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Abstract. Joint Business Group (KUBE) is one of Social Welfare Programs (PROKESOS) created by the Ministry of Social Affairs to build the skills of solving problem, fulfilling daily needs and developing self-potentials of the poor. The success of KUBE depends on various aspects, one of which is the service provider, i.e. government officials who implement KUBE program in the field. The research was conducted in areas that have implemented KUBE. The research locations were determined based on purposive technique in Galih Pakuan village, Bulu Limbangan Sub-district, Garut District, West Java, and Purworejo village, Negeri Katon Sub-district, Pesawaran District, Lampung. The data were collected through interviews, using guidelines of interview, observation, and document-study. The collected data were analyzed using the techniques of qualitative and quantitative descriptive analysis. The result shows that the task implementation and coordination among parties in KUBE program were not effective. To improve the effectiveness of task implementation, the job description and recruitment pattern of supervisors need to be redesigned, while to improve the effectiveness of coordination, communication among parties need to be more intensified.
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INTRODUCTION

Poverty is one of social problems that is complex and multidimensional, both in an economic reality and social reality (Lewandowski, 2008). Poverty is associated with various aspects of life, i.e. economic, social and cultural aspects, and it has both internal and external dimensions. A country is said to have poverty problems when many of its population are still below the poverty line, as is experienced by Indonesia. Poverty is the main problem that should be addressed and should be a top priority in the development of social welfare in Indonesia. Poverty is not an easy problem; it is widespread in the advanced era of globalization (Rivace and Asrati, 2012). Poverty causes one be unable to meet one’s basic needs such as the need for food, health, education, employment, housing, clean water, and land ownership. The Directorate of Rural Poverty Reduction (2012) states that the number of poor people in Indonesia reached 31.02 million, or 13.3% of the total population. Among the number of poor people, 13.75 million people are included in the category of very poor.

Addressing poverty is not easy since the poor have been in their situation for a long time. These communities have limitations in terms of education and skills; they do not have sufficient economic business facilities and do not have adequate business capital to develop their productive economic enterprises. Various offers of loans to set micro, small and medium businesses from entrepreneurs and banks are difficult to access by the poor because of limited capabilities and asset. The Indonesian government does not belittle the poverty problems. Various attempts have been made by governmental institutions to reduce poverty, such as Takesra Saving and Kuksesra Loan by BKKBN; Disadvantaged Villages Program Instruction by the Ministry of Home Affairs; Business Study Group by the Ministry of Education and Culture; Food and Nutrition...
Diversification Program and Small Farmers Revenue Project through Farming Business Group by the Ministry of Agriculture.

As a governmental institution that runs most tasks of governance and development in social welfare, the Ministry of Social Affairs under the Law No. 11 of 2009 on Social Welfare is established as the leading sector in poverty reduction, bearing a great responsibility in dealing with the poor and being the holder of social welfare issues. Social Welfare Program (PROKESOS) is one of the strategic policies designed by the Ministry of Social Affairs. The policy is directed to make each poor family capable to improve its welfare and livelihood as well as improve the quality of social environment. Poverty reduction program is not merely to give economic aids, equipment, materials (stimulant funds), and skills training, but also make the economic resources accessible to poor families. In order to enable the handling of the poor effectively and efficiently achieve the target, i.e. self-sufficiency, the thing to do is to empower families. Referring to the Presidential Decree No. 5 of 1993 on the Improvement of Poverty-Reduction Program, and the Presidential Decree No. 3 of 1996 on the Development of Prosperous Families, the Ministry of Social Affairs has implemented PROKESOS program through Joint Business Group (KUBE).

KUBE is one of the approaches created to develop the skills of solving problem, fulfilling daily needs and developing self-potential of the poor (the Directorate of Rural Poverty Reduction, 2012). The social and economic dimensions become the major pillars of KUBE activity. Socially, the integration of the poor into KUBE program allows them to have positive and democratic social interaction. KUBE is expected to be the medium to improve their communication skills, and jointly resolve personal and group problems. Economically, the business activities conducted in a group enable the members to develop the business, raise capital strength, improve the ability to compete, build business networks, open access to economic resources and create a democratic economic activity. The choosing of KUBE as an approach for PROKESOS is based on the fact that the holder of social welfare and the poor have inherent limitations, such as low human resources, lack of business capital and limited ability to explore and organize the various potentials of the members of KUBE. The assistants are expected to be function as a teacher but as a partner; they work with the involvement of assistants among the group does not exist. This assistantship will escort KUBE members to identify their needs and solve the problems they encounter. The involvement of assistants among the group does not function as a teacher but as a partner; they work with the members of KUBE. The assistants are expected to be capable to explore and organize the various potentials and resources that can be utilized for the empowerment of the poor in accordance with the regulations and the characteristics of the local community.

KUBE is an approach created to develop the ability to solve problems, fulfill daily needs and develop the economic dimension. In general, the purpose of the establishment of KUBE is to improve the quality of life and social well-being of the poor. One KUBE is composed of 10 heads of families who receive business capital aid of IDR 20 million. KUBE aid is accompanied by an assistantship. Through the development of KUBE, its members are expected to be able to increase their ability to fulfill their daily needs, enhance the ability to cope with the problems that occur in the family and social environment, and improve the ability to display both their social roles in the family and in the neighborhood. In the first stage KUBE acquires its capital aid for productive economic business, in the form of stimulus funds, from de-concentration funds or Regional Budget (APBD). Later, after the KUBE is growing, the surrounding community and the KUBE itself are expected to facilitate the establishment of independent financial institution/microfinance, capable to access the banking sector. KUBE program uses social group work method in which self-help groups are created, accompanied by a social worker as an assistant.

KUBE is implemented in five stages, namely: preparation stage, consisting of orientation and observation, identification, action planning of social counseling, social and motivational assistantship, evaluation of preparation conducted by village officials, KUBE assistants and functional supervisors; The second stage is formation stage, consisting of the selection of social trained group candidate, pre-group and group formation, selection/determination of the type of business, training for assistants, skills training, stimulus funding, monitoring and evaluation conducted by village officials, assistants, supervisors, and relevant institutions; The third stage is the business development stage, consisting of business development assistance, business development aid giving, monitoring and evaluation by assistants and functional supervisors; The fourth stage is business partnership stage, consisting of an inventory of
existing resources (natural, economic, social, and human resources), make agreements, implementation of business partnerships, business partnerships network expansion, evaluation by the assistants and functional supervisors; and the last stage is the monitoring and evaluation stage, consisting of the control and monitoring processes on the ongoing implementation, and evaluation of the success already achieved by the assistants and functional supervisors.

The purpose of KUBE is to empower poor families by the indicators of increased knowledge (cognitive), understanding/attitude/commitment (affective) and management skills (psychomotor). On the basis of empirical experience, KUBE has not optimally given benefit for the improvement of social power and well-being of poor families. In conceptual term, KUBE does have its advantages, yet in practical term by reference to empirical facts on the ground, many evidences prove that the approach has not succeeded in alleviating poor families, changing them into a prosperous, creative, innovative family, whose attitudes reflect self-sufficiency (Murdidiyanto, 2010).

The research took a study on KUBE has actually been done by other researchers, such as one conducted by Hardiati (2010) on the effectiveness of social services for poor families through KUBE system, concluding that it is not effective to improve the social welfare of poor families. The results show that there are major inhibiting factors that cause KUBE incapable to improve social welfare, i.e.: low education levels and low capacity of the productive skills of the service recipient. From the research, it is advisable to provide skills assistance for service recipients. However, in a study conducted by Moerdjianto (2010) regarding the alleviation of poor families through KUBE, it is concluded that KUBE program can actually improve the quality of life of its members, improve the social dynamics, as well as enhancing the capabilities and skills of its members in resolving the problem. KUBE also have a positive implication on the surrounding community. However, to fully achieve the purpose of KUBE, it is recommended to improve the quality of human resources, capital, and business partners, as well as expand the reach of the business-product marketing. The research conducted by Moerdjianto (2010) provide findings that are in line with the research conducted by Hardiati (2010) in that the goal of KUBE has not been fully achieved, despite the positive implications felt by members of KUBE. In general, these two studies are more oriented to the service recipient, i.e. the poor who become members of KUBE. Thus far, however, there has been no research on KUBE that highlights the aspect of service provider, i.e. government officials who implement KUBE in the field, whereas the government according to Law No. 11 of 2009 on Social Welfare has the duty and responsibility of alleviating poverty (Article 20 letter a). Specifically, the duties and responsibilities of the implementation of KUBE approach is held by the Directorate General of Rural Poverty Reduction and the Directorate General of Social Empowerment and Poverty Alleviation, the Ministry of

Social Affairs and regional governments, in particular Provincial and District/Municipal Departments/Offices of Social Service in charge of the functional implementation of the program/activity. Since KUBE approach involves many parties in its implementation, the success of the approach is allegedly associated with KUBE task execution and coordination. This notion becomes the background of this research.

In the field of public policy, one of the criteria that can be used for an assessment is its effectiveness (Rossell, 1993). The English word “effective” means successful or do something successfully. In terms of organization, effectiveness is often associated with the achievement of goals. If the goal is reached, then it is declared effective. If it is not achieved then declared ineffective. Therefore, effectiveness is an idea about the level of success in achieving the goals. Sedarmayanti (2001) suggests that effectiveness is a measure that gives an overview of how far the goal is reached. The definition of effectiveness is more oriented to the output. Similar ideas is also expressed by Handayadinigrat (1996): effectiveness is a measurement, in terms of achievement of predetermined objectives. The meaning of effectiveness in terms of task implementation is discussed by Kurniawan (2005) stating that effectiveness is the ability to carry out the duties, and functions (the operations of program activities or missions) of an organization. The definition is also consistent with one suggested by Immordino and Steers. According to Immordino (2009) effectiveness is the ability of an institution or organization to carry out all of its fundamental tasks or to achieve predetermined goals. Meanwhile, according to Steers (2005), effectiveness is an organization’s level of ability to carry out all of its fundamental tasks. The meaning of effectiveness in terms of coordination is found in the statement of Geert (2010), stating that in an effective institution, internal processes run smoothly where the activities of existing parts run in a coordinated manner. Coordination according to Stoner, Freeman, and Gilbert (2009) is the process of bringing together the activities of separate departments to achieve the goals of the organization effectively. Without coordination, those departments may be tempted to advance its own interests at the expense of organizational goals. The spectrum of coordination activities consist of information sharing, collaboration, and the development of plans and joint programs.

Based on the above, the problem raised in this study is “How effective is the task implementation and coordination of KUBE program in Garut and Pesawaran Districts?” Thus the purpose of this study is to sketch a description or picture the effectiveness of task implementation and coordination of KUBE in Garut and Pesawaran Districts.

RESEARCH METHODS

This research is descriptive; it is used to describe or depict the characteristics of the population or phenomenon being studied (Shields and Rangarajan, 2013). The study was conducted in areas that have implemented KUBE
program. Information about the regions is obtained from the Directorate General of Social Aid, the Ministry of Social Affairs. The locations of the research were determined based on purposive sampling technique, i.e. Purworejo village, Negeri Katon Sub-district, Pesawaran District, Lampung; Galih Pakuan Village, Bulu Limbangan Sub-district, Garut District, West Java. The two villages are similar villages chosen as the locations of the research performed by Hardiati. The reason is to continue the research that has been conducted by previous researcher, yet highlighting on another aspect that has not been explored, i.e. the aspect of service providers which, in this case, is the government officials who implement KUBE program in the field. The populations of the research were all concerned parties of KUBE implementation in the field, according to the Guidelines of Poverty Alleviation in Districts’ Disadvantaged Areas, issued by the Ministry of Social Affairs (2012). The concerned parties are: the Directorate of Rural Poverty Reduction, the Provincial Office of Social Service, the District Office of Social Services, Supervisors, Sub-district Assistants, and village Assistants. The object of the research is the executors of KUBE task implementation and coordination or the aforementioned parties.

In this study data were collected through interviews using guidelines of interview, observation, and document-study. The study did not use samples; thus interviews were conducted to all members of the population consisting of 80 persons, i.e. 10 people from the Directorate of Rural Poverty Reduction, 14 people from the Provincial Office of Social Services, 14 people from the District Office of Social Service, 10 supervisors, 15 sub-districts assistants and 20 village assistants, directly involved in the implementation of KUBE program in each location of the research. The collected data were analyzed using the techniques of qualitative and quantitative descriptive analysis. Qualitative analysis is performed to interpret the data obtained by arguments that are factual and scientific. For the purpose of quantitative descriptive analysis, scoring was conducted to measure the effectiveness of tasks implementation and coordination by the related parties, using the assessment criteria of effective (E), fairly effective (C), and ineffective (K). Those criteria were obtained through the total score of respondents’ answers with the lowest value of “1” and the highest value of “3”. The aspect of task implementation by the concerned parties being assessed referred to the list of task implementation mentioned in the Guidelines of Poverty Alleviation in Districts’ Disadvantaged Areas issued by the Ministry of Social Affairs (2012: 46). The aspect of Coordination by the concerned parties being assessed referred to the spectrum of coordination activities.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

To determine the level of effectiveness of the task implementation by the concerned parties, measurements were made on the aspects contained in the job description, mentioned in the Guidelines of Poverty Alleviation in the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Pesawaran</th>
<th>Garut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Preparing reference for task implementation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Preparing a budget</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Implement capacity building</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Determine KUBE receivers, supervisors, and assistants</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Do the controlling</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. The Task Implementation of the Directorate of Rural Poverty Reduction

Districts’ Disadvantaged Areas issued by the Directorate of Rural Poverty Reduction (the Ministry of Social Affairs, 1912).

The Directorate of Rural Poverty Reduction has a duty to make a reference for task implementation, prepare a budget, implement capacity building, determine KUBE receivers, supervisors and assistants, as well as do the controlling.

Table 1 shows that the overall task implementation by the Directorate of Rural Poverty Reduction, the Directorate General of Social Empowerment and Poverty Alleviation, the Ministry of Social Affairs is considered to be effective. From each 10 respondents in both Pesawaran and Garut Districts, more than 80% respondents declared effective. Similarly, for almost every element of the task implementation, more than 80% declared effective. However, the concern is the element of budget preparation contained 30% of respondents in Pesawaran and 40% of respondents in Garut stating fairly effective. In 2013 there was indeed a change related to the preparation of the budget. KUBE budget was no longer delivered to the regions as before, instead it is managed by the center. KUBE was previously established in the regions through de-concentration fund, while the KUBE development used the funds from the center. Now KUBE is formed in the center; the regions merely develop it with the support of networks from the central government. This is why the burden of the central government increases and impacts on the effectiveness of task implementation related to the preparation of the budget.

The Provincial Office of Social Service has the task to facilitate the trial implementation; provide recommendations to the District; do the monitoring and evaluation; and report the progress and results of the trial to the Directorate of Rural Poverty Reduction.

Table 2 shows that the overall task implementation by the Provincial Office of Social Services is considered
to be fairly effective. Of each 14 respondents, 66% in Pesawaran and 61% in Garut declared effective. However, compared between the ones declaring ineffective and effective, more respondents stated ineffective. This applies equally well in Pesawaran (18%) and in Garut (12%). There are two elements of task implementation that are considered ineffective, i.e. ‘do the monitoring and evaluation’ and ‘report the progress and results of the trial to the Directorate of Rural Poverty Reduction’. The lack of effective monitoring and evaluation activities for the Provincial Office of Social Service is due to habit of commonly waiting for a report from the District Office of Social Service. Limitations of budget, personnel, and time resulted in a rare visit to the field. The same thing also happened on the reporting of progress and results of the trial to the Directorate of Rural Poverty Reduction; they also just wait for the report from the District Office of Social Service; thus the report is submitted, depending on how early the District Office of Social Service submit their report. The rare field visits eventually make it difficult to assess the validity of the content of the report.

The District Office of Social Service has the task of preparing the initial data; proposing candidates for the program; implementing recruitment and proposed supervisors and assistants; opening an account for trials operational fund; facilitating KUBE account opening; providing technical guidance and assistantship trainings; reviewing business proposals and provide recommendations of KUBE funding disbursement; conducting supervision, monitoring, and evaluation; and submitting an activity report to the Directorate of Rural Poverty Reduction and the Provincial Office of Social Services.

Table 3 shows that the overall task implementation by the District Office of Social Service was considered ineffective. From each 11 respondents, most declared ineffective, 52% in Pesawaran and 52% in Garut. Only two elements were expressed effective by fraction of respondents (5% in Pesawaran and 7% in Garut), i.e. ‘opening an account for trials operational fund’ and ‘facilitating KUBE account opening’. A government-owned bank appointed as a partner by the Ministry of Social Affairs is required to facilitate the account opening for KUBE implementation. The other tasks (preparing the initial data; proposing candidates for the program; implementing recruitment and proposed supervisors and assistants; providing technical guidance and assistantship trainings; reviewing business proposals and provide recommendations of KUBE funding disbursement; conducting supervision, monitoring, and evaluation; and submitting an activity report to the Directorate of Rural Poverty Reduction and the Provincial Office of Social Services) are considered ineffective due to a lack of understanding of the District Office of Social Service officials concerning the General Guidelines of Rural Poverty Reduction and Guidelines of Poverty Alleviation in the Districts’ Disadvantaged Areas issued by the Directorate of Rural Poverty Reduction.

Supervisors have tasks to: provide guidance and supervision to the sub-district and village assistants; assess the performance of the sub-district and village assistants;
connect KUBE with the resources; implement monitoring and evaluation; report the task implementation of the sub-district and village assistants; and submit a report on the implementation of the supervisors to the District Office of Social Service.

Table 4 shows that the overall task implementation of supervisors was considered ineffective. From each 10 respondents, most respondents expressed ineffective (57% in Pesawaran and 53% in Garut). None of the respondents said that the supervisors have effective task implementation. Most respondents only declared fairly effective for the element of ‘report the task implementation of the sub-district and village assistants’ and ‘submit a report on the implementation of the supervisors’. The ineffective task implementation of the supervisors is due to the improper recruitment process and lack of initiative to use a variety of skills and motivational enhancement techniques.

The sub-district assistants have tasks to: supervise the village assistants; assess the performance of village assistants; connect KUBE with the resources; facilitate the exchange of information among villages assistants; register activities of assistantship; implement monitoring and evaluation; and submit a report on their assistantship to the District Office of Social Service and supervisors.

Table 5 shows the overall task implementation of Sub-district assistants is considered ineffective. From each 15 respondents, they mostly declared ineffective (44% in Pesawaran and 45% in Garut). Almost all of the respondents in both Pesawaran and Garut stated that the least ineffective element (over 80%) is ‘connect KUBE with resources’ which are offices/agencies/instututions/individuals who can provide support to KUBE. In general, sub-districts assistants in Garut and Pesawaran are local heads such as community leaders, religious leaders, social workers, head of Youth Group, Sub-district Social Welfare officers, and formal/informal leaders. The role of sub-district assistants as planner, mentor, information giver, motivator, communicator, facilitator, mobilizer, advocate, and evaluator could not be met by local leaders who serve as assistants.

The village assistants have a task to provide socio-economic guidance to KUBE; provide motivational guidance to KUBE members; provide guidance for planning/business proposals; keep records on KUBE activity development; keep records on assisting activities; facilitate meetings among KUBEs; promote KUBE products; assist in solving the existing KUBE problems; connect KUBE with resources to develop social and economic activities; assess the performance of KUBE;
Table 6. The Task Implementation of Village Assistants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Pesawaran</th>
<th>Garut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Provide socio-economic guidance to KUBE</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Provide motivational guidance to KUBE members</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Provide guidance for planning/business proposals</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Keep records on KUBE activity development</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Keep records on assisting activities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Facilitate meetings among KUBE members</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Promote KUBE product</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Assist in solving the existing KUBE problems</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Correct KUBE with resources to develop social and economic activities</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Assess the performance of KUBE</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Implement monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Submit a report on the assisting implementation to the District Office, supervisors and sub-district assistants</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

implement monitoring and evaluation; and to submit a report on the assisting implementation to the District Office, supervisors and sub-district assistants.

Table 6 shows the overall task implementation of village assistants is considered ineffective. From each 20 respondents, the most widely expressed is ineffective (57% in Pesawaran and 59% in Garut). Only activities related to reporting are declared fairly effective, while the rest is declared ineffective by most respondents. The problem encountered by the village assistants is actually the same as the sub-district assistants. Generally, the village assistants in Garut and Pesawaran are local heads such as community leaders, religious leaders, social workers, head of Youth Group, Village Social Welfare officer, and the formal/informal leaders. The role of assistants as planner, mentor, information giver, motivator, communicator, facilitator, mobilizer, advocate, and evaluator cannot be met by local leaders who serve as village assistants.

To determine the effectiveness level of coordination among the parties concerned, measurements were made on the aspects contained in the spectrum of the coordination activities consisting of information sharing, collaboration, and the development of plans and joint programs.

Table 7 shows that the overall coordination is considered ineffective. Of each 80 respondents, the majority of respondents stated that the coordination is ineffective (82% in Pesawaran and 80% in Garut). None of the respondents declared effective. Actually the Technical Coordination Team was formed at the central, provincial, and district/municipal level, nevertheless these teams are not working optimally and consequently the relevant parties tend to work on their own. The lack of effective coordination among the parties does not affect the goal achievement of coordination itself, i.e. the establishment of cooperation among the parties in terms of utilization and employment of institutional systems in KUBE implementation as stated in the General Guidelines for Rural Poverty Reduction (the Ministry of Social Affairs, 2012: 66). These findings reinforce the statement by Geert (2010) stating that in ineffective institution, the internal processes are not running smoothly in which the activities of existing parts run in less/not coordinated.

This study is not free from a number of limitations. The limitations are related to the methodology and

Table 7. The Implementation of Coordination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Pesawaran</th>
<th>Garut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Information Sharing</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Colaboration</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Development of plans and joint program</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 19 82 42 18 0 0 19 80 48 20 0 0
data. The limitation associated with the methodology is that the study was not conducted in all villages that have implemented the KUBE program Pesawaran and Garut Districts. Should such were done, the number of villages to be studied would be too many, thus unfeasible for researcher, due to limited time and funds. As a consequence, the data collected cannot describe the other villages in Garut and Pesawaran Districts.

CONCLUSION

KUBE program, as an approach to PROKESOS, is an effort to empower the poor through working together in a group. Working in groups is conducted to overcome various limitations encountered by the poor when working in an individual basis. The success or failure of KUBE depends on various aspects both related to the service recipient, i.e. the poor who are members of KUBE, and service providers, i.e. government officials who implement KUBE in the field. In terms of the service provider aspect, the research results showed that the task implementation and coordination among the parties in KUBE implementation is considered ineffective.

From the job description, there are overlapping tasks, in the sense that the same tasks are performed by different parties. Hence, the job description should be redesigned so that there is a clear specialization. Of the several parties involved in KUBE implementation, the role of the assistants is the most crucial since assistants, particularly village assistants, are directly connected to KUBE members. Local leaders may still be village assistants, as long as they are equipped with business skills, ability to motivate and have sufficient time to assist the development of KUBE. It must also be considered to recruit assistants from among professional and academicians in relevant disciplines from nearby higher education. In the mean while, coordination among parties can be improved through better communication. Communication can be done through a variety of meetings, discussions both direct and through intermediary, by using the media or taking advantage of communications technology. The available Technical Coordination Team is composed of structural officers from the Central Government and Regional Government. The work load carried by these officials was too big that the attention and time spared for coordination in KUBE implementation is inadequate. Consideration should be given also to appoint a coordinator whose main task is to coordinate and liaise the parties involved in KUBE implementation. Coordinator can also be recruited from among professionals and academicians in relevant disciplines from the nearby higher education.
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