EFFICIENT

Implementation of Swadaya Housing Stimulant Assistance

Mia Sekarvilia[1]✉, Karsinah[2]

Jurusan Ekonomi Pembangunan, Fakultas Ekonomi, Universitas Negeri Semarang

Abstract

People who are less fortunate still find it difficult to get access to decent homes. The Government of Indonesia through the Ministry of Public Works and Housing has developed a program that is oriented towards housing development, namely the Self-Help Housing Stimulant Assistance aimed at Low-Income Communities. The purpose of this study is to measure the success of the implementation of Self-Help Housing Stimulant Assistance in Tempuran Village, Bringin District, Semarang Regency. The research method used is descriptive percentage. The type of data used is primary data using a questionnaire. The variables used are program standards and targets, institutional capacity, funding and social and political conditions. The results of the study, the percentage of standard variables and program targets is 73% categorized as successful. The results of the analysis of the percentage of institutional capacity variables that is 73% are categorized successful. The results of the analysis of the percentage of financing variables are 86% until the categorization is very successful. The results of the analysis of the percentage of social and political conditions variables are 44% categorized quite successful. The policy implications, assistance and supervision of the Field Facilitator are needed for the KPB to carry out its development independently, the need for prior notification of the preparation of additional self-funding in the BSPS program by the beneficiary community itself for the completion of the housing construction process, the need for participation from surrounding communities and interest groups who have the opinion that the implementation goes well

Keywords: Minimum Wages, Economic Growth, Industry, Unemployment

Abstrak

Masyarakat yang kurang beruntung masih sulitnya akses untuk mendapatkan rumah layak huni. Pemerintah Indonesia melalui Kementeriann PUPR membuat suatu program yang berorientasi pada pembangunan perumahan yaitu Bantuan Stimulan Perumahan Swadaya ditujukan bagi Masyarakat Berpenghasilan Rendah. Tujuajn penelitian ini adalah untuk mengukur keberhasilan impelementasi Bantuan Stimulan Perumahan Swadaya di Desa Tempuran Kecamatan Bringin Kabupaten Semarang. Metode penelitian yang digunakan adalah deskriptif persentase. Jenis data yang digunakan adalaah data primer dengan menggunakan kuesioner. Variabel yang digunakan adalah standar dan sasaran program, kapasitas kelembagaan, pembiayaan serta kondisi sosial dan politik. Hasil penelitian persentase variabel standar dan sasaran program adalah sebesar 73% dikategorikan berhasil. Hasil analisis persentase variabel kapasitas kelembagaan yaitu 73% dikategorikan berhasil. Hasil analisis persentase variabel pembiayaan adalah 86% sdikategorikan sangat berhasil. Hasil analisi persentase variabel kondisi sosial dan politik adalah 44% dikategorikan cukup berhasil. Implikasi kebijakan, pendampingan dan pengawasan dari Tenaga Fasilitator Lapangan diperlukan agar KPB melakukan pembangunannya secara swadaya, perlunya pemberitahuan terlebih dahulu untuk persiapan dana tambahan swadaya pada program BSPS oleh masyarakat penerima bantuan itu sendiri demi terselesaikannya proses pembangunan rumah, perlunya partisipasi dari masyarakat sekitar serta kelompok kepentingan yang berpengarung agar implementasi berjalan dengan baik

Kata Kunci: Upah Minimum, Pertumbuhan Ekonomi,Industri, Pengangguran

✉ Alamat Korespondensi :
 Alamat: Gedung L2 Lantai 2 FE Unnes
 Kampus Sekaran, Gunungpati, Semarang, 50229
 E-mail : Sekarmia@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Poverty is one of the complex problems that is almost experienced by all regions in Indonesia, one of which is Central Java. Poverty is a condition or condition of a person's inability to fulfill his basic needs such as clothing, food, housing, education and health, which is caused by the scarcity of means to fulfill needs or the difficulty of accessing education and health. Poverty causes unable to meet the basic needs of life, so that his life is not prosperous. The level of community welfare in an area basically can be seen in plain view of the existence and ownership of his house. (BPS 2018).

The house is one of the basic needs of individuals. But for some disadvantaged people, it is still difficult to access to get a decent home. Low income earners per month are below the requirements to get housing ownership credit from the National Savings Bank, the results of the development of public housing companies and especially development companies that cannot be reached by low income people are forced to increase the occupants of houses or make patchwork on their homes. This causes a decrease in the quality of housing that is inhabited by most low-income people.

Regional development is carried out to increase the distribution of national development in all regions. (Berliana and Praise 2017). The Government of Indonesia through the Ministry of Public Works and Public Housing developed a program oriented to housing development, namely the Self-Help Housing Stimulant Assistance aimed at Low-Income Communities and regulated by the Republic of Indonesia Minister of Public Works and Public Housing Regulation No. 07 / PRT / M / 2018. This program is carried out to support the acceleration of housing development in increasing access to housing. Self-help Stimulant Assistance, abbreviated as BSPS, is a government assistance for low-income people to encourage and increase self-sufficiency in improving the quality of housing and new construction along with infrastructure, facilities and public utilities.

There are still various kinds of problems and discrepancies in the application of BSPS including those based on research from Isabela, Sesar and Amaliatulwalidain (2014) in Mulyo Rejo Village, Way Serdang District, Mesuji Regency, there are problems regarding the adequacy of BSPS funds due to lack of understanding of the beneficiary community that the assistance received is only of a nature stimulants and a decline in aid funding and a lack of human resources. Then the research conducted by Zukarnain (2016) in the implementation of BSPS in South Parigi Subdistrict also has problems including those who are not wise in the use of aid which should fund only for renovations but used for new development so that construction is not completed, then there are budget cuts which is not explained in its designation and the late distribution of building materials. Research

conducted by Inggriani (2015) in the Dharmasraya Regency in implementing BSPS there was a problem of lack of communicants and information so that many people were unaware of the BSPS program and the recipient community of BSPS also did not understand the BSPS funds which were stimulant, then the lack of human resources also became an obstacle in implementing BSPS.

Semarang Regency as the second most recipient of BSPS as a place of research. The number of RTLH in Semarang District based on 2015 PDBT data was 37,437, and Bringin District with the highest number of uninhabitable houses (RTLH) being the largest recipient in Semarang Regency.

Tempuran village as the recipient of the most BSPS Programs in Bringin District in 2018 is 58 units. Bringin Subdistrict consists of 16 villages, 5 other villages that have not had the opportunity to get assistance, namely Gododalem Village, Nyemoh Village, Popongan Village, Truko Village and Wiru Village. The unequal reception of BSPS means the unequal rights of people living in RTLH conditions to own and occupy a decent house in Semarang Regency.

Based on the initial observation interview to the beneficiary (Mr. Kumarudin, one of the KPB chairmen in Tempuran Village) on February 16, 2019 there was a BSPS implementation in Tempuran Village that was not in accordance with the provisions including

Tabel 1. Penerima BSPS PK di Kecamatan Bringin Tahun 2018

No	Village	Amoont (unit)
1	Tempuran	58
2	Kalijambe	53
3	Bringin	53
4	Pakisarum	51
5	Rembes	50
6	Sendang	50
7	Banding	47
8	Kalikurmo	45
9	Lebak	31
10	Sambirejo	30
11	Tanjung	21
Total		489

Source: Dinas Pemberdayaan Masyarakat dan Desa Kabupaten Semarang

"Most of the recipients here are doing their own construction, not in groups, because they don't have the time either, looking for individual craftsmen some are building new houses too (Penerima disini kebanyakan melakukan pembangunannya sendiri-sendiri, tidak berkelompok, karena tidak sempat juga, pada cari tukang sendiri-sendiri…. ada yang bangun rumah baru juga "

Based on the statement of Mr. Kumarudin, the beneficiary community formed in the group of aid recipients did not carry out the construction in groups, then there were people who built new houses, whereas in the provision of BSPS assistance this was only a stimulant so that the allotment for repair or improvement of the quality of the

house if used for the construction of new houses means that the assistance obtained is not enough, and there are no sanctions for the recipient community who do not carry out the construction according to the provisions.

Implementation is one of the stages in the policy process. The implementation process becomes important, because the successful implementation of a policy program will have an impact in accordance with the objectives of the program made. Based on research conducted by Wardani (2010) the success of implementation is influenced by several things including standards and policy objectives, institutional capacity, and financing.

The suitability of program implementation in accordance with the standards and targets specified in the technical guidelines and regulations can affect the success of program implementation, this is because in a program there are already limits and program provisions as well as clear program implementation objectives. Based on research conducted by Zulkarnain (2016) that the performance of policy implementation can be measured in terms of success if the basic measures and policy objectives must be seen to be understood well by the implementers of the policy and the people who are the target group. The appropriateness of the organizing process and the duties and responsibilities carried out by the implementor become part of the institutional capacity measure. The attitude and ability of the human resources involved as the program implementation influences the successful implementation of the program. Based on research conducted by Inggriani (2015) that the role and attitude of HR as an implementor are things that support

the smooth implementation of the program. Then in his research Priadi (2018) the relationship between institutions and the attitude of the implementor is a matter of influencing program implementation.

One of the resources used besides HR is financing or funding. Program funding in implementation and the adequacy of resources channeled can affect the success of program implementation. Based on Juniarko's research, Surjono and Anwar (2012) Program funding affects the smooth implementation of the program, both from the mechanism of aid distribution and the form of aid distributed. Then the research conducted by Isabela, Sesar and Amaliatulwalidain (2017) community understanding of the assistance received affects the adequacy of assistance according to program needs.

Social and political conditions are also important in influencing implementation. Social and political conditions in each place are different so that it could be that the implementation is said to be successful in one place but not in other places due to different conditions. Based on research conducted by Nata, Manossoh and Mawikere (2018) that the participation of local communities and village officials is important to support the running of the program. Then the research conducted by Hariyani (2016) characteristics of the institutions and ruling regimes influences the implementation of the program. The purpose of this study was to measure the successful implementation of the Self-Help Housing Stimulant Assistance Program in Tempuran Village, Bringin District, Semarang Regency.

METHOD

This research uses descriptive quantitative method. According to Sugiyono

(2014) quantitative research methods are research in which data are in the form of numbers and analysis using statistics. Researchers used this method to describe the success rate of the implementation of the Self-Help Housing Stimulant Assistance Program in Tempuran Village, Bringin District, Semarang Regency.

This study uses primary data that is data obtained directly through research informants. Data obtained through questionnaires, and documentation. The primary data source in this study came from a questionnaire with samples taken from the beneficiary community in Tempuran Village. Measuring success indicators used were: program standards and targets, institutional capacity, funding, and social and political conditions

In the technique of determining the sample for the questionnaire used a random sampling technique. To get the sample, Slovin formula is used in the determination as follows, from the total population with an inaccuracy rate of 12%, then using the formula above obtained a sample of:

$$n = \frac{58}{1 + 58.(0.12)^2}$$
$$n = \approx 32$$

Then the sample taken for filling out the questionnaire was 32 residents receiving BSPS in Tempuran Village

The technique of calculating the questionnaire uses the Guttman scale, where the respondent chooses a firm answer from two answer choices namely yes and no or already and not yet. The technique of scoring on the questionnaire by

Sugiyono (2014) applied in this study is as follows:

For answers "Yes" or "Already" given a score of 1 and For answers "No" or "Not yet" given a score of 0

Questionnaire result data was calculated by percentage descriptive analysis. Then transform from each variable into a sentence. The calculation results are included in the percentage table according to the application criteria. How to determine the application criteria is to determine the highest and lowest percentage first using the following formula Sahara, et al (2012):

$$highest\ percentage$$
$$= \frac{\sum item \times \sum respondent \times \sum highest\ score}{\sum item \times \sum respondent \times \sum highest\ score}$$
$$\times 100\% \dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots..(1)$$

$$lowest\ percentage =$$
$$\frac{\sum item \times \sum respondent \times \sum lowest\ score}{\sum item \times \sum respondent \times \sum highest\ score} \times 100\%\dots\dots(2)$$

After obtaining the highest and lowest percentage the next step is to determine the class interval with the formula Sahara, et al (2012):

$$class\ interval = \frac{\%\ the\ highest - \%Lowest}{the\ desired\ class}\dots\dots\dots(3)$$

This study uses 5 classes namely; Very Unsuccessful, Not Successful, Quite Successful, Successful, and Very Successful. How to calculate descriptive percentages based on the scores received namely;

$$DP = \frac{n}{N} \times 100\%\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots\dots(4)$$

Keterangan:

DP = Descriptive percentage

n = Empirical Score (score obtained)

N= Ideal score for each question item

Based on the calculation results, the following criteria are made:

Tabel 2. Kriteria No   Persentage   Criteria

No	Persentage	Criteria
1	81% -100%	Very successful
2	61% - <80%	Was successful
3	41% - <60%	Successful enough
4	21% - <40%	Not successful
5	0% - <20%	Very unsuccessful

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In 2018 Tempuran Village received a Self-Help Housing Stimulant Assistance (BSPS) with 58 beneficiaries in four hamlets namely Cekelan, Krajan, Glompong and Tepusan. The acceptance of the BSPS is mandated by the central government for low-income people to improve the quality of houses that were previously unfit for habitation and by self-supporting development by the community. Regulations and technical instructions that have been made and issued by the central government in the form of ministerial regulations as well as technical implementation instructions which can then be used as references or guidelines for implementors in implementing BSPS programs

The implementation of the Self-Help Housing Stimulant Assistance Program in Tempuran Village was measured based on 4 variables, namely the program's standards and targets, institutional capacity, financing and social and political conditions. The percentage is divided into 5 classes the lowest percentage is 0 and the highest is 100% with intervals of each class is 20%, namely by category, very unsuccessful, unsuccessful, moderately successful, successful, and very successful. The results of this research are said to be successful with a percentage of 71% calculated based on the acquisition of questionnaire scores that have been filled out by respondents. The results and discussion of the percentage acquisition of each variable are as follows:

Program Standards and Targets

There are 2 indicators measuring the success of implementation in the standard variables and program targets, namely the suitability of the program recipient and the condition of the house before and after the program.Hasil analisi persentase kesesuian penerima program adalah sebagai berikut:

Based on the percentage results that 100% or all respondents have their own homes and also have land certificates so that renovated houses will not have problems in terms of ownership or land disputes. All recipients are also the first time receiving housing assistance. All beneficiaries also formed a group of recipients of aid (KPB), this group was a non-governmental group and within the group also formed a chairperson, secretary and treasurer who were concurrently members of the group, the purpose of establishing a KPB was to increase community self-sufficiency in order to improve housing quality. However, groups consisting of less than 20 people according to the provisions in 1 group. So the percentage for indicators of suitability of program recipients is 80%.

Table 3. Analysis Results of Percentage of Program Beneficiaries' Conformity

No	Question	Number of Respondents	Result Score	Persentage
1	Occupies the only house that belongs to yourself	32	32	100%
2	Having a land certificate / so that the land is not in dispute	32	32	100%
3	First time receiving housing assistance	32	32	100%
4	Form beneficiary groups	32	32	100%
5	The group consists of 20 people	32	0	0%
	Maximum scores, total score and percentage score	160	128	80%

Source: processed data

The results of the analysis of the suitability of housing conditions before the program are as follows Based on the percentage calculation, the most damage to the building is on the roof of the building part of the roof truss or roof cover, that is all respondents with mildly damaged or heavily damaged conditions that are 100% experienced by all respondents.

Table 4. Results of Analysis of Percentage of Housing Conditions Before the Program

No	Questiom	Number of Respondent	Result Score	Persentage
1	The condition of the top (roof) of the building is damaged	32	32	100%
2	The condition of the building walls in a damaged state	32	31	97%
3	The condition of the bottom of the building (floor) is damaged	32	21	66%
4	Insufficient external lighting from inside	32	27	84%
5	Insufficient ventilation in the house	32	19	59%
6	Don't have your own latrine	32	4	13%
7	Do not have their own bathroom	32	4	13%
8	Don't have your own bedroom	32	2	6%
9	on't have your own living room	32	6	19%
10	Building area is not enough space	32	7	22%
	Maximum of scores, total score and percentage score	32	153	48%

Source: processed data

Then out of a total of 32 respondents 66% or 21 respondents have building floors that are still ground and 97% or 31 respondents have buildings with wooden walls. 84% or 27 of a total of 32 respondents had poor lighting conditions and 59% or 19 of a total of 32 respondents ventilated for ventilation in the house were still not enough. Some people also do not have a toilet or bathroom of their own, but the percentage can be seen only 13% or only 4 people from a number of 32 respondents 87% or 28 others have their own toilet and bathroom, meaning that most of the community already has a toilet and own bathroom. Of the minimum area adequacy of 22% or 7 recipients whose houses do not meet the minimum adequacy of the area and 25 other recipients have met the minimum adequacy of area. The percentage of housing conditions before the program is 48% with unfit living conditions

The results of the analysis of the percentage of housing conditions after the program are as follows:

Table 5. Results of Analysis of Percentage of House Conditions After the Program

No	Questioan	Number of Respondent	Result Score	Result Persentage
1	The condition of the top (roof) of the building can protect the safety of its inhabitants	32	32	100%
2	The condition of the building walls can protect the safety of its inhabitants	32	32	100%
3	Conditions under the building (floor) can maintain the safety of its inhabitants	32	31	97%
4	Lighting from the outside is sufficient	32	31	97%
5	Enough ventilation in the house	32	30	94%
6	Has its own latrine	32	29	91%
7	Has its own bathroom	32	29	91%
8	Has its own bedroom	32	32	100%
9	Has its own living room	32	29	91%
10	Space is sufficient	32	29	91%
	Maximum of scores, total score and percentage score	320	275	86%

Source: processed data

Based on the results of the percentage of housing conditions after the program is 86% of the houses have met the criteria for livable homes, meaning that there was a 38% improvement in the quality of housing conditions from before the program after the program. 100% or all respondents have proper roofs and walls and can protect the safety of their residents after renovation, 97% or 31 of 32 respondents have a floor that can protect the safety of their inhabitants after renovation.

The condition of the house 97% of respondents after the program had adequate lighting coming into the house. 94% have adequate ventilation in the house. 91% have their own latrines and bathrooms. 100% or all of the respondents have their own sleeping space. 91% have their own living room and

home area after the program has provided enough space

The results of the analysis of the percentage of standards and policy objectives are:

Table 6. Results of Percentage Analysis of Standard Variables and Program Objectives

No	Indicator	Maximum of scors	Total score	Persentage
1	Program Recipient Conformity	160	153	96%
2	The condition of the house before the program	320	153	48%
3	The condition of the house after the program	320	275	86%
	Maximum number of scores, total score and percentage score	800	581	73%

Source: processed data

The results of the percentage of standard variables and program targets is 73% so that it is categorized successful.

The success of the implementation of a policy program can be measured one of them with the standards and program targets that have been set, in implementing the Self-Help Housing Stimulant Assistance Program the standard and program targets have been regulated in Permen PURP No 07 / PRT / M / 2018 on Self-Help Housing Stimulant Assistance. so that the program implemented can be directed and can achieve the specified targets, according to Van Meter and Horn standards and policy program objectives must be clear and structured so that they can be realized, and according to Grandle in implementing a policy program success can be illustrated from the extent of changes that occur, and whether the location of a program is right. In this case the standards and targets of the BSPS Program in Desa Tempuran in 2018 are measured from 2 indicators namely the suitability of the program recipient, the condition of the house before the program and the condition of the house after the program

The results of the analysis of the percentage of standard and target variables are 73% so that they are categorized successful, and according to the results obtained are in accordance with the theories that have been mentioned. conducted by Hariani and Tuwis (2016) that the impact of the implementation of BSPS is the improvement of people's welfare. The implementation of BSPS in Desa Tempuran in 2018 had carried out the construction of new houses, but this was caused by damage to homes that were already severe so it was better to do new housing construction, as in research by Zulkarnain (2017) there were people who were doing new housing construction which whereas the provisions are only renovation of the house, but in the study by Zulkarnain due to lack of information from the facilitator.

Institutional Capacity

There are 2 indicators of the success of

implementation in the institutional capacity variable, namely the suitability of the tasks and responsibilities of the beneficiaries and the suitability of the program implementation process.

The results of the analysis of the percentage of conformity of duties and responsibilities of beneficiaries are as follows:

Table 7. Results of Analysis of Assistance and Responsibility
Percentage of Assistance and Responsibility

No	Question	Number of Respondent	Result Score	Persentage
1	KPB is looking for a building shop together	32	32	100%
2	The KPB monitors the implementation of development together with members of the group receiving the assistance	32	16	50%
3	KPB carried out the construction of houses together in mutual cooperation	32	4	13%
4	In the implementation of development, the members of the KPB provide labor, money or building materials to fellow KPB members	32	6	19%
5	In the implementation of development, the members of the KPB get assistance from workers, money or building materials from fellow KPB members	32	5	16%
	Total score, total score and percentage score	160	63	39%

Source: processed data

Based on the percentage of the suitability of the duties and responsibilities of the implementor in this case the recipient is 39%. All respondents looked for building shops with their groups, in addition 50% or 16 out of 32 beneficiary respondents said that they monitored fellow beneficiary group members. The percentage number 3 was 13% meaning only 4 out of 32 respondents, percentage number 4 namely 19% or 6 of 32 from pesente number 5 16% or 5 of 32 respondents, based on the results of percentage numbers 3,4 and 5 ie less than 25% so that it can be concluded the lack of participation of beneficiary communities as fellow group members.

The results of the analysis of the suitability of the process of organizing the program are as follows:

Table 8. Results of Analysis of the Suitability of Program Organizing Process

No	Question	Number of Respondent	Result Score	Result Persentage
1	Information about the BSPS program was carried out	32	32	100%
2	Verification or survey when the potential recipient of assistance is conducted	32	32	100%
3	An agreement was made with prospective beneficiaries	32	32	100%
4	Beneficiaries identified needs and drafted a budget	32	32	100%
5	The building shop delivers building materials on time	32	27	84%
6	Construction of beneficiary houses was completed on time	32	27	84%
7	Payment for the purchase of building materials is carried out by the recipient of assistance by way of transfer or transfer of books to a building shop	32	32	100%
8	Payment of the workers wages by cash assistance	32	32	100%
9	Assistance is received in 2 stages	32	32	100%
10	The second phase of assistance you receive after construction reaches 30%	32	32	100%
11	The recipient of the assistance prepares a report on the receipt of aid stages 1 and 2	32	0	0%
	Total score, total score and percentage score	352	310	88%

Source: processed data

Based on the results of the percentage of suitability of the program implementation process that is 88% that the process that is carried out or carried out is very in accordance with predetermined rules, meaning that the characteristics of the implementor are compliant with the rules and regulations. All respondents with a percentage of 100% said that they had done socialization before the program, then also conducted verification and surveying, and identified the need for house renovation. 84% of respondents get a shipment of building materials on time and housing construction is also completed on time.

All respondents with a percentage of 100% also make payments for building materials by way of transfer, pay workers' wages in cash and receive assistance in two phases where the second stage is received after construction has reached 30%. It's just that the recipient of assistance is not able to prepare the report stages 1 and 2 due to the limited ability and understanding of the aid recipient, so that the preparation of the report is entirely carried out by Field Facilitator Staff (TFL).

The results of the analysis of institutional capacity variables are as follows:

Table 9. The Results of Percentage Analysis of Institutional Capacity Variables

No	Indicator	Maximum of Score	Total Skor	Persentage
1	Suitability of Duties and Responsibilities	160	63	39%
2	Suitability of Program Implementation Process	352	310	88%
	Maximum score, total score and percentage score	512	373	73%

Source: processed data

The result of the percentage of institutional characteristic variables is 73% so it is categorized successful.

The institutional capacity of the program in this study was measured based on the suitability of the tasks and responsibilities of the implementor as well as the suitability of the BSPS implementation process. The suitability of the implementor's duties and responsibilities is from the recipient community. The suitability of the process of providing assistance is the process of organizing according to the BSPS technical guidelines for 2018. The result of the percentage of institutional characteristic variables is 73% so that it is categorized successful.

The beneficiaries are members of the BSPS Beneficiary Group (CDE) where there is a responsibility that self-help housing is realized as a result of the efforts of population groups to meet housing needs. Based on the table 4.5 the suitability of the duties and responsibilities of the implementor in this case is the recipient is 39%. The community did not help each other or cooperate in the construction of their houses, statements from the beneficiary communities due to lack of manpower and time so that they focus on working on their own houses, besides the recipient communities also have hired artists individually which is also a new BSPS regulation which was implemented in 2018, so 1 recipient hired 1 handyman

This also happened in several other previous studies such as the research conducted by Isabella, Julios Sesar, and Amaliatulwalidain (2014) in Way Serdang Subdistrict, Mesuji Regency, that there were human resource deficiencies because the community did not carry out mutual development. The new regulation adopted in 2018 has minimized obstacles in the implementation of the program so that in its implementation now there is no shortage of resources.

The successful implementation of a program is inseparable from the support of good resources, and one of them is human resources, this research is not in accordance with the theory by Van Meter and Horn, namely the implementation of the program needs to be supported by both human and non-human resources. Human resource support includes skills and relationships between organizations or communication, the need for coordination and cooperation between agencies for the success of a program. Because even though it is seen from a low percentage, it means that the recipient community did not carry out the construction together or the self-help construction of the house continued to run smoothly because each beneficiary hired a handyman to finish his house, but the purpose of this program caused the self-help objectives of this program were not achieved.

The level of compliance of the implementor in carrying out the program is to carry out in accordance with specified regulations In implementing BSPS 2018, a regulation and guidelines for implementing the program have been determined, the implementor as the executor must follow the provisions that have been made. Based on the results of the percentage of suitability of the program implementation process that is 88% that the process that is carried out or carried out is very in accordance with predetermined rules, meaning that the characteristics of the

implementor are compliant with the rules and regulations. It's just that the recipient of assistance is not able to prepare the report stages 1 and 2 due to the limited ability and understanding of the aid recipient, so that the preparation of the report is entirely carried out by Field Facilitator Staff (TFL). Characteristics of human resources or implementors also influence the success of program implementation as expressed in Grendle's theory, whether a policy has mentioned the implementor in detail and level of compliance, as well as the responsiveness of the target group, and this research is in accordance with the theory.

Different things happened in Zulkarnain's research (2016) The implementor was not compliant with the existing rules, the village technical team only pursued the benefits of sumplayer, so suppliers were reluctant to come to the BSPS location which resulted in the distribution of building materials belonging to the MBR to be not smooth.

Financing

There are 2 indicators of measuring the success of implementation in the financing variable, namely the distribution of aid funds to improve the quality of the house up to the hands of beneficiaries and the adequacy of funds according to community needs. The results of the analysis of the percentage of aid being distributed to the community are as follows:

Tabel 10. Results of Analysis of Percentage of Aid Distributed to Recipient's Hands

No	Question	Number of Respondent	Result	
			Scor	Persentage
1	The recipient of the assistance received assistance to improve the quality of the house by Rp. 15,000,000.00	32	32	100%
2	The help you receive is used to purchase building materials and pay the workers' wages	32	32	100%
3	Beneficiary communities receive building material and cash assistance in stages 1 and 2	32	32	100%
	Maximum number of scores, total score, and percentage score	96	96	100%

Source: processed data

Based on the percentage of funds distributed to aid recipients, it is known that the percentage results are 100%, which means that BSPS funds from the central government of the PURP Ministry can be distributed well to all recipients in the form of building materials and cash and are used by beneficiary communities. in accordance with the provisions and procedures.

The results of the analysis of the percentage of adequacy of funds according to community needs are as follows:

Table 11. Results of Analysis of Fund Adequacy Percentage According to Community Needs

No	Question	Number of Respondent	Result	
			Score	Persentage
1	Assistance received in accordance with the needs of home renovation	32	32	100%
2	There is a need for additional funds beyond assistance to renovate the house	32	27	84%
3	Sufficient assistance	32	10	31%
	Maximum number of scores, total score, and percentage score	96	69	72%

Source: processed data

Funds provided by the government of 15 million are not enough to renovate the house to completion because the funds provided are basically only stimulant funds, so the recipient community must prepare their own personal or self-help funds so that home renovations can be classified based on the results of a percentage of 72% of funds assistance can be said to be sufficient to renovate the respondent's house. All assistance was used by respondents for housing construction known to be 100%. In Tempuran Village, it can be said that it was more successful to see that 84% or 27 of 32 respondents were almost able to finish their renovations well even though they spent additional funds on their own. 31% or 10 out of 32 respondents said that the funds were sufficient to build their houses.

The results of the analysis of the percentage of   financing   variables   are   as   follows:

Table 12. Results of Analysis of Percentage of Financing Variables

No	Indicator	Maximum Score	Total skor	Pesentage
1	The distribution of assistance reaches the recipient's hands	96	96	100%
2	Adequacy of funds according to community needs	96	69	72%
	Maximum number of scores, total score, and percentage score	192	165	86%

Source: processed data

Based on the results of the percentage of financing variables is 86% so it is categorized very successful.

The successful implementation of the program can also be influenced by funding, available and adequate financing and being used wisely will support the successful implementation of the program, in accordance with Van Meter and Horn's theory that implementation needs to support both human and non-human resources, and for non-humans one of them is financing. The success of funding in the implementation of the BSPS program in Desa Tempuran is measured by 2 indicators, namely the distribution of aid to the hands of recipients and the adequacy of funds according to community needs.

Assistance received by the community in the BSPS program is assistance from the central government of the Ministry of PUPR, assistance provided is 15 million rupiahs with the type of assistance in the form of construction materials totaling 12.5 million rupees and cash to pay the wage rental of workers at 2.5 million rupiah , these funds are intended to renovate or improve the quality of the houses of the beneficiary from uninhabitable homes to livable homes. In accordance with Grandle's theory that the types of benefits received interfere with the successful implementation of the program. Based on the results of the percentage in table 4.10 is 86% so it is categorized that the financing variable in the implementation of the BSPS program in Desa Tempuran is very successful.

Based on the percentage of the distribution of funds to the recipient's hands is 100% means that the BSPS funds from the central government of the Ministry of PURP can be channeled properly to all recipients in the form of building materials and cash and as well as used by the beneficiary communities in accordance with the provisions and procedures. The same thing also happened in a study by Ratih Setyo Rini (2018) in West Kalimantan that the funds given to beneficiary communities could be used properly. But what happened was different in Zulkarnain's research (2017) in Parigi Selatan Sub-District, Parigi Moutong Regency. In his research, the reception of aid occurred unevenly and was not used wisely so that home renovations were not completed.

Funds provided by the government in the amount of 15 million are not enough to renovate the house until completion, so the recipient community must prepare their own personal or self-help funds so that renovation of the house can be classified based on the results of a percentage of 72% of aid funds can be said to be sufficient to renovate the respondent's house. In Hariani and Tuwis's research (2016) in Sumber Rejo Village it was also revealed that the same thing happened where the recipient community spent additional self-help funds to renovate their houses, in their research many communities

were not ready, so many beneficiary communities eventually lacked material and home renovation was not completed.

Social and Political Conditions

There are 2 indicators to measure the success of implementation in social and political conditions variables, namely the existence of support from resources from the community and the availability of support from interest groups.

The results of the percentage analysis of the support of resources from the community are as follows:

Table 13. Results of Analysis of Percentage of Community Resource Support

No	Question	Number of Respondent	Result Score	Result Persentage
1	Beneficiaries receive assistance in the form of personnel from neighbors and relatives who are not recipients of BSPS program assistance	32	11	34%
2	Beneficiaries receive assistance in the form of money from neighbors and relatives who are not recipients of BSPS program assistance	32	3	9%
3	Beneficiaries receive assistance in the form of building materials from neighbors and relatives who are not recipients of BSPS program assistance	32	2	6%
	Maximum number of scores, total score and percentage score	96	16	17%

Source: processed data

Based on the analysis of the percentage of resource support from the community is 17% it can be said that the lack of support from the surrounding community for the implementation of the BSPS program. Only 34%, 11 out of 32 respondents who received assistance from workers and relatives who

were not recipients of the assistance. 9% received financial assistance, 3 out of 32 respondents. And 6% received aid in the form of building materials from people or community members who were not. The results of the percentage analysis of the existence of support from interest groups:

Table 14. Results of Analysis of Percentage of Support from Interest Groups

No	Question	Number of Respondent	Resuly	
			Score	Persentage
1	Results of Analysis of Percentage of Support from Interest Groups	32	31	97%
2	The village head is involved in overseeing the implementation of the BSPS program	32	29	91%
3	The village head is involved in implementing the BSPS program	32	9	28%
	Maximum number of scores, total score and percentage score	96	69	72%

Source: processed data

Based on the analysis of the percentage of support tables from interest groups in this case the support from the village head of the percentage is 72%. The involvement of the village head in the BSPS preparation process was 97% of the statements of 31 of the 32 respondents meaning that the village head was very involved in the preparation of the BSPS Program in Desa Tempuran. The involvement of village heads is 91% of the statements of 29 of the 23 respondents. And the involvement of the village head in the implementation was 28% of the statements of 9 of 32 respondents.

The results of the analysis of the percentage of social and political conditions variables are as follows:

Table 15. Results of Analysis of Variables on Social and Political Conditions Variables

No	Indicator	Maximal Score	Total skor	Persentage
1	There is support from community resources	96	16	17%
2	There is support from interest groups	96	69	72%
	Maximum number of scores, total score and percentage score	192	85	44%

Source: processed data

The results of the analysis of the percentage of social and political conditions is 44% so that it is quite successful.

Social and political conditions in the implementation of the BSPS program in Tempuran Village are measured by 2 indicators namely the presence of support from community resources and the support of interest groups. Basically, humans are social creatures, so in a social environment there is a relationship of mutual cooperation and mutual need. In this case social support is support from the surrounding community that is not included in the program recipient and the support from the interest groups here is from the village or kelurahan level government, namely the village head.

The result of the analysis of the percentage of social and political conditions was 44% so that it was categorized as quite

successful, because despite the lack of support from the community, the village head continued to monitor the course of the program implementation process so that the BSPS program could be implemented well. Supporting social and political conditions in one region greatly influences the success of program implementation because it is possible that a program is declared to be successfully implemented in one area but fails to be implemented in another area due to the external conditions of the program which are less supportive. This has also been explained by Grandle in his theory that the policy environment or external environment such as the characteristics of institutions and regimes that are in power affect the implementation of the program. Social and political conditions affecting program implementation are also contained in the theory stated by Van Meter and Horn that the extent to which interest groups provide support, whether political elites support the implementation of policy programs and how the nature of public opinion in the environment.

As in Hariyani's research (2016) that this BSPS provides positive research from the community for the village head so that it will improve its image, which will have an impact on the support of residents when the village head will nominate again as village head in the next period. And the district government is very hopeful that the success of BSPS this year can provide an opportunity for the district to get BSPS assistance again the following year.

Different conditions occur in research conducted by Zulkarnain (2017) that in the research conducted at that time the socio-political conditions were not conducive so that the BSPS program that was implemented did not run well due to lack of coordination and communication between implementors so that the recipients of aid were lacking information.

Implementation of BSPS in Desa Tempuran

The results of the percentage of successful implementation of the BSPS Program in Desa Tempuran are as follows:

Table 16. Results of Analysis of the Percentage of Success of Implementation of BSPS in Desa Tempuran

No	Indicator	Maximal Score	Total scre	Persentage
1	Program Standards and Targets	800	581	73%
2	Institutional Capacity	512	373	73%
3	Financing	192	165	86%
4	Social and Political Conditions	192	85	44%
Maximum scores, total score and percentage score		1696	1204	71%

Source: processed data

Based on the percentage results in table 4.15, the implementation of BSPS in Desa Tempuran is 71% so that the implementation of BSPS in Desa Tempuran is considered Successful.

CONCLUSION

Based on the descriptions that have been disclosed in the discussion, several conclusions can be drawn, namely: The results of the analysis of the percentage of standard variables and program targets are 73% so that they are categorized successful, this is supported by the magnitude of changes that occur from improving the quality of housing conditions from unfit to housing the house is livable, so that it can improve the welfare of the

community, as well as the accuracy of the target recipient program.

The results of the analysis of the percentage of institutional characteristics variables are 73% so that they are categorized successful based on the tasks and responsibilities of the beneficiaries.

The results of the analysis of the percentage of financing variables is 86% so it is categorized that the financing variables in the implementation of the BSPS program in Tempuran Village were very successful. The whole assistance up to the recipient of the beneficiary and the wise use of aid by the beneficiary support the successful implementation of the program. Self-financing from beneficiary communities also supports the completion of the BSPS program.

The results of the analysis of the presentation of social and political conditions is that 44% can be categorized as quite successful, because despite the lack of support from the community, the village head continues to monitor the course of the program implementation process so that the BSPS program can be implemented well.

The results of the analysis of the percentage of successful implementation of BSPS in Tempuran Village, Bringin District, Semarang Regency from 4 variables namely program standards and targets, institutional capacity, financing, and social and political conditions are 70% so that they can be categorized as successful.

REFERENCES

Berliana, LA., Pujiati, Amin. (2017). Analysis of Wild Settlement Policy in the East Flood Canal. Economics Development Analysis Journal. Volume 3. Hal: 264- 272

BPS. (2018). Semarang Regency Regional Statistics. BPS: CV Pelita

Hariani dan Tuwis (2016). The Impact of the Implementation of Self-Help Housing Stimulant Assistance Programs to Increase Community Welfare. Equivalent Journal of Business Economics. Volume 2. No.2 Hal: 77-99

Inggriani. (2015). Evaluation of the Implementation of Self-Help Housing Stimulant Assistance Program (BSPS) in Dharmasraya Regency, West Sumatra JOM FISIP. Volume 2

Isabela., Sesar, Julio., & Amaliatulwalidain. (2017). Evaluation of the Self-Help Housing Stimulant Assistance Program (Rejo Mulyo Village, Way Serdang District, Mesuji Regency, 2014). Journal of Government and Politics. Volume 2. No 1. Hal: 41-44

Jian, Zuo., Bo, Xia., Jake, Barker., & Martin, Skitmore. (2014). Green Buildings for Greying People: a Case Study of a Retirement Village In Australia. Facilities. Volume 32, Hal: 365-381

Juniarko, Oky., Surjono., Anwar, M. Ruslin. (2012). Evaluation of the Self-Help Housing Financing Stimulant Assistance System in Malang Regency. Journal of City and Regional Planning. Volume 4. Hal: 139-149

Nawawi, Ismail. (2009). Public Policy Strategy Analysis and Advocacy Theory and Practice. Surabaya: Putra Media Nusantara Surabaya

Nata, Inggriani., Manosso, H.,Mawikere, L M. (2018). Analysis of the Application of the Principles of Good Governance to the Self-Help Housing Stimulant Assistance Program at the Housing Agency for Settlement and Land Areas in North Halmahera Regency. Journal of Going Concern Accounting Research 13. Volume 3

Peraturan Menteri Pekerjaan Umum dan Perumahan Rakyat Republik Indonesia Nomor 07/ PRT/M Tahun 2018 About Self-help Stimulant Assistance

Priadi, Afisha R. (2018). Implementation of the Self-Help Housing Stimulant Assistance Program (BSPS) in the Provision of Livable Living in Langkat District. Skripsi. Medan: Universitas Sumatra Utara

Rini, Ratih Setyo. (2018). Supervision and Control of 2017 Ministry of Public Works Self-Help Housing Stimulant Assistance Activities in West Kalimantan Province.Cakrawala. Volume 18. Hal: 67-74

Sahara, Sunni., dkk. (2012). Model Paket Pelayanan Penguasaan Konten Bertema Kesiapan Menikah Berbasis Multemedia pada Mahasiswa. Indonesian Journal of Guidance and Conseling Theory and Application.Volume 1. Hal: 64-70

Soesilowati, E. (2008) . Public Policy Theory and Application. Semarang: Universitas Negeri Semarang

Sugiyono. (2014). Quantitative, Qualitative, and R&D Research Methods. Bandung: Alfabeta

Surat Edaran Kementrian PUPR Direktorat Jendral Penyediaan Perumahan Nomor 07/SE/Dr Tahun 2018 Regarding Technical Guidance for Providing Self-Help Housing Stimulant Assistance.

Undang- Undang Dasar Republik Indonesia year 1945 Pasal 28 About Human Rights

Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 1 Tahun 2011 About Housing and Settlement Areas

Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 4 Tahun 1992 About Housing and Settlements.

Wardani, Fatmawati NHK. (2010). About Housing and Settlements. Skripsi. Surakarta: Universitas Sebelas Maret.

Zhang, L, Zhao, S.X.B. and Tian, J.P. (2003). Self-Help in Housing and Chengzhongcun in China's Urbanisation. Internasional Journal of Urban and Regional Research. Volume 27.4. Hal: 912-937

Zulkarnain. (2017). mplementation of Self-Help Housing Stimulant Assistance Policy in South Parigi District. Asian Journal of Environment, History and Heritage. Volume 4. Hal: 179-188