

THE EFFECT OF VILLAGE FUND REALIZATION ON THE NUMBER OF BENEFICIARY FAMILIES (KPM) OF THE FAMILY HOPE PROGRAM (PKH) IN LHOKSEUMAWE CITY

Cut Naila Asyifa

Politeknik Negeri Lhokseumawe
nailaasyifa012@gmail.com

Indra Wijaya

Politeknik Negeri Lhokseumawe

Hamdani

Politeknik Negeri Lhokseumawe

ABSTRACT

This study aims to analyze the effect of Village Fund realization on the number of beneficiary families (KPM) of the Family Hope Program (PKH) in Lhokseumawe City during the 2024–2025 periods. The study employs a quantitative approach with an associative method. Secondary data were obtained from the Lhokseumawe City Community and Village Empowerment Agency and the Lhokseumawe City Social Agency. The study population comprises all villages in Lhokseumawe City, and a saturated sampling technique was used, meaning the entire population served as the research sample. Panel data regression analysis was conducted using EViews software. The results indicate that the FEM is the most appropriate model. Hypothesis testing reveals that the realization of Village Funds does not have a significant effect on the number of PKH beneficiary families in Lhokseumawe City. This suggests that changes in the number of PKH recipients are not directly influenced by the magnitude of Village Fund realization but rather by other factors, such as the community's socioeconomic conditions, the verification and validation processes for social assistance recipients, and government policies regarding the determination of beneficiary families. This study is expected to serve as a reference for the government in optimizing Village Fund management and the implementation of social protection programs to improve community welfare.

Keywords: Village Fund Realization, Family Hope Program, Beneficiary Families, Panel Data Regression.

1. Background

Indonesia is a developing nation that continues to face various development challenges, one of which is poverty. Poverty is not merely a matter of low income levels; it also reflects limited access to basic necessities such as education, healthcare, and social security. Consequently, poverty alleviation has become a key national development priority, pursued by the government through various policy

instruments—ranging from area-based initiatives (such as the Village Fund) to household-based measures (such as social assistance).

Poverty rates in Aceh Province remain above the national average. Similarly, Lhokseumawe City exhibits a poverty rate that is relatively higher than the national average, despite showing a downward trend in 2025. These conditions indicate that poverty alleviation remains a priority for regional development, addressed through various government policies involving both village development and social protection programs, such as PKH.

One government strategy for addressing poverty is the policy of fiscal decentralization, which grants villages the authority to manage their own development finances. In this context, the government allocates the Village Fund as a fiscal policy instrument to stimulate development at the village level. The Village Fund consists of resources sourced from the State Budget (APBN) that are allocated to villages and channeled through regency/city budgets (APBD) to finance village governance, development, community guidance, and community empowerment (Law Number 3 of 2024). The realization of a village's Village Fund is reflected in its realized Village Revenue as recorded in the Village Budget (APBDes), given that the Village Fund constitutes a primary component of the "Transfer Revenue" category within the APBDes structure (Munte et al., 2023).

On the other hand, the central government also implements the PKH, a conditional social assistance program—or Conditional Cash Transfer (CCT)—provided in cash to poor and vulnerable families registered in the Integrated Social Welfare Data (DTKS) (Ministry of Social Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia, 2025). The number of PKH beneficiary families (KPM) in a given area can reflect poverty conditions at the *gampong* (village) level; thus, it is more relevant as an indicator at the village unit-of-analysis level compared to BPS poverty data, which is generally available only at the regency or city level.

Theoretically, the more optimally Village Funds are utilized to support infrastructure development, economic empowerment, and village food security, the fewer families will rely on social assistance programs like PKH; consequently, the number of PKH beneficiary families is expected to decrease as the realization of Village Funds increases. However, an increase in the realization of Village Funds is not always accompanied by a significant decline in the number of PKH beneficiary families. This indicates that the magnitude of realized funds does not necessarily guarantee the program's success in reducing the number of poor families receiving assistance.

The budget and realization of Village Funds in Lhokseumawe City declined in 2025 compared to the previous year. Consistent with this, data from the Lhokseumawe City Basic Food (Sembako) and PKH Social Assistance Recapitulation shows a decrease in the number of PKH beneficiary families across the city. The

number of beneficiary families dropped from 11,906 in 2024 to 11,301 in 2025, a decline of approximately 5.08 percent (Lhokseumawe City Government, Social Affairs Agency, 2026). This reduction in PKH beneficiary families aligns with the downward trend in Lhokseumawe City's poverty rate recorded by BPS, which fell from 10.44 percent in 2024 to 9.01 percent in 2025 (AJNN.net, 2025). This phenomenon warrants close examination because the realization of Village Revenue (serving as a proxy for the Village Fund) and the number of PKH beneficiary households both declined during the 2024–2025 period, rather than exhibiting the inverse pattern (rising Village Funds alongside falling PKH beneficiary numbers) predicted by theory. This situation suggests that the relationship between Village Fund realization and the number of PKH beneficiary households is not as straightforward as assumed; therefore, it is crucial to examine this empirically at the village level, rather than relying solely on aggregated city-level figures.

Furthermore, the actual disbursement of Village Funds in several villages within Lhokseumawe City continues to face obstacles. The Head of the Aceh Village Community Empowerment Agency (DPMG) revealed that during the second disbursement phase of 2024, only six out of 68 villages in Lhokseumawe City had successfully disbursed their Village Funds—lagging significantly behind other regencies and cities in Aceh. This variation in disbursement performance across villages underscores the relevance of conducting research at the village level, rather than solely at the city level. Previous research examining the relationship between Village Funds and poverty or social assistance has yielded mixed results. Fitriana and Qibthiyyah (2021) found that Village Funds allocated primarily for physical infrastructure development do not necessarily have a significant impact on reducing rural poverty. Meanwhile, a study by the Ministry of Finance published in the **Indonesian Treasury Review** asserts that the impact of Village Funds on poverty is contextual and contingent upon local governance. Nevertheless, research specifically linking Village Fund disbursement to the number of PKH beneficiary families at the village level within a city remains limited, particularly regarding Lhokseumawe City using the most recent data from the 2024–2025 periods.

2. Research Method

This study employs panel data, which combines cross-sectional and time-series data. The cross-sectional data were obtained from 68 villages in Lhokseumawe City, while the time-series data cover a two-year observation period (2024–2025). Consequently, the study comprises a total of 136 observations. Data on Village Fund realization were obtained from the Lhokseumawe City Community and Village Empowerment Agency (DPMG) and serve as the independent variable (X), whereas data on the number of PKH beneficiaries were obtained from the Lhokseumawe City Social Agency and serve as the dependent variable (Y).

Panel data regression is an analytical method used to determine the relationship and influence of independent variables on a dependent variable. According to Gujarati, panel data regression can accommodate differences in characteristics among observation units as well as changes in data over time, thereby yielding more efficient estimates compared to standard regression. The panel data regression equation model used as follows. $Y_{it} = \alpha + \beta X_{it} + e_{it}$

Notation:

Y_{it} = Number of *Program Keluarga Harapan* (Family Hope Program) beneficiary families in village *i* in year *t*

α = Constant

β = Regression coefficient of the independent variable

X_{it} = Realized Village Fund amount

e_{it} = Error term

i = Observation unit (village)

t = Time period (2024–2025)

The equation indicates that changes in the value of the dependent variable are influenced by changes in the independent variable and other factors not included in the research model. Furthermore, the panel data regression model is estimated using three approaches: CEM, FEM, and REM. The best model will be selected based on the results of statistical tests conducted in the subsequent stage. According to Greene, each model possesses distinct assumptions and characteristics; therefore, model selection must be aligned with the research data's characteristics to yield consistent and efficient estimates. CEM also known as Pooled Least Squares (PLS) is the simplest panel data regression model. This model pools all cross-sectional and time-series data without distinguishing between the characteristics of individual observation units or time periods. Consequently, all villages are assumed to exhibit identical behavior, resulting in no differences in intercepts or slopes. This model is estimated using the OLS method. CEM equation is as follows: $Y_{it} = \alpha + \beta X_{it} + e_{it}$.

The FEM is a panel data regression model that assumes each observation unit possesses unique characteristics, resulting in distinct intercept values for each unit. These differences may stem from geographical, social, or economic conditions, or other characteristics that remain constant throughout the study period. This model is estimated using the Least Squares Dummy Variable (LSDV) method by incorporating a dummy variable for each observation unit. The equation for the FEM as follows: $Y_{it} = \alpha_i + \beta X_{it} + e_{it}$. Where: α_i = Intercept that differs for each Village.

The REM is a panel data regression model that treats differences in characteristics between observation units as a random component. The REM is employed when the characteristics of each observation unit are treated as random

variables uncorrelated with the independent variables. The equation for the REM is as follows: $Y_{it} = \alpha + \beta X_{it} + \mu_i + e_{it}$, where μ_i represents the specific error term for each village.

The selection of the panel data regression model involves three testing stages: the Chow Test, the Hausman Test, and the Lagrange Multiplier (LM) Test. The results of these tests determine the most appropriate panel data regression model for analyzing the impact of Village Fund realization on the number of PKH beneficiary households. The Chow Test is used to determine the most appropriate panel data regression model between CEM and FEM.

According to Ghozali (2021), the Chow Test is conducted to ascertain whether there are significant differences in characteristics among observation units, thereby making the FEM more suitable than the CEM. The decision-making criteria are as follows:

- If the Cross-section F probability value is < 0.05 , H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted; thus, FEM is selected.
- If the Cross-section F probability value is > 0.05 , H_0 is accepted and H_1 is rejected; thus, CEM is selected.

The Hausman Test is used to determine the best model between the FEM and the REM. This test is performed when the Chow Test results indicate that the FEM is superior to the CEM. According to Greene, the Hausman Test aims to determine whether there is a correlation between individual effects and the independent variables. If such a correlation exists, the FEM is the more appropriate model. The decision-making criteria are as follows:

- If the Chi-Square probability value is < 0.05 , then H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted, meaning the model used is the FEM.
- If the Chi-Square probability value is > 0.05 , then H_0 is accepted and H_1 is rejected, meaning the model used is the REM.

The Lagrange Multiplier (LM) test is used to determine the best model between the CEM and the REM. This test was developed by Breusch and Pagan and is conducted when the Chow Test results indicate that the CEM is superior to the FEM. The decision-making criteria are as follows:

- If the Breusch-Pagan probability value is < 0.05 , then H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted, meaning the selected model is the REM.
- If the Breusch-Pagan probability value is > 0.05 , then H_0 is accepted and H_1 is rejected, meaning the selected model is the CEM.

In this study, if the Chow Test results indicate that the FEM is the more appropriate model, testing proceeds with the Hausman Test. If the Hausman Test

results also indicate that the FEM is the best model, then that model is used for regression analysis and hypothesis testing. Conversely, the Lagrange Multiplier test is used only if the Chow Test results indicate that the CEM is more appropriate than the FEM.

According to Ghozali (2018), the partial test (t-test) is used to determine the effect of each independent variable (X) on the dependent variable (Y). The partial test (t-test) in this study employs a significance level of 5% (or 0.05). With a significance level of 0.05, the testing criteria are as follows:

- If the significance value is < 0.05 and the calculated t-value (t-count) $>$ the t-table value, then there is a significant effect of the independent variable (X) on the dependent variable (Y).
- If the significance value is > 0.05 and the calculated t-value (t-count) $<$ the t-table value, then there is no significant effect of the independent variable (X) on the dependent variable (Y).

Furthermore, according to Gozali (2018), the simultaneous test (F-test) is used to determine whether the independent variables simultaneously (collectively) influence the dependent variable. This study employs a significance level of 5% (0.05); based on this level, the testing criteria are as follows:

- If the significance value is < 0.05 and the calculated F-value is $>$ the F-table value, then all independent variables (X) have an influence on the dependent variable (Y).
- If the significance value is > 0.05 and the calculated F-value is $<$ the F-table value, then none of the independent variables (X) have an influence on the dependent variable (Y).

According to Ghozali (2018), the coefficient of determination test (adjusted R^2) is used to measure the extent to which independent variables explain the variation in the dependent variable, whether individually or simultaneously. The value of the coefficient of determination ranges from 0 to 1 ($0 < \text{adjusted } R^2 < 1$), where:

- If the adjusted R^2 value approaches 0, the ability of the independent variables to explain the dependent variable is very limited.
- If the adjusted R^2 value approaches 1, the independent variables are capable of providing almost all the information needed to predict the dependent variable.

The operational definitions of the research variables are presented in Table 3.1 below

Tabel 3. 1 Definisi Operasional Variabel

Variable	Definition	Measurement	Skala
Village Fund Realization (X)	Village Fund realization refers to the amount of Village Funds actually utilized by the village government to finance governance administration, development implementation, community development, and community empowerment, in accordance with applicable regulations (Law Number 6 of 2014 concerning Villages).	Total realized Village Funds for each village in Lhokseumawe City for the years 2024–2025 (in Rupiah), transformed into natural logarithms (Ln)	Rasio
KPM PKH (Y)	Beneficiary Families (KPM) of the Family Hope Program are poor and vulnerable families designated by the government to receive conditional social assistance aimed at improving public welfare and reducing poverty (Regulation of the Minister of Social Affairs of the Republic of	The number of beneficiary families of the Family Hope Program (Program Keluarga Harapan) in each *gampong* (village) in Lhokseumawe City for the years 2024–2025 (in terms of individuals/families), transformed into the natural logarithm (Ln).	Rasio

Indonesia Number 1 of
2018)

4.1 Research Results

Lhokseumawe City is a city in Aceh Province located on the northern coast of Sumatra Island. Geographically, Lhokseumawe City lies on a strategic route connecting various regions within Aceh Province, thereby playing a vital role as a hub for trade, services, education, and government activities in the northern coastal area of Aceh. Furthermore, Lhokseumawe City is recognized as a developing industrial area, particularly due to the presence of industrial zones.

The distribution of villages across the districts in Lhokseumawe City is as follows: Banda Sakti District (18), Blang Mangat District (22), Muara Dua District (17), and Muara Satu District (11), totaling 68. The study covers the 2024–2025 period, yielding 136 observations that were analyzed using the panel data regression method. Lhokseumawe City was selected as the research site due to the availability of data on Village Fund Realization and the number of KPM PKH at the village level, enabling an analysis of the impact of Village Fund Realization on the number of KPM PKH.

Based on the research results, the KPM PKH variable shows a minimum value of 15, a maximum of 647, a mean of 175.0294, and a standard deviation of 104.7093. This indicates that the average number of KPM PKH per village is approximately 175 families, with significant data variation. Furthermore, the Chow Test results yielded a Cross-section F-statistic of 92.758216 with a probability value (Prob.) of 0.0000. Since the probability value (0.0000) is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected and the alternative hypothesis (H_1) is accepted; thus, FEM is the more appropriate model. Consequently, testing proceeded with the Hausman Test to determine the best model between FEM and REM. Based on the Hausman Test results, a Chi-Square statistic of 35.070377 was obtained, with a probability value (Prob.) of 0.0000. This probability value is lower than the significance level of 0.05 ($0.0000 < 0.05$); therefore, H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted. Consequently, the panel data regression model most appropriate for this study is FEM.

Based on the results of the Chow Test and the Hausman Test, the panel data regression model employed in this study is the FEM. Therefore, subsequent analysis utilizes the FEM estimation results as the basis for hypothesis testing and the discussion of research findings. Furthermore, the regression results yielded the following equation: $Y = 10.98415 + 7.74217X + e$

Notes:

Y = Number of PKH Beneficiary Families (KPM-PKH)

X = Realization of Village Funds

e = Error term

Based on the equation, it can be explained that the constant value of 10.98415 indicates that if the Village Fund Realization variable is held constant or set

to zero, the estimated number of KPM PKH is 10.98415. The regression coefficient of 7.74217 for the Village Fund Realization variable indicates that for every unit increase in Village Fund Realization, the number of PKH beneficiary families is estimated to increase by 7.74217, assuming other variables remain constant. However, given the probability value of 0.2807, this coefficient is not statistically significant; thus, there is no evidence that an increase in Village Fund Realization significantly affects the number of PKH beneficiary families in Lhokseumawe City.

Based on the panel data regression estimation results using FEM, it is evident that each village possesses a distinct intercept value (cross-section effect). These varying intercept values indicate the presence of specific village characteristics that cannot be directly explained by the study's independent variable Village Fund Realization. The variation in intercept values across villages suggests the influence of factors outside the research model on the number of KPM-PKH. These factors may include the community's socioeconomic conditions, poverty levels, population size, unemployment rates, the verification and validation process for social assistance recipients, and government policies regarding the designation of beneficiary families in each village.

A positive intercept value indicates that a village possesses characteristics tending to result in a higher number of PKH beneficiary families compared to the average of other villages. Conversely, a negative intercept value indicates that a village possesses characteristics tending to result in a lower number of PKH beneficiary families compared to the average of other villages. Thus, the variation in intercept values within the FEM model indicates that each village in Lhokseumawe City possesses distinct conditions and characteristics; consequently, the number of PKH recipients is influenced not only by the realization of Village Funds but also by factors outside the scope of this study. Table 4.1 reveals that each village in Lhokseumawe City has a unique intercept value. These differences in intercept values signify the presence of specific characteristics inherent to each village that cannot be directly explained by the Village Fund realization variable.

Tabel 4. 1 Intercept Value based on each Village

No	Village	Constant Value	Fixed Value	Intercept
1	ALUEAWE	10.98415	-84.199160	-73.215010
2	ALUELIM	10.98415	-0.936628	10.047522
3	ASANKAREUNG	10.98415	-60.25933	-49.275180
4	BALOI	10.98415	-109.2167	-98.232550
5	BLANGBULOH	10.98415	-45.40553	-34.421380
6	BLANGCUT	10.98415	-72.47683	-61.492680
7	BLANGNALEUNG	10.98415	-16.16317	-5.179020

No	Village	Constant Value	Fixed Value	Intercept
	MAMEH			
8	BLANGPOHROH	10.98415	-46.6449	-35.660750
9	BLANGPUNTEUT	10.98415	-96.14372	-85.159570
10	BLANGTEUE	10.98415	-120.7813	-109.797150
11	BLANGWEU BAROH	10.98415	-2.741965	8.242185
12	BLANGWEU PANJOE	10.98415	-68.54686	-57.562710
13	COTGIREK KANDANG	10.98415	-21.71059	-10.726440
14	COTTRIENG	10.98415	-41.35148	-30.367330
15	CUTMAMPLAM	10.98415	-23.7782	-12.794050
16	JAMBOMESJID	10.98415	-88.52022	-77.536070
17	JAMBOTIMU	10.98415	-59.88983	-48.905680
18	KAMPUNGJAWABARU	10.98415	-62.70926	-51.725110
19	KEUDECUNDA	10.98415	-49.16019	-38.176040
20	KEUDEPUNTEUT	10.98415	-157.2777	-146.293550
21	KOTALHOKSEUMAWE	10.98415	-130.6553	-119.671150
22	KUALA	10.98415	-64.05946	-53.075310
23	KUMBANGPUNTEUT	10.98415	-103.7208	-92.736650
24	KUTABLANG	10.98415	-10.883	0.101150
25	LANCANGGARAM	10.98415	-145.1817	-134.197550
26	LHOKMONPUTEH	10.98415	-36.03633	-25.052180
27	MANEKAREUNG	10.98415	-60.71443	-49.730280
28	MEUNASAHDAYAH	10.98415	-5.195599	5.788551
29	MEUNASAHMANYANG	10.98415	-15.64478	-4.660630
30	MEUNASAHMEE	10.98415	-65.47696	-54.492810
31	MEURIAPALOH	10.98415	-12.94604	-1.961890
32	PALOHBATEE	10.98415	-69.20007	-58.215920
33	PAYABILI	10.98415	-48.81435	-37.830200
34	PAYAPUNTEUT	10.98415	-0.16957	10.814580
35	RAYEUKKAREUNG	10.98415	-74.53776	-63.553610
36	SEUNEUBOK	10.98415	-102.1474	-91.163250
37	SIMPANGEMPAT	10.98415	-33.42846	-22.444310
38	TEUNGOH	10.98415	-101.3049	-90.320750
39	TUNONG	10.98415	-64.39702	-53.412870
40	UJONGPACU	10.98415	-8.264449	2.719701
41	ULEEBLANGMANE	10.98415	-99.29022	-88.306070
42	BANDAMASEN	10.98415	97.68704	108.671190

No	Village	Constant Value	Fixed Value	Intercept
43	BATUPHATBARAT	10.98415	62.39274	73.376890
44	BATUPHATTIMUR	10.98415	114.909	125.893150
45	BLANGCRUM	10.98415	13.91269	24.896840
46	BLANGPANYANG	10.98415	7.646353	18.630503
47	BLANGPULO	10.98415	112.3282	123.312350
48	HAGUBARATLAUT	10.98415	0.486568	11.470718
49	HAGUSELATAN	10.98415	37.62684	48.610990
50	HAGUTEUNGOH	10.98415	17.61499	28.599140
51	JEULEUKAT	10.98415	39.27515	50.259300
52	KAMPUNG JAWA	10.98415	111.1345	122.118650
53	KEUDEACEH	10.98415	43.14115	54.125300
54	MESJIDPUNTEUT	10.98415	8.478972	19.463122
55	MEUNASAHALUE	10.98415	42.11797	53.102120
56	MEUNASAHBLANG	10.98415	35.29153	46.275680
57	MEUNASAHMESJID	10.98415	4.142598	15.126748
58	MEUNASAH PANGGOI	10.98415	144.9368	155.920950
59	MONGEUDONG	10.98415	97.91725	108.901400
60	PADANGSAKTI	10.98415	55.08461	66.068760
61	PALOH PUNTI	10.98415	67.70313	78.687280
62	PUSONGBARU	10.98415	229.2573	240.241450
63	PUSONG LHOKSEUMAWA	10.98415	467.7096	478.693750
64	TUMPOKTEUNGOH	10.98415	53.38109	64.365240
65	UJONGBLANG	10.98415	327.6286	338.612750
66	ULEEJALAN	10.98415	94.46321	105.447360
67	UTEUNBAYI	10.98415	98.08416	109.068310
68	UTEUNKOT	10.98415	95.63005	106.614200

Source: Data Analysis, 2026

Based on the t-test results, a t-statistic of 1.087593 was obtained with a probability value of 0.2807. This probability value exceeds the significance level of 0.05 ($0.2807 > 0.05$); therefore, H_0 is accepted and H_1 is rejected. Thus, it can be concluded that the realization of Village Funds does not have a significant effect on the number of KPM PKH. Based on the FEM regression results, the Prob. (F-statistic) value was 0.0000. This value is lower than the significance level of 0.05 ($0.0000 < 0.05$); therefore, H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted. Consequently, it can be concluded that the regression model employed in this study is a suitable fit for explaining the relationship between the realization of Village Funds and the number of KPM PKH.

The regression results yielded an Adjusted R-squared value of 0.982654, or 98.27%. This indicates that the Village Fund realization variable explains 98.27% of the variation in the number of KPM PKH, while the remaining 1.73% is explained by variables outside the research variable.

4.2 The Impact of Village Fund Realization on the Number of KPM PKH

Based on the FEM test results, the probability value for the Village Fund Realization variable was 0.2807, which exceeds the 0.05 significance level ($0.2807 > 0.05$). Consequently, H_0 is accepted and H_1 is rejected, leading to the conclusion that Village Fund Realization does not significantly affect the number of KPM PKH beneficiaries. These findings indicate that the magnitude of Village Fund realization in a given village does not directly influence the number of PKH recipients. This is because the Village Fund and PKH are distinct government programs with different objectives, mechanisms, and funding sources.

Furthermore, the number of PKH recipients is more heavily influenced by the poverty data updating process—conducted by the government via the National Socio-Economic Single Data (DTSEN) system—and the results of the verification and validation of poor family data. Thus, even if a village records high Village Fund realization, the number of PKH recipients does not necessarily experience a significant decrease or increase. The study also reveals that Village Fund utilization in each village tends to be allocated primarily to various development and community empowerment programs, such as village infrastructure construction, food security initiatives, stunting mitigation, village government operations, and other priority programs. Therefore, the impact of Village Fund utilization on reducing the number of families receiving social assistance is not immediately apparent in the short term.

5.1 Conclusions

Based on the research findings, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. Based on the panel data regression model selection using the Chow Test, the FEM was selected. Furthermore, the Hausman Test confirmed that the FEM is the most appropriate model for this study.
2. The realization of Village Funds did not have a significant effect on the number of KPM PKH beneficiary households. This indicates that changes in the number of PKH beneficiaries in each village are not directly determined by the magnitude of the Village Funds realized.

5.2 Recommendations

The recommendations arising from this study are as follows:

1. Village governments are encouraged to further optimize the use of Village Funds—particularly for community economic empowerment programs,

productive business development, human resource quality improvement, and job creation—so that the benefits of the funds are more widely felt by the community and contribute to sustainable improvements in public welfare.

2. The Lhokseumawe City Government is encouraged to enhance coordination in the formulation of development and social protection programs, ensuring that implemented policies mutually support efforts to alleviate poverty and improve community welfare.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alfrojem, N., Chairani, D., & Anugrahini, T. (2022). *Pengembangan Masyarakat Berbasis Gender: Analisis Program Dana Desa dan Program Keluarga Harapan. Welfare: Jurnal Ilmu Kesejahteraan Sosial*.
- Badan Pusat Statistik. (2025). *Kota Lhokseumawe Dalam Angka 2025*. Lhokseumawe: BPS Kota Lhokseumawe.
- Badan Pusat Statistik. (2025). *Provinsi Aceh Dalam Angka 2025*. Banda Aceh: BPS Provinsi Aceh.
- Febriani, D., & Arif, M. (2023). Analisis Pengaruh Alokasi Dana Desa, Program Keluarga Harapan, dan Program Indonesia Pintar dalam Penanggulangan Kemiskinan (Studi pada Kecamatan di Kabupaten Wonogiri Tahun 2018–2020). *Determination: Jurnal Riset Manajemen*, 2(2), 94–108.
- Ghozali, I. (2021). *Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate dengan Program IBM SPSS 26* (Edisi 10). Semarang: Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.
- Gujarati, D. N., & Porter, D. C. (2013). *Dasar-Dasar Ekonometrika* (Edisi 5). Jakarta: Salemba Empat.
- Kementerian Keuangan Republik Indonesia. (2023). *Peraturan Menteri Keuangan Nomor 145 Tahun 2023 tentang Pengelolaan Dana Desa*. Jakarta: Kementerian Keuangan Republik Indonesia.
- Kementerian Sosial Republik Indonesia. (2018). *Peraturan Menteri Sosial Republik Indonesia Nomor 1 Tahun 2018 tentang Program Keluarga Harapan*. Jakarta: Kementerian Sosial Republik Indonesia.
- Putri, N., & Rafi, A. (2023). Analisis Program Keluarga Harapan (PKH) dalam Mengatasi Masalah Kemiskinan. *Journal of Economic and Islamic Studies*.
- Republik Indonesia. (2014). *Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 6 Tahun 2014 tentang Desa*. Jakarta: Sekretariat Negara Republik Indonesia.
- Senain, R., & Hanum, L. (2023). *Evaluasi Program Keluarga Harapan (PKH)*. *Cermin: Jurnal Penelitian*.
- Sugiyono. (2022). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Widarjono, A. (2018). *Ekonometrika: Pengantar dan Aplikasinya Disertai Panduan EViews* (Edisi 5). Yogyakarta: UPP STIM YKPN.