests that not all government deficiencies need to be resolved in one go, and since institutions and capacities are products of time, government achievements can also be reversed. GEG elements are reflected in policy and institutional reform [4] as follows: (a) *arena* is a place or environment where the policy is implemented, divided into agenda setting,

design, adoption, implementation, and sustainability; (b) *interests and institutions* focus on assessing the context of governance reforms and how the content affects institutional interests and capacities; and (c) *actions and choices* refer to the steps chosen and taken, emphasizing that opportunities for changes are always limited by certain measures, and in some cases by existing institutions, power structures, and political capacities. GEG plays in the policy arena, starting from agenda setting, designs, adoption, implementation, and sustainability—GEG is affected by interests and institutions and is executed through actions and choices [4].

CFW also faces the same problem—not all villages are ready, and each village has different characteristics. CFW is not optimal due to problems in regulation, human resources, coordination, evaluation, and others.

Based on the background, we were interested in analyzing CFW implementation in Nanga Pamolontian and Mekar Mulya Village from GEG perspectives (the policy arena, interests and institutions, and actions and choices). Therefore, we chose GEG since the concept is theoretically used to analyze policy and institutional reform in developing countries so that it would suit our research purposes. Moreover, CFW is part of the reform agenda of GG as CFW was born from Law Number 6 of 2014 concerning Villages. In addition, CFW aims to alleviate poverty, increase purchasing power, and improve the economy, and it can also solve corruption in the process of physical development in villages. Not to exclude is the fact that political elites and the policy development process are important determinants of the reform agenda [4].

2 Literature Review

2.1 Good Governance

Landell-Mills and Serageldin [5] defined good governance as using political authority and power to manage resources for socio-economic development. The government needs to carry out its functions within good governance by creating a cooperative public administration system with a public service approach relevant to the needs of the communities. Therefore, it is necessary to implement planned, systematic, and integrated steps in doing so.

Good governance in developing countries, especially in Indonesia, has encountered various obstacles. Therefore, the implementation of good governance requires time and specific strategies. There are nine main inhibiting factors of good governance implementation in local government [6]: (a) communication, (b) lack of guidelines for implementing good governance, (c) leadership, (d) human resource and local government capacity, (e) political history, (f) local government customs and culture, (g) employee remuneration and welfare system, (h) minimum public service standards, and (i) community involvement.

In reality, good governance is not always “good”. Good governance has received criticism due to several weaknesses. Walters [7] mention three criticisms of good governance: (a) not all countries need good governance; (b) governance cannot be effectively improved despite conscious efforts—in practice, government institutions are complex, often political, and constantly shaped by context; and (c) the standards set by developed

countries are beyond the reach of developing countries and are unsuitable for developing countries.

2.2 Good “Enough” Governance

According to Grindle [4], Good Enough Governance (GEG) means that not all governance deficiencies need to be resolved in one go. Institutions and capacities are products of the time. GEG pays direct attention to the minimum government needs that enable political and economic development. There are several principles of GEG implementation: 1) providing the greatest benefits for poverty alleviation; 2) time oriented; 3) priority scale oriented; and 4) paying attention to available human resources [3].

GEG in policy and institutional reform is divided into several elements. (1) *Arena* is a place or environment where the policy is implemented. The arena itself can be divided into agenda setting, design, adoption, implementation, and sustainability. (2) *Interests* and *institutions* focus on assessing the context in which governance reforms will occur and how the content affects institutional interests and capacities. (3) *Actions* and *choices* refer to the steps chosen and taken. Good governance hardly contributes to poverty reduction [3]. Good governance is fraught with ambiguity, problems, and possible failures and expected outcomes. Good governance or good enough governance is a long-term goal. Efforts to achieve it will often stop and can be reversed.

2.3 Cash for Work as Community Empowerment

Cash for Work is a village community empowerment effort. The local community carries out planning to supervision activities. According to Kartasasmita [8], community empowerment is an effort to increase the dignity of the society as the community is currently unable to escape poverty and underdevelopment. Community empowerment has the following principles [9]. (1) *Working*. Community empowerment must involve the community as much as possible to do the activity. (2) *Consequences*. The empowerment activities must have a good or beneficial effect or influence. (3) *Association*. Every empowerment activity must be linked to other activities because everyone tends to associate or link their activities with other activities or events. The objectives of community empowerment refer to the following improvements (a) better education, (b) better accessibility, (c) better action, (d) better institution, (e) better business, (f) better income, (g) better environment, (h) better living, and (i) better community [9].

3 Methodology

This study was qualitative. Qualitative research is a method to explore and understand the meaning that, by some individuals or groups of people, is seen to root in social or humanitarian problems [10]. We employed a descriptive case study approach. In general, case studies are a more suitable strategy when the main research questions are about how and why, when the researcher has little opportunity to control the events to be investigated, and when the research focuses on contemporary phenomena (present) in the real-life context [11]. Moreover, a case study is systematic. It examines detailed and in-depth phenomena of our real-life contexts. It is more directed to analyzing unique and interesting problems or phenomena in depth.

Since we used the case study method, we described not only CFW implementation in general but also the characteristics of the policy arena, interests and institutions, and actions and choices. Our study took place in Nanga Pamolontian and Mekar Mulya in Lamandau Regency; the two villages had different characteristics. Nanga Pamolontian is a new village; it was a division from the parent village. Mekar Mulya has long existed since Lamandau Regency was born; it was an ex-transmigration village. Therefore, we expected that the different characteristics would reveal the phenomena in CFW.

Data were collected from several sources: informants, events, and documents. Key informants were chosen through purposive sampling using a criterion-based selection, meaning that we, as the researchers, determined the number of research informants based on certain considerations. The primary selection criterion was related to data and information needed. We chose informants having the required data related to our research problems; we only interviewed informants willing to provide the information. Our informants were the village head, the Head of the Village Consultative Body (*Badan Permusyawaratan Desa – BPD*), the Head of the Management Team (*Tim Pelaksana Kegiatan - TPK*), the district head, experts on Village Community Development and Empowerment Program (*Program Pembangunan dan Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Desa - P3MD*), and the Head of the Village Empowerment Office (*Dinas Pemberdayaan Masyarakat dan Desa - DPMD*).

Events refer to phenomena or situations related to the research focus or problems. The events in our research focus included the characteristics of the policy arena, institutions and interests, and actions and choices in CFW. The observed events included preparation and planning, implementation, evaluation, monitoring, reporting, and supervision.

CFW documents were given by the officials at the DPMD Office of Lamandau Regency, district, and villages. We also collected documents related to policy implementation (minister regulations, regional regulations, regent regulations, regent decrees, village regulations, village decrees, and others), minutes of meetings, implementation reports, and others.

Primary data were directly collected from the data source through interviews, observations, and focus group discussions. Primary data are also called original or new data and are up to date. Secondary data were collected from existing sources, such as the Central Bureau of Statistics, books, reports, journals, and others.

The stages in our study were as follows [11]. (1) Design. GEG would be seen with the process of CFW. We then chose villages with the highest and lowest scores in implementing GEG in CFW—the villages were Nanga Pamolontian and Mekar Mulya. (2) Data collection and analysis for single data. We collected data through interviews, observations, and documentation in the field. We then wrote a single individual report and conducted pattern matching analysis on the policy and replicas; we matched previous assumptions with the data collected from the field. We matched the pattern concerning the previously assumed characteristics of the policy arena, institutions and interests, actions, and choices. (3) Cross-case analysis. This analysis aimed to combine and compare the findings generated from all cases. The steps taken in this cross-case analysis were as follows. First, we drew conclusions from 2 (two) categories: Mekar Mulya Nanga Pamolontian. Then, we modified the theory to the findings in the previous conclusion. The conclusions of cross-cases were linked to the theory used and then modified

according to the research findings. Third, we developed policy implications by conducting a cross-analysis in one case based on the findings generated in each category. The modified theory could be used to develop policy implications derived from the case study's findings. The temporary findings from Mekar Mulya were compared with those from Nanga Pamolontian for their similarities and differences, resulting in cross-case findings between the two villages. This finding was the final finding of the study. (4) Writing conclusions between cases. From the results of pattern matching and cross-case analysis, conclusions could be drawn between cases, and a final conclusion could be drawn to answer the research problem.

4 Results and Discussion

The following section presents the results of the cross-case analysis in Nanga Pamolontian and Mekar Mulya on the implementation of GEG in the CFW program from the perspective of the policy arena (agenda, setting, design, adoption, implementation, and sustainability) affected by institutions and interests, actions, and choices.

4.1 Results

Agenda Setting. Determining CFW's agenda could be done in formal and informal ways. Interview results with the village heads showed that both cases used more formal channels in planning for CFW through village deliberation (*Musyawaharah Perencanaan Pembangunan Desa*). However, both villages did not use informal channels, such as the mass media and social organizations, to collect people's aspirations.

The role of interest groups was not visible. The mass media also did not show much of its role in discussing matters that could become the development agenda. The community also did not show much of its involvement. Yet, Mekar Mulya had given its community part to share their ideas, criticism, suggestions, and others through the website and suggestion box.

From the interest and institutional aspect, the community at Mekar Mulya was more open than that at Nanga Pamolontian. Moreover, people at Mekar Mulya were used to cooperation and had a higher sense of togetherness, which was crucial for CFW.

The executive role is vital in implementing this program because it requires policy intervention in economic and political development. Unfortunately, data confirmed that Nanga Pamolontian had not issued a particular policy regarding CFW. However, Mekar Mulya has made a breakthrough by making wage standards based on price surveys determined through village meetings.

The issue affecting this year's CFW was the Covid-19 pandemic; the pandemic had forced villages to refocus their budget for direct cash assistance (*Bantuan Langsung Tunai* – BLT). The decrease in funding led to reduced funds for CFW, which finally affected the total activities.

In the action aspect, the interview results showed that the heads of the Management Team at both villages were not capable of making budget planning that they were dependent on consultants (the third party) from outside of the villages. It happened due to the minimum training they received before CFW.

There were some interesting differences between the two villages. Nanga Pamolontian, as a newly expanded village, has a local Malay Dayak community, while Mekar Mulya is an ex-transmigration village dominated by Javanese and Sundanese ethnic groups. The villages have different characteristics, which later turned out to affect the implementation of CFW, which relies heavily on human resource capabilities as workers. The two villages have different prime policies. Nanga Pamolontian's prime policy was on distributing oil palm plasma from village gardens, while Mekar Mulya had already established and started pioneering an agrotourism village.

Design. The two villages implemented different policies when CFW was formulated, especially those related to workers' wages. Nanga Pamolontian took the initiative to comply with the wage provisions following the General Cost Standards set by the regency, believing that the village should not make rules on wages. However, Mekar Mulya partly determined wages based on actual conditions in the village. Mekar Mulya considered that the wage standard from the regency no longer followed the actual conditions in the field, so adjustments had to be made through village meetings. Thus, the community could get a decent wage and be willing to work in CFW.

For the interest and institution aspect, the regency government did not formulate a particular policy because there was no directive from the central government. Thus, there should be an initiative from the local government to make breakthrough policies for implementation in their region; one example is the delegation of authority to determine wages that adjust to village conditions.

In terms of action, there was a very striking difference between Nanga Pamolontian and Mekar Mulya regarding recruitment and experience in carrying out work. Nanga Pamolontian is a newly developed village, so the people did not have much experience in carrying out the work. In contrast, Mekar Mulya had more experience.

Because the focus was on intervention, public policy must lead to actions in areas that can indeed be intervened. Therefore, it is appropriate to formulate policies to overcome the various problems in CFW, including the limited members of the Management Team.

The people in Nanga Pamolontian were not fully involved, but the people in Mekar Mulya were completely involved. This was because cooperation had long become part of the culture of Mekar Mulya—people were used to working together, and with or without CFW, they voluntarily worked to build their village. Unfortunately, this did not appear in Nanga Pamolontian—it was hard to look for workers. Therefore, the village government must work hard to encourage better community participation.

Adoption. The interview results with the village heads showed that CFW socialization was first done in 2018 by the regency government, and there had been no other socialization efforts since then. Both villages accepted CFW well because they realized that the development activities were crucial for their villages.

The Village Consultative Body, as representatives of the community in the development process, has a very vital role; therefore, the relationship between the Village Consultative Body and the village government should be reciprocal, not unidirectional. But unfortunately, the role of the Village Consultative Body in the two villages is very different. In Nanga Pamolontian, although the relationship between the Village Head and the Village Consultative Body is always harmonious, the Village Consultative Body

rarely provides input, suggestions, or criticism. This was different from the Village Consultative Body of Mekar Mulya; the members of the Village Consultative Body regularly hold meetings with the Village Head to solve problems in the village.

From the observations, CFW in Nanga Pamolontian was done by contractors, and only a few villagers were involved; thus, people thought that a third party had taken the program over. On the other hand, in Mekar Mulya, many local people were involved in CFW as mandated by the program.

The two villages perceived the policy characteristics specified in CFW differently. The village head of Nanga Pamolontian felt their village was unsuitable for CFW due to their limited resource capacity. In contrast, Mekar Mulya Village felt that CFW was very suitable for their village because they felt capable of implementing the program.

Complaints regarding the actual CFW implementation between the two villages were not much different—it was about the disbursement of the Village Fund, which consisted of 3 (three) stages, the absence of guidance and supervision, and the lack of training for the Management Team. Therefore, villages are forced to do what they can to overcome the problems.

The other difference was that the workers in Mekar Mulya were originally from Mekar Mulya, while the workers in Nanga Pamolontian were from outside the village. For CFW activities in Mekar Mulya, the workers were the residents living around the site of the CFW project. For example, the culvert work was located on the border of neighborhoods 1 (RT 1) and 2 (RT 2), so the work was done by the people living in the two neighborhoods, regardless of their social status (poor or not). In addition, the workers in Mekar Mulya had the skills needed for the work, but those in Nanga Pamolontian did not.

Implementation. Based on the observations, there were differences in perceptions of the interests affected in the two villages. In Nanga Pamolontian, it was not easy to find workers. Therefore, the village head of Nanga Pamolontian recruited workers from outside the village. Meanwhile, in Mekar Mulya, the affected interest was the interest of the people living around the CFW site, because they enjoyed the development, and the workers.

The advantages of CFW in the two villages were also different. The regency mentioned that, theoretically, CFW aims to reduce unemployment and disguised unemployment, alleviate poverty, improve productivity, and increase income and purchasing power. However, the real advantages of CFW were given by the villages. For example, people in Nanga Pamolontian said the advantage was the infrastructure built, and people in Mekar Mulya said they could enjoy development products.

The answer from the regency sounded too sophisticated, given in such systematic words; the villages gave simple answers. The regency government mentioned that CFW improved community empowerment in development, the sense of belonging to the village, and job opportunities. However, the Head of Nanga Pamolontian mentioned that no changes happened from CFW. However, the Head of Mekar Mulya gave a wiser answer that CFW helped build cooperation between community members.

The different perspectives between the two villages related to changes after CFW were affected by their experience and characteristics. As a new village, Nanga Pamolontian was eager to develop its area and wanted to do everything fast.

There were also differences in the policy content of the two villages related to resources. For example, Nanga Pamolontian found it hard to find workers due to the low wages offered. Thus, CFW could not generate the expected changes of alleviating poverty; it instead was only able to provide facilities and infrastructure. Mekar Mulya, on the other hand, found CFW easy because cooperation had been part of its culture. Although CFW could not truly alleviate poverty as its main goal, the people could enjoy the facilities and infrastructure provided. CFW also increased the spirit of togetherness and cooperation between the people.

The authority for CFW implementation in both villages was on the village heads with the Management Team as the controller. However, the Head of the Village Empowerment Office mentioned that the characteristics of the two villages differed. In Nanga Pamolontian, there was a change in the Management Team between 2019 and 2020 because the team did not perform well. Yet, no changes happened in Mekar Mulya because the existing team was considered capable of doing the task well.

The Management Team of Nanga Pamalontian had 5 members, while the Management Team of Mekar Mulya had 3 members. Thus, the Management Team of Mekar Mulya needed a lower cost than Nanga Pamalontian. In addition, more members of the Management Team did not guarantee better performance. With only a few FW programs, the villages did not need many Management Team members.

In the aspect of interest and institutions, both villages had different characteristics, especially from capacity. The Management Team members of Nanga Pamolontian were new and still needed to learn much, while those from Mekar Mulya were experienced and skillful in doing their job affecting the program's success.

Different ways of thinking also led to differences between the two villages and affected the interests. As a new village, Nanga Pamolontian was willing to have all the infrastructure and facilities complete as soon as possible. Mekar Mulya, on the other hand, focused on improving community involvement and empowerment.

The regency and district government rarely provided guidance and supervision. Sometimes, guidance and supervision were available partially in quality and quantity. Guidance and supervision were not integral and integrated, including all aspects of the village.

The action aspect could be seen in the influence of the Head of the Management Team because they had the biggest role in CFW implementation. As mentioned before, The Management Team members of Nanga Pamolontian were new and still needed to learn much, while those from Mekar Mulya were experienced and skillful in doing their job affecting the program's success. However, both teams were willing to solve all the problems regardless of their limitation. For example, Nanga Pamolontian recruited builders from other places for the community to learn. On the other hand, Mekar Mulya used a different technique from the previous year—in 2019, CFW involved people living around the site, yet in 2020, CFW was done by the youth at night because they had to work during the daytime. Regardless of using different strategies, both villages had similar goals of finishing CFW on time. The most important thing was that CFW ran well and reached the expected targets, influence, and advantages.

Sustainability. Basically, CFW must be done continuously. The Head of the Village Empowerment Office said CFW needed the commitments and support of local heads in

decision making and policy planning and the commitment of village heads in its implementation to guarantee success. CFW also needs community involvement, from planning, implementation, to supervision. In addition, CFW also needs special regulations from the local government.

The Head of Nanga Pamolontian said that training for the Management Team would be crucial for CFW sustainability. The Head of Mekar Mulya confirmed the need for supervision, evaluation, and specific regulation to guarantee the program's success.

The reality in both villages, especially in Nanga Pamolontian, led to the emergence of new stakeholders in CFW. However, instead of empowering the local people, CFW had opened opportunities for third parties, which were contractors. The policymakers must take the matter seriously. The other stakeholder was the Local Assistant (*Pendamping Lokal Desa* – PLD). The Local Assistant must become good partners of the village in the development process; they must have good capacity and commitment to the village and CFW.

The Management Team members also complained about the low incentive they got compared to the total fund of CFW. Therefore, the regency government must solve the problem and establish specific regulations. The two villages used different amount of basic salary for the Management Team members; Nanga Pamolontian used the standard set by the regency, while Mekar Mulya used the standard used in the village. The central government has no time for these trivial matters, so the local government must have its own policy.

The regency government rarely evaluated CFW; evaluation was done by the district government with such limited human resources. It will be better if guidance and evaluation are done by certain teams involving local officials to minimize mistakes in auditing.

4.2 Discussion

CFW implementation from the perspective of GEG in the aspect of the arena, starting from agenda setting, design, adoption, and action, will be explained as follows.

Agenda Setting. The policy process starts from a policy “agenda” that comes from the agenda-setting process, followed by policy formulation [12]. In determining this agenda, the point is to make issues in society part of the government's policy agenda by maximizing the role of the mass media, press, social organizations, and other institutions.

Regarding interests and institutions, interest groups appear to have no role in setting the agenda in CFW. However, the power and resources of an interest group can mobilize the community to voice their will and interests into a policy agenda [3]. Therefore, the government needs to foster this interest group so that it can voice its agenda.

The role of executive policy was also not visible because there was no specific policy set by the regency government, which should be able to provide direction and guidance for villages to solve poverty problems and empower communities in the village, as stated by Stevan Peterson in Nugroho [12] that public policy as government action to address some problems.

The non-involvement of the community as workers proved that the program was not empowering, let alone not involving the poor. One of the principles of community

empowerment is *work*, meaning that community empowerment must involve the community as much as possible to empower the poor to have the skills to leave the poverty trap [9].

The GEG framework focuses on assessing the context in which governance reform will take place and how its content affects institutional interest and capacity [4]. For this reason, actions that need to be taken include: (1) maximizing the duties of local assistants; (2) ensuring there is room for maneuver in program policies for change to occur; (3) capacity building; and (4) focusing on the role of local and village governments.

Design. One of the limitations in public policy is the technical ability to formulate the policy itself [12]. So far, in Lamandau Regency, there has been no technical policy design due to limited technical capacity. Therefore, GEG may be a more realistic approach for developing countries. The core elements are the focus (what needs to be done), sequencing (when it needs to be done), approach (how it needs to be done), selection (what is important and what is not), and pragmatism (what is feasible and what is not) [4, 13]. Concerning program implementation, designing a policy at the local level requires a different arena from each region with different characteristics.

In terms of actions, community participation plays an important role. However, community participation in Nanga Pamolontian is low compared to Mekar Mulya because Mekar Mulya's culture of cooperation is very strong, added with their good ability to do physical work.

To sum up, strong local leadership is needed to invite the community to participate in the development process. The growth and development of community participation in development are largely determined by three main elements, namely: (1) the opportunity given to the community to participate; (2) the willingness of the community to participate; (3) the community's ability to participate [14]. Therefore, this stage needs to be designed so that the community can even be required to participate in CFW.

Adoption. The lack of CFW socialization resulted in low policy acceptance or public response. Therefore, the government must also understand the contents of the policy. In other words, the community is ready to implement or be part of the policy; on the other hand, the bureaucrats are ready to become policy implementers [12].

One limitation in each policy is the institutional limitation, namely the adequate skills of officials to manage practices within government institutions and community institutions professionally. This needs to be observed because public policy contains practical and pragmatic properties—it must be feasible, implementable, suitable, and reasonable and can be implemented sustainably [12]. Therefore, the government needs to improve the implementing agency at the village, district, and regency levels regarding managerial capabilities in the field and administration.

Policy adoption is when the public accepts it as necessary for the future, and the government accepts the policy as a task that must be carried out [15]. If this adoption can run well, the implementation will also be well. For this reason, a marketing policy of CFW should be carried out so that the adoption process runs well. The stages after the policy process begins are creating a policy agenda from the agenda-setting process, policy analysis, and policy formulation (design) [12]. After the policy is formulated, the next task is to carry out: (1) marketing policy to obtain policy acceptance and adoption from the target group and (2) policy preparation to prepare human resources or bureaucrats

for implementing policies. Adoption is important because it represents the effort to socialize this reform, especially to the opposition, to ensure that this policy reform can be implemented.

Implementation. The Grindle Model is determined by the content of the policy and the context of its implementation [12]. The basic idea is that the policy implementation is carried out after the policy is transformed. Therefore, its success is determined by the degree of policy implementability. From the policy content, CFW needs to be improved, especially in the degree of change desired and the implementers of the policy. Findings showed that CFW could not change the life of the poor as the program's target group; CFW has not been able to permanently improve the welfare of the community because its activities are temporary. After CFW is completed, people who previously had no jobs will be jobless again. CFW must not stop just like that—it must be able to provide income throughout the year.

In this regard, the strategy needed in CFW is related to empowering rural communities. Of the five-stage empowerment strategies [16], Lamandau Regency begins the fourth stage, which is to develop community activities (people movement) by organizing the community members, identifying local problems and needs, and mobilizing the existing resource. This strategy not only influences the policy but also leads to changes in its implementation. Therefore, this strategy is appropriate for CFW because CFW also deals with resource mobilization (people as workers). Furthermore, it is hoped that this strategy can lead to the fifth stage, empowering people by considering the importance of development, technology, competition, and cooperation. This stage asks for a more open space for the ability and courage of the community and the government's recognition of local initiatives.

The primary purpose of a policy is to intervene. Therefore, policy implementation is the intervention action itself. In this regard, it is necessary to have policy interventions set by the regency, district, and village governments that are specifically related to CFW.

Sustainability. Sustainable development must consider the followings: (1) improvement of financial capital, (2) improvement of physical capital, (3) Improvement of human resource capital, (4) development of social capital, and (5) natural resource management [17]. Thus, human capital improvement and social capital development are very much needed for the sustainability of CFW.

CFW will be sustainable if there is continuous evaluation and monitoring by the relevant agencies. Evaluation will result in improvements in subsequent government policies. Evaluation is very useful for the empowerment activity: (1) to find out how far the objectives of the activity have been achieved; (2) to look for evidence, whether activities have been carried out as planned, and whether all the changes benefit the beneficiaries; (3) to find out all problems that arise related to the desired goal; (4) to measure the effectiveness and efficiency of the work system and empowerment methods that have been implemented; and (5) to attract the sympathy of the officials and citizens [18].

In addition to evaluations, monitoring is also needed to (1) prevent irregularities, errors, and delays, (2) ensure that the implementation process follows the appropriate implementation model, and (3) ensure that policy implementation leads to the desired

policy performance. In addition, evaluation is an early warning system if deviations occur in implementation.

From the experience, information, and discussions with the village government of Nanga Pamolontian and Mekar Mulya, the followings are obtained: (1) not all villages are ready to implement CFW due to limited resources, so specific preparations are needed; (2) if villages are ready to implement CFW, they should be encouraged to do so to alleviate poverty; (3) it is necessary to increase the capacity of the Management Team; (4) villages should be given delegation of authority, such as setting wage standards, to be more independent than before; (5) it is necessary to carry out monitoring and evaluation of CFW; (6) the role of the facilitation team for CFW must be improved to assist villages in implementing CFW.

The GEG theory also discusses governance interventions; thus, the government must try to make breakthroughs in managing CFW from the beginning to the end so that CFW can achieve the expected goals and benefits, especially in poverty alleviation and community empowerment.

5 Conclusion and Future Scope

Some conclusions can be drawn based on the data analysis results and discussion. *First*, CFW pr has not been able to alleviate poverty through community empowerment because it neglects the elements of GEG, especially policies and institutions. *Second*, related to the arena, the government must consider the content and context of CFW implementation so the target groups can truly feel the program's benefits. Therefore, the local government is very much needed in designing regional policies [19]. *Third*, many shortcomings must be addressed in terms of institutions, interests, and actions, such as involving relevant stakeholders. In terms of actions and choices, the regency governments need policy interventions in the form of a policy champion and capacity building of institutions so that CFW can run effectively and efficiently. Because the focus is on intervention, public policy should lead to actions that can be taken in areas that can be intervened and ensure no room for maneuver in implementing institutional and policy reforms. The intervention can be innovations, such as delegating technical authority to villages to regulate matters based on the local and community characteristics and local culture and wisdom. Thus, the policies are more adaptive to local conditions, have a greater impact, and increase the capacity of the village officials in CFW implementation.

This study had some limitations. Since this was qualitative research, the result could not be generalized. We employed a case study approach in Nanga Pamolontian and Mekar Mulya, two villages in Lamandau Regency, so the results may be different if the study is carried out in other villages with different characteristics. Therefore, further research may be done in villages with different characteristics from those of Nanga Pamolontian and Mekar Mulya.

Acknowledgment. Thanks to the Regent, Head of District, Head of Village, Head of Service, Mekar Mulya Village community and Nanga Pamolontian Village Community and other parties that cannot be mentioned one by one.

References

1. Solekhan, M.: Penyelenggaraan pemerintahan desa berbasis partisipasi masyarakat. Setara Press, Malang (2014).
2. Kalteng Express Homepage, <https://kaltengekspres.com/2017/11/tersandung-kasus-dugaan-korupsi-add-dan-dd-direktur-cv-inuhan-permai-dan-kades-kina-ditetapkan-tersangka/>
3. Grindle, M.S., Mason, E.S.: Good enough governance: Poverty reduction and reform in developing countries. Kennedy School of Government of Harvard University, Cambridge (2002).
4. Grindle, M.S.: Good enough governance revisited. *Development Policy Review* 25(5), 533–574 (2007).
5. Landell-Mills, P., Serageldin, I.: Governance and the development process. *Finance and Development* 28(3), 13-24 (1991).
6. Mardiasmo, D., Barnes, P.H., Sakurai, Y.: Implementation of good governance by regional governments in Indonesia: the challenges. In Twelfth Annual Conference of the International Research Society for Public Management (2008).
7. Walters, W.: Some critical notes on “governance”. *Studies in Political Economy* 73(1), 27-46 (2004).
8. Kartasasmita, G.: Power and empowerment: sebuah telaah mengenal konsep pemberdayaan masyarakat. Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional, Jakarta (1996).
9. Mardikanto, T., Soebianto, P.: *Pemberdayaan Masyarakat: dalam Perspektif Publik*. Alfabeta, Bandung (2013).
10. Creswell, J.W.: *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Sage Publications, London (2016).
11. Yin, R.K.: *Studi kasus: Desain dan metode*. Raja Grafindo Persada, Depok (2019).
12. Nugroho, R.: *Public policy: Teori, manajemen, dinamika, analisis, konvergensi dan kimia kebijakan*. PT Elex Media Komputindo, Jakarta (2014).
13. Grindle, M.S.: *Good enough governance revisited: A report for DFID with reference to the governance target strategy paper, 2001*. Harvard University, Cambridge (2005).
14. Slamet, M.: Peningkatan partisipasi masyarakat dalam pembangunan pedesaan. *Interaksi* 1(1), 3–7 (1985).
15. Nugroho, R.: *Public policy: Dinamika kebijakan publik, analisis kebijakan, manajemen kebijakan, teori dan model, perumusan, implementasi, pengendalian, monitoring dan evaluasi, risk management, the fifth estate, metode penelitian kebijakan*. PT Elex Media Komputindo, Jakarta (2017).
16. Korten, D.C.: When corporations rule the world. *European Business Review* 98(1), (1998).
17. Houghton, J., Khandker, S.: *Handbook on poverty and inequality*. World Bank, Washington DC (2009).
18. Mardikanto, T., Sutami, S.: *Pengantar penyuluhan pertanian dalam teori dan praktek*. Hapsara (1985).
19. Brinkerhoff, D.W., Johnson, R.: Good enough governance in fragile states: The role of center-periphery relations and local government. In 4th International Specialised Conference on International Aid and Public Administration, International Institute of Administrative Sciences (2008).

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

