CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

A. Research Background

Poverty is one of the problems facing the government that until now can't be resolved. Indonesia is a country rich in natural resources. Unfortunately, the human resources are very low, it can be seen from the quality of Indonesian society itself. Efforts to reduce poverty have been made even the main priority of national development policy is poverty alleviation. In fact, efforts to reduce poverty levels had been done since the 1970s, only the effort was not maximum so poverty increased in the 1990s. Poverty reduction programs such as BLT (*Bantuan Langsung Tunai*), KUR (*Kredit Usaha Rakyat*), UMKM (*Usaha Mikro Kecil dan Menengah)* development, PNPM *Mandiri Perdesaan (*program *Nasional Pemberdayaan Masyarakat*), and many other programs that have been done by the government are still not enough to overcome these poverty problems. The government must plan and create policies to free Indonesia from poverty. Poverty is a complex and multidimensional problem, it is not addressed properly, then there will be many conflicts occur in our nation that can cause a nation's moral weakness. One heartbreaking and inhuman torture in poor households is the food shortage. Food becomes the dominant spending component for poor families. Moreover, rising food prices and the number of needs in a family causes inability to meet food and other needs. Food is arguably the main factor in increasing poverty, to stimulate the

economy and reduce poverty so the food must be well laid out, by way of local government should start developing the potential in each region.

Food has a meaning and a very important role in the life of a nation, as a basic need and one of the human rights. The availability of food that is smaller than its needs can create economic instability. Various social and political upheavals can also occur if food security is disrupted. Critical food conditions can endanger economic stability and national stability. For Indonesia, food is often identified with rice because this type of food is the main staple food. Experience has proven that disruptions to food security such as rising rice prices during the 1997/1998 economic crisis, which developed into multidimensional crises, have triggered social vulnerabilities that endanger economic stability and national stability (Bulog, 2014).

According to Central Bureau of Statistics (BPS), poverty is the inability of the economy to meet basic food and non-food needs. The poor are residents with the average per capita spending per month below the poverty line. Until now, these problems have not been resolved so that the staple food for the poor has not been met.

The food crisis occurred in 1998 made the price of food demand increased so that people's purchasing power decreased. With the impacts of the economic crisis of that year, it was the beginning of the Raskin *(Beras Miskin)* program which is now called Rastra *(Beras Sejahtera).* The Raskin program was originally called the *Operasi Pasar khusus* (OPK), which is 2002 was renamed Raskin and its function became

widespread not only as an emergency program (social safety net) but as a social protection (social safety). Naming Raskin is also expected to be more targeted and can achieve the goal of Raskin/Rastra. This Raskin program will continue to carry out the perfection of indicators related to the beneficiaries. Rastra is able to help poor households and stabilize rice prices in the market (Jogja, 2017).

 The goals of the Raskin Program is to reduce the burden of KPM's (*Keluarga Penerima Manfaat*) expenditure through the fulfillment of some of the food needs of rice.The target of the Rastra Program has reduced expenses KPM in fulfilling the need of rice food through the distribution of subsidized rice with the allocation of 15 kg /KPM/months or in accordance with Central Government policy. The benefits of the Raskin Program are as follows:

a. Increased food security at KPM level, as well as social protection and poverty reduction mechanism.

b. Increased access to food both physically, rice available in TD *(Titik Distribusi).* As well as economic (affordable selling price) to KPM.

c. As a market for the result of rice farming

d. Stabilization of rice prices in the market

e. Inflation control through government intervention by determining subsidized rice price of Rp.1.600,-/kg or in accordance with central government policy, and maintaining national food stock.

f. Helping economic growth in the regions.

Raskin is a food subsidy in the form of rice destined for low-income households as an effort by the government to increase resilience and provide social protection on the target household. The success of the Raskin program is measured based on the indicators ofright target, right quantity, right price, right time, right quality, right administration. This program aims to reduce the burden of expenditure of *Rumah Tangga Sasaran* (RTS) through fulfilling some basic food needs in the form of rice and prevent the decrease of energy and protein consumption. In addition, Raskin aims to increase/open access to family food through the sale of rice to beneficiary families with the amount that has been determined. *Harga Tebus Beras Raskin* (HTR) price from *Rumah Tangga Sasaran Penerima Manfaat* (RTS-PM) to Raskin Distribution Executor is conducted in cash of Rp 1,600 per kg net atTD.

To improve the effectiveness of Raskin program management, synchronization and coordination among all related agencies, from the central level to the regional (provincial, district and city) levels, districts and village levels; from planning to implementation, by involving various community elements, as well as other related parties(Panggayuh, 2014). Raskin program is considered still less effective at various distribution points, whereas bulog has done its job well and according to program guidance. However, there are some beneficiary households (RTS - PM) who do not receive Raskin, even in some distribution points there are some of the households that are not on the list of poor people get the Raskin. If the success of the Raskin program is measured from all Indicators, then, in this case, its effectiveness is still relatively

weak. Factors of socialization are also very influential in the processing of this Program, unfortunately, this socialization activity is not set in detail, so it makes the society don't really understand about the program. Because of the weakness of this socialization activity, people do not know clearly what Raskin is, the rice allocations should be accepted, the price of rice at the distribution point, and the frequency of receipt per year. Because of the weakness of the transparency of this program, it can potentially lead to corruption, target inaccuracy and makes the program less effective.

Several studies in various regions, the use of Raskin program funds is considered ineffective and inefficient because the program is poorly targeted so that not only poor households get Raskin but those who are not eligible. The operational costs of the program are considered too large and the procurement price difference and Bulog's rice price is too high. Inadequate targeting and honorariums to local officials have also become one of the most ineffective and inefficient disbursements of Raskin program funding and have, of course, violated the terms of use of funds. The beneficiary community is generally satisfied with the Raskin program because it benefited directly from the existence of the program despite its inappropriate targeting. According to some sources, the program is able to reduce the economic burden and the need for poor household rice and increase the quantity and quality of consumption. The three main benefits of the program are helping with food expenses, reducing the burden of mind or family burden, and helping with school costs. The Raskin program reduces the cost of eating so that there are excess revenues that can

be used to help with the cost of the school as well as the Raskin program is useful in preventing price fluctuations at the village level (Hastuti, 2008).

In accordance with Musawa (2009), who did the research in the Gajah Mungkur sub-district, Semarang city, illustrated a mistake in the process of data collection of poor families. It is known that in fact, people understand who the target Raskin but because of the condition of the community, then the implementers based on the agreement of citizens to take a policy to share the Raskin fair to all citizens. By taking its own policy that is causing the ineffectiveness of this Raskin program. The lack of socialization has resulted in the government and local communities lacking understanding of the program and resulting in a reduction in Raskin rations and also at some distribution points, the deliberation and agreed by the local community in the addition of the recipient of this Raskin. Sometimes there is also inappropriate timely distribution of rice and low rice quality due to government's control over rice quality standards which are then distributed. The lack of socialization about the Raskin program also makes a mistake in the distribution of rice, because it is found in some distribution points that the head of the RT makes a different policy for the sake of justice of its citizens, it is precisely this that makes the distribution of Raskin rice is not on target because of the different policies of the household who are not registered poor can get this Raskin rice ration.

Based on the quota of Raskin in the districts in Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta can be seen from the following table :

Table 1.1
Data of Raskin Recipients of Special Region of Yogyakarta in 2017

No	District	RTS-PM 2017
1	Kulon Progo	47,323
2	Bantul	97,472
3	Gunung Kidul	88,267
4	Sleman	66,534
	Total	299,596

Source : Bulog, year 2017.

From the above data shows that Bantul District has a total number of Raskin 97,472 RTS-PM recipients from total recipients in the Special Region of Yogyakarta. This shows that there are still many poor people who need Raskin from the government.According to BPS Bantul Regency has a population of 971,276 inhabitants. Consisting of 17 Sub-districts, and 75 Villages. As for the number of Raskin ceiling for poor households in Bantul Regency is as follows:

Tabel 1.2
The number of Raskin ceiling distribution in Bantul district 2017

No	Sub-District	RTS-PM 2017	15kg/RTS-PM/year
1	Imogiri	6,909	1,243,620
2	Pundong	5,323	958,140
3	Sanden	4,510	811,800
4	Srandakan	4,209	757,620
5	Kretek	3,877	697,860
6	Bambangglipuro	5,968	1,074,240
7	Pajangan	5,460	982,800
8	Sedayu	4,684	843,120
9	Banguntapan	6,437	1,158,660
10	Pleret	5,336	960,480
11	Jetis	6,349	1.142,820
12	BaSntul	5,535	996,300
13	Piyungan	5,256	946,080
14	Kasihan	6,949	1,250,820
15	**Pandak**	**7,707**	**1,387,260**
16	Sewon	7,387	1,329,660
17	Dlingo	5,576	1,003,680
Total		**97,472**	**17,544,960**

Source: Bulog, year 2017.

The number of Raskin recipients in Bantul District is 97,472/RTS-PM of the population of 971,276 inhabitants. The data above shows that Pandak districts as the largest Raskin recipient in Bantul with the amount of 7,707. Therefore, the Researcher wants to know whether the management of the Raskin program In Pandak districts is effective in the area and whether it is in accordance with Raskin's general guidelines.

Table 1.3
The number of Raskin recipients in Pandak districts 2017

No	Sub-District	Villages	RTS-PM 2017	Persentase
1	Pandak	Triharjo	2,202	28,57%
		Caturharjo	1,676	21,74%
		Gilangharjo	**2,416**	**31,34%**
		Wijirejo	1,413	18,33%
Total			**7,707**	**100%**

Source: Bulog, year 2017.

Gilangharjo is a village in Pandak sub-district, Bantul, Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta, Indonesia. This village has an area of ± 726 hectares, consisting of 15 Hamlet and 91 Neigborhood. The fifteen hamlets are: Kadisoro Hamlet, Jodog Hamlet, Karangasem Hamlet, Daleman Hamlet, Jomboran Hamlet, Kauman Hamlet, Kadekrowo Hamlet, Bongsren Hamlet, Ngaran Hamlet, Karanggede Hamlet, Gunting Hamlet, Depok Hamlet, Tegallurung Hamlet, Banjarwaru and Krekah. The population of Gilangharjo Village in 2009 was 16,390 people consisting of 4,653 households. From the data of Raskin recipients in Pandak above the Researcher will take Gilangharjo as a research area with the Largest total recipients 2,416 RTS-PM its 31,34% higher than other villages.

B. Research Questions

Based on the description of the background above, the problems in this research are formulated as follows:

1. How is the effectiveness of the Raskin distributed inGilangharjo?

2. How is the strategy to make Raskin program right target?

C. Research Objectives

the purposes of this study are :

1. To analyze the effectiveness of Raskin distribution in Gilangharjo.

2. To analyzethe strategy to make Raskin program right target.

D. Research Benefits

The research benefits are :

1. As a mean to understand more about the Raskin program in general.

2. The results of this research are expected to contribute thoughts for related parties, especially local governments and teams that conduct the proses of Raskinprogram and its distribution.

3. As a further material of thought in research of Raskin allocation program related to the effectiveness of Raskin program.

4. As reference materials and studies for the parties in need.