THE EFFECTS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FAMILY OF HOPE PROGRAM POLICY ON THE QUALITY OF EDUCATION AND HEALTH SERVICE FOR POOR FAMILY IN EAST JAKARTA

Paiman Raharjo

Postgraduate Program, Prof. Dr. Moestopo (Beragama) University

ABSTRACT

Family of Hope Program is established due to low income of poor families in Indonesia that cannot fulfill their needs in regard to health and education. This condition is often seen in health care for poor pregnant women, affecting poor baby's health and even baby's mortality rate. Furthermore, there are still many poor families who cannot afford to provide their basic education needs due to the lack of budget. Problem discussed in this research is how big the influence of Family of Hope Program policy on the quality of education and health service for poor families in East Jakarta. The purpose of this research is to gain information about the effect of policy implementation on the quality of education and health service for poor family. This research applies policy implementation model by Smith, with its four components: idealized policy, target group, implementing organization and environmental. This research applies quantitative approach using questionnaire, observation and interview. Data is analyzed through Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) and supported by observation and interview. The subject of analysis in this research is the staffs from Department of Social Affairs of East Jakarta by applying rule of thumb to get the sample. The research shows that the policy implementation of Family of Hope Program has significant effect on the quality of education and health service in East Jakarta.
Keywords*: Policy Implementation, Family of Hope Program, Service Quality.*

INTRODUCTION

Poverty and social problems in Indonesia has grown more complicated within the last 12 years since the passing of Reformation in 1999. It is characterized by the increase in the number of poor people in 2013, about 101 million people or 40.4% of Indonesian population (± 250 million people). Regarding the poverty level, Indonesian Government has implemented Family of Hope Program in order to reduce poverty as well as to develop policies related to social protection since 2007. Family of Hope Program is designed to help the poor of lowest cluster in the form of conditional aid. This program is an ongoing program, at least until 2020, and is expected to accelerate the achievement of MDGs (Millennium Development Goals). MDGs are supported by Family of Hope Program through reduction of extreme poverty and hunger, achievement of primary education and gender equality,

reduction of mortality rate of infants and toddlers, and reduction of maternal mortality.

Family of Hope Program is inspired by low income of very poor families in Indonesia leading to the families' inability to meet their needs of health and education. This condition is often seen in the inadequate health maintenance of pregnant women of very poor families, leading to poor health of newborn babies and even high infant mortality. In addition, the condition is also seen from the number of very poor families who cannot meet their basic needs of education due to the lack of money. The data in 2007 to 2012 showed that the number of very poor families in East Jakarta is about 633,329 Very Poor Households spread over 10 subdistricts.

METHOD

The research is descriptive in nature, collecting data on about the effects of policy implementation on the quality of education

and health service for poor families. A questionnaire, observation, and interview were carried out to gather information regarding research subjects as shown in the table below.

Table 1.1
The Number of Very Poor Households
In East Jakarta in 2007 to 2012

No	Subdistrict	The Number of Very Poor Households
1	Pasar Rebo	55.425
2	Ciracas	61.302
3	Cipayung	50.150
4	Makasar	62.101
5	Kramat Jati	50.315
6	Jatinegara	80.125
7	Duren Sawit	62.332
8	Cakung	90.230
9	Pulo Gadung	82.199
10	Matraman	52.150
	Total	633.329

Source: Department of Social Affairs of East Jakarta, 2014

The aforementioned conditions indicate that the fulfillment of basic needs, especially education and health care for the very poor communities needs to be improved by the government through development of education and health facilities and infrastructure, i.e. Family of Hope Program. Family of Hope Program is the forerunner of the development of the social protection system, especially for poor families. Family of Hope Program requires very poor families to check the health of their pregnant women and send their children to school.

The implementation of Family of Hope Program is the duty and responsibility of the government under the coordination of the Ministry of Social Affairs. The implementation of Family of Hope Program is associated with a variety of technical and non-technical aspects, under the responsibility of the Ministry of Social Affairs and the Coordinating Ministry for People's Welfare. The Ministry of Social Affairs, in this case Directorate of Social Welfare Security and Directorate-General of Social Assistance Security, shoulder the duty and responsibility to always continuously perform planned improvements of system and management of Family of Hope Program in coordination with local governments throughout Indonesia, in this case Social Agency and Department of Social Affairs.

The implementation of Family of Hope Program is meant to reduce poverty, improve the quality of human resources, as well as to change the behavior of very poor families that are relatively less supportive in supporting the improvement of the welfare for the poor. However, the implementation of Family of Hope Program in the field often receives disappointment from society, ranging from the lack of socialization of the program to the society, less accurate data collection of poor families, less rapid health and education service, to frequent delay in funding given to poor families.

In addition, there are many complaints as a form of public dissatisfaction with the services provided by the government, particularly for the implementation of Family of Hope Program, because many poor people are not registered to receive the program, such as in East Jakarta. This is because the number of recipients of Family of Hope Program in East Jakarta, about 5,894 Very Poor Households spread in 10 subdistricts, is not proportional to the number of poor people in East Jakarta, about ± 625,115 Very Poor Households, as shown in the following table:

The number of recipients of Family of Hope Program shown in the table above is considered not to meet the society's expectation. It is very closely related to the budget policy that has not been adequate as expected, where the national budget for Family of Hope program in 2011/2012 was about IDR 1.3 trillion throughout Indonesia and ± IDR 12,966,800,000 for East Jakarta.

Table 1.2
The Number of Very Poor Households
Receiving Family of Hope Program in
2011/2012 In East Jakarta

No	Subdistrict	Very Poor Households Receiving Family of Hope Program
1	Pasar Rebo	264
2	Ciracas	270
3	Cipayung	225
4	Makasar	440
5	Kramat Jati	225
6	Jatinegara	860
7	Duren Sawit	750
8	Cakung	1.710
9	Pulo Gadung	900
10	Matraman	250

Source: Department of Social Affairs of East Jakarta, 2013

In addition to the limited budget, inadequate facilities and infrastructure, family factors, and diverse social values, there are other problems found in the field, namely implemented family of hope programs have not been socialized properly, so that many people do not know about the form of the assistance from the intended family of hope program. From information obtained, the socialization of education and health assistance through the Family of Hope Program is found lacking.

Considering the aforementioned issues and observing the fact related to family of hope program in particular, generally family of hope program still does not have a significant effect on improving very poor households' lives. It can be seen from the development of the implementation of Family of Hope Program in East Jakarta, since 2010 until 2012 it only contributed to improve the welfare of very poor households for %.

The data from 2007 to 2012 showed that the number of very poor families in East Jakarta was about 633,329 households, and decreased to 633,201 households in 2012. Thus, for 3 years since Family of Hope Program had been implemented in East Jakarta, it was only able to improve the status of 128 households into Poor Households, as shown in Table 1.3 below.

Table 1.3
The Number of Very Poor Households
in East Jakarta in 2012
After the Implementation of Family of
Hope Program

No	Subdistricts	The Number of Very Poor Households
1	Pasar Rebo	55.415
2	Ciracas	61.282
3	Cipayung	50.138
4	Makasar	62.090
5	Kramat Jati	50.305
6	Jatinegara	80.123
7	Duren Sawit	62.327
8	Cakung	90.205
9	Pulo Gadung	82.181
10	Matraman	52.135
	Total	633.201

Source: Department of Social Affairs of East Jakarta, April 2013

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The findings in the field show that policy implementation of Family of Hope Program has not ran as expected, so that the quality of education and health service has not met the expectations of society. It is caused by several factors, including: limited human resources in charge of Family of Hope Program, minimal socialization of family of hope programs, limited availability of adequate funds, facilities and infrastructure, family factors, diverse social values, environmental factors, as well as the absence of mapping of priority for people classified as very poor and poor families.

Policy implementation

Related to the word of implementation, Pressman and Aaron (1984: xxi) define the word by stating that *"Implementation as to carry out, accomplish, fulfill, produce, complete. But what is it that is being implemented? A policy, naturally"*. Thus, implementation can be interpreted as an activity related to the effort of completion of a job by utilizing the facilities and infrastructure to achieve maximal results.

Meanwhile, Mazmanian and Sabatier (1983: 4) state that, *To understand what actually happens after program is enacted or formulated is the subject of policy implementation: those events and activities that occur after the issuing of authoritative public policy directives, which include both the effort to administer and the substantive impact on people and events.*

Based on the views expressed by Mazmanian and Sabatier, it can be explained that the meaning of policy implementation is an attempt to understand what in reality happens after a program is declared valid or are formulated so that it becomes the focus of policy implementation, including the events and activities that arise after the ratification of national policy guidelines, with an effort to administrate them or actualize the consequences or real effects on society or existing events.

Policy implementation is a part of the process of public policy. In this case, policy implementation is a crucial part of the achievement of policy objectives in addressing the existing problems, or for the successful implementation of a particular activity. The success of policy implementation will not be easily achieved without an effort to consider the various factors affecting policy implementation. As revealed by Adiwisastra (in Tachjan, 2006: xii) that:

Public policy implementation is essential. Public policy that has been made will only be 'paper tiger' if it is not implemented successfully. Therefore, public policy implementation should be done by considering various factors, so that the public policy in question can actually serve as a means to actualize the desired expectations. In other words, public policy implementation is an attempt to actualize a decision or agreement that has been set previously.

In a public policy, at the stage of formulation, the policy can be prepared as good as possible. However, without a targeted policy implementation, the policy that has been established can cause pessimistic appraisal from the society to the policy makers, namely the ability to establish a policy without having the ability in the policy implementation. Tachjan (2006: 25) states that,

Public policy implementation is a process of administrative activity conducted after the policy is defined/ approved. This activity is located between policy formulation and policy evaluation. Policy implementation contains top down logic, meaning lowering/ interpreting abstract or macro alternatives into concrete or micro alternatives.

To understand the policy implementation can be seen from several aspects, as told by Anderson (1979: 92-93) that, *"Who is involved in policy implementation, the nature of the administration process, compliance with policy and effect of implementation or policy content and impact"*. Grindle (1980: 7) provides an understanding of public policy implementation by revealing that, *"Implementation to be a general process of administrative action that can be investigated at the specific program level"*. In this case he provides an understanding of implementation as an overall process of the administrative action and can examine in the specific program. In this case, to implement a policy implementation, obviously in any

activities until the very important details, policy implementation is important to note so that it will not experience too much deviation from the desired objectives.

Soenarko (1998: 204) expresses the sense of policy implementation by stating that, "Policy implementation is basically an activity to achieve the objectives set out in government policy". Meanwhile, Braun, *et al.* (2000: 7) give their opinion about policy implementation by arguing that, "*Policy implementation think tank could contribute to improving the quality of pursued and the effectiveness with which they are implemented, especially at the provincial and municipal level*".

Van Master and Van Horn (1975: 447) provide an understanding of policy implementation by revealing that, "*Policy implementation encompasses those actions by public and private individual (or group) that are directed at the achievement of objectives set forth in prior policy decision*". Meanwhile, in highlighting policy implementation, Tangkilisan (2005: 7) reveals that, "Policy implementation is a series of translation process of policy responded in the form of action from the actors of development in consistent manner in order to achieve the objectives and purposes that have been outlined by the policy itself".

The opinions of some experts above confirm that policy implementation is an action performed based on the policy defined, in this case policy implementation is an attempt to actualize the provisions outlined in the policy, and it is performed so that the desired objectives in policy will be achieved as expected. In addition, policy implementation will provide a contribution for future policy. Therefore, policy implementation requires the unity of action from the actors of the implementation.

Meanwhile, Wahab (2004: 64) defines policy implementation by revealing that, "Policy implementation can be seen as a process to implement policy decisions

(usually in the form of laws, government regulations, judicial decisions, executive orders or presidential decree)". In this case, he confirms that policy implementation, as a part of a public policy, has steps of action to be taken that has been determined and has been clearly stated in a written policy. It is also in accordance with the opinion expressed by Edwards III (1980: 1), stating that,

Policy implementation, as we have seen, is the stage of policy making between the establishments of a policy – such as the passage of a legislative act, the issuing of an executive order, the handing down of a judicial decision or the promulgation of a regulatory rule and the consequences of the policy for the people whom it affects.

The opinion expressed by Edward III has explained that policy implementation is a stage of policy-making between the formulation of policy like decisions formed in a law made by the legislature (parliament), or the regulations issued by the executive, or the regulations passed by judicial (court or tribunal); such public policy can provide a consequence to society in some aspects of life order.

Smith (1973: 202) argues about policy implementation by stating that,

Governmental policies have been defined as deliberate action by a government to establish new transaction patterns or institutions or to change established patterns within old institutions. Policy formulated by a government, then, serves as a tension generating force in society. While policies are implemented, tensions, strains, and conflicts are experienced by those who are implementing the policy and by those affected by the policy. The tensions generated by the implementation of policies may cause transaction patterns and, in some instances, the establishment of institutions required for the realization

of policy goals. Also, the process of policy implementation may generate tensions that trigger changes in other related institutions.

From the opinions expressed by Smith, it can be concluded that government policy has been defined as a deliberate action by the government to establish patterns of formation of an agency or alter the patterns that have formed long in the agency. Policies that have been formulated by the government then function as strength and also generate tensions or implications for society that in this case there will be pros and cons. Policy implementation results in tension and conflict experienced by those who implement the policy as well as those who become the targets of the policy. The implication derived from policy implementation may lead to the establishment of the necessary institutions to achieve policy objectives. Besides, the process of policy implementation can have implications that trigger changes in other relevant institutions.

The model of policy implementation according to Smith emphasizes the idealized policy, the target groups, implementing organizations, and environmental factors. Meanwhile, the model of policy implementation according to Donald Van Meter and Carl Van Horn emphasizes on standards aspects and policy objectives, resources, the characteristics of the implementing organization, communication between related organization and implementation activities, the attitude of the executors, social, economic, and political environment.

The model of policy implementation by Brian W. Hoogwood and Lewis A. Gunn consists of external conditions faced by agencies/executing agencies will not cause interference/serious problem, time and adequate resources are available for the implementation of the program, the fusion of sources required is actually available, the policy that will be implemented is based on

a reliable causality, the causality relationship is direct and has only few connecting links, the relationship of interdependence should be minimal, deep understanding and agreement on objectives, tasks are detailed and placed in the proper time sequence, communication and coordination are perfect, and the parties with authority may demand and get a perfect obedience.

The model of policy implementation proposed by other experts such as Mazmanian and Sabatier emphasize the aspects of ease and difficulty of the issues to be worked out, the ability to structure the process of policy implementation appropriately and variables outside the laws affecting the implementation. The model of policy implementation, according to Grindle consists of policy content in which there are interests affected by the policy, the type of benefits that will be generated, the degree of the desired changes, the position of policy makers, who implement the program and deploy the resources, while the context of implementation consists of power, interests and strategies of the actors involved, the characteristics of institutions and authorities, and the obedience and responsiveness.

The model of policy implementation according to George Edward III consists of communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure. The model of policy implementation according to Richard Elmore, Michael Lipsky, Benny Hjern and David O'Porter consists of identifying the network of actors involved in the service process and inquiring about the objectives, strategies, activities, and contacts they have. The model of policy implementation according to Warwick consists of the ability of the organization, information, support, and sharing potential. The model of policy implementation according to Charles O. Jones consists of the organization, interpretation, and application.

The components of the model of policy implementation are highly functioning as

a guide as well as a system that should be considered in policy implementation.

From various models of policy implementation proposed by the experts, the model applied in this study is the one proposed by Smith. In the model proposed by Smith, there are four components that should be considered in the process of policy implementation. The components do not stand alone, but a unity that affects each other and interacts reciprocally. Smith (1973: 203) argues that,

As policy is implemented, interaction within and between the components of the policy implementation system result in discrepancies and tensions. The tensions result in transaction patterns- non-permanent patterns related to the aims and goals of the policy. The transaction patterns may or may not result in institutionalization. Feedback in the form of relieved tensions or increased tension is introduced back into the tension generation matrix from transaction patterns and institution.

From the aforementioned descriptions, it can be understood that when a policy is implemented, there is an interaction within and between the components of policy implementation as the result of discrepancies and tensions. The tensions result in the formation of institutions or institutions that are not permanently related to the goals and objectives of the policy. Feedback in the form of relieved tensions or increased tension can be introduced back into the policy implementation process from institutional formation.

Therefore, the social tensions of the policies can lead to the appearance of protests, and even physical action, to which it requires the enforcement of new institutions to achieve the policy objectives. These tensions can also lead to the changes in these institutions. Thus the interaction pattern of the four components in the model of policy implementation proposed by Smith can

result in discrepancy, tension and pressure. The interaction pattern may result in the establishment of certain institutions, as well as serve as a feedback to reduce the tension and introduce it back to the component of policy implementation from the patterns of institutional formation.

The four components in the model of policy implementation according to Smith (1973: 202-205):

The context of the implementation of policies – the policy relevant components which form the tension generating matrix. I wish to identify four such components which are important in the policy implementation process:

1. *The idealized policy, that is the idealized patterns of interaction that those who have defined the policy are attempting to induce.*

2. *The target groups, defined as those who are required to adopt new patterns of interaction by the policy. They are the people most directly affected by the policy and who must change to meet its demands.*

3. *The implementing organization, usually a unit of the government bureaucracy, responsible for implementation of the policy.*

4. *The environmental factor, those elements in the environment that influence or are influenced by the policy implementation. The general public and the various special interest groups are here.*

According to the model of policy implementation proposed by Smith, there are components of policy implementation, including: 1) the policy is implemented as aspired (idealized policy), where the policy is implemented in the form of programs; 2) policy targets (target groups) are those the most directly affected by the policy and should adopt patterns of interaction as expected by policy makers; 3). Implementing organization is the implementing agencies or units of government bureaucracy responsible for the policy implementation; 4). Environmental factors, namely the elements in the environment that affect or are affected by the policy implementation, such

as cultural, social, economic, and political aspects.

From the opinion expressed by Smith, it can be concluded that the model of public policy is implemented in the form of programs performed by agencies or units of government bureaucracy as the parties responsible for policy implementation. Therefore, it requires public service system in order to actualize good government bureaucracy.

Family of Hope Program

According to Thomas (2009: 21), a program is a planning that involves quantification of to-be-implemented activities. According to Wibowo (2011: 7), a program is a design of principle as well as effort to be achieved. Binarto (2009: 11) states that a program is a set of written instructions made to facilitate the goals to be achieved. Furthermore, Yulikuspartono (2009: 29) states that a program is a series of instructions to help facilitating the achievement of the objectives to be achieved.

Meanwhile, according to Budisantoso, Family of Hope Program is a program that provides cash assistance to Very Poor Households, if they meet the requirements associated with the efforts to improve the quality of human resources, namely education and health. The main purpose of Family of Hope Program is to reduce poverty and improve the quality of human resources, especially in poor communities. These objectives are also the efforts to accelerate the achievement of the MDGs.

a. To improve socio-economic condition of Very Poor Households.

b. To improve the education of children of Very Poor Households.

c. To improve health and nutritional status of pregnant women, postpartum women, and children under 6 years of age of Very Poor Households.

d. To improve the access and quality of education and health services, especially for Very Poor Households.

The main purpose of Family of Hope Program is to reduce poverty by improving the quality of human resources, especially in very poor communities. In the short term, this assistance is expected to help reducing the expense of Very Poor Households, while the long term is expected to break the cycle of intergenerational poverty by requiring beneficiary families to send their children to school, do immunization for their infants, consult their pregnant women, and nutritional improvement. Family of Hope Program was started in Indonesia in 2007 and is expected to be implemented on an ongoing basis, at least until 2015. The year of 2007 was an early stage of program development or the test phase. The purpose of the test is to test a variety of instruments needed in the implementation of the program, such as targeting methods, requirement verification, payment mechanism, and public complaint.

In 2007 it would be tested in seven provinces with the target number was about 500,000 Very Poor Households. Those seven provinces were West Sumatra, Jakarta, West Java, East Java, North Sulawesi, Gorontalo, and East Nusa Tenggara. If the test phase is successful, then Family of Hope Program will be held at least until 2015. This is in accordance with the commitment to achieve the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), given that most indicators are also pursued through Family of Hope Program. During that period, the target recipient will gradually be increased to involve the entire Very Poor Households with children of school age and pregnant/postpartum women.

Family of Hope Program is a part of other programs aiming to reduce poverty. Family of Hope Program is under the coordination of the Poverty Alleviation Coordinating Teams (TKPK), both at central and regional levels. Therefore, a Control Team of Family of Hope Program will soon be established in TKPK to enable good coordination and synergy. Family of Hope

Program is a cross-ministerial program and agency, since its main actor is from National Development Planning Agency, Department of Social Affairs, Department of Health, Department of National Education, Department of Religious Affairs, Department of Communication and Information, and the Central Bureau of Statistics. To make the program successful, the program will be assisted by Qualified Expert Team for Family of Hope Program and consultants of World Bank.

Targets or beneficiaries of Family of Hope Program are Very Poor Households that have family members consisting of children from 0-15 years of age and/or pregnant/ postpartum women and live in selected locations. Beneficiary is mothers or adult women who take care of children in the households (if no mothers then grandmothers, aunts, or sisters can be the beneficiaries). Thus, the membership card of Family of Hope Program will include the name of mothers/ women who take care of the children, not the head of the households and people who need and are entitled to take payment is the people whose names are listed in the Card.

The selected candidates must sign an agreement that as long as they receive assistance, they will: 1) Send their children to school, especially children from 7-15 and 16-18 years of age who have not completed the nine years of compulsory education; (2) Bring children from 0-6 years of age to health facilities in accordance with the Family of Hope Program's health procedure for children; and (3) Pregnant women should consult their own health and the health of the fetus to health facilities in accordance with the Family of Hope Program's health procedure for pregnant women.

In terms of Family of Hope Program, it is clearly stated that the component that has been the primary focus is health and education field. The main purpose of Family of Hope Program in terms of health is to improve the health status of mothers and children in Indonesia, especially for very poor communities, through the provision of incentives to do preventive health visits (prevention, not treatment). All participants of Family of Hope Program is the recipient of free health services provided by the health insurance for poor people and other programs intended for poor people so that the card can be used as an identity card to obtain the services.

Educational component in Family of Hope Program is developed to improve the participation rate of 9 years of compulsory basic education and as the efforts to reduce the rate of child labor in a very poor family. Family of Hope Program's children from 7-18 years of age who have not completed the 9-year basic education program must enroll in formal or non-formal school and attend for at least 85% of the time face to face. Each child is entitled to receive assistance other than Family of Hope Program, both national and local programs. Family of Hope Program is not a replacement for other programs; therefore it does not sufficiently help other expenses such as uniforms, books etc. Family of Hope Program is an aid for parents to send their children to school.

The amount of cash given to participants of Family of Hope Program varies depending on the number of family members taken into account for receiving the assistance, both health and education components. The amount of this assistance in the future can be changed in accordance with the conditions of the family at that time or if the participants cannot meet the specified requirements.

Relation between policy implementation and service quality

Policy implementation is an attempt to understand what in reality happens after a program is declared valid or are formulated so that it becomes the focus of policy implementation, including the events and activities that arise after the ratification of national policy guidelines, with an

effort to administrate them or actualize the consequences or real effects on society or existing events. Policy implementation is a crucial part of the achievement of policy objectives in addressing the existing problems, or for the successful implementation of a particular activity. The success of policy implementation will not be easily achieved without an effort to consider the various factors affecting the policy implementation.

Service quality is a model that describes the condition of society by comparing the service they expect with what they receive in evaluating quality. Good service quality is one important factor in the effort to create a community's satisfaction.

Regarding relation between policy implementation and service quality, Wibowo (2008: 36) states that if the policy is implemented properly, it will have a positive effect on increasing the service quality. Thus, according to Wibowo, it is obvious that policy implementation has a relation with the service quality.

According to Tjiptono (1994: 42), policy implementation based on people's aspirations will affect the service quality. Thus, according to Tjiptono, policy implementation has a very close relation with the service quality.

Gunawan (2010: 213), in the research entitled Analysis of Policy Implementation of Family of Hope Program towards Quality Improvement of Family's Health and Education, states that policy implementation can improve the quality of family's health and education. The results of the research and discussion show that the policy substance of family of hope program is still the authority of the central government based on the principle of de-concentration, while regions implement family of hope program as a co-administration from the central government.

From the conclusion, it is obvious that policy implementation has a close relation with the quality of education and health.

Another theory stating that policy

implementation has a relation with the service quality is one by Muhammad Fauzi (2009: 198) in the research entitled "Effect of Policy Implementation of Family of Hope Program on Service Quality of Education for Poor Families in North Jakarta", stating that policy implementation of family of hope program has significant effect on the quality of educational services, so that the more effective the policy implementation is, the more the quality of basic education service in North Jakarta will improve. Based on the results obtained, it is obvious that policy implementation has a significant relation with the service quality.

Furthermore, according to Nur Kholizah (2011: 207) in the research entitled "The Effect of Policy Implementation of Family of Hope Program on Service Quality of Education and Health of Poor Families in Bantul, Yogyakarta", policy implementation of family of hope program has a significant effect on the quality of education and health service.

According to Mahfudiin (2011: 201) in the research entitled "Effect of Policy Implementation of Family of Hope Program on the Effectiveness of Education and Health Service for Poor Families in Tangerang, Banten", policy implementation of family of hope program has positive and significant effect on the effectiveness of education and health service.

From aforementioned opinions, it can be concluded that policy implementation has a significant relation with service quality.

The analysis result shows that policy implementation of family of hope program has a positive and significant effect on the quality of education and health service for poor families.

Through the test of effect, policy implementation of Family of Hope Program provides a positive contribution on service quality on each dimension.

For idealized policy dimension, (R^2) gives effect of 0.62 or 62%; while the value

of t-count is 8.520 greater than the value of t-table = 1.978.

For target groups dimension, (R^2) gives effect of 0.61 or 61%; while the value of t-count is 6.13 greater than the value of t-table = 1.978.

For implementing organization dimension, (R^2) gives effect of 0.69 or 69%; while the value of t-count is 7.80 greater than the value of t-table = 1.978.

For environmental dimension, (R^2) gives effect of 0.74 or 74%; while the value of t-count is 8.67 greater than the value of t-table = 1.978.

The result of collective calculation shows that policy implementation of family of hope program has a positive and significant effect on the quality of education and health services by 0.78, or 78%, whereas factors outside the variables studied are about 22% and aren't discussed in this research.

Furthermore, when observed from the weight held by each dimension of policy implementation, environmental dimension has the most dominant weight / strongest effect on the service quality equal to 0.74, or 74%, while the dimension giving the lowest contribution is the target groups dimension, equal to 0.61, or 61%.

CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis and discussion, it can be concluded that policy implementation of Family of Hope Program has significant effect on the quality of education and health service for poor families in East Jakarta.

The biggest effect of policy implementation of Family of Hope Program is shown by environmental dimension, emphasizing that there must be harmony between policy implementation and the environment for the policy implementation to be implemented properly. Then it is followed by implementing organization dimension and policy idealized dimension, while the smallest dimension is target groups dimension. It can be studied in policy implementation of Family of Hope Program policies that can lead to improved quality of education and health service for poor families in East Jakarta.

From these results, new concept obtained is that in policy implementation in education and health field, environmental factor has a dominant effect compared to other factors. Thus, environmental factor can serve as one of the main determinants of the success of policy implementation.

REFERENCES

Abidin, S. Z. (2004). *Kebijakan Publik*. Jakarta: Yayasan Pancur Siwah.

Agustino, L. (2006). *Dasar-Dasar Kebijakan Publik*. Bandung: Alfabeta.

Agustino, L. (2006). *Politik dan Kebijakan Publik*. Bandung: Indonesian Political Science Association in collaboration with KP2W Research Center, Padjadjaran University Research Institute.

Aminullah, E. (2004). *Berpikir Sistemik: Untuk Pembuatan Kebijakan Publik, Bisnis, dan Ekonomi*. Jakarta: Penerbit PPM.

Anderson, J.E. (1979). *Public Policy Making (2nd Edition)*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Anderson, J.E. (2003). *Public Policy Making (5th Edition)*. Texas: A & M University.

Arikunto, S. (2003). *Manajemen Penelitian*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Barker, C., Nancy P. & Robert, E. (2002). *Research Methods in Clinical Psychology (2nd Edition)*. Chichester England: John Wiley and Sons.

Barber, M. (1972). *Public Administration*. Macdonald and Evans Limited.

Brown, S. (1992). *A Total Quality Service*. Ontario: Prentice Hall, Canada Inc.

Bollen, K.A. (1989). *Structural Equations with Latent Variable*. Canada: A Wiley-Inter Science Publication.

Brannen, J. (1997). *Memadu Metode Penelitian Kualitatif dan Kuantitatif*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

Bromley, D.W. (1989). *Economic Interest and Institution: The Conceptual Foundation of Public Policy*. New York: Basil Blackwell Inc.

Browne, M.W., & Cudeck, R. (1993). Alternative ways of assessing model fit. In Bollen, K.A., & Long, J.S. (Eds). *Testing Structural Equation Models*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J.W. (2002). *Research Design Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Translated by Class III and IV KIK (Small Investment Loans) – University of Indonesia and cooperate with Nur Khabibah. Jakarta: KIK Press.

Davidow, W. H., & Bro Uttal. (1989). *Total Customer Service the Ultimate Weapon.* New York: The Free Press.

Dimock & Dimock. (1992). *Administrasi Negara*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Dunn, W.N. (1981). *Public Policy Analysis*. New York: Prentice-Hall,Inc.

Dunn, W.N. (2000). *Analisa Kebijakan Publik*. Yogyakarta: Hanindita Graha Widia.

Dwijowijoto, R. N. (1994). *Pengantar Kebijakan Publik (Public Policy)*. Translated by Ricky Istamto. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.

Dwijowijoto, R. N. (2004). *Kebijakan Publik: Formulasi, Implementasi, dan Evaluasi*. Jakarta: Elex Media Komputindo.

Dwijowijoto, R. N. (2008). *Public Policy; Teori Kebijakan – Analisis Kebijakan – Proses Kebijakan, Perumusan, Implementasi, Evaluasi, Revisi, Risk Management Dalam Kebijakan Publik, Kebijakan Sebagai The Fifth Estate – Metode Penelitian Kebijakan*. Jakarta: Elex Media Komputindo.

Dye, T.R. (1981). *Understanding Public Policy (4th Edition)*. New York: Prentice-Hall Inc. Englewood Cliffs.

Edwards III, George C. (1980). *Implementing Public Policy*. Washington D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Press.

Ekowati, M.R.L. (2005). *Perencanaan, Implementasi dan Evaluasi Kebijakan atau Program; Suatu Kajian Teoritis dan Praktis*. Surakarta: Pustaka Cakra.

Gibson, J.L., Jhon M.I, & James H.D. Jr. (1997). *Organisasi dan Manajemen: Perilaku, Struktur, Proses*. Translated by Djoerban Wahid. Jakarta: Penerbit Erlangga.

Grindle, M.S. (1980). *Politics and Policy Implementation in the Third World*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Hadi, S.P. (2005). *Dimensi Lingkungan Perencanaan Pembangunan*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.

Hair Jr., J.F., Rolph E.A., Ronald L.T., William C.B. (1998). *Multivariate Data Analysis (5th Edition)*. USA: Prentice Hall International, Inc.

Hasan, M.I. (2002). *Pokok-Pokok Materi Metodologi Penelitian dan Aplikasinya*. Jakarta: Ghalia Indonesia.

Hasibuan, M.S.P. (1997). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia: Dasar dan Kunci Keberhasilannya*. Jakarta: Toko Gunung Agung.

Henry, N. (1988). *Administrasi Negara dan Masalah-Masalah Kenegaraan*. Translated by Luciana D. Lontoh. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers.

Hersey, P., & Kenneth H.B. (1995). *Manajemen Perilaku Organisasi: Pendayagunaan Sumber Daya Manusia*. Translated by Agus Dharma. Jakarta: Penerbit Erlangga.

Hogwood, B.W., & Lewis A.G. (1984). *Policy Analysis for the Real World*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Indiahono, D. (2009). *Kebijakan Publik: Berbasis Dynamic Policy Analysis*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Gava Media.

Ibrahim, A. (2004). *Pokok-Pokok Analysis Kebijakan Publik*. Bandung: Mandar Maju.

Islamy, I.M. (2002). *Prinsip-Prinsip Perumusan Kebijaksanaan Negara*.

Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.

Jones, C.O. (1984). *An Introduction to the Study of Public Policy (3rd Edition)*. California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

Kast, Fremont E., & James E. Rosenzweig. (1995). *Organisasi dan Manajemen (4th Edition)*. Translated by A. Hasyim Ali. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.

Kelloway, E.K. (1998). *Using LISREL For Structural Equation Modeling: A Researcher's Guide*. California: Sage Publishing, Inc.

Keraf, A. S. (2006). *Etika Lingkungan*. Jakarta: Penerbit Buku Kompas.

Kumorotomo, W. (2002). *Etika Administrasi Negara*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.

Lembaga Administrasi Negara Republik Indonesia. (1996). *Sistem Administrasi Negara Republik Indonesia Jilid II (3rd Edition)*. Jakarta: Toko Gunung Agung.

Lindblom, C.E. (1980). *Proses Penetapan Kebijakan (2nd Edition)*. Translated by Ardian Syamsudin. Jakarta: Penerbit Erlangga.

Mazmanian, D.A., & Paul A.S. (1983). *Implementation and Public Policy*. Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company.

Moenir, A.S. (1995). *Manajemen Pelayanan Umum di Indonesia*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.

Mueller, R.O., & Gregory R.H. (2005). *Structural Equation Modeling: A First Course Utilizing the Simples Command Language*. Chicago: SSI Scientific Software International, IL.

Mustopadidjaja. (2003). *Manajemen Proses Kebijakan Publik; Formulasi, Implementasi, dan Evaluasi Kinerja*. Jakarta: Lembaga Administrasi Negara – Duta Pertiwi Foundation.

Nasution, S. (1996). *Metode Research (Penelitian Ilmiah)*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.

Nawawi, H. & Martini, H. (1994). *Ilmu Administrasi*. Jakarta: Ghalia Indonesia.

Nazir, M. (2003). *Metode Penelitian*. Jakarta:

Ghalia Indonesia.

Pedhazur, E. J. (1982). *Multiple Regressions in Behavioral Research: Explanation and Prediction, (2nd Edition)*. New York: Holt and Rinehart and Winston.

Pramudji. (1994). *Manajemen Pelayanan Publik*. Jakarta: Rhineka Cipta

Pressman, J. L., & Aaron, W. (1984). *Implementation; How Great Expectation in Washington are Dashed in Oakland or Why It's Amazing That Federal Programs Work At All. This Being a Saga of The Economic Development Administration As Told by Two Sympathetic Observers Who Seek To Build Morals*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.

Raykov, T., & Marcoudiles, G. A. (2000). *A First Course in Structure Equation Modeling*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Assocates, Inc., Mahwah.

Riggs, F.W. (1988). *Administrasi Negara-Negara Berkembang: Teori Masyarakat Prismatis*. Translated by Yasogama Translator Team, Jakarta: Rajawali Pers.

Robbins, S.P. (1994). *Teori Organisasi: Struktur, Desain, dan Aplikasi*. Translated by Jusuf Udaya. Jakarta: Penerbit Arcan.

Rosenblom, D.H., & Robert S.K. (2005). *Public Administration: Understanding Management, Politics, and Law in the Public Sector*. New York: The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc. 1221 Avenue of the Americas, NY 10020.

Saefullah, A.D. (2007). *Pemikiran Kontemporer Administrasi Publik; Perspektif Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia dalam Era Desentralisasi*. Bandung: Laboratory of Assessment, Research, and Development of National Administration (LP3AN), Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Padjadjaran University.

Saris, W.E., & Stronkhorst, L.H. (1984). *Causal Modeling in Nonexperimental Research: An Introduction to the LISREL Approach*. Amsterdam: Sociometric

Research Fondation, The Netherlands.

Schumacker, R.E., & Lomax, R.G. (1996). *A Beginner's Guide to Structural Equation Modelling*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Assocates, Inc., Mahwa.

Siagian, S.P. (1992). *Kerangka Dasar Ilmu Administrasi*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Silalahi, U. (2002). *Studi Tentang Ilmu Administrasi: Konsep, Teori dan Dimensi.* Bandung: Sinar Baru Algensindo.

Simon, H.A. (1998). *Perilaku Administrasi; Suatu Studi Tentang Proses Pengambilan Keputusan dalam Organisasi Administrasi*, Translated by St. Dianjung. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.

Singarimbun, M. & Efendi, S. Eds. (1995). *Metode Penelitian Survai*. Jakarta: LP3ES.

Smith, T.B. (1973). The policy implementation process. *Policy Sciences* 4, pp. 197–209. Elsevier Scientific Publishing Company, Amsterdam – Printed in Scotland.

Sobandi, B. (2004). *Etika Kebijakan Publik; Moralitas–Profetis dan Profesionalisme Kinerja Birokrasi*. Bandung: Humaniora Utama Press.

Soehartono, I. (1999). *Metode Penelitian Sosial; Suatu Teknik Penelitian Bidang Kesejahteraan Sosial dan Ilmu Sosial Lainnya*. Introduction by Kusnaka Adimihardja. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.

Soenarko. (1998). *Public Policy; Pengertian Pokok Untuk Memahami dan Analisa Kebijaksanaan Pemerintah*. Surabaya: Papyrus.

Steers, R. M. (1985). *Efektivitas Organisasi (Kaidah Perilaku)*. Translated by Magdalena Jamin. Jakarta: Penerbit Erlangga.

Subarsono. (2005). *Analisis Kebijakan Publik*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Pustaka Pelajar.

Sugandha, D. (1991). *Koordinasi : Alat Pemersatu Gerak Administrasi*. Jakarta : Intermedia.

Sugandhy, A. & Rustam, H. (2007). *Prinsip Dasar Kebijakan Pembangunan Berkelanjutan Berwawasan Lingkungan*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.

Supriyatna, T. (1999). *Legitimasi Pemerintahan dalam Konteks Administrasi Publik Memasuki Era Indonesia Baru; Manajemen dan Organisasi Publik Serta Manajemen Pemerintahan Daerah*. Bandung: Maulana.

Suradinata, E. (1998). *Administrasi Lingkungan dan Ekologi Pemerintahan Dalam Pembangunan*. Bandung: Ramadhan Citra Grafika.

Susilo, R.K.D. (2008). *Sosiologi Lingkungan*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.

Sutarto. (2002). *Dasar-Dasar Organisasi*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.

Syaukani. (2004). *Otonomi Daerah Demi Kesejahteraan Rakyat*. Jakarta: Penerbit Nuansa Madani.

Tachjan. (2006). *Implementasi Kebijakan Publik*. Bandung: Indonesian Political Science Association - KP2W Research Center, Padjadjaran University Research Center.

Tangkilisan, H.N.S. (2003). *Implementasi Kebijakan Publik: Transformasi Pikiran George Edwards III*. Yogyakarta: Lukman Offset and Yayasan Pembaruan Administrasi Publik Indonesia.

Tangkilisan, H.N.S., Koryati, N.D. & Hidayat, W. (2004). *Kebijakan dan Manajemen: Pembangunan Wilayah*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Yayasan Pembaruan Administrasi Publik Indonesia (YPAPI).

Tangkilisan, H.N.S (2005). *Kebijakan dan Manajemen Otonomi Daerah*. Yogyakarta: Lukman Offset.

Taliziduhu, N. (1981). *Dimensi-Dimensi Pemerintahan Desa*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.

Taliziduhu, N. (2005). *Teori Budaya Organisasi*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipota.

Taliziduhu, N. (2009). *Kybernologi Sebuah Rekonstruksi Ilmu Pemerintah*. Jakarta:

Rineka Cipta.

Terry, G.R. (1986). *Asas-Asas Manajemen*. Translated by Winardi. Bandung: Penerbit Alumni.

Thoha, M. (2002). *Dimensi-Dimensi Prima Ilmu Administrasi Negara*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.

Thompson, J.L. (1990). *Strategic Management: Awareness and Change*. London: Chapman and Hall.

Tjiptono, A. 1994. *Membangun Layanan Prima Dalam Sebuah Organisasi*. Yogyakarta: CV. Andi.

Tjiptono, A. (1997). *Manajemen Jasa*. Yogyakarta: CV. Andi.

Tjiptono, A. (2009). *Service Manajemen Mewujudkan Layanan Prima*. Yogyakarta: CV. Andi.

Umar, H. (1999). *Riset Sumber Daya Manusia Dalam Organisasi*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Wahab, S.A. (2004). *Analisis Kebijaksanaan: dari Formulasi ke Implementasi Kebijaksanaan Negara*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.

Wibawa, S. (1994). *Kebijakan Publik: Proses dan Analisi*. Jakarta: Intermedia.

Widjaja, A.W. (1999). *Etika Administrasi Negara*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.

Widodo, J. (2008). *Analisis Kebijakan Publik: Konsep dan Aplikasi Analisis Proses Kebijakan Publik*. Malang: Bayumedia Publishing.

Winardi, J. (2005). *Pemikiran Sistemik Dalam Bidang Organisasi dan Manajemen*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.

Winarno, B. (2007). *Kebijakan Publik: Teori dan Proses*. Yogyakarta: Media Pressindo.

Wursanto, I. (2003). *Dasar-Dasar Ilmu Organisasi*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Andi.

Zeithmal, V.A., & Bitner, M.J. (1990). *Service Marketing*. Translated by Tjiptono. Mc Grow Hill International Editions.