

## Research Article

# Evaluation of Increasing Employment and Business Opportunities for Rural Communities in Pinrang District, South Sulawesi Province

Muh. Arifai\*, Sangkala, Deddy T. Tikson, Muhammad Yunus, and Andi Mustaman

Universitas Hasanuddin, Indonesia

## Abstract.

This study aims to evaluate the effectiveness of the implementation of the Cash Labor Intensive Programme (PKT) and Business Capital Assistance through the Village Fund in encouraging increased employment and business opportunities in Pinrang District, South Sulawesi. Although the allocation of the Village Fund nationally increased significantly from Rp20.8 trillion to Rp72 trillion (2020) and Pinrang Regency received Rp68.9 billion, regional economic growth experienced a downward trend from 8.51% in 2012 to only 4.52% in 2022. This mismatch between budget increases and economic performance shows that the amount of funds does not automatically produce optimal development impacts. Using William N. Dunn's policy evaluation approach, this study found that the programme has provided immediate benefits such as temporary job creation and capital support. However, long-term effectiveness has not been achieved due to lack of assistance, coordination constraints, and weak community involvement. The evaluation also revealed that the assistance has not been sufficient (adequacy), has not been equitable (equity), and has not been entirely targeted (accuracy). Therefore, improvements are suggested in various aspects, including doing local data-based planning, increasing the capacity of implementers and assistants, improving the beneficiary verification system, integrating training and business assistance, and developing partnerships and an impact-based evaluation system. This research reinforces the importance of participatory governance and strengthening village institutional capacity to realize sustainable economic development. Additionally, it provides a theoretical contribution through the integration of Dunn's evaluation approach in the context of village-based policies.

**Keywords:** programme evaluation, employment opportunities, entrepreneurship

## 1. Introduction

Development inequality between urban and rural areas in Indonesia has long been a structural problem. The government has responded to this issue through the Village Fund policy stipulated in Law No. 6/2014. The fund is intended to strengthen village development, empower communities, and expand employment opportunities.

Corresponding Author: Muh. Arifai; email: arifaimuh@wirabhaktimakassar.ac.id

**Published:** 2 September 2025

**Publishing services provided by Knowledge E**

© Muh. Arifai et al. This article is distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use and redistribution provided that the original author and source are credited.

Selection and Peer-review under the responsibility of the 2nd Doctoral International Conference Committee.



Pinrang district economic growth in 2012 was (8.51%), in 2013 it was (7.27%), in 2014 economic growth was (8.11%), in 2015 economic growth increased by (8.24%), in 2016 economic growth fell (7.44%), in 2017 economic growth was (7.84%), in 2018 economic growth decreased by (6.91%), in 2019 economic growth was (6.53%) and in 2020 it decreased by (0.44%) and in 2021 it increased by (5.04%) and in 2022 it decreased by (4.52%). Meanwhile, the Village Fund budget as of 2020 increased by 2.86 per cent from the previous year, to IDR 72 trillion. In 2019, the total budget was IDR70 trillion, while in 2018 it was IDR60 trillion. In the last six years, the trend of the Village Fund budget tends to increase. The sharpest increase occurred in 2016, which was 125 per cent to Rp46.9 trillion from the previous year, Rp20.8 trillion in 2015.

Starting from the description above, the economic growth in Pinrang Regency is considered to be low due to the decline in economic growth from 2012 to 2022, even though the village fund budget has begun to be realised in 2018 amounting to Rp. 60 Trillion, and continues to increase in 2019 by Rp. 70 Trillion, and in 2020 it increases by Rp. 72 Trillion. The funds were transferred to 434 district governments in 33 provinces with the number of villages reaching 74 thousand villages, while Pinrang Regency received a budget of 68.9 billion to be allocated in 69 villages in Pinrang Regency, but in fact economic growth received a decreasing percentage of 0.4% growth rate in 2020. Before the village fund was realised in 2012, economic growth was at a percentage rate of 8.51% and should be with the allocation of village funds which each year increases the budget, the economic growth rate should increase every year as stated in Law No. 6 of 2014 concerning Village Funds.

Law No. 6/2014 explains that the objectives of direct assistance from the Village Fund (DD) are: (1) To improve the administration of the village government in carrying out government, development and community services in accordance with its authority. (2) Improving the ability of community institutions in the village to plan, implement and control development in a participatory manner in accordance with their potential. (3) Improve income equality, employment opportunities, and business opportunities for the village community as well as in the context of developing community socio-economic activities. (4) Encourage increased participation of community self-help.

This is reflected in the attitude of the community, which is still less involved in submitting ideas and suggestions in the musbangdes forum. The ignorance of some communities about the programmes and activities to be implemented and the lack of community involvement during the implementation of empowerment and development

programmes means that the support provided by the community is not optimal. Pinrang Regency has been one of the significant recipients of Village Funds since 2015.

However, high budget realisation has not been followed by improvements in the village economy. This phenomenon suggests the need for an evaluation of policy implementation. Previous studies have discussed the effectiveness of the Village Fund nationally, but in-depth studies at the local level, especially Pinrang, are limited. Thus, this research contributes by filling this gap through evaluative analysis based on Dunn's [1] theory.

## 1.1. Literature Review

### 1. Village Fund

Law No. 6/2014 explains that the objectives of direct assistance from the Village Fund (DD) are: (1) Improving the administration of the village government in carrying out government, development and community services in accordance with its authority. (2) Improving the ability of community institutions in the village to plan, implement and control development in a participatory manner in accordance with their potential. (3) Improving income equality, employment opportunities, and business opportunities for the village community and in the context of developing the community's socio-economic activities. (4) Encourage increased participation of community self-help [2].

### 2. Public Policy Evaluation (Dunn)

Evaluating a programme or public policy requires the existence of criteria to measure the success of the programme or public policy. Regarding policy performance in producing information, there are evaluation criteria. The criteria above are benchmarks or indicators of public policy evaluation. Since this research uses a qualitative method, the discussion in this research relates to the questions formulated by William N. Dunn for each criterion.

William N. Dunn developed six criteria for policy evaluation: effectiveness, efficiency, adequacy, equity, responsiveness, and accuracy. This kind of evaluation allows the identification of mismatches between policy objectives and outcomes [3].

For more details, each indicator will be explained as follows:

- a) Effectiveness Effectiveness comes from the word effective which implies the achievement of success in achieving predetermined goals. Effectiveness is also called the result of use. Effectiveness is always related to the relationship between

the expected results and the results that are actually achieved. William N. Dunn in his book entitled *Introduction to Public Policy Analysis: Second Edition*, states that: “Effectiveness (effectiveness) is concerned with whether an alternative achieves the expected results (consequences), or achieves the objectives of the action. Closely related to technical rationality, it is always measured in units of product or service or monetary value” [1] .

- b) **Efficiency** Efficiency concerns the amount of effort required to produce a certain level of effectiveness. Efficiency, which is a synonym for economic rationality, is the relationship between effectiveness and effort, the latter generally measured in monetary costs. Efficiency is usually determined through the calculation of cost per unit of product or service. [1] argues that “Efficiency is concerned with the amount of effort required to produce a certain level of effectiveness. Efficiency, which is a synonym for economic rationality, is the relationship between effectiveness and effort, the latter of which is generally measured in monetary costs. Efficiency is usually determined through the calculation of cost per unit of product or service. The policy that achieves the highest effectiveness at the least cost is called efficient.”
- c) **Adequacy** Adequacy in public policy can be said that the goals that have been achieved are felt to be sufficient in various ways. William N. Dunn argues that adequacy concerns how far a level of effectiveness satisfies the needs, values, or opportunities that foster problems . From the above understanding, it can be concluded that adequacy is still related to effectiveness by measuring or predicting how far existing alternatives can satisfy needs, values or opportunities in solving problems that occur [4].
- d) **Responsiveness** Responsiveness in public policy can be interpreted as a response to an activity. Which means the response of public policy targets to the implementation of a policy. According to states that responsiveness is concerned with how far a policy can satisfy the needs, preferences, or values of certain groups of people. A successful policy can be seen through the response of the community who responds to the implementation after first predicting the effects that will occur if a policy will be implemented, as well as the community’s response after the policy impact has begun to be felt in a positive form in the form of support or a negative form in the form of rejection also argues that [5]: “The responsiveness criterion is important because an analysis that can satisfy all the other criteria (effectiveness,

efficiency, adequacy, equity) still fails if it does not respond to the actual needs of the groups that should benefit from a policy”.

Accuracy In this process, the success of a policy can be seen from the policy objectives that are actually achieved, useful and valuable to the target group, having an impact on changes in accordance with the policy mission. Looking at the criteria that have been stated, in this study researchers will use the type of research from William N. Dunn as a basic reference material in research. Referring to the various problems that have been expressed previously, in this case the researcher will use Dunn's six evaluation criteria, namely effectiveness, efficiency, adequacy, equity, responsiveness and accuracy.

## 2. Methods

This type of research is descriptive qualitative as according to [6] qualitative research is a type of research that explores and understands the meaning in a number of individuals or a group of people who come from social problems. Qualitative research can generally be used for research on people's lives, history, behaviour, concepts or phenomena, social problems, and others. One of the reasons why using a qualitative approach is the researcher's experience where this method can find and understand what is hidden behind phenomena that are sometimes difficult to understand. The type of qualitative research used by researchers in this study is phenomenology. This research took place in Pinrang Regency, with the unit of analysis being the evaluation of the village fund policy in Pinrang Regency, South Sulawesi Province. The determination of the research location is intended to focus the scope of the discussion and at the same time sharpen the social phenomena to be studied in accordance with the substance of the observed policy, which was chosen based on including the Transitional Villages in Pinrang Regency, namely 3 sub-districts and 3 villages in the mountainous area, 3 villages in the mainland area and 3 villages in the coastal area.

The population in this study is the entire community in each village in Pinrang Regency which consists of 12 sub-districts and 65 villages. The sampling technique was carried out by purposive sampling, namely selecting informants who are considered to know the problem and can be trusted to be a valid source of data. The informants were selected purposively in Mattiro Sompe Sub-district which is an Independent Village cluster including Patobong Village, Samaenre Village and Mattiro Tasi Village, then

Suppa Sub-district is an Advanced Village cluster including Polewali Village, Tasiwalie Village and Wiringtasi Village and Lembang Sub-district is a Disadvantaged Village cluster including Basseang Village, Bakarlu Village and Letta Village. The informants taken were 3 representatives of each village, consisting of the village head and the community involved in local beneficiaries who were considered important in providing information.

### 3. Results and Discussion

The evaluation of increasing employment opportunities through the Cash Intensive programme according to William Dunn includes several main criteria, such as effectiveness, efficiency, adequacy, fairness, responsiveness, and accuracy. When looking at the reality of the Cash Intensive Work Programme (PKT) in several villages in Pinrang Regency based on the data you provided, there are several reasons why this programme has not fully complied with William Dunn's evaluation theory:

Cash labour intensive

#### a) **Effectiveness**

Village Cash Labor Intensive (PKTD) is an empowerment activity for village communities, especially the poor and marginalised, that is productive in nature by prioritising the use of local resources, labour, and technology to provide additional wages/income, reduce poverty, and improve people's welfare. PKTD is focused on the development of infrastructure in the village or the sustainable utilisation of natural resources based on community empowerment.

The Cash Intensive Work Programme (PKT) is considered effective in meeting the development and welfare objectives of village communities. The PKT programme's indicators of success, such as villagers who can become craftsmen and understand how to read drawings, show that the programme has provided benefits and increased the capacity of village communities. Although there is no quantitative data showing the achievement of the programme objectives, the assessment of the effectiveness of the PKT programme is based on the qualitative information obtained. To improve the effectiveness of the PKT programme, it is necessary to evaluate and improve the sustainability of the programme so that it can have a more optimal impact on the development and welfare of village communities.

The government of Basseang Village, Lembang Sub-district, Pinrang District, stated differently: “The implementation of the PKT involved the local community around the project site, no outsiders were involved. The division of PKT work is done based on the location of the village, where the people around the village are the workers. There are no complaints or social jealousy related to the division of PKT work” (Interview. 27 February 2024).

The Letta Village Government further explained about the budget for the Cash for Work (PKT) programme, that: “The Cash for Work (PKT) programme was compulsory in 2020-2021, but currently it is no longer compulsory. When it was mandatory, the PKT programme provided employment to the community, where the budget came from the government. Under the PKT programme, the community worked on agricultural land and was paid by the government, but the produce from the land was taken by the community. The village head thinks that the PKT programme is a bit ambiguous and strange, because the people who are given jobs have nothing to lose if the programme is not successful, so the results are not optimal” (Interview 14 February 2024). Based on the results of these interviews, it indicates that overall, the Cash-for-Work programme that was once mandatory in Basseang Village was considered somewhat ambiguous and strange by the village head, because the people who were given work had nothing to lose if the programme was not successful, so the results were not optimal. This suggests the need for further improvement and evaluation in the implementation of the PKT programme in the village.

#### **b) Efficiency**

Efficiency Efficiency concerns the amount of effort required to produce a certain level of effectiveness. Efficiency, which is a synonym for economic rationality, is the relationship between effectiveness and effort, the latter generally measured in monetary costs. Efficiency is usually determined through the calculation of cost per unit of product or service. [1] argues that “Efficiency is concerned with the amount of effort required to produce a certain level of effectiveness. Efficiency, which is a synonym for economic rationality, is the relationship between effectiveness and effort, the latter of which is generally measured in monetary costs. Efficiency is usually determined through the calculation of cost per unit of product or service. The policy that achieves the highest effectiveness at the least cost is called efficient”.

Mattirovasi Village Government. Explained that a fair and equitable distribution system was implemented to ensure the efficiency of the PKT programme. Communities are

involved alternately by region (North Amani and South Amani) so that all have the opportunity to be involved. This approach aims to divide the work of the PKT evenly, so that no community group is overly dominant or neglected.

As for the interviews conducted by the Wiringtasi Village Government regarding the efficiency of the Cash Labor Intensive Programme (PKT), that

“When it comes to budget efficiency, we are not afraid to change it, it has already been determined there, sir, what the daily salary is. It is already clear there sir, the wages of labourers are so much, the wages of builders are so much, so we are guided by what is already in the RAB sir.” (Interview 18 March 2024)

Based on the interview results, it indicates that the PKT programme manager ensures budget efficiency by not worrying about making changes, because the programme budget has been set beforehand. They are guided by the budget plan (RAB) that has been determined, including the amount of daily wages for labourers and craftsmen. By adhering to the provisions in the RAB, managers can ensure budget efficiency in the implementation of the PKT programme. The government continues to strive to ensure that the aid funds distributed are truly targeted and in accordance with the needs of the community. This is an important commitment so that the assistance is not only received by those in need, but also provides real benefits in improving people’s lives. In an interview, Bapaak AR said, “The government will endeavour to make sure that the aid is really right on target and needed by the community.”

This statement shows the government’s seriousness in monitoring and evaluating the aid distribution process, so that the programmes implemented can run effectively and have a significant impact [7].

### c) **Sufficiency**

The Mattirotasi Village Government explained the adequacy of the Cash Intensive Work Programme (PKT), that:

“I don’t think it’s enough. No, because it’s not necessarily there every month. I don’t think it is enough, because there are many workers who can be reminded but the PKT on cash careers is limited and not enough.” (Interview 14 May 2024)

The interviews indicate that the current Padang Karya Tunai (PKT) programme is not sufficient to meet the needs of workers and the aspirations of the community. This is because the PKT programme does not take place every month, so it is not sustainable. In addition, the PKT programme is also not sufficient to accommodate the amount of labour available in the village. Many workers can be engaged, but the PKT programme is



limited. There is a need to improve and expand the PKT programme to more adequately meet the needs of workers and the aspirations of the community.

As for the results of interviews conducted by the Mattirotasi Village Government regarding efforts to involve the community in determining the type of PKT project, that:

“There is an effort to involve the community in determining the type of Padang Karya Tunai (PKT) project that is implemented. This is done through deliberations with the community to determine the type of PKT project that suits their needs.” (Interview 27 March 2024) The results of these interviews illustrate that the PKT assistance programme has benefited some communities, although not equally. Mr Ari from Patobong Village said that the assistance has been very helpful to him personally, although it is possible that there are other communities that have not felt the same benefits. This shows that the PKT programme has had a positive impact, but its distribution and utilisation may still need to be improved to make it more equitable.

#### **d) Flattening**

Equalisation in public policy can be said to have meaning with the justice given and obtained by public policy targets. [1]states that the criteria of equity are closely related to legal and social rationality and point to the distribution of consequences and efforts between different groups in society. Equity-orientated policies are policies in which the consequences or efforts are fairly distributed. A particular programme may be effective, efficient, and sufficient if the costs of benefits are equitable. The key to levelling is justice or fairness. As for the results of interviews from the Letta Village Government, Lembang Sub-district, Pinrang Regency, regarding the distribution of the Cash Intensive Work Programme (PKT) evenly, that:

“Cash labour-intensive programmes in villages first record the people who are interested. Furthermore, budget availability is also considered. Although many people are interested, the amount of assistance is limited due to budget constraints. The parat karyatunai programme is given in the form of chilli planting activities, with a duration of 10 days per person. An onion planting programme was considered, but the community was not very enthusiastic about it” (Interview 14 February 2024). To ensure that the cash-for-work programme is distributed evenly, the manager collects data on community interest. In addition, budget availability is also a major consideration in determining the number of beneficiaries. Although there are many interested people, the assistance provided is limited according to the ability of the existing budget. The form of assistance chosen was the chilli planting activity, based on the community’s higher enthusiasm compared

to onion planting. This effort was made to achieve a fair distribution of assistance in accordance with the interests and needs of the community in the village. The Letta Village Government further explained in interviews regarding the special efforts made to ensure that every group or area in the village benefited equitably from the PKT programme, that:

“There are no special efforts from the village to ensure equitable distribution of benefits. However, there are monitoring and monitoring efforts from the district government. Monitoring is carried out by the inspectorate and the kecamatan government” (Interview 18 February 2024).

Village governments have no specific efforts to ensure that every group or area in the village benefits equitably from the PKT programme. Efforts to ensure equitable distribution of benefits are made by the district government through monitoring and surveillance conducted by the inspectorate and sub-district government. Although there are no special efforts from the village, monitoring by the district government is expected to ensure equitable distribution of benefits to every group and region in the village.

#### e) **Responsiveness**

Responsiveness in public policy can be interpreted as a response to an activity. Which means the response of public policy targets to the implementation of a policy. According to states that responsiveness is concerned with how far a policy can satisfy the needs, preferences, or values of certain groups of people. A policy success can be seen through the response of the community who responds to the implementation after first predicting the effects that will occur if a policy will be implemented, as well as the community's response after the policy impact has begun to be felt in a positive form in the form of support or a negative form in the form of rejection also argues that: “The responsiveness criterion is important because an analysis that can satisfy all other criteria (effectiveness, efficiency, adequacy, equity) still fails if it does not respond to the actual needs of the groups that should benefit from a policy”.

The PKT programme in this village has attempted to be responsive to the changing economic, social and environmental conditions in the village. Some of the concrete examples mentioned, such as the construction of concrete rebates, street lighting, and improvements to road and drainage infrastructure, indicate an effort to fulfil the basic needs of village communities. This approach can be considered an attempt to improve community welfare and environmental quality, which are indicators of the responsiveness of the PKT programme to changing village conditions.

#### f) Decree

In this process, the success of a policy can be seen from the policy objectives that are actually achieved that are useful and valuable to the target group, have an impact on changes in accordance with the policy mission. Looking at the criteria that have been stated, in this study researchers will use the type of research from William N. Dunn as a basic reference material in research. Referring to the various problems that have been expressed previously, in this case the researcher will use Dunn's six evaluation criteria, namely effectiveness, efficiency, adequacy, equity, responsiveness and accuracy.

The Mattirotasi Village Government explained the steps taken to ensure that the PKT project selected was truly relevant to the conditions and needs of the village community, that:

"They enthusiastically participated in implementing the PKT. Because of the timeliness, the work at the time of work and the direct use can be like concrete rebates can be passed as soon as possible." (Interview 18 June 2024)

The enthusiasm of the community in participating in implementing the PKT programme is an indicator that the project is relevant to the conditions and needs of the village community. Pak Desa believes that the timeliness of PKT project implementation and the direct utilisation of project results by the community, such as the construction of concrete rebates, are signs that the project is achieving the desired results and providing maximum benefits.

#### B. D. **Why the** employment programme is not good

Programme evaluation according to William Dunn includes several main criteria, such as effectiveness, efficiency, adequacy, fairness, responsiveness, and accuracy. When looking at the reality of the Cash Intensive Work Programme (PKT) in several villages in Pinrang Regency based on the data, there are several reasons why this programme has not fully complied with William Dunn's evaluation theory (Table 1):

##### 1. Effectiveness

Effectiveness measures the extent to which a programme achieves its stated objectives. In this context, the objective of the CCP is to improve community welfare through the provision of temporary employment. However, the poverty rate in Kabupaten Pinrang increased from 8.79% (2022) to 8.90% (2023), indicating that the programme has not had a significant impact in reducing poverty. The imbalance between the budget allocation and the number of workers shows that not all community groups benefit from the programme.

TABLE 1: Evaluation of the Labor-Intensive Village Program in Pinrang Regency Based on William Dunn's Policy Criteria.

Evaluation Criteria (William Dunn)	Findings in Pinrang Regency	Conclusion
Effectiveness	Poverty rate increased from 8.79% (2022) to 8.90% (2023). Imbalance between budget allocation and labour force.	It has not been effective, as it has not had a significant impact on poverty reduction.
Efficiency	Some villages did not receive the PKT budget. Some villages received the budget but did not hire labour. Indications of politicisation in labour recruitment.	Not yet efficient, as budget and labour allocations are not optimal.
Sufficiency	The amount of budget and the number of workers are not balanced. Certain groups, such as women, are less involved.	Not enough, because not all people in need benefit.
Justice	There are villages that get bigger budgets without transparency. Only people with certain skills are employed. Some sub-districts did not get a budget.	It is not yet fair, as the distribution of budget and recruitment is uneven.
Responsiveness	The programme does not fully accommodate the poor. There is no active involvement of all groups in planning and implementation.	Less responsive, as not all community needs are met.
Accuracy	Budget allocations are not based on village poverty levels. Programmes do not effectively reach all the poor.	It's not right, because there are still villages that don't get the budget.

## 2. Efficiency

Efficiency looks at how resources are used to achieve maximum results, some villages did not receive any PKT budget at all, such as Patobong and Mattiro Tasi villages in Mattiro Sompe sub-district and Tasiwalie and Polewali villages in Suppa sub-district. There were villages that received budgets but did not hire labour (e.g., Wiringtasi village in 2023 received a budget): Wiringtasi Village in 2023 received a budget of Rp. 8,279,400 but did not employ any people) This shows that there is no responsibility in managing the budget, which should have been given to the community, indicating that the PKT program has not been efficient in its implementation, and the politicisation of labour recruitment shows that the use of resources is not optimal.

## 3. Sufficiency

Adequacy measures whether the programme provides sufficient solutions to existing problems. However, in the case of the PKT in Pinrang district, the amount of budget

and the number of workers were not balanced, so the programme could not absorb a sufficient number of workers. Certain groups, such as women, were not involved, indicating that the solutions provided were not sufficient to impact all village communities in Pinrang district.

#### 4. Justice

Equity assesses whether the benefits of the programme are spread evenly across community groups. However: Some villages receive a larger budget than others without transparency in distribution. Only people with certain skills are employed, while other communities do not get the same opportunities. Some sub-districts received no budget at all, despite having high poverty rates.

#### 5. Responsiveness

Responsiveness looks at whether the programme meets the real needs of the community. In the case of the PKT in Pinrang District: The programme did not fully accommodate the needs of the poor, as evidenced by the increasing poverty rate. There is no active involvement of all community groups in programme planning and implementation.

#### 6. Accuracy

The accuracy of measuring whether the programme is truly the best solution to the problem at hand. While the programme aims to reduce poverty by creating jobs, uneven budget allocation and politicisation in worker recruitment undermine its effectiveness. If the programme is right, villages should be given priority, but in reality there are villages that do not receive any PKT budget at all.

The PKT programme in Pinrang District is not in line with William Dunn's evaluation theory because there are still gaps in effectiveness, efficiency, adequacy, fairness, responsiveness, and accuracy. To improve its effectiveness, improvements need to be made in the transparency of budget distribution, a more inclusive labour recruitment mechanism, and a more thorough evaluation of the programme's impact on community welfare.

### C. **Business Capital / Entrepreneurship Assistance**

In the entrepreneurship programme of the Bassaeng Village Government, Lembang Sub-district, Pinrang Regency explained that:

"Not yet. Entrepreneurship training includes agriculture. This year, we have a fertiliser-making training programme. This means the use of agricultural waste as fertiliser for animal feed. This is budgeted from the village fund, Insyah Allah. Because this has not been implemented yet. Yes, that means we have set it. Yes, we have determined

that the programme will be implemented this year. Yes, this year. I have told you the programme, my staff friends said go ahead. There are indeed many speakers, it's just a matter of implementing it. We set it in the deliberation, because there was also a lot of response from the community, because there were many stories that the corn harvest yesterday was just thrown away, if it could be managed to be used as animal feed. There is already a regulation there not to let livestock. So it's actually good there, because it has to be caged because it's livestock. Yes, it is necessary. When it's necessary to let the community. But because it's good there, it's the community. Those who own livestock are no longer just letting their livestock go. The planters and all. So there, especially those who feed the livestock" (Interview 14 June 2024).

Based on the results from these interviews, it indicates that the village government has never organised entrepreneurship training, but agricultural training is included. The village government has planned training on making fertiliser by utilising agricultural waste as animal feed, which will be financed from village funds. The training on making fertiliser from agricultural waste has not yet been implemented, but has been included in this year's village programme plan. The training plan for making fertiliser from agricultural waste is an effort by the village government to improve agricultural waste management and support livestock activities in the village. The village government needs to ensure the implementation of the training on making fertiliser from agricultural waste, and develop assistance or mentoring programmes for livestock activities in the village.

Based on the data obtained by the researchers, the business capital assistance provided to the village as the locus of this research is as follows:

In 2023 and 2024, the government provided various business capital assistance in several kecamatan to support community economic development. In Mattiro Sompe Sub-district, particularly in Patobong Village, in 2023, there was assistance in the form of a workshop group worth Rp9,000,000 and MSME businesses worth Rp36,000,000. However, in 2024, this type of assistance was not continued, and instead, the government allocated a budget of Rp28,878,000 for the procurement of MSME facilities and infrastructure. Mattiro Tasi Village in 2023 received assistance for MSME equipment worth Rp16,000,000, but in 2024 no assistance was provided. Meanwhile, in Samaenre Village, sewing equipment assistance totalling Rp7,000,000 was only provided in 2023.

In Kecamatan Suppa, Wiring Tasi Village experienced an increase in assistance in 2024. Bubutnaga/Belle assistance increased from Rp14,000,000 in 2023 to Rp25,600,000 in 2024. Similarly, the fishing equipment assistance that was previously

Rp5,000,000 in 2023 increased to Rp25,600,000 in 2024. However, in Tasiwalie Village, the assistance of tilapia fingerlings of Rp36,000,000 that was provided in 2023 was no longer continued in 2024. Instead, new assistance in the form of a compressor machine totalling Rp5,000,000 was provided. In Polewali Village, 2024 saw an increase in support through maize seed assistance of Rp39,600,000 and a water pump machine of Rp10,083,050, which was not available in 2023.

In Kecamatan Lembang, Basseang Village in 2023 received assistance with durian, rambutan, and avocado seedlings, each totalling Rp58,500,000. However, in 2024, there was no further assistance for this village. In 2023, Bakar Village received vegetable seed assistance worth Rp42,000,000, which included spinach, long beans, eggplant, pakcoy, and tomatoes. This assistance was also discontinued in 2024, but was replaced by new assistance in the form of a sewing machine worth Rp5,000,000.

Overall, business capital assistance in 2024 shows a change in focus. If in 2023 there were many allocations for seeds and small-scale business equipment, then in 2024 the priority of assistance shifted to the procurement of production facilities such as compressor engines, water pumps, and MSME facilities. This change reflects the government's efforts to boost the efficiency and productivity of community businesses in a sustainable manner.

The explanation from the Bakar Village Government, Lembang Sub-district, Pinrang Regency explains the effectiveness of the entrepreneurship programme that:

"The training here that has been in the management training is CSR funds. So it was sewing training. So for effectiveness, I think yesterday it went well, but for this, there is nothing yet because here, the population is small so the need for people to sew is only small so if you only tear using this needle, manually using your hands, so paying is a bit difficult." (Interview 27 March 2024)

Based on the results of the interviews above, it indicates that entrepreneurship training in the form of sewing training that has been carried out in the village is considered effective in providing knowledge and skills to participants. However, the sustainability of the sewing business after the training is still constrained due to the lack of demand for sewing services in the village due to the small population. This makes it difficult for the trainees to earn an adequate income from the sewing business. Is there capital assistance from the village government? It can't be if the village gives people capital, it can't, we can't provide an activity with money. But this entrepreneurship programme has indeed been implemented. But the assistance is only in the form of

goods? Yes, goods, so the training goods are given to them. It is CSR funds. But if the village cannot provide capital to bring this much to this, it cannot.” (Interview 27 February 2024)

The entrepreneurship training programme in this village is still not optimal. There is only one type of training that has been implemented, and the programme has not been running effectively. Meanwhile, the village government cannot provide business capital assistance in the form of money, but only in the form of training tools (goods). There is a people’s business credit programme (KUR) that can be accessed by the community, but information and access to the programme is still not optimal.

Apart from that, a different opinion from Patobong Village, Mattiro Sompe Sub-district, one of the people who received business capital assistance explained that:

“I had submitted a proposal for business capital assistance through the village musrembang with an amount of 7 million but after the disbursement I only received 2.5 million in business capital assistance” (Interview AKM June 2024).

This shows that the business capital assistance funds were not transparent, so that the proposed assistance funds were not fully received by the community. In Patobong Village, a recipient applied for Rp7 million in business capital assistance, but only received Rp2.5 million without clarity on the remaining funds. Lack of transparency in the distribution of funds can lead to community distrust of the programme and reduce its effectiveness.

In addition, not all villages received the same assistance, and the type of assistance often changed every year. For example, in Patobong Village in Mattiro Sompe Sub-district, the assistance for workshops and MSMEs in 2023 was stopped in 2024, and replaced with the procurement of MSME facilities. Some villages received substantial funding, while others received no assistance at all. This has led to inequalities in entrepreneurial development between regions. The assistance provided is often not in accordance with the needs of the community. For example, in Bakaru Village, Lembang Sub-district, vegetable seed assistance in 2023 was replaced with sewing machines in 2024, even though the sewing business is not necessarily more desirable or has a good market. Programmes often only focus on providing capital assistance or equipment, but are not followed by ongoing mentoring and training. Many beneficiaries lack business management skills, so the capital provided is not optimally developed. For example, sewing equipment assistance in Samaenre Village, Mattiro Sompe Sub-district, was



only provided once in 2023, with no additional training or support for marketing sewn products.

Businesses have difficulty selling their products due to a limited market or lack of supporting infrastructure. In Bakaru Village, Lembang Sub-district, sewing businesses are less developed due to a small market and difficult access. Thus, even though a sewing machine was provided, the business could not run optimally. The assistance provided will be more effective if supported by access to markets or adequate distribution facilities.

Many programmes only last one year without any continuity, making it difficult for newly established businesses to survive and develop further. For example, in Basseang Village, Lembang Subdistrict, the durian, rambutan and avocado seedling assistance provided in 2023 was discontinued in 2024. If there is no follow-up support, the farming business may stop midway.

Some beneficiaries still rely on government assistance and lack the initiative to develop their businesses independently. Without the drive for economic independence, the assistance provided will only be temporary and not create long-term impact.

Meanwhile, the effectiveness of the village entrepreneurship programme in Pinrang Regency still shows that the programme has not been effective. Business capital assistance is often not tailored to the real needs of recipients. A resident in Patobong Village in Mattiro Sompe sub-district applied for Rp7 million, but only received Rp2.5 million. Insufficient capital makes it difficult for businesses to grow. If the capital provided is too small, business actors cannot run their businesses optimally.

Meanwhile, in Bakaru Village, many assistance programmes only provide equipment or goods, not cash, which is more flexible for business needs, for example, vegetable seed assistance in 2023 was replaced by a sewing machine in 2024, although not all residents are interested in or have sewing skills. If the tools or goods provided do not match the needs, then the assistance becomes less useful.

Many programmes only provide capital assistance without mentoring to ensure the business thrives, resulting in recipients who may not have good business skills, financial management or marketing strategies. Without mentoring, capital assistance is only a temporary injection of funds with no long-term impact. Capital assistance or business tools will not have a big impact if recipients have difficulty selling their products. Sewing businesses are difficult to grow because of limited markets and difficult access to

distribution. If there is no clear marketing strategy or market access, the business will find it difficult to survive despite the capital assistance.

Funds applied for often do not match those received, raising questions about the transparency of distribution. Villagers receive only a fraction of the funds applied for without explanation. This lack of transparency can reduce community trust in government assistance programmes. Many assistance programmes are one-off with no continuity or follow-up support. For example, Basseang Village received durian, rambutan and avocado seedlings in 2023, but no follow-up assistance in 2024. Without long-term support, newly established businesses may stop midway. Some beneficiaries rely on aid rather than developing their businesses independently. If there is no push for self-reliance, capital assistance will only be a short-term solution with no real impact on the community's economy.

In terms of the adequacy of business capital, it is known that the assistance is not proportional to the needs of the villages that received assistance with relatively small values, especially when compared to the operational costs of the business required, such as Patobong Village, Mattiro Sompe Sub-district A recipient applied for Rp7 million, but only received Rp2.5 million. With funds reduced by more than 50%, the planned business is unlikely to develop as expected and Bakaru Village, Lembang Sub-district In 2024, only received Rp5 million for sewing machine assistance, which is likely only enough for a few units of machines, therefore capital assistance is often too small to really encourage sustainable business growth.

Furthermore, there was no sustainability of the assistance programme in several villages, which was only provided once without any continuation or evaluation of the success of the businesses that had been supported, such as Basseang Village in Lembang Sub-district, which only received assistance with durian, rambutan and avocado seedlings in 2023, but no additional assistance in 2024. Similarly, in Samaenre Village, Mattiro Sompe Sub-district, assistance with sewing equipment was provided in 2023, but was not continued in 2024, even though the sewing business needed additional capital such as raw materials and marketing. Business capital assistance tends to be temporary, whereas businesses need long-term assistance in order to survive and develop. Each village receives different types of assistance each year, but not always in accordance with the needs of the community, such as what happened in Wiring Tasi Village, Suppa Sub-district, where the assistance for fishing gear increased dramatically from Rp5 million (2023) to Rp25.6 million (2024), but there was no information on whether this increase was really needed or just a unilateral policy change in Tasiwalie

Village, Suppa Sub-district, where the assistance for tilapia fingerlings of Rp36 million (2023) was stopped and replaced with a compressor machine of Rp5 million (2024). This shows a change in priorities that is not always based on community needs.

Assistance is mostly provided in the form of goods or equipment, rather than cash capital which is more flexible for operational needs. Assistance in many villages is in the form of equipment such as sewing machines, seeds, and fishing gear. Not all recipients can immediately run a business with only tools, because they also need additional capital for raw materials, marketing, and other operational costs. In-kind assistance is not enough, as businesses need cash capital for daily operational costs.

However, in terms of equity, it is clear that the business capital assistance for village communities in Kabupaten Pinrang has not been evenly distributed, with some villages receiving large budgets, while other villages received much smaller amounts or even no assistance at all. Patobong village in 2023 received Rp36 million for MSMEs, but in 2024 only Rp28.8 million for facilities and infrastructure. Wiring Tasi village experienced a large increase in assistance for fishing gear from Rp5 million (2023) to Rp25.6 million (2024), while other villages experienced a decrease in assistance. Samaenre Village in Mattiro Sompe Sub-district only received Rp7 million for sewing equipment in 2023 and no assistance at all in 2024. Therefore, not all villages received an equal amount of budget, resulting in unequal economic opportunities between villages.

In addition, not all village communities received direct assistance. Some programmes were only given to certain groups or individuals who submitted proposals. One villager submitted a proposal for Rp7 million, but only received Rp2.5 million, which shows that not all requests for assistance can be fulfilled fairly. Assistance is mostly provided in kind, while people who need cash capital have to look for alternatives such as Kredit Usaha Rakyat (KUR) and not all people can access assistance easily, so there are disparities in the receipt of benefits. Based on analysis, the village budget in Pinrang Regency has not been distributed evenly, as some villages receive large amounts of assistance, while other villages do not receive comparable assistance. Assistance is not provided consistently every year, so some communities lose access in certain years. The type of assistance does not always match the needs of the community, making budget allocations less effective and also not all village communities can access assistance fairly, due to the proposal submission system and limited funds and political indications.

In terms of responsiveness, assistance was often provided without considering the specific requests or needs of the local community. In Tasiwalie Village, Suppa Sub-district, assistance with tilapia fingerlings in 2023 was discontinued and replaced with a compressor machine in 2024, even though not all communities had businesses that needed the machine. In Wiring Tasi Village, Suppa Sub-district, assistance with fishing equipment increased dramatically from Rp5 million (2023) to Rp25.6 million (2024), but there has been no evaluation of whether this increase was really necessary. Therefore, the programme is less responsive to real conditions in the field, because changes in the type of assistance are not always based on community needs.

In terms of accuracy, assistance is often not given to those who need it most, or the type of assistance does not match the economic potential of the village. Some villages receive assistance that changes every year, with no clarity on its effectiveness. For example, in Polewali Village in Suppa Sub-district, in 2023 there was no assistance for the agricultural sector, but in 2024 corn seeds and water pumping machines were suddenly provided without any clarity on whether farmers in the village really needed the assistance. Aid focuses more on goods (such as machinery and equipment) rather than cash capital, whereas cash capital is more flexible for business development. Therefore, assistance is often poorly targeted because it does not take into account the economic potential of each village

#### **D. Entrepreneurship/Business Capital Assistance**

Based on the results of interviews through efficiency, it can be seen as follows The Bakar Village Government, Lembang District, Pinrang Regency explained the obstacles faced in implementing the entrepreneurship programme that: "There is no business capital yet, so the CSR yesterday was only sewing training. This means that in terms of entrepreneurship training, it has not been optimal, because it has only been once. So maybe if there is this new year again, we are if the existing village will depend on community requests, previously deliberations so today there has been no request from the community, the focus is on development only. Because for business, there are several businesses here, but for this business, it's a bit like for others, if we sew, it's still a bit like this because the market is lacking, then access, distance, so almost everything is a bit difficult. oh that means there is no capital assistance in this village? No, but here most of the kur funds come in. I think there is capital assistance from the village government? It can't be if the village gives people capital, it can't, we can't provide an activity with money. But this entrepreneurship programme has indeed been implemented. But the assistance is only in the form of goods? Yes, goods, so the training

goods are given to them. It is CSR funds. But if the village cannot provide capital to bring this much to this, it cannot.” (Interview 27 February 2024)

The entrepreneurship training programme in this village is still not optimal. There is only one type of training that has been implemented, and the programme has not been running effectively. Meanwhile, the village government cannot provide business capital assistance in the form of money, but only in the form of training tools (goods). There is a people’s business credit programme (KUR) that can be accessed by the community, but information and access to the programme is still not optimal.

Apart from that, a different opinion from Patobong Village, Mattiro Sompe Sub-district, one of the people who received business capital assistance explained that:

“I had submitted a proposal for business capital assistance through the village musrembang with an amount of 7 million but after the disbursement I only received 2.5 million in business capital assistance” (Interview AKM June 2024).

This shows that the business capital assistance funds were not transparent, so that the proposed assistance funds were not fully received by the community. In Patobong Village, a recipient applied for Rp7 million in business capital assistance, but only received Rp2.5 million without clarity on the remaining funds. Lack of transparency in the distribution of funds can lead to community distrust of the programme and reduce its effectiveness.

In addition, not all villages received the same assistance, and the type of assistance often changed every year. For example, in Patobong Village in Mattiro Sompe Sub-district, the assistance for workshops and MSMEs in 2023 was stopped in 2024, and replaced with the procurement of MSME facilities. Some villages received substantial funding, while others received no assistance at all. This has led to inequalities in entrepreneurial development between regions. The assistance provided is often not in accordance with the needs of the community. For example, in Bakar Village, Lembang Sub-district, vegetable seed assistance in 2023 was replaced with sewing machines in 2024, even though the sewing business is not necessarily more desirable or has a good market. Programmes often only focus on providing capital assistance or equipment, but are not followed by ongoing mentoring and training. Many beneficiaries lack business management skills, so the capital provided is not optimally developed. For example, sewing equipment assistance in Samaenre Village, Mattiro Sompe Sub-district, was only provided once in 2023, with no additional training or support for marketing sewn products.

Businesses have difficulty selling their products due to a limited market or lack of supporting infrastructure. In Bakar Village, Lembang Sub-district, sewing businesses are less developed due to a small market and difficult access. Thus, even though a sewing machine was provided, the business could not run optimally. The assistance provided will be more effective if supported by access to markets or adequate distribution facilities.

Many programmes only last one year without any continuity, making it difficult for newly established businesses to survive and develop further. For example, in Basseang Village, Lembang Subdistrict, the durian, rambutan and avocado seedling assistance provided in 2023 was discontinued in 2024. If there is no follow-up support, the farming business may stop midway.

Some beneficiaries still rely on government assistance and lack the initiative to develop their businesses independently. Without the drive for economic independence, the assistance provided will only be temporary and not create long-term impact.

Meanwhile, the effectiveness of the village entrepreneurship programme in Pinrang Regency still shows that the programme has not been effective. Business capital assistance is often not tailored to the real needs of recipients. A resident in Patobong Village in Mattiro Sompe sub-district applied for Rp7 million, but only received Rp2.5 million. Insufficient capital makes it difficult for businesses to grow. If the capital provided is too small, business actors cannot run their businesses optimally.

Meanwhile, in Bakar Village, many assistance programmes only provide equipment or goods, not cash, which is more flexible for business needs, for example, vegetable seed assistance in 2023 was replaced by a sewing machine in 2024, although not all residents are interested in or have sewing skills. If the tools or goods provided do not match the needs, then the assistance becomes less useful.

Many programmes only provide capital assistance without mentoring to ensure the business thrives, resulting in recipients who may not have good business skills, financial management or marketing strategies. Without mentoring, capital assistance is only a temporary injection of funds with no long-term impact. Capital assistance or business tools will not have a big impact if recipients have difficulty selling their products. Sewing businesses are difficult to grow because of limited markets and difficult access to distribution. If there is no clear marketing strategy or market access, the business will find it difficult to survive despite the capital assistance.

Funds applied for often do not match those received, raising questions about the transparency of distribution. Villagers receive only a fraction of the funds applied for without explanation. This lack of transparency can reduce community trust in government assistance programmes. Many assistance programmes are one-off with no continuity or follow-up support. For example, Basseang Village received durian, rambutan and avocado seedlings in 2023, but no follow-up assistance in 2024. Without long-term support, newly established businesses may stop midway. Some beneficiaries rely on aid rather than developing their businesses independently. If there is no push for self-reliance, capital assistance will only be a short-term solution with no real impact on the community's economy.

In terms of the adequacy of business capital, it is known that the assistance is not proportional to the needs of the villages that received assistance with relatively small values, especially when compared to the operational costs of the business required, such as Patobong Village, Mattiro Sompe Sub-district A recipient applied for Rp7 million, but only received Rp2.5 million. With funds reduced by more than 50%, the planned business is unlikely to develop as expected and Bakar Village, Lembang Sub-district In 2024, only received Rp5 million for sewing machine assistance, which is likely only enough for a few units of machines, therefore capital assistance is often too small to really encourage sustainable business growth.

Furthermore, there was no sustainability of the assistance programme in several villages, which was only provided once without any continuation or evaluation of the success of the businesses that had been supported, such as Basseang Village in Lembang Sub-district, which only received assistance with durian, rambutan and avocado seedlings in 2023, but no additional assistance in 2024. Similarly, in Samaenre Village, Mattiro Sompe Sub-district, assistance with sewing equipment was provided in 2023, but was not continued in 2024, even though the sewing business needed additional capital such as raw materials and marketing. Business capital assistance tends to be temporary, whereas businesses need long-term assistance in order to survive and develop. Each village receives different types of assistance each year, but not always in accordance with the needs of the community, such as what happened in Wiring Tasi Village, Suppa Sub-district, where the assistance for fishing gear increased dramatically from Rp5 million (2023) to Rp25.6 million (2024), but there was no information on whether this increase was really needed or just a unilateral policy change in Tasiwalie Village, Suppa Sub-district, where the assistance for tilapia fingerlings of Rp36 million

(2023) was stopped and replaced with a compressor machine of Rp5 million (2024). This shows a change in priorities that is not always based on community needs.

Assistance is mostly provided in the form of goods or equipment, rather than cash capital which is more flexible for operational needs. Assistance in many villages is in the form of equipment such as sewing machines, seeds, and fishing gear. Not all recipients can immediately run a business with only tools, because they also need additional capital for raw materials, marketing, and other operational costs. In-kind assistance is not enough, as businesses need cash capital for daily operational costs.

However, in terms of equity, it is clear that the business capital assistance for village communities in Kabupaten Pinrang has not been evenly distributed, with some villages receiving large budgets, while other villages received much smaller amounts or even no assistance at all. Patobong village in 2023 received Rp36 million for MSMEs, but in 2024 only Rp28.8 million for facilities and infrastructure. Wiring Tasi village experienced a large increase in assistance for fishing gear from Rp5 million (2023) to Rp25.6 million (2024), while other villages experienced a decrease in assistance. Samaenre Village in Mattiro Sompe Sub-district only received Rp7 million for sewing equipment in 2023 and no assistance at all in 2024. Therefore, not all villages received an equal amount of budget, resulting in unequal economic opportunities between villages.

In addition, not all village communities received direct assistance. Some programmes were only given to certain groups or individuals who submitted proposals. One villager submitted a proposal for Rp7 million, but only received Rp2.5 million, which shows that not all requests for assistance can be fulfilled fairly. Assistance is mostly provided in kind, while people who need cash capital have to look for alternatives such as Kredit Usaha Rakyat (KUR) and not all people can access assistance easily, so there are disparities in the receipt of benefits. Based on analysis, the village budget in Pinrang Regency has not been distributed evenly, as some villages receive large amounts of assistance, while other villages do not receive comparable assistance. Assistance is not provided consistently every year, so some communities lose access in certain years. The type of assistance does not always match the needs of the community, making budget allocations less effective and also not all village communities can access assistance fairly, due to the proposal submission system and limited funds and political indications.

In terms of responsiveness, assistance was often provided without considering the specific requests or needs of the local community. In Tasiwalie Village, Suppa Sub-district, assistance with tilapia fingerlings in 2023 was discontinued and replaced with



a compressor machine in 2024, even though not all communities had businesses that needed the machine. In Wiring Tasi Village, Suppa Sub-district, assistance with fishing equipment increased dramatically from Rp5 million (2023) to Rp25.6 million (2024), but there has been no evaluation of whether this increase was really necessary. Therefore, the programme is less responsive to real conditions in the field, because changes in the type of assistance are not always based on community needs.

In terms of accuracy, assistance is often not given to those who need it most, or the type of assistance does not match the economic potential of the village. Some villages receive assistance that changes every year, with no clarity on its effectiveness. For example, in Polewali Village in Suppa Sub-district, in 2023 there was no assistance for the agricultural sector, but in 2024 corn seeds and water pumping machines were suddenly provided without any clarity on whether farmers in the village really needed the assistance. Aid focuses more on goods (such as machinery and equipment) rather than cash capital, whereas cash capital is more flexible for business development. Therefore, assistance is often poorly targeted because it does not take into account the economic potential of each village.

## 4. Conclusion

Based on the research results regarding the implementation of the Cash Intensive Work Programme (PKT) and Business Capital Assistance in several villages, the following conclusions are based on policy evaluation indicators according to William N. Dunn:

### a) Effectiveness

The PKT programme and business capital assistance have been able to provide direct benefits in the form of temporary job creation and capital support for village communities. However, the effectiveness of the programme has not been maximised as not all activities have been able to increase income sustainably or empower the community as a whole.

### b) Efficiency

Programme implementation still faces various administrative and coordination constraints between agencies, leading to delays in the distribution of funds and low optimal utilisation of resources. This shows that implementation efficiency still needs to be improved through improved reporting and monitoring mechanisms.

c) Adequacy

The assistance provided is sufficient to fulfil the basic needs of the poor and vulnerable groups. However, in terms of long-term economic improvement capacity, this assistance is still limited and not fully adequate without further training or assistance.

d) Equity

There are efforts to equalise benefits through the distribution of assistance to various community groups. However, in practice, inequalities are still found, especially for marginalised groups or remote areas that lack equal access and information.

e) Responsiveness

The village government showed efforts in adjusting the programme to the needs of the community, such as holding village meetings. However, responses to community complaints or inputs are still limited due to the lack of effective communication channels and minimal community involvement in programme evaluation.

f) Appropriateness

The programme has generally targeted the right groups, namely the poor, unemployed, and micro- entrepreneurs. However, there are still cases of mistargeting due to the lack of data verification and thorough needs mapping at the village level.

## References

- [1] Dunn WN. Public Policy Analysis: An Integrated Approach. 6th ed. Routledge; 2018.
- [2] Hanson-DeFusco, J. William Newlin Dunn (1939-2022): “The truest measure of an academic pillar”..
- [3] Estache A, Fay M. Current Debates on Infrastructure Policy. Oxf Rev Econ Policy. 2020;36(3):414–31.
- [4] UNDP. Decentralised Governance for Development: A Combined Practice Note on Decentralisation, Local Governance and Urban/Rural Development. United Nations Development Programme; 2022.
- [5] Rodrik D. Straight Talk on Trade: Ideas for a Sane World Economy. Princeton University Press Wasudewa; 2021.
- [6] Creswell JW. Qualitative Research & Research Design. Student Library; 2016.

[7] Chambers R. Rural Development: Putting the Last First. Routledge; 2021.