

Assessing the Family Hope Program's (PKH) Impact on Community Welfare through the CIBEST Method

Alief Ulfatun Hasanah¹ and Anna Zakiyah Hastriana²

¹Annuqayah University, Indonesia, aliefulfatun22@gmail.com

²Annuqayah University, Indonesia, anna.asthow@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study analyzes the effectiveness of the Family Hope Program (PKH) in improving community welfare in Bragung Village, Sumenep District, through a holistic approach that combines material and spiritual aspects using the CIBEST model. Using a descriptive qualitative method, data was collected through participatory observation, in-depth interviews with 30 beneficiary families, and a study of official documents. The CIBEST model was applied to assess welfare through four dimensions: material-spiritual welfare, material poverty, spiritual poverty and absolute poverty. The research findings show that PKH succeeded in significantly improving welfare. The Welfare Index (W) increased from 0.267 to 0.8 (200%), while the Spiritual (Ps) and Absolute (Pa) Poverty Indices were eliminated. However, the Material Poverty Index (Pm) only fell by 25%, indicating the need to strengthen the economic aspects of the program. Theoretically, this research makes an innovative contribution by adapting the CIBEST model - originally for zakat programs - into a social policy evaluation instrument. This approach offers a new perspective in measuring well-being that is more comprehensive by integrating the spiritual dimension. The findings recommend: (1) strengthening community-based economic assistance programs, (2) improving synergies between social assistance programs, and (3) developing a monitoring system based on holistic indicators to ensure the sustainability of community welfare improvements

Keywords: Family Hope Program, CIBEST Model, and Holistic Welfare

INTRODUCTION

Background

Indonesia, as the largest archipelago in the world with the fourth most populous population (Devi et al., 2016), faces complex challenges in national development, particularly in addressing poverty (Febriani et al., 2022). Poverty not only includes the inability to meet basic needs such as food, clothing, shelter, education, and health (Agus Purwannto, 2007), but is also influenced by cultural factors such as low work ethic (Mutmainnah et al., 2022). In an Islamic perspective, poverty is understood as a multidimensional phenomenon that includes economic and spiritual aspects, so it requires a holistic approach to achieve the overall benefit of life (Beik, 2016; Muin & Rosdiana, 2020).

National economic development aims to improve people's welfare, which is reflected in the Human Development Index (HDI) as the main indicator. Aligns with Law No. 11/2009 on

Social Welfare, which defines welfare as the fulfillment of material, spiritual, and social needs (Khalifah & Basar, 2023). As one of the strategic policy instruments, the Family Hope Program (PKH) is regulated through Minister of Social Affairs Regulation No. 1/2018 (Muin & Rosdiana, 2020) and functions as a conditional cash transfer program to improve access to education, health, and the economic welfare of poor families (Aulya Wardani et al., 2023). PKH is not only assistive in nature, but also oriented towards community empowerment to increase independence and self-esteem (Laksono, 2018; Shomadani, 2024). Along with its development, PKH has become one of the largest social protection schemes in Indonesia (Shomadani, 2024), demonstrating the government's commitment to evidence-based poverty reduction.

While PKH coverage has expanded to underdeveloped areas such as the Sumenep district, the effectiveness of this program in improving welfare still needs in-depth evaluation. Bragung village in Guluk-Guluk sub-district, as one of the PKH beneficiaries, still faces complex welfare problems, such as household incomes below the Regional Minimum Wage (UMR), low levels of education, and lack of health awareness (BPS Sumenep, 2025). These conditions indicate that poverty is still a structural problem in the region, raising critical questions about the extent to which PKH is able to answer the multidimensional challenges of poverty in disadvantaged areas (Alisjahbana & Murniningtyas, 2018).

This study adopts an innovative approach through the CIBEST method (Beik, 2016) to evaluate well-being holistically, including both material and spiritual dimensions. This approach differs from previous studies that only focused on economic indicators (Karimah et al., 2023; Pratiwi & Imsar, 2022). In fact, Andika and Safitri found that the effect of PKH on welfare was only 19.6% through linear regression analysis, showing the limitations of a purely economic approach (Andika, 2021). In contrast, recent research proves the significant impact of PKH. states that every increase in PKH implementation units increases welfare by 0.610%. Similar findings were revealed by Ernita et al. (2024), where the effectiveness of PKH contributes 38% to welfare Rahmatillah also emphasized the key role of policy implementation, with the communication and bureaucracy dimensions reaching a score of 89%. PKH has an 85% effect on welfare (Rahmatillah et al., 2024).

Other studies reinforce the findings of PKH's effectiveness, namely that of Abizal et al. (2022) who found the crucial role of PKH during the pandemic, while Sako et al., (2023) confirmed its positive impact. Rohman & Novitawati (2020) and Lapasau et al. (2023) noted an increase in welfare in their respective regions. Research such as Rukmana & Citra (2022) reveals the social impact of PKH that goes beyond the economic aspects. Mawarni (2019), Arum & Sugiyanto (2023), Fajriati et al. (2020) and Djumura et al. (2022) emphasize the importance of the companion's role in program implementation. In addition, Khalifah & Basar (2023) highlight the benefits of PKH for children's education, while Virgoreta & Pratiwi, (2014) and Utomo et al., (2013) analyze the technical aspects of implementation. Holida et al. (2023) and Dehani et al. (2018) summarized the improvement of recipients' living standards in Probolinggo and Bogor, suggesting that PKH contributes to welfare improvement albeit with variations in success rates between locations (Driantama & Muljaningsih, 2024).

This study has the theoretical novelty of introducing an innovative approach by adapting the CIBEST model that was previously widely applied in the evaluation of zakat programs (Gusmina & Eva, 2023; Driantama & Muljaningsih, 2024) to analyze the impact of PKH as a government social assistance program. This methodological adaptation allows for a more

comprehensive assessment by considering both material and spiritual aspects at once, as well as filling the literature gap in the evaluation of Islamic values-based social programs (Karunia & Amir, 2024). The findings of this study are expected to make a significant contribution, both practically as a basis for policy evaluation and academically in the development of an integrated welfare measurement model (Virgoreta & Pratiwi, 2014).

This study is specifically designed to measure the extent to which the Family Hope Program (PKH) is able to encourage improvements in the welfare of residents of Bragung Village, Sumenep District, by applying a comprehensive approach through the CIBEST model that considers the balance of material and non-material aspects. The significance of this study includes three layers of contribution: First, in the academic realm, the application of the CIBEST framework that was originally developed for the analysis of zakat programs in the context of government social policy offers a new perspective in the study of welfare based on Islamic values. Second, in terms of policy, the results of the analysis are expected to serve as a reference in designing more adaptive poverty interventions, especially for disadvantaged areas, by incorporating the spiritual dimension as a supporting element for sustainability. Third, methodologically, the proposed hybrid approach can serve as a reference for other researchers who want to develop welfare measurement tools that are responsive to the characteristics of Indonesian society, both in local and national contexts.

Objective

The objective of this study is to evaluate the effectiveness of the Family Hope Program (PKH) in improving the welfare of the residents of Bragung Village, Sumenep District, by employing the CIBEST model as a holistic measurement tool that integrates both material and spiritual dimensions. This research aims to provide a comprehensive assessment of how PKH contributes to poverty alleviation in underdeveloped regions, considering not only economic indicators but also Islamic values that influence well-being.

Furthermore, this study seeks to bridge the gap in the existing literature by adapting the CIBEST framework—previously used primarily for zakat program evaluations—to assess a government-led social assistance initiative, thereby offering new insights into the intersection of Islamic welfare principles and public policy. The findings are expected to inform policymakers in refining PKH implementation strategies, ensuring they are more responsive to the multidimensional nature of poverty, particularly in disadvantaged areas.

Additionally, this research intends to contribute methodologically by demonstrating the applicability of hybrid approaches in welfare measurement, which can serve as a reference for future studies aiming to develop context-sensitive evaluation tools tailored to Indonesia's socio-cultural and religious characteristics. Ultimately, the study aspires to strengthen the theoretical and practical foundations for evidence-based poverty reduction programs that align with both national development goals and Islamic perspectives on well-being.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Implementation of Public Policy in the Family Hope Program (PKH)

Public policy implementation is a critical phase in the policy cycle that connects planning with real impact on society (Winarno, 2017). According to Virgorita, implementation is the process

of carrying out activities by the government and the private sector to achieve policy objectives, which involves the transformation of inputs into outputs and outcomes through structured mechanisms (**Virgoreta & Pratiwi, 2020**). Successful implementation relies heavily on three key elements: (1) coordination between actors, (2) availability of resources, and (3) a sustainable monitoring system (**Winarno, 2017**).

A conditional cash transfer (CCT) program, PKH has been the main poverty reduction instrument in Indonesia since 2007 (**Djumura et al., 2022**). The program targets poor families registered in the Integrated Database with three main intervention components: (1) health (antenatal check-ups and immunizations), (2) education (primary to secondary school retention), and (3) social welfare (support for the elderly and people with disabilities). Beneficiary criteria include economic (integrated poverty data), social (pregnant women and school children), and geographic (disadvantaged areas) dimensions (**Daud & Marini, 2019; Rohman & Novitawati, 2020**). An evaluation by Pratiwi & Imsar shows that PKH is effective in improving material indicators although it has not optimally touched the spiritual aspects of beneficiaries (**Pratiwi & Imsar, 2022**).

Multidimensional Concept of Welfare

The concept welfare form a conventional perspective tends to be limited to material indicators such as income **Purnamasari et al., (2023)**, while the Islamic view emphasizes the integration of material and spiritual aspects (**Sukmasari, 2020**). **Azizy, (2019)** defines welfare as a state of security and happiness which is in line with Law No.11/2009 on the fulfillment of material-spiritual needs. Criticism of the conventional concept of welfare arises because of its materialistic and hedonistic tendencies without considering religious elements (**Azizy, 2019**). Social assistance should not only improve economic conditions but also the dignity of recipients (**Beik, 2016**).

CIBEST Model

The CIBEST model developed by **Beik (2016)** offers a unique evaluation framework through four quadrants: (1) prosperous (material and spiritual), (2) materially poor, (3) spiritually poor, and (4) absolute poor (**Beik, 2016**). This model is derived from a conceptual framework that reflects Islamic views on poverty and welfare (**Annisa' et al., 2020**). The advantage of this model lies in its ability to provide a precise mapping of interventions: economic empowerment for quadrant II (**Havivah, 2022**), religious deepening for quadrant III (**Qadarin & Ulumiyah, 2020**), and comprehensive programs for quadrant IV (**Sukmawati et al., 2023**). The CIBEST model measures poverty and welfare through two main complementary dimensions: material and spiritual, thus providing a holistic assessment of household welfare (**Beik, 2016**). Meanwhile, the Spiritual Index (SV) is calculated from the average score of worship (prayer, fasting, zakat) and family environment, referring to the concept of holistic welfare in economics. The CIBEST model consists of a welfare index, material poverty index, spiritual poverty index, and absolute poverty index. This index is based on the CIBEST quadrant concept that represents the Islamic concept of poverty and welfare (**Beik, 2016; Mubarokah et al., 2018**).

Integration between PKH and CIBEST Measurement

The synergy between PKH and the CIBEST model lies in its ability to answer the limitations of social program evaluations that have tended to be partial (**Wulansari, 2024**). The findings of **Annisa' et al., (2020)** show that the material-spiritual approach can reveal non-economic impacts such as increased worship participation that often escape traditional measurement (**Annisa' et al., 2020**). A recent study by **Karunia & Amir, (2024)** strengthens the argument that the integration of the CIBEST model in the evaluation of government social programs can provide a more comprehensive picture of program impacts, while ensuring that policy interventions not only touch on economic aspects but also build the spiritual resilience of beneficiaries.

METHODOLOGY

Type of Research

This research uses a descriptive qualitative approach to analyze the implementation of the Family Hope Program (PKH) in improving community welfare in Bragung Village, Sumenep District. The qualitative approach was chosen for its ability to explore an in-depth understanding of the social context through direct interaction with research subjects (Bryman, 2016; Creswell, 2018). The research focuses on measuring welfare using the CIBEST model (Beik & Arsyianti, 2015), which integrates material and spiritual aspects, in line with multidimensional poverty studies (Alkire & Foster, 2011).

Location and Research Subjects

Bragung village was purposively selected because it has a high poverty rate and is a PKH recipient, making it relevant to evaluate the impact of the program. The study population included 607 households, with a sample of 30 KPM selected through purposive sampling based on the criteria: (1) active PKH recipients, and (2) ability to provide in-depth information (Patton, 2002).

Data Collection Methods

Data collection was conducted through three main techniques including non-participant observation conducted to observe environmental conditions and PKH-related activities without involving oneself in program interventions, direct interviews with PKH facilitators and KPM, and documentation (photos, recordings, reports). Data were analyzed qualitatively to produce written descriptions.

Data Analysis Technique

Data validity was tested through method triangulation (comparing observation, interview, document data) and source triangulation (cross-checking between informants). Data analysis used several stages: (1) data reduction, (2) thematic data presentation, and (3) conclusion drawing, carried out iteratively until reaching data saturation (Lexy et al., 2014).

Poverty is measured using the CIBEST model (Beik & Arsyianti, 2015) with four indices: welfare, material, spiritual, and absolute. The poverty line refers to the BPS of Sumenep District (Rp1,840,842/family). The first step in determining the material value (MV) is to determine the poverty line. Next, the MV value is compared with the monthly income received by KPM. KPM is considered materially well-off if the MV value is less than the income, while KPM is not

considered materially well-off if the MV value is greater than the income. The BPS Sumenep district poverty line is the basis for this research poverty line of IDR 1,840,842 for each family (BPS Sumenep, 2025). To calculate the Spiritual Value (SV) is obtained in the following way: (Beik & Arsyianti, 2015).

Here is the formula.

$H_i = (V_p + V_f + V_z + V_h + V_g) / 5$ Description:

H_i = Actual score of household member -i

V_p = Prayer Score

V_f = Fasting Score

V_z = Zakat and Infaki Score

V_h = Family environment score

V_g = Government policy score

After calculating SV and MV, households can be categorized into CIBEST quadrants. The final step is to calculate the overall CIBEST index, which includes the material poverty index (P_m), spiritual poverty index (P_s), and absolute poverty index (P_a) (Beik & Arsyianti, 2015).

1. Welfare Index (W)

$$W = W / N$$

Description:

W = Mustahik Welfare Index, where $0 \leq W \leq 1$

W = Number of mustahiks who are materially and spiritually prosperous N = Number of samples studied

2. Material Poverty Index (P_m)

$$P_m = M_p / N$$

Description:

P_m = is a measure of material poverty; $0 \leq P_m \leq 1$

M_p = number of families with materially but spiritually rich members

N = number of people (number of families observed)

3. Spiritual Poverty Index (P_s)

$$P_s = S_p / N$$

Description:

P_s = is the spiritual poverty index, $0 \leq P_s \leq 1$

S_p = is the number of families that are spiritually poor but materially prosperous.

N = is the population (number of families observed)

4. Absolute Poverty Index (P_a)

$$P_a = A_p / N$$

Description:

P_a = Absolute Poverty Index, $0 \leq P_a \leq 1$

A_p = is the number of families with material poverty

N = number of families observed

RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

Results

Demographic Characteristics of Informants

This study examines the demographic characteristics of 30 PKH recipient families in Bragung Village. Results show unique patterns that reflect local socioeconomic conditions. The majority of recipients are women, in line with program policy. The age distribution is dominated by the middle-aged productive group, in line with the PKH selection mechanism. Education levels are generally primary to secondary, indicating limited access to education. The employment profile is dominated by the agricultural sector, reflecting the rural economic base. These findings provide an initial picture of the program's interaction with the community structure before further analysis. Full details of informant data follow:

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Informants

Variables	Category	Number of People	Percentage (%)
Gender	Female	27	90%
	Male	3	10%
	Total	30	100%
Age Group	Young Productive (29-39 years old)	3	10.0%
	Productive Middle- Aged (40-54years old)	19	63.3%
	Pre-elderly (55-64 years old)	8	26.7%
	Elderly (≥65 years old)	0	0%
	Total	30	100%
Education Level	SD	11	36.67%
	SMP	8	26.67%
	MA/SMA	9	30.00%
	Not in School	1	3.33%
	S1	1	3.33%
	Total	30	100%
Type of Work	Farmers	19	63.3%
	Merchant	6	20.0%
	Housemaid	1	3.3%
	Teacher	1	3.3%
	Total	30	100%

Source: Research Data Process (2025)

The research revealed the unique characteristics of PKH recipients in Bragung Village. The majority of recipients (90%) are women, in line with PKH's policy of prioritizing women as family financial managers. Demographically, 63.3% of recipients are aged 40-54 years (middle-aged productive), followed by 26.7% aged 55-64 years (pre-elderly), and only 10% young (29-39 years). Education levels are dominated by elementary school graduates (33.3%), junior high school graduates (30%), and senior high school graduates (26.7%), with only 3.3% college graduates and 6.7% with no formal education. This condition reflects structural constraints in education.

Most recipients (63.3%) worked in the agricultural sector, 20% in trade, and the rest in various informal jobs. This pattern is in line with the character of Desa Bragung as an agricultural area with limited formal employment opportunities. Dependence on the agricultural sector, which is vulnerable to price fluctuations, is the main reason for the need for the PKH program in this area.

This demographic data shows that PKH is well-targeted to vulnerable groups with various structural limitations. The dominance of agricultural sector workers and low education levels reinforce the argument that social assistance such as PKH is still very much needed to improve the welfare of rural communities.

Material Variables in Individual Scope

The analysis of material variables at the individual level involved 30 households with a composition of 27 female households (90%) and 3 male households (10%). The results showed that there was an increase in material achievements after participating in the Family Hope

Program (PKH) compared to the conditions before the intervention. This increase is measured based on indicators of income, expenditure, and access to basic needs.

Calculation of the Material Poverty Line Value (MV)

This study adapted the BPS poverty line calculation methodology with modifications to evaluate the material welfare of households in Desa Bragung. The calculation is done by multiplying the monthly per capita poverty line (IDR525,955) by the average number of household members (3.5 people). The average household size is obtained by dividing the total population of Sumenep (1,124,436 people) by the number of household heads (320,742 households), resulting in 3.5 people per household. From this calculation it is obtained:

$$MV = \text{Rp}525,955 \times 3.5 = \text{Rp}1,840,842 \text{ per household per month}$$

A household is said to be materially well-off if its income exceeds this MV value. For example, if a family with 3.5 members has an income above IDR 1,840,842 per month, then the family is categorized as materially well-off.

Material Poverty Line Value (MV) Income After PKH

After receiving assistance from the Family Hope Program (PKH), 8 families in Bragung Village still have incomes below the material poverty line of IDR 1,840,842 per month. The following data shows how PKH interventions have increased their incomes, although it has not fully lifted their economic status above the poverty threshold. The following table shows the family groups with incomes after receiving PKH below IDR 1,840,842:

Table 2. family groups with income after PKH < Rp1,840,842

No.	Name	Income After PKH
1	Rosidah	Rp. 900,000
2	Zuyyinah	Rp. 800,000
3	Mamduhah	Rp. 1,300,000
4	Helliyah	Rp. 1,300,000
5	Mulyanto	Rp. 1,000,000
6	Kholid	Rp. 1,500,000
7	Zulaiha	Rp. 1,600,000
8	Tipa	Rp. 1,000,000

Source: Research Data Process (2025)

From the data, it can be seen that PKH assistance has succeeded in increasing the income of recipient families, although it is not enough to bring them out of the material poverty category. Rosidah and Zuyyinah, who previously only earned Rp500,000 per month, have seen their incomes increase to Rp900,000 and Rp800,000 respectively, although they are still far below the poverty line. Meanwhile, some families such as Mamduhah and Helliyah experienced a more significant increase, reaching Rp1,300,000 after the assistance, although still not sufficient.

The largest increases in income were seen for Kholid (Rp1,000,000 → Rp1,500,000) and Zulaiha (Rp1,100,000 → Rp1,600,000), suggesting that the combination of PKH assistance and other sources of income may have helped them approach the welfare threshold. However, Tipa and Mulyanto, although their incomes have increased, are still in the range of Rp1,000,000 indicating that they need additional support beyond PKH to achieve financial independence. Overall, this data illustrates that while PKH has had a positive impact, the program has not fully addressed the root causes of poverty in Bragung Village. Further interventions, such as

skills training, access to more stable employment, or business mentoring programs, are needed for these families to truly escape poverty.

Average Income of KPM Before & After PKH

The Family Hope Program (PKH) as a form of government social assistance has had a significant impact on increasing the income of beneficiary families in Bragung Village. The following data compares the average income of KPM before and after receiving PKH interventions, showing how the program has contributed to improving the economic conditions of the poor in the area.

Table 3. Comparison of Average Income of KPM Before & After PKH

Indicator	Value (Rp)	Increase
Average Income Before PKH	Rp. 1,660,000	-
Average Income After PKH	Rp. 2,137,000	+ Rp. 477,000
Percentage Increase	-	28.7%

Source: Research Data Process (2025)

Based on this data, it can be seen that PKH succeeded in increasing the average income of KPM by Rp477,000 or around 28.7%, from previously Rp1,660,000 to Rp2,137,000 per month. This increase shows that social assistance has a positive impact in encouraging an increase in the economic capacity of poor families. However, despite this significant increase, the average income after PKH is still around the national poverty line, indicating that although this assistance helps to reduce the economic burden, it has not been able to fully lift recipient families to a more independent level of welfare. Factors such as dependence on the agricultural sector with irregular income, lack of access to jobs with decent wages, and limited diversification of income sources are the main challenges that need to be overcome. In addition to cash transfers such as PKH, more comprehensive assistance programs, such as skills training, access to capital, or strengthening micro-enterprises, are needed to ensure that this increase in income can be sustainable and truly bring these families out of poverty. Thus, while PKH has made an appreciable contribution, more holistic and integrated efforts are still needed to create more transformative changes in the lives of the rural poor.

Spiritual Variables within the Individual Sphere

The analysis of spiritual variables at the individual level involved 30 households consisting of 27 female households (90%) and 3 male households (10%). The results showed that all informants experienced an increase in spiritual achievements after participating in the Family Hope Program (PKH) compared to the conditions before the intervention. This improvement was measured based on the standard of fulfillment of basic spiritual needs with a standard verification (SV) value of 3.

Post-intervention PKH CIBEST Model Quadrants

This study involved 30 heads of households as informants who were enrolled in the Family Hope Program (PKH). The analysis was conducted by applying the CIBEST quadrant model to examine the implementation of PKH on the informants' multidimensional welfare conditions, including the material and spiritual dimensions. The results of the study show the distribution of informants' welfare conditions after the intervention, as comprehensively described in the following table, which presents the pattern of changes in beneficiaries' welfare status.

Table 4. Quadrant of CIBEST Model for KPM Post PKH Intervention

Quadrant 2 (Material Poor) 8 households	Quadrant 1 (Prosperous) 22 households
Quadrant 4 (Material and Spiritual Poor) 0 households	Quadrant 3 (Spiritual Poor) 0 households

Source: Research Data Process (2025)

Research on 30 beneficiary families (KPM) through the CIBEST model approach shows the significant impact of the Family Hope Program (PKH) intervention. After program implementation, it was observed that the majority of informants (22 KPM or 73.3%) managed to achieve dual welfare that includes the simultaneous fulfillment of material and spiritual needs (Quadrant I). This finding indicates the effectiveness of PKH in improving the holistic welfare of beneficiaries. However, there are still 8 KPM (26.7%) who, although they have achieved spiritual welfare, still experience limitations in fulfilling their material needs (Quadrant II). This condition suggests that there is room for improvement in the economic assistance aspect of the program. Meanwhile, there are no more KPM in Quadrant III (materially sufficient but spiritually deficient) or Quadrant IV (absolute poverty), indicating the program's success in overcoming the problem of spiritual and multidimensional poverty.

Overall, the results of this study reinforce previous findings regarding the positive contribution of conditional social assistance programs in improving welfare indicators, particularly the non-material aspects. However, the findings regarding the persistence of material problems among some beneficiaries imply the need to strengthen the economic empowerment component of the PKH program in the future, either through skills training, business assistance, or a more targeted assistance scheme.

CIBEST Model Quadrant Pre and Post PKH Intervention KPM Households

Research on 30 beneficiary families showed significant changes after receiving PKH assistance. The following data compares the informants' conditions before and after the intervention, classified based on the four quadrants of the CIBEST model:

Table 5. CIBEST Model Quadrants of Pre- and Post- PKH Intervention KPM Households

Quadrant 2 is materially poor		Quadrant 1 is prosperous	
Before getting PKH assistance (8 households)	After receiving PKH assistance (8 households)	Before getting PKH assistance (8 households)	After receiving PKH assistance (22 households)
Quadrant 4 is materially and spiritually poor		Quadrant 3 is spiritually poor	
Before getting PKH assistance (10 households)	After receiving PKH assistance (0 households)	Before getting PKH assistance (4 households)	After receiving PKH assistance (0 households)

Source: Research Data Process (2025)

This study examines the impact of the Family Hope Program (PKH) on 30 beneficiary families using the CIBEST model, showing significant improvements in multidimensional welfare. The PKH intervention succeeded in increasing the number of families in Quadrant I (material-spiritual well-being) from 26.7% to 73.3%, reflecting the program's success in creating holistic well-being. Meanwhile, 26.7% of families remain in Quadrant II (spiritual fulfilled-material limited), indicating the need for a stronger approach to material aspects. Encouraging

results were seen in the disappearance of all families from Quadrant III (material sufficient-spiritual deficient) and Quadrant IV (double poverty), proving the effectiveness of PKH in alleviating the worst poverty conditions. These findings highlight the importance of maintaining PKH's holistic approach while developing additional programs specifically for families who still experience material deprivation. This success also supports expanding the scope of similar intervention models given their proven positive impact.

CIBEST Poverty Index of KPM Post PKH Intervention

The implementation of the Family Hope Program (PKH) has resulted in a significant transformation in the welfare level of beneficiary families, as measured through the CIBEST Index. These structural changes illustrate the real impact of program interventions on various dimensions of family welfare, as shown in the following post-intervention data:

Table 6. Poverty Index after PKH Intervention

Index	Formula Result	After
Welfare Index (W)	$W = 24/30 = 0.8$	0.8
Material Poverty Index (PMI)	$P_m = 6/30 = 0.2$	0.2
Spiritual Poverty Index (Ps)	$P_s = 0/30 = 0$	0
Absolute Poverty Index (Pa)	$P_a = 0/30 = 0$	0

Source: Research Data Process (2025)

CIBEST index data post-implementation of PKH reveals encouraging achievements while providing some important notes. The Welfare Index (W), which reached 0.8, shows that the program succeeded in improving family welfare by three times the initial condition. This large jump indicates that the majority of KPM have now achieved a more holistic and sustainable level of welfare.

On the material aspect, although the Material Poverty Index (MPI) fell to 0.2 (a 25% decrease), this figure still leaves room for improvement. Compared to other dimensions, this more moderate decline suggests that additional approaches may be needed to address families' economic challenges more deeply. This is an important note for future program development. Meanwhile, the achievements in the spiritual and absolute dimensions are remarkable. The zero score on the Spiritual Poverty Index (Ps) and Absolute Poverty Index (Pa) proves that PKH has not only succeeded in eliminating all forms of spiritual poverty, but has also been able to alleviate families from the most severe conditions of multidimensional poverty. This double success confirms that PKH's integrated approach to building family resilience works effectively.

Overall, the transformation that has occurred shows that PKH has functioned as an important catalyst in accelerating improvements in family welfare. The patterns of change that have occurred also provide valuable lessons that a program approach that touches various dimensions of life simultaneously can create a more sustainable and holistic impact on beneficiaries.

CIBEST Poverty Index Pre and Post PKH Intervention KPM

The CIBEST model measures Islamic poverty through four index components: (1) welfare index, (2) material poverty index, (3) spiritual poverty index, and (4) absolute poverty index. The CIBEST quadrant analysis classifies households based on these categories. Based on this classification, a comprehensive Islamic poverty index value can be calculated. The full calculation results are presented below.

Table 7. Comparison of Poverty Index Pre and Post PKH Intervention

Index	Before	After	Difference (Value)	Difference (%)	Interpretation
Welfare Index (W)	0.2667	0.8	+0.5333	+200%	Welfare increased 3×
Material Poverty Index (PMI)	0.2667	0.2	-0.0667	-25%	Material poverty falls by a quarter
Spiritual Poverty Index (Ps)	0.1333	0	-0.1333	-100%	Spiritual poverty disappears completely
Absolute Poverty Index (Pa)	0.3333	0	-0.3333	-100%	Absolute poverty eliminated Completely

Source: Research Data Process (2025)

The results of the analysis show that the Family Hope Program (PKH) has significantly improved the welfare of beneficiary families. The overall welfare index tripled from 0.267 before the intervention to 0.8 after the program, representing a 200% improvement. PKH also proved effective in reducing material poverty, albeit with a more moderate impact compared to other aspects. The material poverty index fell by 25%, from 0.267 to 0.2, indicating that the program was successful in reducing economic vulnerability, although there is still room for further improvement. Most striking is PKH's success in the spiritual aspect. The spiritual poverty index fell from 0.133 to 0, indicating that the program succeeded in fully eliminating spiritual poverty. This complements the program's achievement in eliminating absolute poverty, which also fell from 0.333 to 0 after the intervention. Overall, these findings suggest that PKH not only improves economic welfare, but also strengthens family resilience in a holistic manner, encompassing both material and spiritual dimensions. Nonetheless, challenges remain in reducing material poverty more deeply, which requires additional approaches beyond conditional cash transfers.

Analysis

PKH Implementation in Bragung Village Using the CIBEST Method

This study reveals the significant impact of the Family Hope Program (PKH) on improving the welfare of the people of Bragung Village, Sumenep District, both from material and spiritual aspects. By applying the CIBEST model (Beik, 2016), the research findings show that PKH interventions have created a multidimensional transformation in beneficiaries' welfare conditions. The CIBEST quadrant analysis reveals interesting structural changes, where the proportion of families in Quadrant I (Materially-Spiritually Prosperous) increased dramatically from 26.7% to 73.3%, while Quadrant III (Materially Rich-Spiritually Poor) and Quadrant IV (Absolutely Poor) were completely eliminated. These changes demonstrate the effectiveness of PKH in creating holistic welfare that covers both dimensions in a balanced manner.

The results of the CIBEST index measurements reinforce these findings, with the Welfare Index (W) increasing by 200% from 0.2667 to 0.8. A more moderate improvement was seen in the Material Poverty Index (Pm) which fell by 25%, while the Spiritual (Ps) and Absolute Poverty Index (Pa) reached zero. This pattern of change indicates that PKH is more effective in improving spiritual aspects than material aspects, although both show positive developments. This finding is consistent with research by Annisa' et al., (2020) and (Karunia & Amir, 2024) which also found a positive impact of PKH on religious and social participation, while supporting Islamic economic theory on the importance of material-spiritual balance in the concept of welfare.

A deeper analysis of the persistence of 26.7% of families in Quadrant II (Materially Poor-Spiritually Rich) reveals the limitations of PKH in addressing the root causes of structural poverty. This finding gains empirical support from the study Andika, (2021) which only found a 19.6% effect of PKH on economic welfare, as well as the study by Pratiwi & Imsar, (2022) on the program's limitations in addressing structural poverty. Several key factors such as dependence on the vulnerable agricultural sector, low levels of education, and limited access to employment were identified as key challenges that require additional interventions beyond the conditional cash transfer mechanism.

Methodologically, the CIBEST model applied in this study provides important added value for social program evaluation. In contrast to conventional approaches that only focus on economic indicators, the CIBEST framework allows for a more thorough assessment by including consideration of the spiritual dimension. This methodological advantage is particularly meaningful given the characteristics of Indonesia's religious society, where non-material aspects are an essential component in the construction of welfare.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Conclusion

This research examines evaluating the implementation of the Family Hope Program (PKH) in Bragung Village, Sumenep, using a holistic approach using the CIBEST method. The results show that PKH has significantly improved community welfare, especially in the spiritual dimension. Before the PKH intervention, the welfare distribution was divided into 4 quadrants, namely: Quadrant I (Materially-Spiritually Prosperous) 26.7%, Quadrant II (Materially Poor-Spiritually Rich) 26.7%, Quadrant III (Materially Rich-Spiritually Poor) 13.3%, and Quadrant IV (Absolutely Poor) 33.3%. After the intervention, there was a dramatic transformation where Quadrant I jumped to 73.3%, Quadrant II stayed at 26.7%, while Quadrants III and IV disappeared completely. This change is reflected in the CIBEST index which shows that the Welfare Index (W) jumped from 0.267 to 0.8 (a threefold increase), the Material Poverty Index (Pm) dropped by 25% (from 0.267 to 0.2), and the Spiritual (Ps) and Absolute Poverty Index (Pa) dropped to 0.

This finding gains strong support from Islamic economic theory which emphasizes the balance between material and spiritual needs in achieving holistic well-being (Beik & Arsyianti, 2016). Previous studies by Annisa' et al., (2020) and Karunia & Amir, (2024) also show that conditionality-based social assistance programs such as PKH not only improve economic indicators, but also encourage participation in religious and social activities. Research by Ernita et al. (2024) and Rahmatillah et al., (2024) reinforce these findings by showing that PKH's effectiveness in improving welfare reaches 38-85%, depending on the quality of implementation and supporting factors. However, the findings regarding PKH's limitations in overcoming material poverty are consistent with the study Andika, (2021) which states that PKH's effect on economic welfare is only 19.6%, indicating the need for additional interventions to address the structural root causes.

This research makes a theoretical contribution by adapting the CIBEST model originally for zakat evaluation to government social policy, offering a new perspective that integrates the spiritual dimension in welfare assessment. Practically, the findings recommend: (1) strengthening PKH's economic empowerment through business training and mentoring,

particularly for materially poor families; (2) improving inter-program synergies (PKH, KUR, BPNT); and (3) maintaining PKH's holistic approach that combines material assistance with conditional participation in health and education services, given its effectiveness in addressing spiritual and absolute poverty.

Despite providing valuable findings, this study has several limitations that need to be acknowledged. First, the scope is limited to one village with a relatively small sample (30 households), so generalization of the findings needs to be done with caution. Secondly, the descriptive qualitative approach used, although in-depth, is less able to capture the longitudinal dynamics of welfare changes. Thirdly, the CIBEST model, although comprehensive, does not fully accommodate contextual variables such as access to health, the quality of education, or environmental factors that might affect welfare.

Recommendation

Based on these findings and limitations, future research could expand on several important aspects. First, by adopting a longitudinal approach to assess the long-term impact of PKH. Second, expand the sample coverage and variables (e.g. including health access and education quality). Third, conduct a comparative study across regions to understand the contextual factors that influence PKH effectiveness. Fourth, refine the CIBEST model by adding indicators such as environmental resilience or financial inclusion

REFERENCES

- Abizal, N., Maimun, & Yulindawati. (2022). Efektivitas Program Keluarga Harapan (PKH) terhadap Kesejahteraan Masyarakat Masa Pandemi Covid-19 (Studi Kasus Kecamatan Tangan-tangan Kabupaten Aceh Barat Daya). *Jurnal Ilmiah Basis Ekonomi dan Bisnis*, 1(1), 55–70. <https://doi.org/10.22373/jibes.v1i1.1576>
- Agus Purwannto, E. (2007). Mengkaji Potensi Usaha Kecil dan Menengah (UKM) untuk Pembuatan Kebiasaan Anti Kemiskinan di Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik*, 10(3), 295–330.
- Alisjahbana, & Murniningtyas. (2018). Tujuan Pembangunan Berkelanjutan di Indonesia: Konsep Target dan Strategi Implementasi (2 ed.).
- Alkire, S., & Foster, J. (2011). Counting and multidimensional poverty measurement Author links open overlay panel. *Journal of Public Economics*, 95(7–8), 476–487.
- Andika, S. (2021). Pengaruh Program Keluarga Harapan Terhadap Kesejahteraan Masyarakat Menurut Perspektif Ekonomi Islam (Studi Kasus Desa Mekar Delima Kecamatan Tasik Putri Puyu). *Bertuah Jurnal Syariah dan Ekonomi Islam*, 2(1), 44–55. <https://doi.org/10.56633/jsie.v2i1.227>
- Annisa', R., Syihabuddin, A., Fuad, L., & Surabaya, U. S. A. (2024). CIBEST Model Analysis of ZIS Funds Empowerment Through Mandiri Entrepreneur Center Program. *Proceedings, 8th International Conference on Zakat*, 400–410.
- Arum, D. S., & Sugiyanto, E. (2023). Pengaruh Implementasi Program Keluarga Harapan Terhadap Kesejahteraan Masyarakat di Kelurahan Baktijaya Kota Depok. *Populis: Jurnal Sosial dan Humaniora*, 8(2), 134. <https://doi.org/10.47313/pjsh.v8i2.2831>
- Aulya Wardani, W., Ismail, M., Kurniawansyah, E., & Sawaludin, S. (2023). Implementasi Program Keluarga Harapan (PKH) di Desa Tenga Kecamatan Woha Kabupaten Bima. *Jurnal Ilmiah Profesi Pendidikan*, 8(4), 2189–2196. <https://doi.org/10.29303/jipp.v8i4.1706>
- Azizy, S. H. (2019). The Concept of Welfare From Siyasa Syar'iyah Perspective and Its Implementation on Zakat Management in Indonesia. *Islamic Economics Journal*, 5(1), 35. <https://doi.org/10.21111/iej.v5i1.3666>

- Beik, I. S. (2016). ISLAMISASI ILMU EKONOMI. *ISLAMICONOMIC: Jurnal Ekonomi Islam*, 7(2). <https://doi.org/10.32678/ijei.v7i2.40>
- Beik, I. S., & Arsyianti, L. D. (2015). CONSTRUCTION OF CIBEST MODEL AS MEASUREMENT OF POVERTY AND WELFARE INDICES FROM ISLAMIC PERSPECTIVE. *Jurnal Al-Iqtishad*, 7(1), 88-104.
- BPS Sumenep. (2025). "KABUPATEN SUMENEP DALAM ANGKA 2025" (Vol. 19), Sumenep: BPS Sumenep.
- Bryman, A. (2016). "Social Research Methods", Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (2018). "Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches", Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Daud, M., & Marini, Y. (2019). Implementasi Program Keluarga Harapan Dalam Meningkatkan Kesejahteraan Masyarakat Miskin. *Jurnal Humaniora: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial, Ekonomi dan Hukum*, 2(1), 29-38. <https://doi.org/10.30601/humaniora.v2i1.51>
- Dehani, M., Hernawan, D., & Purnamasari, I. (2018). EVALUASI PROGRAM KELUARGA HARAPAN (PKH) DI KECAMATAN BOGOR SELATAN KOTA BOGOR. *Jurnal Governansi*, 4(1), 45-56. <https://doi.org/10.30997/jgs.v4i1.1140>
- Devi, S., Fatchiya, A., & Susanto, D. (2016). Kapasitas Kader dalam Penyuluhan Keluarga Berencana di Kota Palembang, Provinsi Sumatera Selatan. *Jurnal Penyuluhan*, 12(2), 144. <https://doi.org/10.25015/penyuluhan.v12i2.11223>
- Djumura, N. P., Panigoro, M., Maruwae, A., & Popoi, I. (2022). Program Keluarga Harapan Dalam Peningkatan Kesejahteraan Masyarakat Desa Bubeya. *Oikos-Nomos: JURNAL KAJIAN EKONOMI DAN BISNIS*, 15(1), 33-42.
- Ernita, T., Handayani, R., & Hasbiyah, S. (2024). PENGARUH PELAKSANAAN PROGRAM KELUARGA HARAPAN (PKH) TERHADAP KESEJAHTERAAN MASYARAKAT DI DESA TELUK BULUH KECAMATAN BANJANG KABUPATEN HULU SUNGAI UTARA. *Jurnal Kebijakan Publik* 1(3), 509-519.
- Febriani, C., Rahmawati, J., & Silalahi, N. A. (2022). Evaluasi Dampak Pelaksanaan Program Keluarga Harapan dalam Meningkatkan Kesejahteraan Masyarakat: Studi kasus di Kampung Sidomulyo, Kecamatan Tanjungpinang Timur, Kota Tanjungpinang. *Social Issues Quartely*, 1(1), 114-124.
- Gusmina, M., & Eva, E. (2023). Analisis Kesejahteraan Penerima Zakat Produktif di Desa Sulung Berdasarkan Model CIBEST. *Jurnal Pelita Nusantara*, 1(1), 23-32. <https://doi.org/10.59996/jurnalpelitanusantara.v1i1.110>
- Havivah, N., & Mahyuni. (2022). Pengukuran Pendayagunaan Zakat Produktif untuk Pengentasan Kemiskinan Berdasarkan Model CIBEST (Studi Kasus BAZNAS Kabupaten Banjar). *Indonesian Journal of Applied Accounting and Finance*, 2(2), 187-196.
- Irtiah Fajriati, N., Isnaeni, N., & Ridhwan, R. (2020). Analisis Pengaruh Program Keluarga Harapan Dalam Peningkatan Kesejahteraan Masyarakat Miskin (Studi Kasus Di Kecamatan Tungkal Ilir). *Najaha Iqtishod: Journal of Islamic Economic and Finance*, 1(1), 43-50. <https://doi.org/10.22437/jief.v1i1.11198>
- J Lexy, M., (2014). "Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif", Edisi Revisi, Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Kahfi Septian Mawarni. (2019). PENGARUH IMPLEMENTASI PROGRAM KELUARGA HARAPAN TERHADAP KESEJAHTERAAN MASYARAKAT OLEH PENDAMPING PROGRAM KELUARGA HARAPAN (PKH) DI DESA CIOMAS KECAMATAN PANJALU KABUPATEN CIAMIS. *Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Administrasi Negara*, 6(3), 56-66.
- Karimah, S., Masrur, M., & Shulthoni, M. (2023). Pengaruh Program Bantuan Sosial PKH Terhadap Kesejahteraan Masyarakat di Desa Wringinagung Kabupaten Pekalongan. *Jurnal Sahmiyya*, 2(2), 304-313.

- Karunia, S. O. F., & Amir, F. (2024). Productive zakat distribution in improving mustahik welfare: CIBEST model approach. *Journal of Enterprise and Development*, 6(2), 290–299. <https://doi.org/10.20414/jed.v6i2.9723>.
- Khalifah, S. N., & Basar, G. G. K. (2023). PERAN PROGRAM KELUARGA HARAPAN DALAM MENUNJANG PENDIDIKAN ANAK SEKOLAH DASAR. *Focus: Jurnal Pekerjaan Sosial*, 6(1), 143. <https://doi.org/10.24198/focus.v6i1.39445>.
- Laksono, B. A. (2018). The Community Empowerment Through Social and Educational Institutions. *Jurnal Pendidikan Humaniora*, 6(3), 115–122.
- Mahadika Driantama, N., & Muljaningsih, S. (2024). ANALISIS PENINGKATAN KESEJAHTERAAN MUSTAHIK DARI SEGI SPIRITUAL DAN MATERIAL MENGGUNAKAN METODE CIBEST (STUDI KASUS: PROGRAM KUM DI YDSF MALANG). *Islamic Economic and Finance in Focus*, 3(2), 270–296.
- Mubarokah, I., Beik, I. S., & Irawan, T. (2018). Dampak Zakat terhadap Kemiskinan dan Kesejahteraan Mustahik (Kasus: BAZNAS Provinsi Jawa Tengah). *Al-Muzara'ah*, 5(1), 37–50. <https://doi.org/10.29244/jam.5.1.37-50>.
- Muin, R., & Rosdiana, R. (2020). EFEKTIVITAS PROGRAM KELUARGA HARAPAN (PKH) TERHADAP PENERIMA BANTUAN DI DESA LALIKO KECAMATAN CAMPALAGIAN KABUPATEN POLEWALI MANDAR. *J-Alif: Jurnal Penelitian Hukum Ekonomi Syariah dan Budaya Islam*, 5(2), 130. <https://doi.org/10.35329/jalif.v5i2.1844>.
- Mutmainnah, Paddu, H., & Hamrullah. (2022). DETERMINANTS OF POVERTY LEVEL IN INDONESIA. *Jurnal Ekonomi*, 11(03), 1930–1936.
- Nurdiana Holida, Martina Eka Saputri, & Icha Cahya Kusuma Ningtias. (2023). Dampak Program Keluarga Harapan Terhadap Kesejahteraan Keluarga Di Kelurahan Mayangan Kota Probolinggo. *TUTURAN: Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi, Sosial dan Humaniora*, 1(2), 136–158. <https://doi.org/10.47861/tuturan.v1i2.171>.
- Patton, M. (2002). *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*, CA: Sage.
- Pratiwi, D. C., & Imsar, I. (2022). Analisis penyaluran bantuan sosial program keluarga harapan (PKH) dan bantuan pangan non tunai (BPNT) dinas sosial pada masyarakat Kabupaten Batu Bara. *Fair Value: Jurnal Ilmiah Akuntansi dan Keuangan*, 4(12), 5684–5690. <https://doi.org/10.32670/fairvalue.v4i12.2122>.
- Purnamasari, L., Ayuniyyah, Q., & Tanjung, H. (2023). EFEKTIVITAS ZAKAT PRODUKTIF DALAM PENINGKATAN USAHA MUSTAHIK. *JURNAL EKONOMI ISLAM*, 16(2), 87–96.
- Qadarin, M., & Ulumiyah, S. (2020). ANALISIS DAMPAK ZAKAT PRODUKTIF TERHADAP KESEJAHTERAAN MUSTAHIK (MODEL CIBEST BAZNAS SAMPANG). *Kabilah: Journal of Social Community*, 5(1), 1–21.
- Rahmatillah, S. A., Rochaeni, A., Fujilestari, N. A., & Yamardi. (2024). Pengaruh Implementasi Kebijakan Program Keluarga Harapan Terhadap Kesejahteraan Masyarakat di Kecamatan Cimahi Selatan Kota Cimahi. *Ranah Research: Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Development*, 6(6), 2604–2622. <https://doi.org/10.38035/rrj.v6i6.1119>.
- Raliandy Sako, I., Bumolo, F., Bahsoan, A., Moonti, U., Mahmud, M., & Novrita Dama, M. (2023). Pengaruh Program Keluarga Harapan Terhadap Tingkat Kesejahteraan Masyarakat di Desa Tihu Kecamatan Bone Pantai Kabupaten Bone Bolango. *AKSARA: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan Nonformal*, 9(1), 45–52.
- Rohman, A., & Novitawati, R. A. D. (2020). IMPLEMENTASI PELAYANAN PROGRAM KELUARGA HARAPAN (PKH) DALAM MENINGKATKAN KESEJAHTERAAN MASYARAKAT. *Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen dan Akuntansi*, 8(2), 98–111.
- Rukmana, B. I., & Citra, F. P. (2022). ANALISIS DAMPAK PROGRAM KELUARGA HARAPAN (PKH) TERHADAP KESEJAHTERAAN SOSIAL. *Nusantara Journal of Economics*, 04(01), 10–18.

- Shomadani, M. H. (2024). PENGARUH PROGRAM KELUARGA HARAPAN UNTUK KESEJAHTERAAN MASYARAKAT MENURUT PERSPEKTIF EKONOMI ISLAM. *Jurnal Hukum Islam*, 10(1), 1-9.
- Sukmasari, D. (2020). KONSEP KESEJAHTERAAN MASYARAKAT DALAM PERSPEKTIF AL-QUR'AN. *AT-TIBYAN: Jurnal of Al-Quran and Hadis Studies*, 3(1), 1-16.
- Sukmawati, U. S., Rojia, R., Maya, M., Santi, S., & Iswandi, I. (2023). Analisis Kesejahteraan di Desa Jirak dengan Metode CIBEST. *Jurnal Alwatzikhoebillah: Kajian Islam, Pendidikan, Ekonomi, Humaniora*, 9(2), 362-375. <https://doi.org/10.37567/alwatzikhoebillah.v9i2.1748>.
- Utomo, D., Hakim, A., & Ribawanto, H. (2013). PELAKSANAAN PROGRAM KELUARGA HARAPAN DALAM MENINGKATKAN KUALITAS HIDUP RUMAH TANGGA MISKIN (Studi pada Unit Pelaksana Program Keluarga Harapan Kecamatan Purwoasri, Kabupaten Kediri). *Jurnal Administrasi Publik (JAP)*, 2(1), 29-34.
- Virgoreta, D. A., & Pratiwi, R. N. (2014). IMPLEMENTASI PROGRAM KELUARGA HARAPAN (PKH) DALAM UPAYA MENINGKATKAN KESEJAHTERAAN MASYARAKAT (Studi pada Desa Beji Kecamatan Jenu, Kabupaten Tuban). *Jurnal Administrasi Publik (JAP)*, 2(12), 1-6.
- Winarno, B. (2017). Kebijakan Publik: Teori dan Proses, Media Pressindo.
- Wulansari, F. (2024). Analisis ZIS Produktif terhadap Kesejahteraan Penerima ZIS di Kota Malang Menggunakan Metode CIBEST (Studi Kasus pada Lazis Sabilillah dan LAZ Yatim Mandiri). *Jurnal Kolaboratif Sains*, 7(4), 1521-1528.
- Y. Lapasau, U., Panigoro, M., Hafid, R., Mahmud, M., & Bahsoan, A. (2023). Pengaruh Program Keluarga Harapan (PKH) terhadap Kesejahteraan Masyarakat Lemito Kecamatan Lemito Kabupaten Pohuwato. *JlIP-Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Pendidikan*, 6(10), 8156-8160.