IJSSR
International Journal of Social Service and Research

Vol. 03, No. 07, July 2023
e-ISSN: 2807-8691 | *p*-ISSN: 2807-839X

The Effect of Samisake Policy Implementation and Development on the Poverty of Jambi City People

Muhammad Sahlani
Satyagama University, Jakarta, Indonesia
*Email: m_sahlani@gmail.com

Keywords
Policy Implementation, Samisake, Development and Poverty

ABSTRACT

The SAMISAKE (One Billion One District) program is the belle of the 2010-2015 elected governor program. Implementation of the One Billion One District Program (SAMISAKE) and the Acceleration of Development is basically a program aimed at the poor through house renovations, free house certificates, scholarships, regional health insurance and UMKM facilities. This research is a survey research using explanatory research. The sampling technique in this study was proportionate stratified random sampling with a sample of 100 respondents. The instrument of data collection in this study was a questionnaire based on a Likert scale. Statistical analysis used was regression analysis with SPSS version 25. Data collection methods used literature study techniques, questionnaires, documentation studies and observations. The results of the study prove that: (i) Implementation of the Samisake Policy has a positive and significant impact on the poverty of the people of Jambi City, which is 86.1%. (ii) Development has a positive and significant impact on the poverty of the people of Jambi City, which is 90%. (iii) The implementation of the Samisake Policy and development together has a positive and significant impact on the poverty of the people of Jambi City, which is 90%. From this research, it can be seen and proven that development of 0.900 or 90% has an effect on the poverty of the people of Jambi City and then the implementation of the Samisake Policy is 0.861 or 86.1% of the poverty of the people of Jambi City who jointly implement the Samisake Policy and Development on the poverty of the people of the city. Jambi is 90%.

INTRODUCTION

In an effort to realize the goal of regional autonomy, the conception of regional autonomy implemented in Indonesia uses the principle of granting the widest possible autonomy to the regions. The principle of the widest autonomy can be interpreted as the authority given through laws and regulations to regions to make policies that are considered right and fair in order to improve the welfare of the people in their respective regions. Each region in carrying out affairs under its authority has the right to make policies both in the context of improving services and in increasing community participation in regional development which is expected to lead to ideals to realize community welfare. In addition to the principle of granting the widest possible autonomy to the community, the principle of real and responsible autonomy is also applied. What is meant by granting the principle of real autonomy is that the authority, duties and responsibilities of local government are carried out based on the objective conditions of a region. Meanwhile, what is meant by responsible autonomy is that the implementation of regional autonomy by regional governments in each region is basically to realize the goals of regional autonomy as part of national goals.

https://doi.org/10.XXXXX/ijssr.xxxx.xx

In this regard, the implementation of regional autonomy must not be separated from the purpose of regional autonomy, namely realizing the improvement of community welfare and therefore, must always pay attention to what are the interests and aspirations that grow and develop in the community in each region Each region is led by the head of regional government called the regional head. The regional head for the province is called the governor, for the regency is called the regent and for the city is the mayor. The regional head is assisted by one deputy regional head, for provinces it is called the deputy governor, for districts it is called the deputy regent and for cities it is called the deputy mayor. Regional heads and deputy heads have duties, authorities and obligations as well as prohibitions. Regional heads also have the obligation to provide reports on the implementation of local government to the Government, and provide reports on accountability information to the DPRD, as well as inform reports on the implementation of local government to the community.

The Governor, who because of his position is also the representative of the central government in the relevant provincial area, in the sense of bridging and shortening the span of control over the implementation of government duties and functions, including in the guidance and supervision of the implementation of government affairs at the district and city government strata. In his position as representative of the central government as intended, the Governor is responsible to the President. In the framework of implementing local government, regional development planning is prepared as a unit in the national development planning system.

In Law Number 23 of 2014 concerning Regional Government article 1 paragraph 2 states that Regional Government is the implementation of government affairs by regional governments and regional people's representative councils according to the principle of autonomy and assistance duties with the principle of the widest autonomy in the system and principles of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia as referred to in the Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia Year 1945. Government affairs as mentioned above in accordance with Article 1 paragraph 5 states government affairs "government power which is the authority of the president whose implementation is carried out by state ministries and local government administrators to protect, serve, empower, and prosper the community".

Based on these provisions, it is stated that there are 4 (four) government affairs that are the objectives of regional autonomy, namely protecting, serving, empowering and improving community welfare. Improving community welfare is expected to be accelerated through improving services in the regions and community empowerment or community participation in the implementation of development in the regions. Meanwhile, efforts to increase competitiveness are expected to be carried out by taking into account the privileges or specificities as well as regional potential and diversity owned by regions within the framework of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia.

Independence is the result of the struggle of the Indonesian nation by previous generations. But that does not mean the struggle ends at this point, because the end of the struggle for independence is a new step for the next generation to maintain and fill independence with development in all areas of life.

Development can be interpreted as an effort or series of planned growth and change efforts carried out consciously by a nation, state, and government, towards modernity in the context of nation building (Siagian 1983: 2-3). Modernity that relies on the values of the nation's people to be maintained and linked into assets for sustainable and sustainable phase development. Social development according to Conyers (Soetomo, 2006: 312) is given meaning in a more general sense as development carried out from and by the people. In another sense, specifically social development can be interpreted as development that concerns non-economic aspects and in the context of achieving human rights or lives of citizens in accordance with their dignity and dignity as human beings.

Sumarno Nugroho in Soetomo (2006: 312) uses the notion of social development taken from the Pre Conference Working Party formulation from the International Conference of Social Welfare. In this formulation, social development is defined as an overall aspect of development related to social relations and values related to it. Furthermore, it is also explained that social development pays attention to the balance of human life in improving or perfecting their social conditions. The formulation includes the notion of social development which has a fairly broad scope.

The concept of social development can also be seen in relation to efforts to realize the ideals of the Welfare State. The concept stems from an understanding of the functioning of the state. In the Welfare State, the state is no longer only tasked with maintaining order and enforcing the law, but primarily is improving the welfare of its citizens (Ndraha in Boediono, 2006: 313). In this view, the state is required to play an active role in seeking the welfare of its people, which is driven by recognition or awareness that the people are entitled to welfare according to their dignity and dignity as human beings. In many ways, people's right to prosperity will also be linked to human rights.

This idea will then have implications if a country that adheres to the Welfare State organizes a national development program. In this case, the country concerned is required to place social development as an integral part of its national development. Therefore, it can also be understood the emergence of social aspects as one aspect of national development in addition to other aspects such as economics and politics. As a consequence, the government must allocate funds for the purposes of social development, although in terms of efforts to pursue productivity and attract economic benefits, the allocation of funds is considered unproductive, because it tends to be consumptive, at least from a short-term perspective. Thus, as one aspect of national development, the fields covered in social development include things that are outside the economic aspect, namely things that do not directly affect productivity and do not directly provide economic benefits, but are related to the dignity and human rights as human beings. However, viewed from the lens of national development as a roundness, social development is often positioned as complementary and complementary to economic development. This is reflected in the definition formulated by Midgley (Boediono 2006.3314), which states that social development is a planned process of social change designed to improve the standard of living of the community as a whole, where this development is carried out to complement the dynamics of the economic development process.

According to Sorjono Soekanto (1990), defining poverty as a condition in which a person is unable to maintain himself in accordance with the standard of group life and is also unable to utilize energy, mentally and physically. The reality shows that poverty still exists in the population of developing countries including Indonesia. Poverty is still often associated with underdevelopment and underdevelopment. In addition, poverty is also one of the most serious social problems. To find relevant solutions in solving the problem of poverty, it is necessary to understand the causes of poverty.

The government seeks to prioritize the role of community participation by referring to the Bottom-Up theory. In this case, the government hopes that the community can be encouraged to be able to penetrate the poverty trap attached to them so that it can reduce the number of poverty levels in urban communities. One of them is the launch of the One Billion One Sub-District Program (SAMISAKE). The One Billion One Sub-District Distribution Program is a program to help accelerate development and help the poor is a program of the Jambi Provincial Government, especially the Governor in his vision and mission of 5 years in office. This program is implemented under the responsibility of the Governor of Jambi Province in collaboration with the level II regional government and sub-districts and SKPD who are responsible for realizing the program. Which is in accordance with the development planning system, the mandate of laws and government regulations as well as governor regulations involving related agencies, local governments and communities.

The one billion one sub-district program aims to reduce the burden and expenditure of poor households as a form of support in improving food security by providing social protection in various programs in order to reduce poverty growth, as well as improve welfare and employment opportunities for the poor in rural and urban areas, the Jambi Provincial Government launched a program designed for equitable development improving the quality of life of MBR throughout the Earth Sepucuk Jambi Sembilan Lurah. By building village-based sub-districts and kelurahan, equitable development will be felt. From this was born the term SAMISAKE. SAMISAKE is a bottom-up development program, meaning that the form of this program is aspirations that come from below (the community) where each sub-district is given the freedom to propose aspirations for the needs of the people in its area.

The vision of Jambi Province development under the leadership of the current Jambi Governor is Jambi Advanced Economy, Safe, Just and Prosperous (EMAS) 2015. SAMISAKE is one of the acceleration programs towards Jambi EMAS's vision. The government's goal in the One Billion One

Sub-District Program is certainly impossible to escape in deviations. There are problems in the distribution of this Jambi provincial government program. Regarding one of the targets of the One Billion Subdistrict Program that should be distributed or given to poor families, it turns out that it falls on other community groups (prosperous families). This mistargeting is mostly caused by human error, where field officers actually distribute or record not in accordance with the program SOPs that have been launched for underprivileged families. In fact, not a few prosperous families "collect rations" against the social assistance. On the other hand, there is also for example the government has not clearly defined the criteria for getting / sub-districts that get this assistance, because after 2 years this cannot be explained in detail. According to data obtained in the field, it is stated that the One Billion One Sub-District Program (SAMISAKE) is able to reach out to reduce the burden on the poor in Jambi City with mainstay programs in the samisake, among others, house renovations, free house certificates, scholarships, regional health insurance and provide convenience in managing MSMEs. Of course, this makes this program a flagship program of the Jambi Provincial Government if in its implementation that Samisake is more widely accepted by poor / underprivileged households.

The implementation of the One Billion One Sub-District Program (SAMISAKE) and the Acceleration of Development is basically a program aimed at reducing the burden on the poor and accelerating development in Jambi Province. Each sub-district will be allocated Rp 1 billion, which aims to reduce development inequality between regions, improve the quality of community welfare, and increase the economic pulse in the village. From the implementation of the program that is run, of course, there are factors that affect this program so that it cannot run effectively and optimally. A number of influencing factors can be seen from communication, disposition, resources, and bureaucratic structure. Likewise, the process of accelerating development directed in the SAMISAKE program includes several factors that become indicators of development such as income, human resources, natural resources, and technology. The burden of the community in meeting their primary needs is also the focus of this program in reducing the burden of the poor such as problems, health and nutrition, education, employment, consumption levels and patterns, housing and the environment, and socio-culture.

According to data obtained in the field, it is stated that the samisake program has not been able to optimally reach out to reduce the burden of poverty in Jambi City with the mainstay program in the samisake among others, house renovations, free house certificates, scholarships, regional health insurance and provide convenience in managing MSMEs. Of course, this makes this program a flagship program of the Jambi provincial government if in its implementation that samisake is more widely accepted by poor / underprivileged households.

From the explanations and problems described above, the author is interested and poured in this research in the form of a thesis entitled "The Effect of One Billion One Sub-District Policy Implementation (SAMISAKE) and Human Resource Development on Poverty Alleviation in Jambi City Community.

METHODS

The type of research used by the author in this study is Explanatory Research, which is to test the relationship between hypothesized variables or to find out whether a variable is associated or not with other variables (Faisal, 2000: 21). To strengthen the hypothesis, it will be analyzed quantitatively, so that it is expected to explain the relationship and influence of a symptom with other symptoms.

In this study also data and information were collected from respondents using questionnaires with descriptive analysis (Riduwan, 2005: 275). The data obtained from the results of the distribution of questionnaires in the Jambi City Regional Government were given a predetermined score and analyzed using statistical tests. Statistical analysis is processed using the computer program Statistical Product for Service Solution (SPSS)16.0 for windows.

RESULTS

Analysis Requirements Testing

Statistical Test Results

Descriptive statistics are concerned with the collection and ranking of data, which describes the characteristics of the sample used in the study. This analysis describes the characteristics of the sample, especially those that include: mean, standard deviation, extreme values, namely: minimum value, maximum value and standard deviation. Based on the results of the analysis, statistical descriptions of the variables of SAMISAKE Policy Implementation (X1), Development (X_2), and Poverty (Y) were obtained as in Table 1

Table 1 Descriptive Statistical Test Results X1

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Sum	Mean		Std. Deviation	Variance
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Statistic
X1.1.	100	2	3	5	406	4,06	,076	,763	,582
X1.2	100	3	2	5	404	4,04	,084	,840	,705
X1.3	100	2	3	5	420	4,20	,075	,752	,566
X1.4	100	2	3	5	438	4,38	,056	,565	,319
X1.5	100	2	3	5	434	4,34	,055	,555	,307
X1.6	100	1	4	5	439	4,39	,049	,490	,240
X1.7	100	3	2	5	400	4,00	,096	,964	,929
X1.8	100	2	3	5	425	4,25	,064	,642	,412
X1.9	100	2	3	5	434	4,34	,055	,555	,307
X1.10	100	2	3	5	406	4,06	,076	,763	,582
X1.11	100	3	2	5	404	4,04	,084	,840	,705
X1.12	100	2	3	5	420	4,20	,075	,752	,566
X1.13	100	1	4	5	439	4,39	,049	,490	,240
X1.14	100	2	3	5	410	4,10	,088	,882	,778
X1.15	100	2	3	5	377	3,77	,092	,920	,846
TOTAL X1	100	23	49	72	6256	62,56	,466	4,661	21,724
Valid N (listwise)	100								

Source : Output SPSS 25 (data processed, 2019)

Based on the results of statistical analysis in Table.4.8 shows the value of N or the amount of data studied amounting to 100 samples. Policy Implementation has a total mean *of* 62.56 with a standard deviation of 4.661.

Table 2 Descriptive Statistical Test Results X2

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Sum	Mean		Std. Deviation	Variance
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Statistic
X2.1	100	2	3	5	406	4,06	,076	,763	,582
X2.2	100	3	2	5	398	3,98	,084	,841	,707
X2.3	100	2	3	5	420	4,20	,075	,752	,566
X2.4	100	2	3	5	438	4,38	,056	,565	,319
X2.5	100	2	3	5	435	4,35	,056	,557	,311
X2.6	100	1	4	5	439	4,39	,049	,490	,240
X2.7	100	3	2	5	395	3,95	,097	,968	,937
X2.8	100	2	3	5	427	4,27	,065	,649	,421
X2.9	100	2	3	5	434	4,34	,055	,555	,307
X2.10	100	2	3	5	406	4,06	,076	,763	,582
X2.11	100	3	2	5	398	3,98	,084	,841	,707
X2.12	100	2	3	5	420	4,20	,075	,752	,566
X2.13	100	1	4	5	439	4,39	,049	,490	,240
X2.14	100	2	3	5	411	4,11	,089	,886	,786
X2.15	100	2	3	5	371	3,71	,091	,913	,834
TOTAL X2	100	23	49	72	6237	62,37	,476	4,758	22,639
Valid N (listwise)	100								

Source : Output SPSS 25 (data processed, 2019)

Based on the results of statistical analysis in Table 2. shows the value of N or the amount of data studied amounting to 100 samples. The construction has a total mean *of* 62.37 with a standard deviation of 4.758.

Table.3 Descriptive Statistical Test Results Y

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Sum	Mean		Std. Deviation	Variance
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Statistic
Y1.1	100	2	3	5	405	4,05	,077	,770	,593
Y1.2	100	3	2	5	395	3,95	,085	,845	,715
Y1.3	100	2	3	5	419	4,19	,075	,748	,559
Y1.4	100	2	3	5	437	4,37	,056	,562	,316
Y1.5	100	2	3	5	434	4,34	,055	,555	,307
Y1.6	100	1	4	5	439	4,39	,049	,490	,240
Y1.7	100	3	2	5	395	3,95	,097	,968	,937
Y1.8	100	2	3	5	427	4,27	,065	,649	,421
Y1.9	100	2	3	5	434	4,34	,055	,555	,307
Y1.10	100	2	3	5	419	4,19	,075	,748	,559
Y1.11	100	2	3	5	437	4,37	,056	,562	,316
Y1.12	100	2	3	5	434	4,34	,055	,555	,307
Y1.13	100	1	4	5	439	4,39	,049	,490	,240
Y1.14	100	2	3	5	412	4,12	,088	,879	,773
Y1.15	100	2	3	5	373	3,73	,092	,920	,846
TOTAL Y	100	23	49	72	6299	62,99	,458	4,578	20,959
Valid N (listwise)	100								

Based on the results of statistical analysis in Table 3. shows the value of N or the amount of data studied amounting to 100 samples. Poverty has a total mean *of* 62.99 with a standard deviation of 4.578.

Test Validity and Reliability

Table.4. Test of Validity and Reliability of SAMISAKE Policy Implementation (X1)(n=100, α=10%, df= 98)

Question	r calculate	r table	Validity	Cronbach A	Reliability
			r calculate > r table		Cronbach α > R Table
1	0,573	0,2324	Valid	0,701	Reliability
2	0,428		Valid		Reliability
3	0,573		Valid		Reliability
4	0,210		Valid		Reliability
5	0,484		Valid		Reliability
6	0,443		Valid		Reliability
7	0,461		Valid		Reliability
8	0,182		Tidak Valid		Reliability
9	0,484		Valid		Reliability
10	0,573		Valid		Reliability
11	0,428		Valid		Reliability
12	0,573		Valid		Reliability
13	0,443		Valid		Reliability
14	0,269		Valid		Reliability
15	0,346		Valid		Reliability

Source : processed data, SPSS Version 25 (2019)

From the results of the validity test in table 4 it can be seen that the results are quite good and respondents agree that the implementation of SAMISAKE Policy (X1) can affect poverty (Y). This can be seen in the validity of ten there are nine indicators declared Valid because the value of r is calculated> from the r table, and one indicator is declared invalid.

The statement with the highest validity value is the first statement, namely the Information Clarity indicator (0.573), the third statement of the information consistency indicator (0.573), the tenth statement of the organizational importance indicator (0.573) and the twelfth statement of the task distribution indicator (0.573). This means that these indicators predominantly affect Poverty (Y). While the lowest Validity value is the statement of the eight indicators of personal interest of

(0.182). This means that special attention is needed to indicators of self-interest. Evenwith the Reliability test, all indicators are declared Reliability because Cronbach α > r table (0.701>0.2324).

Table 5 Development Validity and Reliability Test(X2) (n=100, α=10%, df= 98)

Question	r calculate	r table	Validity	Cronbach A	Reliability
			r calculate > r table		Cronbach α > R Table
1	0,566	0,2324	Valid	0,705	Reliability
2	0,414		Valid		Reliability
3	0,558		Valid		Reliability
4	0,334		Valid		Reliability
5	0,522		Valid		Reliability
6	0,457		Valid		Reliability
7	0,458		Valid		Reliability
8	0,183		Tidak Valid		Reliability
9	0,530		Valid		Reliability
10	0,556		Valid		Reliability
11	0,414		Valid		Reliability
12	0,558		Valid		Reliability
13	0,457		Valid		Reliability
14	0,280		Valid		Reliability
15	0,376		Valid		Reliability

Source: :d ata processed, SPSS Version 25 (2019)

From the results of the validity test in Table 5, it can be seen that the results are quite good and respondents agree that Development (X_2) can affect Poverty (Y). This can be seen in Uji the validity of all average indicators is declared Valid because the r value is calculated > from the r table, and one indicator is declared invalid.

The statement with the highest validity value is the first statement of the salary/wage indicator (0.566), the third statement is the business indicator (0.558), and the twelfth statement of the fisheries ndikator (0.558). This means that these indicators predominantly affect Poverty (Y). While the lowest validity value is the statement of the eight responsible indicators with a validity value of (0.182). This means that special attention is needed to responsible indicators. Evenwith the Reliability test, all indicators are declared Reliability because Cronbach α > r table (0.705>0.2324).

Table 6 Test of Poverty Validity and Reliability (Y) (n=100, α=10%, df= 98)

Question	r calculate	r table	Validity	Cronbach A	Reliability
			r calculate > r table		Cronbach α > R Table
1	0,393	0,2324	Valid	0,705	Reliability
2	0,282		Valid		Reliability
3	0,543		Valid		Reliability
4	0,468		Valid		Reliability
5	0,650		Valid		Reliability
6	0,474		Valid		Reliability
7	0,463		Valid		Reliability
8	0,164		Tidak Valid		Reliability
9	0,650		Valid		Reliability
10	0,543		Valid		Reliability
11	0,468		Valid		Reliability
12	0,650		Valid		Reliability
13	0,474		Valid		Reliability
14	0,279		Valid		Reliability
15	0,383		Valid		Reliability

Source : processed data, SPSS Version 25 (2019)

From the results of the validity test in Table 6 it can be seen that the results are quite good and respondents agree that Poverty(Y) is important, because experience in many countries shows that no country can implement development and poverty alleviation alone.

This can be seen in Uji the validity of all indicators declared Valid because the value of r is calculated > from r table. The statement with the highest validity value is the fifth statement, namely the indicator of ease of health services (0.650), the ninth statement, namely the scholarship indicator (0.650), and the twelfth statement, namely the unemployment indicator with a validity value of (0.650). While the lowest validity value is the statement of the eight indicators of education costs with a validity value of (0.182). This means that special attention is needed on the indicator of the cost of education. Even with the Reliability test, all indicators are declared Reliability because Cronbach α > r table (0.705>0.2324).

Linearity Test

A linearity test is needed to determine the linearity or absence of the relationship of the independent variable with the related variable. The rule used in determining the normal distribution or not is that if (p < 0.05) then the distribution is said to be linear.

Table. 7 Linearity Test Results X_1

ANOVAa

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Itself.
1	Regression	1787,280	1	1787,280	608,784	,000b
	Residual	287,710	98	2,936		
	Total	2074,990	99			

a. Dependent Variable: TOTAL Y
b. Predictors: (Constant), TOTAL X1

Source : Output SPSS 25 (data processed, 2019)

Based on Table 8 results of the linearity test on the distribution obtained F of 608.784 with Sig 0.000 then the variable relationship in this study is linear.

Table 8 Linearity Test Results X_2

ANOVAa

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Itself.
1	Regression	1866,559	1	1866,559	877,620	,000b
	Residual	208,431	98	2,127		
	Total	2074,990	99			

a. Dependent Variable: TOTAL Y
b. Predictors: (Constant), TOTAL X2

Source : Output SPSS 25 (data processed, 2019)

Based on Table 9 results of the linearity test on the distribution obtained F of 877.620 with Sig 0.000, then the variable relationship in this study is linear.

Table 9 Linearity Test Results X_1, X2, Against Y

ANOVAa

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Itself.
1	Regression	1866,560	2	933,280	434,333	,000b
	Residual	208,430	97	2,149		
	Total	2074,990	99			

a. Dependent Variable: TOTAL Y
b. Predictors: (Constant), TOTAL X1, TOTAL X2

Source : Output SPSS 25 (data processed, 2019)

Based on Table 9 results of the linearity test on the distribution obtained F of 434.333 with Sig 0.000, then the variable relationship in this study is linear.

Multiple Regression Analysis

Multiple linear regression analysis is a linear relationship between two or more independent variables (X_1, X2,Xn) with the dependent variable (Y). This analysis is to determine the direction of the relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable whether each independent variable is positively or negatively related and to predict the value of the dependent variable if the value of the independent variable increases or decreases. The equation or multiple linear regression model produced is:

Table 10 Multiple Linear Regression Model Results

Type	Regression Coefficient
Constant	6,070
Policy Implementation (X1)	0,912
Development (X2)	0,001

Source : processed data, SPSS Version 25 (2019)

The regression equation is as follows:

Y= a + b1 X1 + b2 X2Y= 6.070+ 0.912 X1 + 0.001 X2

Information:

Y= Poverty= constant
B1, B2= Regression Coefficient
X1= Policy Implementation
X2= Development

The regression equation can be described as follows:

a. The resulting constant of 6.070 means that if the village development policy Implementation of SAMISAKE Policy (X1) and Development (X2) is 0, then Poverty(Y) is 6.070.
b. The regression coefficient of the SAMISAKE Policy Implementation variable (X1) of 0.912 means that if other independent variables have a fixed value, if the Policy Implementation increases by 1%, then poverty (Y) will decrease by 0.912.
c. The regression coefficient of the Development variable (X2) of 0.001 means that if other independent variables have a fixed value and Development increases by 1%, then Poverty (Y) will decrease by 0.001. A positive coefficient means that there is a positive relationship between Development and Poverty, the better the Policy Implementation, the higher the decrease in Poverty.

Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1: There is an effect of the implementation of the One Billion One Sub-District (SAMISAKE) policy on the poverty of the people of Jambi City.

Table 11 Model Summary[b] Variable X1

Model Summary[b]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	,928[a]	,861	,860	1,713	,861	608,784	1	98	,000

a. Predictors: (Constant), TOTAL X1

b. Dependent Variable: TOTAL Y

Source: processed data, SPSS Version 25 (2019)

From the calculation results of Table 11 of the model summary variable of SAMISAKE Policy Implementation (X1), *the R* Square (R2) value of 0.861 means 86.1%.

Table 12 SAMISAKE Policy Implementation Test Results (X1)

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	5,959	2,318		2,571	,012		
	TOTAL X1	,912	,037	,928	24,674	,000	1,000	1,000

a. Dependent Variable: TOTAL Y

Source: processed data, SPSS Version 25 (2019)

Based on Table 12 Variable Coefficient X_1 from the SPSS calculation result, P_{x1} = 5.959

a. Test t

Based on Table 12, the path coefficient (P_{x1}) = 5.959 is$_{\text{obtained, the calculated t value = 24.674, while}}$ the table $_{\text{t value =}}$ 1.29043. The value reveals that t is $_{\text{calculated}}$ > $t_{\text{table,}}$ and the Significance value is 0.012This means that the coefficient of this path is significant, this finding can be interpreted that the implementation of the SAMISAKE Policy (X1) has an effect on poverty.

b. Determination Test

From the calculation of the SAMISAKE Policy Implementation (X1) model summary table for the determination test, the Square Value (R2) of 0.861 means 86.1%. This means that the variation of the dependent variable that can be explained by the independent variable is 86.1%, and the remaining 13.9% is influenced by other variables. For this reason, it is concluded that Leadership Implementation affects 86.1% of poverty, and the remaining 13.9% is influenced by other variables.

c. Simple Linear Regression Equation

Based on Table Coefficientsa X_1 column B in contant (a) 5,959 while the value of X_1 (b) 0,912 So the regression equation is as follows:

Y = a + bX1

Y = 5.959+ 0.912X1

The coefficient b is called the regression direction coefficient and expresses the change in the average of the Poverty variable (Y) for each change in the SAMISAKE Policy Implementation variable (X1) by one unit. This means an increase if b has a positive sign and a decrease if b has a negative sign. So that the equation Y has the meaning:

1. The constant 5.959 states that if there is no value X1 $_{\text{then the value of Y increases by 5.959.}}$
2. The regression coefficient X 10.912 $_{\text{states that for every addition of 1 value X1 then the value of Y increases by}}$ 0.912.

From the output above, it can be known that the calculated value = 24.674 with a significance value of 0.012> 0.05, meaning that the coefficient of this path is significant, this finding is interpreted that the implementation of the SAMISAKE Policy (X1) has a significant effect on poverty.

Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis: There is an influence of development on poverty alleviation in Jambi City

Table 13 Model Summary[b] Variable X2

Model Summary[b]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	,948[a]	,900	,899	1,458	,900	877,620	1	98	,000

a. Predictors: (Constant), TOTAL X2

b. Dependent Variable: TOTAL Y

Source : processed data, SPSS Version 25 (2019)

From the calculation results of Table 4.20.model summary of the Development variable (X_1), the *R* Square value (R2) of 0.900 means 90%.

Table 14 Development T Test Results (X_2)

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	6,073	1,927		3,152	,002		
	TOTAL X2	,913	,031	,948	29,625	,000	1,000	1,000

a. Dependent Variable: TOTAL Y

Source : processed data, SPSS Version 25 (2019)

Based on Table 14 Variable Coefficient X_2 from the SPSS calculation result, P_{x1} = 6.073.

a. Test t

Based on Table 15, the path coefficient (P_{x2}) = 6.073$_{calculated\ t}$ value = 3.152 while the table t value = 1.29043. The value reveals that t $_{counts}$ > $t_{table,}$ with a significance value of 0.134. This means that the coefficient of this pathway is significant, this finding can be interpreted that Development (X_2) has an effect on poverty.

b. Determination Test

From the calculation of the Development summary model table ($X_{2)}$ for the determination test Square Value (R2) of 0.900 means 90%. This means that the variation of the dependent variable can be explained by the independent variable 90%, and the remaining 10% is influenced by other variables. For this reason, it is concluded that Development affects 90% of poverty, and the remaining 10% is influenced by other variables.

c. Simple Linear Regression Equation

Based on TableCoefficientsa X_2 column B at contant (a) 6.073while the value X_2 (b) 0,913 So the regression equation is as follows:

Y = a + bX$_2$

Y = 6.073+ 0.913X2

The coefficient b is called the regression direction coefficient and expresses the change in the average of the Poverty variable (Y) for each change in the Development variable (X_2) by one unit. This means an increase if b has a positive sign and a decrease if b has a negative sign. So that the equation Y has the meaning:

1. The constant 6.073states that if there is no value of X2 then the value of Y is 6.073.

2. The regression coefficient x 20.913 states that for every addition of 1 value X2then the value of Y increases by 0.913.

From the output above, it can be known that the calculated value = 3.152 with a significance value of 0.002< 0.05, meaning that the coefficient of this path is not significant, this finding is interpreted that Development (X_2) has an insignificant effect on poverty.

Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3: There is an effect of the implementation of the One Billion One Sub-District (SAMISAKE) policy and development together on the poverty of the people of Jambi City.

Table 15 Model Summary[b] X1 and X2 Against Y

Model Summary[b]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	,948[a]	,900	,897	1,466	,900	434,333	2	97	,000

a. Predictors: (Constant), TOTAL X1, TOTAL X2

b. Dependent Variable: TOTAL Y

Source : processed data, SPSS Version 25 (2019)

From table 4.23.obtained the number R^2 (R *Square*) of 0.900means 90%.

Table 16 Test Results T (x 1, X$_2$ Against Y)

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	6,070	1,983		3,061	,003		
	TOTAL X2	,912	,150	,947	6,074	,000	,043	23,497
	TOTAL X1	,001	,153	,001	,006	,995	,043	23,497

a. Dependent Variable: TOTAL Y

Source : processed data, SPSS Version 25 (2019)

Based on Table 16 Variable Coefficients X_1 and X2 from the SPSS calculation results, together $P_x = 6.070$

a. Test t

Based on Table 16, obtained the path coefficient (P_{x2}) = 6.070calculated $_{t\ value\ =}$ 3.061 while table t value = 1.29043. The value reveals that $t_{counts} > t_{table,}$ with a significance of 0.003. This means that the coefficient of this pathway is significant, this finding can be interpreted that the implementation of SAMISAKE Policy (X1) and Development (X_2) together affect poverty.

b. Determination Test

From the calculation results of Table 4.23, the model summaryImplementation of SAMISAKE Policy (X1) and Development ($X_{2)}$ together for the determination test Square Value (R2) of 0.900 means 90%. This means that the variation of the dependent variable can be explained by the independent variable 90%, and the remaining 10% is influenced by other variables. For this reason, it is concluded that Development affects 90% of poverty, and the remaining 10% is influenced by other variables.

c. Simple Linear Regression Equation

Based on Table 4.23 Coefficientsa X_1 and X2 column B at contant (a) 6,070while the value of $X_{1\ and\ 2}$ (b) 0.912 and X2(b) 0,001 So the regression equation is as follows:

$Y = a + bX_{1+} bX_2$

Y = 6.070+ 0.912X1 **+0.001 X2**

The coefficient b is called the regression direction coefficient and expresses the change in the average of the Poverty variable (Y) for each change in the Development variable (X_2) by one unit. This means an increase if b has a positive sign and a decrease if b has a negative sign. So that the equation Y has the meaning:

1. The constant 6.060 states that if there are no values of$X1_{\ and\ X2}$ then the value of Y is 6.070.
2. The regression coefficient $_{X\ 10.912}$ states that for every addition of 1 value X 1 then the value of Y increases by 0.912.
3. The regression coefficient $_{X\ 20.001}$states that for every addition of 1 value X_2 then the value of Y increases by 0.001.

From the output above, it can be seen that the calculated value = 3.061 with a significance value of 0.003< 0.05, meaning that the coefficient of this path is not significant, this finding is interpreted that the implementation of SAMISAKE Policy (X1) and Development (X_2) together have an insignificant effect on poverty.

Concurrent Test (F Test)

This test is used to determine whether the independent variable (X1,X2,,,Xn) together has a significant effect on the dependent variable (Y). Or to find out the regression model can be used to predict the dependent variable or not. Significant means that the relationship that occurs can apply to the population (can be generalized).

The significance level uses a = 10% (significance 10% or 0.10), the test criterion is that the hypothesis is accepted when $F_{calculate} > F_{table}$. When $F_{count} > F_{table}$ obtained F_{table} amounted to 3,024. The results of the F test are as follows:

Table 17 Test Results F Variable X1

ANOVAa

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Itself.
1	Regression	1787,280	1	1787,280	608,784	,000b
	Residual	287,710	98	2,936		
	Total	2074,990	99			

a. Dependent Variable: TOTAL Y
b. Predictors: (Constant), TOTAL X1
Source: :d ata processed, SPSS Version 25 (2019)

From the table 17 shows that F count < F table is 608.784>1.93 with a significance value below 0.10 which is 0.000, then the hypothesis is accepted, meaning that there is a significant influence between the Implementation of SAMISAKE Policy (X1) on Jambi City Poverty.

Table 18 Test Results F Variable X2

ANOVAa

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Itself.
1	Regression	1866,559	1	1866,559	877,620	,000b
	Residual	208,431	98	2,127		
	Total	2074,990	99			

a. Dependent Variable: TOTAL Y

b. Predictors: (Constant), TOTAL X2

Source : processed data, SPSS Version 25 (2019)

From the table 18 shows that F count > F table is 877.620>1.93 with a significance value below 0.10 which is 0.000, then the hypothesis is accepted, meaning that there is no significant influence between Development (X_2) to Jambi City Poverty.

Table 19 Test Results F Variables X1 and X2 Against Y

ANOVAa

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Itself.
1	Regression	1866,560	2	933,280	434,333	,000b
	Residual	208,430	97	2,149		
	Total	2074,990	99			

a. Dependent Variable: TOTAL Y
b. Predictors: (Constant), TOTAL X1, TOTAL X2

Source : processed data, SPSS Version 25 (2019)

From table 4.26 shows that F count > F table is 434.333>1.93 with significance value below 0.10 i.e. 0.000, the hypothesis is accepted, meaning that there is no significant influence between SAMISAKE Policy Implementation (X1) and Development (X_2) together with the Jambi City Poverty.

Discussion of Research Results

Based on the calculation results with multiple linear regression analysis, the regression equation / model below is obtained:

Y = 0.394+ 0.274X1 **+0.716X2**

Table 20 Dafatar 2017 SAMISAKE Recipients

No	District	Samisake Program Recipients					Qty
		Home Surgery	*Free Certificate*	*Beasiswas*	*UMKM*	*Jamkesda*	
1	South Jambi	3	2	5	5	5	20
2	New Town	4	3	5	2	8	22
3	Telanaipura	2	4	3	3	3	15
4	Pelayangan	4	2	2	2	5	15
5	Jambi Market	1	2	5	2	3	13
6	Gulf Lake	2	3	3	3	4	15
7	Jelutung	2	4	5	2	3	16
8	East Jambi	2	2	4	3	4	15
	Total Population						**131**

Based on table 4.27. The list of SAMISAKE recipients in 2017 was highest in Kota Baru District with 22 assistance, and South Jambi District with 20 assistance. The lowest in Pasar Jambi sub-district was 13 aids. It can be seen that the assistance is in the form of (1) house renovation programs, (2) free certificates, (3) scholarships, (4) MSMEs) and (5) JAMKESDA.

These results are supported by the results of research on Policy Implementation Variables, namely the lowest validity value is the statement of the eight indicators of personal interest as much as (0.182). So it is needed to prioritize personal interests, in the form of fulfilling basic needs in poor households in Jambi City Center only to lead to other priority areas. The personal interests referred to here, should be based on the situation of real conditions in the field, not just supported by emotional closeness due to kinship and other closeness as elements of personal interest.

These results are also supported by the value of the Development Variable (X2), namely the lowest validity value is the statement of the eight responsible indicators with a validity value of (0.182). It is expected that every assistance provided, distributed evenly and on target and can be accounted for.

Furthermore, in the results of the Poverty Variable (Y) the lowest validity value is the statement of the eight indicators of education costs with a validity value of (0.182). So based on the results of research both questionnaire and field data processing, the provision of assistance in the form of scholarships is appropriate, in connection with the problem of poverty focusing on education, emphasized by the high cost of education, so government assistance in the form of scholarships is needed, especially for the poor or poor.

The Relationship between Samisake Policy Implementation and Development on the Poverty of Jambi City People

1. The Relationship of Samisake Policy Implementation to the Poverty of Jambi City People

Based on the results of research data analysis that has been carried out, the Implementation of SAMISAKE Policy (X1) for the determination test of Square Value (R2) of 0.861 means 86.1%. This means that the variation of the dependent variable that can be explained by the independent variable is 86.1%, and the remaining 13.9% is influenced by other variables. For this reason, it is concluded that Policy Implementation has an effect of 86.1% on poverty, and the remaining 13.9% is influenced by other variables.

According to Wahab (1991: 45) policy implementation is an important aspect of the entire policy process, policy implementation is not only related to the mechanism of elaborating political decisions into routine procedures through bureaucratic channels but more than that. It concerns issues of conflict, the decision of who and obtaining what from a policy. He also stated, in implementation, especially those involved by many government organizations, it can actually be seen from 3 (three) points of view, namely: "(1) policy initiators/policy makers (*the center*); (2) *the*

periphery; (3) individual actors outside the government bodies to whom the programs are realized, namely target groups (Wahab, 1997: 63).

On another occasion according to Daniel Mazmanian and Paul Sabatier (in Leo Agustino, 2014: 138) defined policy implementation as:

> "The implementation of basic policy decisions is usually in the form of law, but it can also take the form of important executive orders or decisions or decisions of the judiciary. Typically, the decision identifies the problem to be addressed, specifies explicitly the goal or objectives to be achieved, and the various ways to structure or organize the implementation process."

Poverty is defined as the inability to participate in society economically, socially, culturally, and politically. Therefore, the form of poverty is not only unidimensional but also includes human poverty and dignity poverty (Lubis, 2004). Poverty is a profile of a person's life that illustrates his inability to live a decent life and participate in ongoing development. This poverty will hinder its development, make it difficult for society at large, and in itself hinder development (Pasandaran, 1994).

2. Development Relationship to Poverty of Jambi City People

Based on the results of research data analysis that has been done, Development (X2) for the determination test of Square Value (R2) of 0.900 means 90%. This means that the variation of the dependent variable can be explained by the independent variable 90%, and the remaining 10% is influenced by other variables. For this reason, it is concluded that Development affects 90% of poverty, and the remaining 10% is influenced by other variables.

This is in accordance with development theory created by experts who have diverse backgrounds and represent different and many interests, dominant interests in a community group. Here are some understandings of development theory mentioned by Supriyatno (2014: 7) in the process of acceleration, growth and economic development.

1. *Adam Smith,* viewed economic development as a process of economic growth and economic development by utilizing market mechanisms. An economy will grow and develop if the market mechanism works well and perfectly.
2. *Harrod and Domar*, see that the development carried out by the government on its people is often constrained by funds, so economic growth is largely determined by the savings and investments it has.
3. *WW. Rostow,* views that the human factor is a major factor of economic growth. By explaining the growth in the *five-stage scheme* from traditional to modern. By starting at the *traditional stage,* changing to *pre-consecrated take-off, taking off society,* becoming a *growth maturation society* , and achieving *modern society.*
4. *Celco Furtado's theory (theory of depedency),* argues that development is essentially a process that creates imbalance, understanding backwardness as deeply embedded in certain political structures.
5. *Thomas Robert Malthus*, considered that the continuous increase in population is a necessary element for additional demand, the existence of economic development requires an increase in the amount of capital for continuous investment in development

Poverty is defined as the inability to participate in society economically, socially, culturally, and politically. Therefore, the form of poverty is not only unidimensional but also includes human poverty and dignity poverty (Lubis, 2004). Poverty is a profile of people's lives that illustrates their inability to live a decent life and participate in ongoing development. This poverty will hinder its development, make it difficult for society at large, and in itself hinder development (Pasandaran, 1994).

CONCLUSION

The conclusion obtained based on the results of the research on the Effect of Samisake Policy Implementation and Development on the Poverty of the People of Jambi City and the discussion is that there is a positive (lowering) and significant influence of Samisake Policy Implementation on

the Poverty of the People of Jambi City by 86.1%. This is because the implementation of the Samisake Policy is quite good, which is shown by the Information Clarity indicator 0.573, the third statement of the information consistency indicator 0.573, the tenth statement of the organizational importance indicator 0.573 and the twelfth statement of the task distribution indicator 0.573. This means that these indicators predominantly affect Poverty (Y).

There is a positive (lowering) and significant influence of development on the poverty of the people of Jambi City by 90%. This is due to the feasible and fair implementation of the Samisake Policy directly, direct development indicated by the salary/wage indicator of 0.566, the third statement is the business indicator of 0.558, and the twelfth statement of fisheries ndikator 0.558. This means that these indicators predominantly affect Poverty (Y). While the lowest validity value is the statement of the eight responsible indicators with a validity value of (0.182). This means that special attention is needed to responsible indicators.

There is a positive (lowering) and significant influence on the implementation of Samisake Policy and Development together on the poverty of the people of Jambi City by 90.2%. However, the success rate in implementing the Samisake Policy Implementation and the ability to achieve the goals that have been set is maximum. As for the 10% due to individual factors, psychological factors and organizational factors in development, all of which affect the poverty of the Jambi City community.

REFERENCES

Abdul Wahab, Solichin, 1997, Policy Analysis of State Policy Implementation Formulation, Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.

Agustino, Leo. 2014, Fundamentals of Public Policy, Bandung : CV. Alphabeta

Arsyad, L. 1992. Understanding the Problem of Poverty in Indonesia An Introduction.

Adi, Isbandi Rukminto, 2003. Empowerment, Community development and community intervention, ; Introduction to practical thinking and approach. Publishing House, Faculty of Economics, University of Indonesia, Jakarta.

Arikunto, Suharsimi, 2002, Research Procedures for a Practical approach, Jakarta : Rineka Cipta

Badjuri Abdul Kahar and Teguh Yuwono, 2002, Public Policy: Concept and Strategy, Semarang : Diponegoro University.

Bakhit, Izzedin (et al). 2001. Attacking The Roots Of Poverty, Menggembur akar-akar kemiskinan, Jakarta : Yakoma- PGI

Bungin, Burhan, 2001, Social Research Methodology: Quantitative and Qualitative Formats. Surabaya : Airlangga University Press.

Department of Settlement and Regional Infrastructure. 2002. Strategic Plan for Poverty Reduction in Regional Housing and Infrastructure. Jakarta: Department of Settlement and Regional Infrastructure

Dwiyanto, Agus (Editor).2005. Realizing Good Governance through Public Services. Yogjakarta : Gadjah Mada University Press.

Faisal, Sanapiah, 2000, Social Research Formats (basics and Applications), Jakarta : Rajawali Press.

Gaffar, Afan, 1989, Some Aspects of Political Development, Jakarta : Rajawali.

Jones, Charles O, 1991, Public Policy Administrator, Jakarta : Rajawali

Kerlinger, Fred N. 2013. Principles of Behavioural Research, Yogjakarta : Gadjah Mada University Press.

Kuncoro, Mudrajad. 2003, Development Economics: Theory, problems and policies. Yogyakarta : AMP YKPN.

Mardikanto, Totok, and Soebiato, Poerwoko. 2013, Community Empowerment, in public policy perspective. Bandung : CV. Alphabeta

Ndraha, Taliziduhu. 2011. Kybernology (New Government Science), Jakarta : PT. Rineka Cipta.

Riduwan, 2013. Methods and Techniques for Compiling a Thesis, Bandung : CV. Alphabeta.

Siagian, Sondang P. 2012. Human Resource Management, Jakarta : Bumi Aksara.

Sjafari, Agus. 2014. Poverty and Group Empowerment, Yogjakarta : Graha Ilmu.

Supriyanto, Budi. 2014. Theory of Government in Development, Jakarta: Satyagama University.

Supriyatna, Thahya and Yassin, Shaharuddin. 2013. Management and Public Policy. Bandung : CV. Indra Prahasta Bandung.
Suharto, Edi. 2012. Public Policy Analysis 'practical guide to studying social problems and policies', Bandung : Alfabeta.
Sumaryadi, I Nyoman. 2013. Sociology of Government, Bogor : Ghalia Indonesia
Sugiono. 2011. Qualitative Quantitative Research Methods and R & D, Bandung : Alfabeta.
Suparmoko, M. and Irawan. 1992. Development Economics, Yogjakarta : FE. UGM
Suwandi S. Brata. 1992. Sustainable Development, Looking for a political format, Jakarta : PT. Gramedia.
Wasistiono, Sadu. 2013. Introduction to Government Ecology, Bandung: IPDN Press.