Journal of Multidisciplinary Academic and Practice Studies (JoMAPS)
ISSN: 2656-2359, Vol, 3 No 3, 2025, 245-258 https://doi.org/10.35912/jomaps.v3i3.3125

Analysis of the effect of the Family Hope Program on extreme poverty in Mimika District

Yohanis Sakke Palitean
Univesitas Cenderawasih, Jayapura, Indonesia
paliteany@gmail.com

Article History
Received on 13 August 2025
1st Revision on 20 August 2025
Accepted on 27 August 2025

Abstract
Purpose: This study aims to analyze the impact of the Family Hope Program (PKH) on alleviating extreme poverty in Mimika District. The main focus is to assess the effectiveness of government social assistance in reducing the number of extremely poor families using a panel data approach.
Research methodology: Using panel data analysis methods through Fixed Effects (FE) and Random Effects (RE) models. The selection of the FE and RE models is based on the consideration that panel data allows for controlling unobserved heterogeneity between observation units. The Hausman test will be used to determine the most appropriate model between FE and RE. Data processing in this study was carried out using Eviews version 7.2.
Results: Social assistance through PKH has a significant effect on reducing extreme poverty in Mimika District.The number of extremely poor families decreased from 3,709 families in 2022 to 2,691 families in 2024. Regression results indicate that every increase in PKH assistance contributes to a decrease in the number of extremely poor individuals.The program's effectiveness varies across districts, especially in remote areas with poor infrastructure.
Conclusions: The Family Hope Program (PKH) has proven effective in helping to reduce extreme poverty in Mimika District. The conditional assistance provided through PKH has improved the welfare of beneficiary families, although its effectiveness differs across regions depending on infrastructure and access to basic services.
Limitations: The variation in program effectiveness across districts indicates limitations in infrastructure and access to basic services (education and healthcare), which affect program success.This study does not deeply explore local social, cultural, and economic factors that may also influence program outcomes.
Contribution: Provides empirical evidence on the effectiveness of conditional social assistance (PKH) in reducing extreme poverty in underdeveloped regions. Offers policy recommendations for local governments to better allocate and optimize social assistance programs based on infrastructure conditions and access to public services in each district.

Keywords: *Extreme, Family, Hope, Mimika, Poverty, Program*

How to Cite: Palitean, Y. S. (2025). Analysis of the effect of the Family Hope Program on extreme poverty in Mimika District. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Academic and Practice Studies*, 3(3), 245-258.

1. Introduction

Government policy refers to actions formulated and implemented by provincial, district/city, or village governments (Bustomi, Turmudzi, & Chaidir, 2020). These policies are designed to meet the needs of the community in their respective regions and aim to enhance population well-being (Alidoust, Gleeson, & Khalaj, 2024). The substance of local government policies can vary depending on the issues or

problems encountered in a region. (Saputra et al., 2022). The government plays a crucial role in ensuring the continuous provision of quality services to all citizens, irrespective of their ethnicity, religion, or race, in accordance with the law (Ramasamy, 2020).

With the increasing population, social issues have also escalated in various sectors, one of the most significant being that of poverty. Poverty has remained a persistent problem for the nation over time. Despite governmental transitions, the social issue of poverty has not been effectively addressed. The synergy between the central and regional governments has not been optimal, leaving many marginalized communities trapped in poverty. Given these issues, it is expected that the government can enhance services for the poor, including the formulation of policies and tangible roles that can address this social problem. Through concrete government action, poverty can be minimized as much as possible, thereby reducing the poverty rate in Indonesia and ensuring that all citizens have access to a decent living, contributing to national progress.

1.1. Problem Formulation

1. What is the development of the Family Hope Program (PKH) and extreme poverty in the Mimika District?
2. Does the Family Hope Program (PKH) affect poverty levels?

1.2. Research Objectives

1. To understand and analyze the development of the Family Hope Program (PKH) and extreme poverty in the Mimika District.
2. This study aimed to analyze the impact of the Family Hope Program (PKH) on poverty levels.

1.3. Research Benefits

The outcomes of this research are expected to provide valuable contributions, both theoretically and practically. Theoretically, the author hopes to formulate concrete policies to address poverty issues in the Mimika District, particularly within the region. Practically, the government can implement policies aimed at providing maximum service that directly impacts marginalized communities to reduce poverty, thus fostering equitable development in terms of income distribution, human resources, and cultural advancement.

1.4. Problem Formulation

1. What is the development of the Family Hope Program (PKH) and extreme poverty in the Mimika District?
2. Does the Family Hope Program (PKH) affect poverty levels?

1.5. Research Objectives

1. To understand and analyze the development of the Family Hope Program (PKH) and extreme poverty in the Mimika District.
2. This study aimed to analyze the impact of the Family Hope Program (PKH) on poverty levels.

1.6. Research Benefits

The outcomes of this research are expected to provide valuable contributions, both theoretically and practically. Theoretically, the author hopes to formulate concrete policies to address poverty issues in the Mimika District, particularly within the region. Practically, the government can implement policies aimed at providing maximum service that directly impacts marginalized communities to reduce poverty, thus fostering equitable development in terms of income distribution, human resources, and cultural advancement.

2. Literature review

2.1. Social Dynamics of Society

Social dynamics refer to the social changes that occur as a result of interactions between two or more individuals in a society who have a clear psychological connection within the context they experience.

In social dynamics, social interactions, groups, and classes can occur. Both rural and urban communities experience social dynamics (Wu, Tong, Li, Wall, & Wu, 2023). Mutual influences occurring during interactions between individuals and groups result in social dynamics. Social dynamics include social values and norms, individual and organizational behavior patterns, social class structures, and governance systems within a society. The development of science and technology is a major factor in driving social dynamics. The impact of social dynamics can be either positive or negative. Concrete manifestations of social dynamics include changes in population size, changes in population quality, governance structures, livelihoods, and composition. Surjono Sukanto argues that social dynamics are social changes in society that face various forms of problems, whether at the individual or group level, causing social order within society to not function properly.

One of the factors contributing to social dynamics is population growth. As the population increases, the scale of social dynamics also increases, both negative and positive. One negative factor that may emerge is the increase in poverty rates. A large population exacerbates poverty. Countries with large populations typically have higher poverty rates than those with smaller ones. Population size is a crucial indicator for any country. Poverty is a fundamental issue in countries worldwide, especially in developing nations such as Indonesia. Poverty has long been a persistent issue in Indonesia. Nearly every Indonesian administration has identified poverty as a development problem (Suhandi, Putri, & Agnisa, 2018).Poverty refers to a condition in which an individual or group is unable to meet their daily needs for food, clothing, and shelter. Poverty results in a lower standard of living with limited access to essential needs. A significant portion of the population lives below the poverty line, with many having low income.

While the worst poverty is found in developing countries, evidence of poverty exists in all regions of the world. In developed countries, this condition manifests as homelessness, with people wandering in poor urban outskirts and ghettos. Poverty can be seen as a collective condition of the poor or a group of poor individuals, and in this sense, entire countries are sometimes considered poor countries. To avoid this stigma, these countries are often referred to as developing countries. Poverty cannot be understood using a single dimension or an indicator. Poverty is a complex issue that requires multidimensional analysis. The most commonly used indicators are global indicators that employ a monetary approach, such as the poverty line used by the World Bank with a threshold of USD 1.25 Purchasing Power Parity (PPP) or the basic needs approach used in Indonesia. However, these approaches focus solely on income or consumption indicators, and according to Sen (2000), they fail to capture the true roots of poverty. The Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI) was developed to approach poverty holistically. This concept was first introduced by the Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative (OPHI) in collaboration with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in 2010. The main purpose of developing this concept was to map poverty indicators more comprehensively and clearly (Alkire & Santos, 2011). When applied in Indonesia, three indicators are used to understand poverty: health, education, and standards of living. These indicators show that a purely monetary and consumption-based approach is insufficient to provide a clear picture of poverty; additional indicators, such as health, education, and standards of living, are necessary.

2.2. Poverty Theory

Poverty is a condition of economic incapacity to meet the standard of living that is typical for the population of a specific region (Fahad, Nguyen-Thi-Lan, Nguyen-Manh, Tran-Duc, & To-The, 2023). This incapacity is characterized by the inability to generate sufficient income to fulfill basic needs such as food, clothing, and shelter. Low income also results in an inability to meet other living standards, such as public health and education standards. Essentially, living standards in a society are not only defined by the fulfillment of basic nutritional needs but also by accessibility to health and education services. Adequate housing or living conditions are also important standards of living or welfare within a community. Based on this condition, a community is considered poor if its income is significantly lower than the average, leading to limited opportunities for its members to improve their well-being.

Generally, each country, including Indonesia, defines what constitutes an individual or community being categorized as poor. This is because poverty is a relative concept that varies across countries and

is influenced by factors such as economic conditions, welfare standards, and social circumstances. Each definition is determined according to criteria or metrics based on specific conditions, including average income, purchasing power or average consumption capability, education level and health status.

According to Law No. 24 of 2004, poverty is the socio-economic condition of an individual or a group of people who are unable to meet their basic rights to sustain and develop a dignified life. Basic needs that constitute the rights of individuals or groups include food, health, education, employment, housing, clean water, land, natural resources, a healthy environment, safety from violence or threats, and the right to participate in the social and political life of the community. The Welfare Department Report issued by the Ministry of Welfare in 2004 also explains that the term "poor" applies to those who are employed but earn insufficient income to meet their basic needs..

3. Research methodology

3.1. Research Location

This study was conducted in the Mimika District of the Central Papua Province. Mimika District was chosen as the research location based on the following considerations: (1) Mimika District has a relatively high number of extremely poor individuals, estimated at 12,700 people in 2024, indicating a significant poverty issue that requires intervention; (2) the local government of Mimika District has implemented various social assistance programs, including the Family Hope Program (PKH), aimed at improving community welfare and reducing poverty; and (3) Mimika District has unique geographical and socio-economic characteristics that could affect the effectiveness of social assistance programs. Therefore, this study aims to provide a deeper understanding of the role of government social assistance in alleviating poverty in the Mimika District.

3.2. Data Sources

Quantitative data in this study include: (1) the number of extremely poor individuals in the Mimika District from 2022 to 2023, sourced from the (Tutkey, Santoso, & Akib, 2025) website or the official sites of TNP2K (National Team for the Acceleration of Poverty Reduction) and P3KE (Targeting of Extreme Poverty Eradication); (2) data on recipients of social assistance under the Family Hope Program from 2022 to 2024, obtained from the Social Services Department of the Mimika District.

3.3. Data Collection Techniques

Data collection for this research was conducted using two primary techniques: (1) Documentary study, which involved gathering and analyzing relevant documents related to social assistance programs, such as program implementation reports, data on social assistance recipients from the Social Services Department of Mimika District, and extreme poverty statistics from the official websites of TNP2K and P3KE;(Sutiyo, 2023) (2) In-depth interviews, conducted with beneficiaries of social assistance programs, as well as community leaders with knowledge of the social and economic conditions in Mimika District. These interviews were designed to gather information on the effectiveness of social assistance programs, the factors influencing program success, and the impact of the program on community welfare (Habibullah, Yuda, Setiawan, & Susantyo, 2024).

3.4. Data Analysis Method

This study employs panel data analysis using Fixed Effects (FE) and Random Effects (RE) models to analyze the influence of government social assistance on poverty alleviation in the Mimika District using the Eviews program application. The choice of FE and RE models is based on the consideration that panel data allow for the control of unobserved heterogeneity between observation units. The Hausman test was used to determine the most appropriate model between FE and RE (Sihombing & Arsani, 2021). Data processing in this study was performed using Eviews (version 7.2). According to Daryanto and Hafizrianda, (Saban & Falatehan, 2023) "Among various dynamic data processing tools, Eviews with its various versions is one of the best programs for dynamic model data processing compared to other programs." In this case, Eviews was also used to facilitate the testing procedures.

The advantages of panel data regression are as follows: First, panel data can explicitly account for individual heterogeneity by allowing for individual-specific variables. Second, the ability to control for

heterogeneity enables panel data to be used to test and develop more complex behavioral models. Third, panel data are based on repeated cross-sectional observations (time series), making them suitable for dynamic adjustment studies. Fourth, the high number of observations leads to more informative and varied data with reduced multicollinearity and higher degrees of freedom, which results in more efficient estimation. Fifth, panel data can be used to study complex behavioral patterns. Finally, panel data can help minimize bias that may arise from aggregating individual data.

The regression equation used to measure the impact of government social assistance, namely the Family Hope Program (PKH), on poverty alleviation (as measured by the number of extremely poor individuals) in the Mimika District is as follows:

$$\text{Ln PKH} = \text{Ln } a_{it} + \beta \text{ Ln KME}_{it} + e_{it}$$

Where :
PKH = Family Hope Program
KME = Number of Extreme Poor Individuals
β = Elasticity Coefficient
a = Constant
i = District
t = Time/Period
e = Disturbance Error (Random Disturbance)

1) Panel Data Regression Estimation Method
According to Nachrowi and Usman (2005), several techniques are available for estimating model parameters using panel data, including
a) Common Effect Model/Pooled Least Square
The simplest approach to panel data processing is to use the ordinary least squares method applied to pooled data, commonly referred to as Pooled Least Squares. The disadvantage of the pooled least-squares method is its inconsistency with real-world conditions. Each object is different, and even an object at one point in time may be significantly different from that at another time (Winarno, 2007). The model equation can be formulated as follows:

$$\text{Ln Yit} = \text{Ln } \alpha + \beta j \text{ Ln Xitj} + \varepsilon it$$

Where :
Yit : Dependent variable for individual i at time t
Xitj : Independent variable j for individual i at time t
i : Unit of cross-section (N units)
j : Time series unit (T periods)
εit : Error component for individual i at time t
α : Intercept
βj : Parameter for independent variable j

b) Fixed Effect Model (Fixed Effect)
This method can reveal differences between objects, even with identical regression coefficients. The Fixed Effect regression model implies that each object has a constant value across different time periods. Similarly, the regression coefficients remain unchanged over time (time-invariant). The advantages of this method include the ability to differentiate between individual and time effects and the lack of assumption that error components are uncorrelated with independent variables, which may be difficult to satisfy. The disadvantage of this method is that it may not fit the real-world conditions. The condition of each object is different, and even an object at one point in time may be very different from that at another time. The model equation can be formulated as follows:

$$\text{Ln Yit} = \text{Ln } \alpha i + \beta j \text{ Ln Xitj} + \Sigma ni=2 \, \alpha i Di + \varepsilon it$$

Where:
Yit : Dependent variable for individual i at time t
Xitj : Independent variable j for individual i at time t
Di : Dummy variable
εit : Error component for individual i at time t
α : Intercept

βj : Parameter for independent variable j

c) Random Effect Model (Random Effect)
This model accommodates differences in individual and time characteristics by incorporating them into the model's error term. Two components contribute to the formation of the error term: individual and time effects. Therefore, in this method, the error must be decomposed into individual component errors, time component errors, and a general error term.

2) Selection of Panel Data Regression Estimation Method
To determine the appropriate method for estimating panel data regression, several procedures can be conducted, including
a) Chow Test
The Chow Test is used to choose the appropriate method between Pooled Least Squares (PLS) or Fixed Effects Model (Nugroho, Femala, & Maryani). This test follows the F-statistic distribution. The hypotheses in this study are as follows (Widarjono, 2009):
Ho : Pooled Least Square (PLS)
Ha :Fixed Effect Model(Nugroho et al.)
If the calculated F-value is greater than the F-table value, it is considered significant, indicating that the null hypothesis is rejected. In other words, accepting the alternative hypothesis (Ha) indicates that estimation using the fixed effects model is better than using Pooled Least Squares estimation.

b) Hausman Test
The Hausman test is used to determine the better method between FEM and REM. This test follows a chi-square distribution with degrees of freedom (k-1). The hypotheses proposed are as follows (Widarjono, 2009):
Ho = REM
Ha = FEM
If chi-square > 0.05, the null hypothesis (Ho) is accepted, indicating that the REM is the appropriate model. If chi-square < 0.05, the null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected, and the FEM is considered the appropriate model.

c) Lagrange Multiplier (LM) Test
The Lagrange Multiplier (LM) test was used to determine whether the REM or PLS was the most suitable method. The significance test for the REM was developed by Breusch and Pagan. The Breusch-Pagan method for testing REM significance is based on the residuals from the PLS method. The LM test is based on a chi-square distribution with degrees of freedom equal to the number of independent variables. The hypotheses are as follows:
Ho = PLS
Ha = REM
If chi-square > 0.05, Ho is accepted, indicating that PLS is the most appropriate method for this study. If chi-square < 0.05, Ho is rejected, and the REM is considered the more suitable method.

3) Classical Assumption Test
Classical assumption testing is used to determine whether the regression model can generate good linear estimators. Multiple linear regression tests can be conducted after the model in this study meets the classical assumption criteria, such as passing the assumptions of normality, no heteroscedasticity, and no multicollinearity. If the classical assumptions are satisfied, the regression model is the Best Linear Unbiased Estimator (BLUE). Thus, classical assumption testing must be conducted before performing multiple linear regression testing.
a) Multicollinearity Test
Multicollinearity refers to the condition in which independent variables are linearly correlated with each other. The Pearson Correlation criteria for detecting multicollinearity is when the correlation coefficient exceeds 0.9, as stated by Gujarati 2003), which is used to identify multicollinearity issues.

b) Heteroscedasticity Test

The heteroscedasticity test was used to examine whether there was unequal variance in the residuals between observations. The assumption in the regression model, as per Winarno 2015), is

- Residuals (ei) have a mean value of zero.
- Residuals have constant variance or var (ei) = σ^2, and
- Residuals for any observation are not correlated with those of other observations or cov.

If assumption (a) is not met, only the slope estimator is affected and does not lead to serious consequences in the econometric analysis. However, if assumptions (b) and (c) are violated, it will have significant implications for the predictions made using the model. In this study, heteroscedasticity was tested using the White test. If the probability value of obs*R-squared > α = 5%, then there is no heteroscedasticity in the model.

c) Normality Test

The normality test was used to determine whether the residual variable in the regression model followed a normal distribution. The t-test and F-test assume that the residuals follow a normal distribution (Santoso, 2015). A regression model is considered good if the independent and dependent variables are normally or approximately normally distributed with a significance value (sig.) > 0.05.

4) Hypothesis Testing

a) t-Test

The t-test was used to test one of the hypotheses in the research that employed multiple linear regression analysis. A t-test was used to test each variable individually. The criteria for the t-test results were as follows:

- If the probability is < 0.05, it can be stated that there is a partial effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable.
- If the probability is > 0.05, it can be stated that there is no partial effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable.

b) F-Test

The F-test is used to test one of the hypotheses in research employing multiple linear regression analysis. The F-test was used to determine the joint (simultaneous) effect of the independent variables on the dependent variable. The criteria for the F-test results are as follows:

- If the probability value is < 0.05, it can be concluded that there is a significant joint effect of the independent variables on the dependent variable.
- If the probability value is > 0.05, it can be concluded that there is no significant joint effect of the independent variables on the dependent variable.

c) Coefficient of Determination (Adjusted R Square)

This test aims to determine the proportion or percentage of the total variation in the dependent variable that is explained by the independent variables. If the analysis uses simple regression, the R-squared value is used. However, if the analysis employs multiple regression, Adjusted R Square is used. The R-squared value ranges from 0 to 1 ($0 < R^2 < 1$). The closer R^2 is to 1, the better the model and the stronger the relationship between dependent variable Y and independent variables.

3.5. Operational Definitions of Variables

Operational definitions are crucial in any research because they provide a clear framework for measuring the variables being studied. In the context of this research, which focuses on analyzing the role of government social assistance in poverty alleviation in the Mimika District, operational definitions are required to ensure that each variable is measured consistently and accurately. The variables used in this study are as follows:

a) Social Assistance

Social assistance, according to the Ministry of Home Affairs Regulation No. 32 of 2011, as amended by Regulation No. 39 of 2012 regarding guidelines for granting grants and social assistance sourced from the regional revenue and expenditure budget, refers to the provision of non-continuous and

selective assistance in the form of money or goods to the community to improve their welfare. In this study, the variable "Social Assistance" is measured based on the number of beneficiaries of the social assistance program, namely the Family Hope Program (PKH) in the Mimika District, and the total amount of assistance distributed from 2022 to 2024.

b) Poverty
According to the Central Bureau of Statistics (BPS), poverty is defined as a condition in which an individual or group of people is unable to meet their basic rights to sustain and develop a dignified life. The "Poverty" variable in this study is measured using data from the National Social and Economic Survey (Susenas), which includes household consumption expenditures. This data indicates the number of individuals living in extreme poverty in the Mimika District.

4. Result and discussion

4.1. Analysis Result

4.1.1. Panel Data Model Selectin Test for the Impact of PKH on Extreme Poverty

P The panel data model selection test was conducted in two stages, which can be explained as follows: First, the Chow test was conducted using the chi-square test to choose between the Common Effect Model (Marfuah et al.) and the Fixed Effect Model (Nugroho et al.), with the hypotheses tested as follows:

Table 1. Results of the Chow Test

Redundant Fixed Effects Tests
Pool: POOL01
Test cross-section fixed effects

Effects Test	Statistic	d.f.	Prob.
Cross-section F	57.995525	(17,35)	0.0000
Cross-section Chi-square	182.148223	17	0.0000

Sumber: Eviews, (diolah)

H0 : Common Effect Model
H1 : Fixed Effect Model
Decision:
Since the p-value = 0.0000 < 0.05, we reject Ho and accept H1. This indicates that the fixed effects model is more appropriate than the common effects model.

Second, after the Chow test and determining that the Fixed Effect model is the correct model, the next step is to test which model, between Fixed Effect (Nugroho et al.) and Random Effect (REM), is the most appropriate. This test is called the Hausman test, and the hypotheses are tested as follows:

Table 2. Results of the Hausman Test

Correlated Random Effects - Hausman Test
Pool: POOL01
Test cross-section random effects

Test Summary	Chi-Sq. Statistic	Chi-Sq. d.f.	Prob.
Cross-section random	13.859321	1	0.0002

Cross-section random effects test comparisons:

Variable	Fixed	Random	Var(Diff.)	Prob.
PKH?	-0.129623	-0.107326	0.000036	0.0002

Source: Eviews, (processed)
H0 : Random Effect Model
H1 : Fixed Effect Model
Decision:
Since the p-value = 0.0002 < 0.05, we reject Ho and accept H1. This means that the Fixed Effect Model

is more suitable than the Random Effect Model. Therefore, we conclude that the most appropriate panel data regression model for analysis is the fixed effects model.

4.1.2. Panel Data Regression Test Result for the Impact of the Family Hope Program (PKH)on Extreme Poverty

To address extreme poverty in the Mimika District, the Family Hope Program (PKH) has been one of the key initiatives launched by the government. This program aims to provide financial support to poor families through conditional financial aid, with the hope of improving welfare and reducing poverty in the Mimika District. The results of the estimation of the regression model for the Impact of PKH on Extreme Poverty are presented in table below:

Table 3. Fixed Effect Model Panel Data Regression Results for the Impact of PKH on Extreme Poverty

Dependent Variable: KME?
Method: Pooled Least Squares
Date: 05/01/25 Time: 21:23
Sample: 2022 2024
Included observations: 3
Cross-sections included: 18
Total pool (balanced) observations: 54

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	197.6236	7.110911	27.79161	0.0000
PKH?	-0.129623	0.032391	-4.001872	0.0003
Fixed Effects (Cross)				
_MBR--C	-95.59558			
_MBJ--C	96.05184			
_MBT--C	-55.43030			
_AMR--C	-13.32660			
_MMT--C	120.0912			
_MTG--C	98.10669			
_MTJ--C	108.7721			
_MRU--C	636.8312			
_KUK--C	-76.45784			
_TBG--C	-125.6698			
_WNI--C	-9.342794			
_IWK--C	-68.40247			
_KNR--C	-118.2084			
_AGA--C	-140.7780			
_JLA--C	-89.80090			
_JTA--C	-62.90345			
_ALM--C	-95.41445			
_HYA--C	-108.5225			
Effects Specification				
Cross-section fixed (dummy variables)				
R-squared	0.971053	Mean dependent var		176.2963
Adjusted R-squared	0.956165	S.D. dependent var		165.2360
S.E. of regression	34.59497	Akaike info criterion		10.19536
Sum squared resid	41888.42	Schwarz criterion		10.89519
Log likelihood	-256.2748	Hannan-Quinn criter.		10.46526
F-statistic	65.22731	Durbin-Watson stat		1.940554
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000			

Source: Eviews, processed

The results of the panel data regression equation show that the coefficient of the government social assistance variable through the Family Hope Program (PKH) is significantly and negatively associated

with extreme poverty, as indicated by the p-value (Sig.).. The p-value was 0.0003, which is less than α = 0.05, with a coefficient of -0.129623. This means that if PKH assistance increases by one unit, the number of extremely poor people will decrease by 0.013171. The coefficient of determination or adjusted R^2 shows that R-squared is 0.971053, meaning that 97.11% of the variation in extreme poverty can be explained by this model.

Based on the output in Table 4.5, the probability (Sig.) The value of the F-statistic test for the impact of the Family Hope Program (PKH) on extreme poverty is 0.000 < 0.05, so it can be concluded that the Family Hope Program (PKH) has a significant effect on extreme poverty. The results of the panel data regression for the impact of the Family Hope Program (PKH) on extreme poverty in the Mimika District also show variation in coefficients across districts (Pakage, Umar, & Ngutra, 2024). While the cumulative results of the panel data regression indicate a significant impact, some districts show positive coefficients, indicating that the Family Hope Program (PKH) has not yet fully succeeded in reducing extreme poverty in those areas.(Bakhri, Nasrulloh, & Pratista, 2025)

The lowest coefficient was found in the Agimuga district, with a value of -140.778. This indicates a significant negative effect, suggesting that the Family Hope Program (PKH) has been highly effective in reducing extreme poverty in this region of Indonesia. This large reduction suggests that the people in Agimuga have felt tangible benefits from the program. Next, Tembagapura has a coefficient of -125.6698, also showing a significant positive impact, indicating that the Family Hope Program (PKH) successfully helped reduce extreme poverty. However, this reduction still needs to be strengthened with additional interventions to achieve optimal results (Falentina & Resosudarmo).

The coefficient of -118.2084 for Kwamki Narama shows that the Family Hope Program (PKH) has contributed to reducing extreme poverty, although its impact is not as significant as that in Agimuga and Tembagapura. This indicates the potential for increasing the program's effectiveness in this district. The coefficient of -108.5225 for Hoya suggests that the Family Hope Program (PKH) has a positive impact on reducing extreme poverty, although it is not as strong as in the previous districts. This indicates that the program is still relevant but requires more attention.

In contrast, Mimika Timur Jauh District has a coefficient of 108.7721, showing a less effective positive impact on reducing extreme poverty. This coefficient suggests that further evaluation is needed to understand the challenges in this region better. Mimika Baru has a coefficient of 636.8312, indicating a positive impact, but also reflects challenges that need to be addressed to ensure the effectiveness of the Family Hope Program (PKH). This positive coefficient suggests that, while there are benefits, the program may not have produced the expected results.

Mimika Tengah has a coefficient of 98.10669, indicating an improvement, but also reflecting challenges that need to be addressed to ensure the effectiveness of the program in this area. The positive coefficient for Mimika Timur, with a value of 120.0912, suggests that although there is a positive impact, the Family Hope Program (PKH) has not fully functioned effectively in reducing extreme poverty. The Jila district has a coefficient of -89.8009, showing a negative impact, indicating a reduction in extreme poverty; however, the impact is relatively smaller than that of other districts. Kuala Kencana, with a value of -76.45784, suggests that the Family Hope Program (PKH) contributes to the reduction of extreme poverty, although the impact is more limited.

Iwaka has a coefficient of -68.40247, indicating a positive impact, but it is not as strong as that of districts with more negative coefficients. Wania, with a coefficient of -9.342794, shows a small negative impact, suggesting that the Family Hope Program (PKH) may not yet be fully effective in this district. Amar has a coefficient of -13.3266, indicating a negative impact but with a smaller effect than other districts, suggesting that the Family Hope Program (PKH) needs to be strengthened in this area. Mimika Barat Tengah, with a coefficient of -55.4303, shows that the Family Hope Program (PKH) has a positive impact, but it is not significant compared to other districts.

Mimika Barat, with a coefficient of -95.59558, shows that the Family Hope Program (PKH) works to

reduce extreme poverty, but the impact still needs to be enhanced. The district of Jita, with a coefficient of -62.90345, shows that the Family Hope Program (PKH) has a negative impact, but with a lower reduction than districts with lower coefficients. Finally, Mimika Barat Jauh has a coefficient of 96.05184, suggesting that in this district, the Family Hope Program (PKH) may not yet have the expected impact on reducing extreme poverty (Shah, Hatamyar, Hidayat, & Kreif, 2025).

Overall, the regression analysis of coefficients in each district in Mimika District shows varying impacts of the Family Hope Program (PKH) across districts, with some districts experiencing significant benefits, including Mimika Barat, Mimika Barat Tengah, Amar, Kuala Kencana, Tembagapura, Wania, Iwaka, Kwamki Narama, Agimuga, Jila, Jita, Alama, and Hoya. Meanwhile, other districts such as Mimika Barat Jauh, Mimika Timur, Mimika Tengah, Mimika Timur Jauh, and Mimika Baru face challenges that need to be addressed to increase the impact of the Family Hope Program (PKH).

The Family Hope Program (PKH), as part of the national social protection program, has significantly contributed to reducing extreme poverty in the Mimika District (Widiastuti, Umar, & Hafiziandra, 2024). In general, PKH acts as an instrument of state intervention for the poorest and most vulnerable groups of society, using a conditional cash transfer approach that aims not only to provide direct cash assistance but also to encourage behavioral changes, especially in education and health. The research results and panel data analysis indicate that PKH has a significant negative effect on extreme poverty levels. In other words, the larger the coverage and distribution of PKH assistance, the lower the extreme poverty rate in the Mimika District (Naa, Umar, & Ngutra, 2024). This indicates the effectiveness of PKH in alleviating the economic burden of beneficiary families and providing them with the opportunity to gradually escape absolute poverty.

PKH has successfully improved access to basic services for the poor. Pregnant women, children, the elderly, and people with disabilities, the program's primary target groups, have shown increased participation in health and education services. With the fulfillment of basic needs such as immunization, pregnancy check-ups, and children attending school, PKH has helped create a strong socio-economic foundation for the next generation of poor families (Cahyadi et al., 2020). A significant indirect impact of this program is the increased social awareness among the poor to become more active in productive economic activities. Some beneficiaries have used part of the PKH funds to support microenterprises and household capital needs, such as selling food, opening small shops, or engaging in small-scale animal husbandry. Although its contribution to income is not yet significant, this demonstrates the program's multiplier effect on economic independence.

However, the implementation of PKH in Mimika has not been fully consistent with its results. There are differences in effectiveness across districts, influenced by factors such as the quality of social assistants, infrastructure access to public services, and the validity of the beneficiary data. For instance, some remote districts with limited access to education and health facilities, coupled with limited assistance capacity, show lower program effectiveness. Additionally, there are still technical challenges, such as data discrepancies, delays in distribution, and communication gaps between assistants and beneficiaries. Overall, PKH is a highly relevant and adaptive program for addressing extreme poverty in complex regions such as the Mimika District. Its effectiveness is evident from the significant impact on reducing extreme poverty rates in the quantitative data, as well as improved accessibility to basic services and welfare in qualitative terms. However, the sustainability and improvement of the program's effectiveness require institutional improvements, strengthening of data systems, and cross-sector synergy, including collaboration with local economic empowerment programs, infrastructure development, and capacity building at the local level (Anggraeni, Khusaini, & Prasetyia, 2023).

5. Conclusion

5.1. Conclusion

In the context of social development, poverty is a critical issue that must be addressed. The Mimika District, with its unique geographic and demographic characteristics, faces challenges in reducing poverty levels. By analyzing extreme poverty data and the Family Hope Program (PKH) from 2022 to 2024, we can identify the extent to which poverty alleviation efforts have succeeded and areas that still

require more attention. The following conclusions summarize the key findings of this analysis.

1. Poverty in the Mimika District is the result of a combination of interrelated factors, including unequal access to basic services such as education and health, especially in remote districts. This is evident from the variation in the effectiveness of the Family Hope Program (PKH), where districts with inadequate infrastructure show lower program impact. The government's social assistance through the Family Hope Program (PKH) significantly alleviates poverty in the Mimika District. Data analysis shows that the number of families living in extreme poverty decreases from 3,709 families in 2022 to 2,691 families in 2024. This reflects the effectiveness of the Family Hope Program (PKH) in providing conditional financial assistance that helps improve the welfare of the beneficiary families. The regression results indicate that every increase in PKH assistance contributes to a reduction in the number of people living in extreme poverty (Hadna, 2022).
2. The government has played a comprehensive role in poverty alleviation efforts in the Mimika District through various policies and concrete actions. The Family Hope Program (PKH) serves as tangible proof of the government's commitment to reducing extreme poverty in the district. PKH does not merely provide cash assistance but is systematically designed as conditional aid that encourages behavior change in poor communities, particularly in education and health. In its implementation, the government has not only focused on financial assistance. PKH has also successfully increased the access of the poor to basic services, such as health and education. Increased participation in immunization programs, pregnancy checkups, and school attendance demonstrates that this program has successfully created a long-term foundation to break the cycle of poverty by improving human capital. However, challenges remain in the distribution of program benefits, which have not been evenly distributed across all the districts. Some areas, such as Agimuga and Tembagapura, have shown significant poverty reduction, while districts such as Mimika Timur Jauh and Mimika Baru still face challenges in terms of program effectiveness. This indicates the need for a more specific and intensive approach in certain areas of the country. The government has recognized these challenges and has begun taking corrective actions, including strengthening the social assistance system, improving the validity of beneficiary data, and building synergy with other development programs. Efforts to integrate PKH with economic empowerment programs, such as skill training and micro-enterprise capital access, demonstrate the government's commitment to creating more holistic solutions(Soekiman, 2023).

5.2. Recommendations

5.2.1. Academic Recommendations

- Further research should delve deeper into the factors affecting the Family Hope Program (PKH) in districts that show poor results. This research could include qualitative approaches to understand the local socioeconomic context.
- Development of a theoretical model explaining the relationship between social assistance and poverty alleviation. This could help formulate more effective strategies for future social programs in the region.
- Utilize broader data to analyze the long-term impacts of the Family Hope Program (PKH) and other programs. These data could provide insights into poverty trends and socioeconomic dynamics over a longer period.

5.2.2. Practical Recommendations

- Increase program socialization by conducting more intensive awareness campaigns to enhance the public's understanding of the Family Hope Program (PKH), including registration procedures and available benefits.
- Training beneficiaries in financial management and relevant skills can help them better utilize assistance and increase their income.
- Implement an effective monitoring system to periodically evaluate the impact of the Family Hope Program (PKH). This will help identify issues and make the necessary adjustments quickly.
- Collaborate with non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and local organizations to expand the program's reach and ensure that aid reaches the families most in need.

References

Alidoust, S., Gleeson, N., & Khalaj, F. (2024). A systematic review of planning policies for community wellbeing. *Journal of Urbanism: International Research on Placemaking and Urban Sustainability, 17*(4), 577-595. doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/17549175.2022.2071971

Alkire, S., & Santos, M. E. (2011). Acute multidimensional poverty: A new index for developing countries. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1815243

Anggraeni, R. M., Khusaini, M., & Prasetyia, F. (2023). Fiscal Decentralization and its Effect on Poverty Alleviation: Case Study of Indonesia. *Bulletin of Islamic Economics, 1*(2), 35-48. doi:https://doi.org/10.14421/bie.2022.012-04

Bakhri, M. S., Nasrulloh, A., & Pratista, D. (2025). *Determinants of Poverty in the Special Region of Yogyakarta: A Panel Data Analysis Approach.* Paper presented at the SHS Web of Conferences.

Bustomi, T., Turmudzi, D., & Chaidir, J. (2020). *Implementation Strategy of Village Fund Distribution Policy: Development of Rural in Serang District.* Paper presented at the International Conference on Public Administration, Policy and Governance (ICPAPG 2019).

Cahyadi, N., Hanna, R., Olken, B. A., Prima, R. A., Satriawan, E., & Syamsulhakim, E. (2020). Cumulative impacts of conditional cash transfer programs: Experimental evidence from Indonesia. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy, 12*(4), 88-110. doi:10.1257/pol.20190245

Fahad, S., Nguyen-Thi-Lan, H., Nguyen-Manh, D., Tran-Duc, H., & To-The, N. (2023). Analyzing the status of multidimensional poverty of rural households by using sustainable livelihood framework: policy implications for economic growth. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research, 30*(6), 16106-16119. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-022-23143-0

Falentina, A. T., & Resosudarmo, B. P. Targeted social assistance programs and local economies: The case of conditional cash transfer in Indonesia.

Habibullah, H., Yuda, T. K., Setiawan, H. H., & Susantyo, B. (2024). Moving beyond stereotype: A qualitative study of long-standing recipients of the Indonesian conditional cash transfers (CCT/PKH). *Social Policy & Administration, 58*(1), 108-121. doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/spol.12946

Hadna, A. H. (2022). The impact of conditional cash transfers on low-income individuals in Indonesia. *Advances in Southeast Asian Studies, 15*(1), 23-41. doi:https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3635-0961

Marfuah, Cempaka, S., Ardiansyah, A. R., Rahmawati, L., Rediana, M. Y., & Koswara, R. (2021). Kebijakan Pemerintah dalam Penanggulangan Bencana di Indonesia. *Jurnal Studi Ilmu Sosial dan Politik, 1*(1), 35-45. doi:https://doi.org/10.35912/jasispol.v1i1.184

Naa, O., Umar, H. B., & Ngutra, R. N. (2024). Analysis of the effect of Supplementary Food Provision (PMT) budget distribution on improving child nutrition for stunting eradication in Mimika Regency. *Global Academy of Business Studies, 1*(3), 161-172. doi:https://doi.org/10.35912/gabs.v1i3.3477

Nugroho, L. S., Femala, D., & Maryani, Y. (2019). Perilaku Menyikat Gigi Terhadap Oral Hygiene Anak Sekolah. *Dental Therapist Journal, 1*(1), 44-51. doi:https://doi.org/10.31965/dtl.v1i1.358

Pakage, C. L., Umar, H. B., & Ngutra, R. N. (2024). Raja Analysis of the potential and effectiveness of central market retribution revenue on the Regional Original Income (PAD) of Mimika Regency. *Global Academy of Business Studies, 1*(3), 173-185. doi:https://doi.org/10.35912/gabs.v1i3.3478

Ramasamy, R. (2020). Quality of government, public service delivery and institutional impartiality in ethnically polarised societies: evidence for policy makers. *Asia Pacific Journal of Public Administration, 42*(1), 46-60. doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/23276665.2020.1731246

Saban, A. B., & Falatehan, A. F. (2023). Economic Transformation: How Does the Agricultural Sector Performance in Indonesia's Regional Economic Structure. *Jurnal Ekonomi Pembangunan, 21*(2), 175-190. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.29259/jep.v21i2.22744

Saputra, A. S., Trianfano, A., Sartono, S., Nagiyanti, G., Agustina, A., & Chaerunisa, S. (2022). Evaluation Of The Family Hope Program (Pkh) In Tamansari Village, Karanglewas District, Banyumas Regency. *Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi: Media Pengembangan Ilmu dan Praktek Administrasi, 19*(2), 235-245. doi:https://doi.org/10.31113/jia.v19i2.889

Shah, V., Hatamyar, J., Hidayat, T., & Kreif, N. (2025). Exploring the heterogeneous impacts of Indonesia's conditional cash transfer scheme (PKH) on maternal health care utilisation using instrumental causal forests. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12803*. doi:https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2501.12803

Sihombing, P., & Arsani, A. (2021). *Static and dynamic panel models: Which is better?(Case study: Poverty data in Indonesia 2012-2019).* Paper presented at the IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science.

Soekiman, J. S. (2023). Analysiss Implementation of the Family Hope Program (Pkh) in Parangjoro Village. *International Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting Research (IJEBAR), 7*(3). doi:https://doi.org/10.29040/ijebar.v7i3.11122

Suhandi, N., Putri, E. A. K., & Agnisa, S. (2018). Analisis Pengaruh Jumlah Penduduk terhadap Jumlah Kemiskinan Menggunakan Metode Regresi Linear di Kota Palembang. *Jurnal Ilmiah Informatika Global, 9*(2). doi:https://doi.org/10.36982/jiig.v9i2.543

Sutiyo, S. (2023). A neo-institutional analysis of social protection: Insights from Indonesia. *Global Social Policy, 23*(2), 268-285. doi:https://doi.org/10.1177/14680181221144559

Tutkey, S. B., Santoso, I. R., & Akib, F. H. Y. (2025). Analysis of The Effects of Size Population, Unemployment, and Government Expenditures on Poverty Levels in Mimika Regency 2011-2023. *Jurnal Simki Economic, 8*(1), 124-132. doi:https://doi.org/10.29407/jse.v8i1.953

Widiastuti, M. S., Umar, H. B., & Hafiziandra, Y. (2024). The influence of the e-catalogue system on fraud prevention in goods and services procurement in the regional government of Mimika Regency. *Global Academy of Multidisciplinary Studies, 1*(2), 141-156. doi:https://doi.org/10.35912/gams.v1i2.3470

Wu, M.-Y., Tong, Y., Li, Q., Wall, G., & Wu, X. (2023). Interaction rituals and social relationships in a rural tourism destination. *Journal of Travel Research, 62*(7), 1480-1496. doi:https://doi.org/10.1177/00472875221130495