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ABSTRACT

Scientists and public administration practitioners still find it hard to answer how to develop new institutions with limited resources. What principles must be prioritized by public managers when developing such institutions? This study aimed to answer such a question. Our case study involving new villages in remote areas of Kalimantan, Indonesia, confirmed four principles to be prioritized by public managers in implementing development programs in villages: (1) focusing on poverty alleviation, (2) being punctually oriented, (3) priority-oriented, and (4) paying attention to human resources. Focusing on poverty alleviation has the most significant proportion since it aims to achieve reformation agenda by choosing the most beneficial and relevant programs to eradicate poverty. Punctually oriented means that programs must be arranged historically based on the characteristics and conditions of the local people. Priority-oriented means sorting out programs and activities the local people truly need. Paying attention to available human resources means considering the skills and abilities of human resources to do the programs planned. Our findings confirmed that the village did not implement good enough governance (GEG) well because it did not involve the poor as workers, did not analyze the work, did not make a list of work as the priority, and did not involve the local people but people from other villages. Thus, we recommend the need for specific intervention related to policy and institutionalization so the village can run the poverty alleviation programs and community empowerment through Cash for Work Programs.
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1. Introduction

Reformation as the manifestation of good governance has given birth to the Cash for Work Program. Villages are given chances to plan and implement their activities with the fund provided by the central government. The central government has provided guidelines for the Cash for Work Program; however, the guidelines are the same for all villages in Indonesia without considering the village types of developed to underdeveloped villages. It is essential to consider the village types because the type determines the quality and characteristics of human resources and the village condition.

Implementing the Cash for Work Program will be easy in villages with good infrastructure, adequate human resources, and a culture of cooperation. However, it will be different for villages without such quality; for villages with limited resources, no cooperation, and no support from stakeholders, the Cash for Work Program may seem a mission impossible.

The Cash for Work Program was originally expected to alleviate poverty, increase people’s purchasing power, and improve the economy in the village. However, in reality, it has not been able to generate the expected results. The Cash for Work Program, one of the embodiments of good governance, was criticized through the concept of good enough governance (GEG) by (Grindle & Mason, 2002), stating that the concept of one size fits for all cannot be implemented by all countries. Due to their limitation, it would be impossible for developing countries to practice all the good governance principles. With this GEG principle, developing countries only need to prioritize what is truly
needed by the country and people—the focus is on solving the problems at hand. This also applies to villages—they do not have to do all principles of good governance. Instead, villages only need to focus on four principles: (1) focusing on poverty alleviation, (2) being punctually oriented, (3) priority-oriented, and (4) paying attention to human resources. Based on the above explanation, we are interested in examining the implementation of GEG to alleviate poverty in the Nanga Pamolontian Village of Lamandau Regency.

2. Theory

2.1. Good Governance

Good governance refers to a healthy government system with a vision and mission capable of doing the tasks and functions as mandated by the people (Addink, 2019) (Rewansyah, 2012) (Weiss, 2000). Governance is good if it fulfills three requirements of integration, harmony, and interdependence—if it fails to fulfill the three, then the governance is bad. Each component has its role: (1) the state lays the foundation for equity, justice, and peace, creating a conducive political and legal environment for development; (2) the private sector lays the foundation for economic growth, job opportunities, and development; and (3) the civil society, lays the foundation for liberty, equality, responsibility, and self-expression (Weiss, 2000). Based on Law Number 28 of 1999 on Good Governance, Indonesia has seven principles for good governance: (1) (1) the principle of legal certainty, (2) the principle of orderly state administration, (3) the principle of public interest, (4) the principle of openness, (5) the principle of proportionality, (6) the principle of professionalism, and (7) the principle of accountability.

In reality, good governance is not always “good”. Good governance has been criticized for several weaknesses. The concept has experienced many biases or deviations, both at concept derivation and policy implementation. Bettcher (2017) also put forward three criticisms of good governance: (1) not all countries need good governance; (2) governance cannot be improved effectively even through conscious efforts; and (3) the standards set by developed countries are beyond the reach of developing countries and provide them with inappropriate criteria.

2.2. Good “Enough” Governance

Good enough governance (GEG) refers to the minimum acceptable government performance and civil society involvement that does not significantly impede economic and political development and allows poverty alleviation initiatives to progress (Grindle & Mason, 2002) (Grindle M. S., 2007). Therefore, the concept of good enough governance also talks about governance interventions, especially in policy reform. Furthermore, the GEG concept suggests that not all government shortcomings need to be addressed in one go, institutions and capacities are products of time, and government achievements can also be reversed. There are several principles in the implementation of GEG (Grindle & Mason, 2002):

- **What’s the payoff for poverty reduction**—poverty alleviation efforts would be more effective if they reduce the focus on government and pay more attention to strengthening the political influence of the poor within the civic society.

- **Thinking in time**—there must be an understanding of important and less important changes, the sequence of changes, and alternative ways to improve government performance.

- **Thinking strategically about priorities**—priorities can be better set if there is a good understanding of which actions result in more efficiency, effectiveness, and responsiveness.

- **Who needs to do it**—it refers to available human resources since much of the good governance agenda is about what governments need to do to achieve better results.

2.3. Cash For Work (Padat Karya Tunai - PKT)

Cash for Work (Padat Karya Tunai - PKT) is a rural community empowerment program, especially for the poor and marginalized groups, focusing on productivity and using local human resources, capital, and technology to provide additional income, alleviate poverty, and increase community welfare. Cash for Work objectives include:

- opening up employment through labor-intensive development programs paid in cash;

- growing the sense of togetherness, cooperation, and participation of village communities;

- improving access for the poor, women, children, and marginalized groups to basic education and healthcare services;

- increasing rural income, and

- generating social and economic activities in villages.

The General Guidelines for Cash for Work in villages in 2018 state the following groups as the target of the program:

- unemployed: rural community members, both men and women, but not children, with no jobs, being laid off from work, and are currently looking for job opportunities;
underemployed: rural community members with less than normal working hours (<35 hours per week) and farmers experiencing famine or are waiting for the planting or harvest time;

poor people: rural community members with monthly per capita income under the poverty line; and

stunted children: rural community members having under-fives with nutritional problems.

Based on the general guidelines for the implementation of Cash for Work, the types of activities that can be carried out in the Cash for Work include:

- construction and/or rehabilitation of rural infrastructure and facilities based on the list of village authorities, including improvement of river channels and irrigation, construction and/or repair of village-scale roads and bridges and boat moorings;

- utilization of land to increase production, including in forest areas for agriculture, forestry, plantation, farm, and fisheries;

- other productive activities such as the development of tourist villages, creative economy, development of local economic potential by encouraging entrepreneurship, management of agricultural production, and management of service businesses and small industries;

- community empowerment, including waste management, residential environmental management, renewable energy development, and provision and distribution of additional food for children (infants and toddlers); and

- other activities not directly related to the completion of the physical work of buildings but support the successful implementation of the physical work, for example, driving a vehicle for transporting materials and work tools.

Cash for Work is one form of public policy set by the central government to empower the community to alleviate poverty.

2.4. Conceptual Framework

Based on the previous explanation, the conceptual framework is presented in Figure 1.

![Figure 1. Conceptual Framework](Source: Adapted from Grindle (2007))

3. Research Method

This research was descriptive and qualitative with a case study approach. We conducted an in-depth exploration of a program, event, process, and activity on one or more people. A case study is bound to a certain time and activities, and the researcher continuously collects detailed data using different data collection methods continuously (Creswell, 2016) (Starman, 2013).

Based on the objectives, the research focused on applying the principles of GEG in the Cash for Work Program: (a) providing the greatest benefit for poverty reduction in Nanga Pamolontian Village, (b) being punctually oriented, (c) priority-oriented, and (4) paying attention to available human resources.

The research was conducted in Nanga Pamolontian Village, Lamandau Regency, Central Kalimantan Province, Indonesia. Nanga Pamolontian Village was chosen as the research location; we wanted to analyze further how GEG was implemented by policymakers of the Cash for Work Program at the village level.

The data sources consisted of informants, phenomena or events, and documents. Informants included the village head, the head of the Village Consultative Body (Badan Permuyawaratan Desa – BPD), the head of the Management Team (Tim Pengelola 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). The data types were primary data (observations, interviews, focus group discussions, and questionnaires) and secondary data (data from the Central Bureau of Statistics, books, reports, journals, and others).

In a case study, data collection techniques consist of documentation, interviews, and direct observations (Yin, 2009). The data validity in qualitative research refers to credibility (internal validity), transferability, reliability, and objectivity (Creswell, 2016). Triangulation is necessary to test the data validity by utilizing the sources, methods, investigators, and theories (Denzin, 2009).
Data were analyzed using pattern match analysis (Yin, 2009). First, we collected data using interviews, observations, and documents in the process of implementing the Cash for Work in Nanga Pamolontian Village. Then a conclusion was drawn from the case in Nanga Pamolontian Village. After that, the theory was modified based on the findings in the previous conclusion. It was then connected with the theory used. Finally, it was modified according to the research findings, and conclusions were drawn.

4. Results

As explained previously, if a region cannot implement all GEG principles, it can take only the four primary principles to solve poverty problems: (a) providing the greatest benefit for poverty reduction, (b) being punctually oriented, (c) priority-oriented, and (4) paying attention to available human resources. Therefore, the implementation of the four primary GEG principles in Nanga Pamolontian is elaborated as follows.

4.1 Principle 1: Providing the Greatest Benefit for Poverty Reduction

The principle of providing the greatest benefits for poverty alleviation can be seen from three indicators, which are as follows:

- Reform agenda to alleviate poverty

Our observations confirmed that the Cash for Work Program in Nanga Pamolontian focused on infrastructure development and public wealth because the village was new that it did not have adequate infrastructure. The local people also got additional income from oil palm plasma. Unfortunately, the infrastructure development process did not involve the poor, and the local people did not significantly enjoy the effect of the Cash for Work Program. The oil palm plasma was distributed to the local people as a charity program, and it could not become economic leverage to reduce the number of poor people; in other words, the program was ineffective.

- Supervision on efforts to alleviate poverty

Village council and the village government developed a quite good relationship. However, Village council lacked the role during the implementation of the Cash for Work Program in Nanga Pamolontian Village. Village council rarely provides suggestions, input, or criticism. This is due to their lack of understanding of governance, especially in monitoring poverty alleviation strategies and policies.

- The effects of poverty alleviation through Cash for Work as a reform agenda

We could not clearly see the effect of the Cash for Work Program on poverty alleviation in Nanga Pamolontian. This was because the workers in the program were not the local poor. The workers came from other villages. Therefore, the impact of the program could not be enjoyed or felt by the local poor of Nanga Pamolontian.

4.2 Principle 2: Being Punctually Oriented

The principle comes with three indicators:

- Efforts to analyze the program

The village government of Nanga Pamolontian conducted a straightforward analysis based on their experience. The analysis has not used complete indicators that have gone through in-depth studies, so the conclusions are not comprehensive and reliable.

- Efforts to inventory village characteristics

Our observations showed that the culture of gotong royong (working together, cooperation) had not been well developed in Nanga Pamolontian Village. Thus, the Cash for Work Program faced a challenge finding workers from the local people of Nanga Pamolontian Village.

- Government regulations to support Cash for Work

The Nanga Pamolontian Village government confirmed that they had not issued any regulations for the Cash for Work Program. The village only implements the regulations that have been set by the central and the regency government through general guidelines for the Cash for Work Program. So far, Nanga Pamolontian Village has only issued regulations regarding the appointment of TPK or village fund management officials (Pejabat Teknis Pengelolaan Keuangan Desa - PTPKD).

4.3 Principle 3: Priority-Oriented

The principle can be seen in the following three indicators:

- Policy priorities related to village development

RPJMDes (Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Desa - Village Short Term Development

Figure 2. Implementation of PKT in Nanga Pamolontian Village by 5 workers
Plan) of Nanga Pamolontian 2018-2024 mentions the following development priorities: (1) improving the standard of living and welfare of the community; (2) creating job opportunities for the community to alleviate poverty; (3) improving services to the community in all fields; (4) improving human resources for village officials and institutions; (5) improving office facilities and infrastructure; (6) developing infrastructure and facilities; (7) fulfilling basic needs (early childhood education, integrated health service, and health service); (8) fulfilling facilities and infrastructure (construction of village roads, farm roads, sanitation, clean water, and other economic facilities); (9) developing economic potential includes the establishment of BUMDes or village-owned enterprises, building food barns, providing production inputs, and others; and (10) utilizing natural resources and maintaining.

- Policy priorities related to community and poor community empowerment

From the list of 10 priorities mentioned in RPJMDes of Nanga Pamolontian 2018-2024, only 3 priorities are directly related to community empowerment: 1) improving the standard of living and welfare of the community; (2) creating job opportunities for the community to alleviate poverty; and (3) developing economic potential includes the establishment of BUMDes or village-owned enterprises, building food barns, providing production inputs, and others.

- Policy priorities related to program implementation

Based on our observations, there were no priorities directly related to Cash for Work implementation because there was no further guideline on village policy related to Cash for Work. The village only prepared a general guideline for Cash for Work, such as appointing the management team. The village did not prepare technical guidelines.

4.4 Principle 4: Paying Attention to Available Human Resources

The principle is manifested in three actions:

- The role of the community in program planning, implementation, and supervision

Our interviews revealed that the community did not play a dominant role in the Cash for Work Program. The community was only involved in planning, not implementation and supervision because the program involved outsiders.

- Role of Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO) and the press in program implementation

The role of NGOs is still minimal in the implementation of the program. The press, such as TVRI and the Kalteng Pos Daily Newspaper, has also not played a significant role in conveying the development results in Nanga Pamolontian Village.

- Village government efforts to ensure the success of the program implementation

The obstacle in the Cash for Work Program is the dependence of TPK on third parties for budget planning, causing a delay in work. Therefore, Village Council always urges TPK to improve its capacity through technical guidance or training funded by the regional budget. If no funds are provided by the provincial or regency government, Village Council asks the village government to fund using the village budget for TPK to make its budget planning without dependence on third parties.

5. Discussion and conclusion

So what should an undeveloped village do? The following will explain each of these principles.

5.1 Principle 1: Providing the Greatest Benefit for Poverty Reduction

- Reform agenda to alleviate poverty

The charity program was good on one side but not on the other since it did not encourage the local people to work hard for income. In addition, the poor and the rich got the same income from the oil palm plasma program, which was not fair. Poverty alleviation programs demand structural changes and policies followed up with innovative programs. Grindle (2007) says that poverty can only be reduced by better government performance. So if the Cash for Work Program has not been able to run well, something needs to be improved regarding the government’s performance in poverty alleviation. In order to achieve the government’s goals, the government should make various efforts, including poverty alleviation. Grindle and Mason (2002) mention: “In particular, it is important to assess which reforms are encouraged and pursued because they are good for governance, and which are particularly relevant to poverty reduction”. Public managers must be very careful in choosing work programs, especially those that impact poverty alleviation. Therefore, assistance from the government is needed so that the chosen reform agenda can solve the problem of poverty.

Before the village sets a budget for development programs, an understanding of how to set an agenda
for priority activities, especially for new villages, is crucial. These new villages must understand that development is not merely physical. In addition, not all villages have the same needs—all depend on the characteristics of the village and the resources they have. Without government intervention and stakeholders’ support, it may be difficult for the village to develop the agenda because of their limitations.

In this regard, it is suggested that public managers in Nanga Pamolontian Village develop an agenda directly connected to poverty alleviation, both physical and non-physical activities, which are skill-based or in the form of soft financing or loans.

- Supervision on efforts to alleviate poverty

It is important to assess which reform agenda should be encouraged and pursued, as they are useful to governance, and which ones are specifically related to poverty alleviation. Governance reforms are important as goals to improve government performance, but agenda specifically linked to poverty alleviation is even more crucial. For example, consider the role that the legislature plays in overseeing and monitoring poverty alleviation strategies and policies. Such activities can increase checks and balances in the architecture of government (Grindle and Mason, 2007). Supervision and monitoring village strategies and policies by village council are expected to accelerate the reform agendas related to poverty alleviation and community empowerment.

It is highly recommended that village council members be equipped with the ability and knowledge to do so through training or regular assistance and guidance by the district and regency governments. In addition, a change in the mindset of village council members is also vital—they must understand that they are not only complementary but also have a significant role in village governance. With such ability, village council can cooperate with public managers and monitor their performance. Thus, policies regarding poverty alleviation can be implemented properly, and an evaluation of the performance of public managers can be done well.

It would be even better if village council included representatives of the poor because Grindle and Mason (2002) say the fight against poverty can be more effective if the focus is less on government and more on strengthening the political influence of the poor in civil society. That way, they will certainly be more courageous in voicing the interests of the poor so that they can be immediately addressed.

- The effects of poverty alleviation through Cash for Work as a reform agenda

It is harmful when the government expends huge capital, resources, and political capital to make changes that may not impact poverty much. Thus, one way to begin to scale back good governance programs is to assess more thoroughly and empirically the impact of specific types of poverty alleviation reform (Grindle dan Mason, 2007).

For this reason, village public managers need to sort out the activities to be carried out to impact poverty alleviation efforts. The indicators are easy—the implementers must be the poor or significantly impact the poor by increasing skills, welfare, income, or access to employment. So far, the village government considers the Cash for Work Program identical to physical work, even though the activities may be related to skills, the addition of business capital, and others.

In this regard, it is necessary to divide work that has an impact on the poor: (1) physical work that only requires physical strength for poor people with good physical strength; and (2) work that does not require physical strength for poor people who are old, have disabilities, or are still children. Those who fall into the second category can focus more on activities needing skills, additional capital, and access to markets so that they have their income to finance their lives and escape poverty.

Such projects or programs can be initiated by the district or regency government through relevant offices, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), or companies with Company Social Responsibility (CSR) programs. Naturally, villages have to choose which is more suitable and profitable because public managers will face several choices with their respective consequences that must be anticipated early on. Public managers whose capacity is limited to formulating options and making policy selections can ask for assistance from relevant stakeholders who can provide views or directions, either from the top-level government element or other third parties.

5.2 Principle 2: Being Punctually Oriented

The principle comes with three indicators:

- Efforts to analyze the program

All development programs should be analyzed before implementing. The village government of Nanga Pamolontian conducted a straightforward analysis based on their experience.

This is contrary to what Grindle and Mason (2002) suggest, that analysis will make it possible to
understand the important and less important changes, the sequence of changes, and alternative ways to improve government performance. By knowing which changes are important and which are less important, we can decide which policies should be implemented and which should be postponed. However, Robert Chambers (1985), in his book entitled Village Development, states that mistakes that arise and opportunities that are lost are not only caused by habits such as pragmatism but also because of errors in analysis. Therefore, the analysis must be done carefully—errors in the analysis will lead to the wrong policy.

Analyzing the Cash for Work Program is one manifestation of the principle of being punctually oriented. Grindle and Mason (2002) suggest that conducting more analyzes of government performance and the order in which the elements of good governance are carried out could provide clues to reducing the agenda to more manageable proportions. A simple thing, for example, is that so far, villages have not been given the freedom to determine the standard cost of wages, so they need to be given the authority to do so that more and more people are interested in joining the Cash for Work Program.

The regency government can provide simple guidelines for the village government to analyze and self-evaluate their performance—whether they are capable or not of implementing the Cash for Work Program. Then, if the self-analysis shows that they are not capable of implementing the Cash for Work Program, they have the guidelines of what to do. But unfortunately, the regency government has not provided such simple guidelines that villages implement do exactly the same for their Cash for Work Program. Therefore, there is no difference in programs done by the developed, developing, and underdeveloped villages. Therefore, once again, we emphasize the importance of analysis before the Cash for Work Program that the program is truly beneficial for the local people.

- Efforts to inventory village characteristics

Grindle and Mason (2002) state that by studying the history of other countries, people can learn what is needed to correct the mistakes made in the past, cause and effect relationships, and choose which things are needed most and which one is needed less. GEG may be a more realistic approach for developing countries (and villages, too). The core elements are (a) focus or what needs to be done, (b) sequencing or when it needs to be done, (c) approach or how it needs to be done, (d) selection or what is important and what is not, and (e) pragmatism or what is feasible and what is not (Grindle, 2007). Therefore, it is necessary to conduct an inventory of village characteristics to determine which program is more appropriate for a particular type of village. Because not all villages can implement the same program, it is necessary to make an inventory according to the capabilities and characteristics of the village.

As previously stated, there needs to be a self-assessment to assess whether the village has been able to implement the Cash for Work Program or not. The next question is, what should be done if a village is declared unfit to implement the Cash for Work Program. It is necessary to know, first, what obstacles the village faces in implementing the Cash for Work Program, whether it is human resources, the environment, the rules that have not been issued, the culture of the community, rejection from other parties, and others. If it has been inventoried, it will be easy for public managers to find solutions to these problems. No village is powerless. All villages can be empowered if the treatment is suitable and there is a willingness to change and conditions that support it.

For this reason, we suggest that the central or regional government must not force a village to implement the Cash for Work Program when the village is not ready. For example, projects requiring physical work can be eliminated if a village has no workers who can do the physical work. It is better to look for other alternative activities. If enforced, this will lead to irregularities and potential law violations that may lead to imprisonment.

- Government regulations to support Cash for Work

In addition to the general guidelines set by the central government, the regency government should also be able to make policies regarding technical guidelines that specifically discuss details in the field. Unfortunately, there is a gap in policy implementation at the village level. This is not in line with Grindle and Mason’s opinion (2002) that implementation is a political and administrative process. The political process is seen from how the policy was born from various existing interests; regarding the Cash for Work Program, the political process has already begun during the designing or preparing activities for the Cash for Work Program. The administrative process is seen from the institution implementing the policy (in this case, TPK is in charge of managing the implementation of the Cash for Work Program). However,
unfortunately, the lack of technical policy regulations has resulted in the Cash for Work Program PKT being less optimal, whether it is the policies set by the regency, district, or village. The policies set are a way out of the complexity of the existing problems.

This is also related to the previous point that there has been no delegation of authority to villages to make technical policy regulations, thus allowing each village to set different regulations, which adapt to local situations and conditions. The simplest example is the policy on wage standards. The standard of wages for workers in villages with oil palm companies close to road access and villages far from road access is undoubtedly different because the needs and prices of essential commodities are also different. Therefore, the standard of wages for workers cannot be applied equally to all villages because villages have different characteristics. Likewise, special treatment or dispensation is needed for villages that are not ready to implement the Cash for Work Program. In the end, they will still be directed to implement the Cash for Work Program if they are ready.

5.3 Principle 3: Priority-Oriented

The principle can be seen in the following three indicators:

- Policy priorities related to village development

Based on the priority program, the Nanga Pamolontian Village Government does not apply priority number two because it does not employ the poor in the Cash for Work Program, meaning that the program has not been fully oriented as the priority. The inconsistency of development priorities is because Nanga Pamolontian Village wants to catch up with the developed villages, so they prioritize economic and infrastructure development, including roads and bridges. This is intended to accelerate economic growth by providing roads and bridges.

Grindle and Mason (2002) say that setting priorities is also inherently political. The priorities of certain politicians differ from those of the elite and the poor. Thus, conflicts about priorities are inevitable, and the more open the political system is, the more likely it is that these conflicts are openly debated.

What the Nanga Pamolontian Village government did was not wrong. However, we have to bear in mind that development is not only about physical facilities and infrastructure but also about human resources. This means that people also need to be developed and empowered, and capacity needs to be improved. Human resources are a natural advantage that must be fostered and improved in capacity and quality.

Then, village public managers must consistently implement the development priorities prepared previously. For this reason, it is also necessary to be careful in setting priorities because there are various limitations of funds to realize them. Sometimes, we are too enthusiastic about preparing priority programs that we forget about the limited funds; in the end, many priority programs are not implemented because there are no funds. As with Nanga Pamolontian Village, there are too many priority programs. The village is new, and it does not have much experience or funds. Therefore, the village government should be more realistic with the existing limitations.

- Policy priorities related to community and poor community empowerment

However, none of RIJMDEs priorities is directly related to the empowerment of the poor. It does not mean that Cash for Work neglects the poor. Indeed, empowerment for the poor is in the form of assistance, both indirect and cash assistance.

Grindle and Mason (2002) explain that priorities can be better set if there is a good understanding of which actions result in more efficiency, effectiveness, and responsiveness, which bring the most significant benefit to the poor, which logically precede others, which deliver results in the short term, and under what conditions specific reforms can have the most significant impact. This cannot be done as long as the village officials are not able to organize activities related to empowering the community and the poor. As long as the poor sit as spectators, poverty alleviation will not happen. Therefore the poor must become actors; they must become subjects, no longer objects of poverty alleviation. By becoming the actors in poverty alleviation, they will get more opportunities to escape poverty. Especially for the poor, valid data collection is also needed regarding the number, age group, and their needs, so the policies chosen later can be a solution based on their needs.

- Policy priorities related to program implementation

Priorities in villages are also political. Thus, village council, as the embodiment of the community, must be involved. This is where the political process begins because it will involve various interests in the village, and conflict may arise. For example, the debate on priorities may revolve around poverty alleviation efforts, fulfilling infrastructure needs,
health services, community empowerment, increasing community economic capacity, empowering community institutions, and others that require no small amount of money. Due to the limited needs, it is necessary to have development priorities according to the urgent needs of the village. Therefore, the public manager, together with village council, must be able to assess what are the priorities and then make policies or regulations to implement them.

Grindle (2007) suggests that countries that fall into the category of a fragile state are better off carrying out activities on a selected set of changes that are good enough to create critical improvements in the political and administrative systems appropriate for the country. This is quite realistic, considering that implementing the good governance agenda is too much of a burden to be borne by this unstable country. The village government has experienced a similar situation. Thus, in its efforts to implement empowerment and poverty alleviation, it is necessary to take only selected actions that are more effective and efficient and whose targets will directly impact the community. Surely, to choose more effective and efficient activities, appropriate indicators are needed to make it easier to choose the most effective and efficient ones. Therefore, if the village wants to eradicate poverty, the programs that must be implemented are priority programs directly related to empowering the community and the poor.

5.4 Principle 4: Paying Attention to Available Human Resources

The principle is manifested in three actions:

- The role of the community in program planning, implementation, and supervision

The community did not play a dominant role in the Cash for Work Program. This did not support Grindle and Mason (2002) that development practices in recent years have led to innovations to improve service delivery through community involvement, making contracts, and how to involve communities in development planning and budget management. However, the community must be involved in every development process. It takes a different time between regions to manifest, but still, the subject must be the local community. People will learn to be responsible for what they do if given a chance to become a subject of such action. Even though the community is not ready, it must be prepared to be empowered and increase its capacity through training or technical guidance.

Grindle and Mason (2002) also mention that a large part of the good governance agenda is about what governments need to do to achieve better results. For the Cash for Work Program to achieve better results, the government must involve the community of Nanga Pamolontian Village.

- Role of Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO) and the press in program implementation

The Cash for Work Program needs support from NGOs and the press. Grindle and Mason (2002) state that development practices in recent years have led to innovations. One of which is how to help NGOs carry out activities that governments cannot or do not want to do and how to find another substitute for the government in such a situation. Undoubtedly, the government will not be able to do everything independently; it needs help and support from relevant stakeholders. Sometimes some NGOs have the capacity but have never been allowed to help the village. In our opinion, if NGOs are allowed to help villages, and they can do so, they will be willing to do so, likewise with the press. It is better for them to also participate in development in the village, especially in raising issues currently happening in the village, so that the government or NGOs are concerned about it.

- Village government efforts to ensure the success of the program implementation

The village government has made extra efforts to implement the Cash for Work Program, but there are still obstacles due to limited official resources, especially for the TPK. For villages experiencing this, the village should be able to make specific innovations to overcome the shortcomings. Grindle and Mason (2002) state that development practices in recent years have led to innovations in improving service delivery through community involvement. The point is that the village must be innovative to come up with more creative ideas regarding implementing the Cash for Work Program. Ideas from the community must also be explored and accommodated, filtered or even modified so that they can then be executed. If there are people with the will and potential, they can be trained to help the village, such as making the budget planning. Likewise with other fields, for example, in making concrete construction, because people always use wood so far. Based on the general guidelines for the Cash for Work Program, the activities that can be carried out in the Cash for Work Program in Nanga Pamolontian Village include (1) development and/or rehabilitation of rural infrastructure and facilities following the list of village authorities, including improvement of river
channels and irrigation, construction and/or repair of village roads and bridges, boat moorings; (2) land use to increase production, including forest areas, such as agriculture, plantation, farm, and fisheries; (3) other productive activities, including development of tourist villages, creative economy, development of local economic potential by encouraging entrepreneurship, management of agricultural production, and management of service businesses and small industries; (4) community empowerment, including waste management, residential environmental management, renewable energy development, and provision and distribution of additional food for children (infants and toddlers); (5) other activities that are not directly related to the completion of the physical work of the building, but support the successful implementation of the physical work, for example, driving a vehicle for transporting materials and work tools.

Before doing this, public managers must consider and choose a series of innovative actions that can help the success of the Cash for Work Program according to their needs and abilities.

Based on the findings and discussion, the following conclusions are presented:

- Cash for Work implementation in Nanga Pamolontian did not fully apply GEG principles. The program did not involve the poor as the target group; it, instead, involved the outsiders. The program was not analyzed, had no priority, and had not employed the local human resources.

- The Cash for Work Program in Nanga Pamolontian Village has not gone well due to the absence of technical policies and delegation of authority. In addition, the village government institutions were not employed optimally due to limited capacity and training.

Based on the conclusion, the following suggestions are given:

- Local governments must have policy champions to determine technical guidelines for the Cash for Work Program, especially those related to the poor as the target group. Policies that need to be made immediately are (1) delegation of authority to the village, to make policies that follow the conditions of the local community, including wage standards and types of work that adapt to the characteristics of the local community; (2) capacity building of community resources; (3) setting development priorities, primarily related to the poor and local community empowerment; and (4) assistance, guidance and support by relevant stakeholders as well as by the mass media.

- In addition to issuing policies, the government needs to re-empower existing institutions in the village, be it the village government, TPK, BPD and local village assistants, primarily related to their main tasks and functions.
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