

Research Article

Evaluation of the Training Program for Homeless and Beggars at the Social Rehabilitation UPTD Bina Karya Pasuruan: A Public Policy Perspective

Agung Purnomo^{1*}, Ika Devy Pramudiana², Nihayatus Sholichah³

¹⁻³ Program Studi Administrasi Publik, Universitas Dr. Soetomo, Surabaya, Indonesia.

* Corresponding Author: e-mail : 01985agungpurnomo@gmail.com

Abstract: This study evaluates the effectiveness of vocational training programs for homeless persons and beggars at the UPT Rehabilitasi Sosial Bina Karya Pasuruan, East Java, Indonesia, through a public policy perspective. Drawing on Edi Sutrisno's (2007) effectiveness indicators—comprising program comprehension, targeting accuracy, time management, goal attainment, and visible behavioral change—the research employs a qualitative descriptive method. Data were collected through participatory observation, in-depth interviews with nine key subjects (social rehabilitation staff, social workers, and skills instructors) and four beneficiary informants, and documentary analysis. The findings reveal that the program has not yet reached an effective level of implementation. Key inhibiting factors include mismatches between beneficiaries' backgrounds and available skill tracks, outdated program design, low intrinsic motivation among clients, and limited post-rehabilitation follow-up. Supporting factors include the availability of qualified instructors, adequate facilities and infrastructure, and a generally high willingness among beneficiaries to participate in activities. The study concludes that a policy redesign is necessary, incorporating needs-based program planning, enhanced motivational interventions, updated curriculum content aligned with current labor market demands, and strengthened inter-agency collaboration. These findings contribute to public policy discourse on social welfare program evaluation and offer practical recommendations for government rehabilitation institutions.

Received: September 23, 2025

Revised: November 28, 2025

Accepted: January 21, 2026

Online Available: March 30, 2026

Curr. Ver.: March 30, 2026

Keywords: Program evaluation; vocational training; Homeless; Social rehabilitation; Public policy.



Copyright: © 2025 by the authors.

Submitted for possible open

access publication under the

terms and conditions of the

Creative Commons Attribution

(CC BY SA) license

(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>)

1. Introduction

Social welfare programs targeting marginalized populations—particularly homeless persons (gelandangan) and beggars (pengemis)—represent a critical nexus between public policy theory and practice. In Indonesia, rapid urbanization has consistently outpaced formal labor market absorption, generating a persistent population of individuals who subsist through begging or nomadic living in urban and peri-urban areas (Suharto, 2014). East Java Province recorded approximately 4.18 million poor residents in 2023 according to the Central Statistics Agency (BPS), underscoring the scale of the challenge.

The Indonesian government has institutionalized responses to this challenge through *Panti Rehabilitasi Sosial* (Social Rehabilitation Centers), operating under Ministerial Regulation No. 7 of 2022. Among these, the *UPT Rehabilitasi Sosial Bina Karya (RSBK) Pasuruan* functions as a residential rehabilitation facility providing vocational guidance, social skills development, and re-integration support for its beneficiaries. Despite this institutional framework, recidivism—whereby former clients return to begging or homelessness after completing rehabilitation—remains a persistent problem, suggesting that program effectiveness is not yet optimal.

Program evaluation in the context of public policy has gained increasing scholarly attention. Scholars such as Weiss (1998), Rossi, Lipsey and Freeman (2004), and Patton (2008) have articulated frameworks for assessing whether social interventions achieve their intended outcomes. From a public policy standpoint, effectiveness evaluation must go beyond output counting and engage with questions of whether beneficiaries internalize new capacities, whether program design is contextually appropriate, and whether institutional arrangements support sustained behavioral change (Dunn, 2012).

The present study addresses a research gap by systematically applying a multi-indicator effectiveness framework to the vocational training component of the *RSBK Pasuruan* program. Specifically, this research examines (1) the degree to which the skills training program is effective in improving the social functioning of homeless persons and beggars; and (2) the supporting and inhibiting factors that shape program effectiveness. The theoretical anchor is *Edi Sutrisno's* (2007) effectiveness indicators framework, which operationalizes effectiveness across five dimensions: program comprehension, targeting accuracy, time management, goal attainment, and visible behavioral change. This framework is situated within broader public policy evaluation theory, drawing on *Stufflebeam's* CIPP model (Context, Input, Process, Product) and implementation theory as articulated by *Mazmanian and Sabatier* (1983).

The practical significance of this study lies in its potential to inform evidence-based policy reform. Rehabilitation institutions across Indonesia face similar structural challenges; findings from *RSBK Pasuruan* may therefore offer transferable lessons for improving social welfare program design at the regional and national levels.

2. Literature Review

Program Effectiveness in Public Policy

Effectiveness is fundamentally about the degree of goal attainment. In public policy scholarship, effectiveness is distinguished from efficiency (the cost of goal attainment) and equity (the distribution of benefits), though all three dimensions are important for comprehensive program evaluation (Dunn, 2012). *Rossi, Lipsey, and Freeman* (2004) define program effectiveness as the extent to which an intervention produces intended changes in the target population under real-world conditions, as opposed to the controlled conditions of efficacy trials.

Stufflebeam's CIPP model provides a structured evaluative framework that examines Context (the environment and needs the program addresses), Input (resources, design, and strategy), Process (implementation fidelity and quality), and Product (outcomes and impact) (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007). This model is particularly apt for evaluating social rehabilitation programs, where contextual factors—beneficiary heterogeneity, institutional capacity, community environment—substantially moderate program outcomes.

Implementation theory further emphasizes that policy effectiveness is not merely a function of program design but is shaped by the interaction of organizational capacity, street-level bureaucracy, and target group characteristics (Lipsky, 2010; Mazmanian & Sabatier, 1983). Sabatier (1986) argues that successful implementation requires clear and consistent policy objectives, adequate causal theory linking intervention to outcomes, legal and financial resources, committed implementing officials, and supportive external conditions.

Social Rehabilitation and Vocational Training

Social rehabilitation is conceptualized as a set of purposive activities designed to restore and develop individual social functioning for persons experiencing social dysfunction (United Nations, 2019). Indonesian Law No. 11 of 2009 on Social Welfare defines social rehabilitation as actions to restore and develop the abilities of individuals who experience social dysfunction, enabling them to carry out their social functions appropriately.

Vocational training within rehabilitation settings is grounded in human capital theory (Becker, 1993), which posits that investment in skills development enhances individual productivity and labor market employability. However, the literature increasingly recognizes that skills acquisition alone is insufficient for social reintegration; it must be accompanied by psychosocial support, motivational enhancement, and post-release case management (Holzer et al., 2003). Andrews and Bonta (2010) emphasize the importance of matching intervention intensity and type to individual risk, need, and responsivity factors—a principle that resonates strongly with the challenges observed at RSBK Pasuruan.

International comparative evidence suggests that the most effective vocational programs for marginalized populations combine practical skills training with life skills education, mentoring, and linkages to employment or microenterprise opportunities (ILO, 2017). Programs that fail to address underlying motivational deficits or social support networks tend to show high dropout rates and limited long-term impact (Giguere & Frisken, 2004).

Homeless Persons Beggars as a Target Population

The phenomenon of homelessness and begging in developing country contexts is structurally embedded in urban poverty, rural-urban migration, and labor market exclusion (Roy, 2011). In Indonesia, Government Regulation No. 31 of 1980 defines homeless persons as those living in conditions contrary to prevailing social norms, without fixed residence or occupation, who wander in public spaces. Beggars are defined as those who obtain income by soliciting in public places through various means designed to elicit sympathy.

Research on this population consistently identifies heterogeneous profiles: urban migrants without adequate education or skills, individuals with physical or mental disabilities, elderly persons without family support, and in some cases individuals who have adopted begging as a rational economic strategy (Anggriana & Dewi, 2016; Fadri, 2019). This heterogeneity has important implications for program design—it implies that standardized,

one-size-fits-all vocational training is unlikely to be maximally effective across the client population.

Social functioning—the capacity to meet basic needs, fulfill social roles, and solve life problems—is the primary outcome targeted by rehabilitation programs (Suharto, 2017; Indonesian Ministry of Social Affairs Regulation No. 7, 2022). Siporin (1975) conceptualized social functioning as the ways in which individuals, families, or groups carry out life tasks and meet their needs, emphasizing its relational and contextual nature.

3. Materials and Method

This research employs a qualitative methodology with a descriptive approach, appropriate for exploring the nuanced dimensions of program effectiveness in a specific institutional context (Creswell, 2014). The research was conducted at UPT Rehabilitasi Sosial Bina Karya Pasuruan, located at Jalan Raya Warungdowo No. 149, Kecamatan Pohjentrek, Pasuruan, East Java—a provincial government facility operating under the auspices of the East Java Social Service.

Research Subjects and Informants

The primary subjects comprised nine individuals: four staff members from the Social Rehabilitation Section, two social workers (*pekerja sosial*), and three vocational skills instructors. These subjects were selected on the basis of their direct involvement in program design, delivery, and oversight. Four beneficiary informants were selected as secondary sources using purposive sampling, based on the following criteria: current or former clients of the facility; aged 18 years or older; participation in at least one vocational training program (either compulsory or elective); and program participation of at least one month. Informant data served a triangulation and validation function, enabling cross-checking of institutional accounts against beneficiary perspectives.

Data Collection

Three data collection techniques were employed: (1) participatory observation, in which the researcher was directly engaged in daily activities at the facility; (2) in-depth interviews using a semi-structured, open-ended guide, allowing subjects to articulate perspectives freely while remaining anchored to research objectives; and (3) documentary analysis of institutional documents, activity schedules, program materials, and personnel records. This triangulation of methods strengthens the credibility and transferability of findings (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed following the Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña (2014) interactive model, comprising three iterative phases: (1) data condensation (reduction)—selecting, focusing, and summarizing raw data; (2) data display—organizing condensed data into structured formats enabling analytical insight; and (3) conclusion drawing and verification—formulating and testing interpretations against the totality of evidence. Trustworthiness was ensured through source triangulation (comparing perspectives across subjects, informants, and documents) and member checking.

Analytical Framework

Effectiveness was operationalized using Edi Sutrisno's (2007) five indicators, situated within the CIPP evaluation model and public policy implementation theory. The five indicators are: (1) program comprehension—the degree to which beneficiaries understand program content; (2) targeting accuracy—the fit between program offerings and beneficiary needs and capacities; (3) time management—adherence to scheduled program activities; (4) goal attainment—the extent to which program objectives are achieved; and (5) visible behavioral change—observable improvements in beneficiary behavior and social functioning.

4. Results and Discussion

Institutional Profile and program Overview

UPT Rehabilitasi Sosial Bina Karya Pasuruan was established under East Java Governor Regulation No. 85 of 2018. Its mandate encompasses social rehabilitation services for homeless persons and beggars, administrative functions, and community service delivery. The facility is headed by a Unit Head and organized into four functional sections: Administration, Social Rehabilitation, Beneficiary Services, and Human Resources.

The facility implements a structured service and rehabilitation process encompassing: (1) identification and intake; (2) social assessment (registrasi sosial); (3) case conferencing and individual service planning; (4) program implementation including physical health services, psychosocial guidance, religious and moral education, social skills training, and vocational skills training; (5) repatriation and social reintegration; and (6) post-rehabilitation follow-up.

Vocational training programs offered at the time of this study are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Vocational Training Programs at UPT RSBK Pasuruan.

No.	Program	Skills Targeted	Classification
1	Sewing (Menjahit)	Garment fabrication, pattern cutting	Compulsory
2	Batik Production	Wax-resist dyeing, textile decoration	Compulsory
3	Cooking and Catering (Memasak)	Food preparation, catering management	Compulsory
4	Embroidery (Bordir)	Textile embroidery, decorative stitching	Elective
5	Hairdressing / Barbering	Hair cutting, styling, coloring	Elective
6	Handcraft / Handicrafts	Craft production, creative goods	Elective

Effectiveness Analysis

Effectiveness was assessed against Sutrisno's (2007) five indicators. Table 2 presents a summary analytical matrix.

Table 2. Effectiveness Analysis of Vocational Training Program.

Indicator	Findings	Assessment
1. Program Comprehension	Majority of beneficiaries reported partial understanding of program content; instructional methods were	Partially Met

Indicator	Findings	Assessment
	inconsistently tailored to literacy levels	
2. Targeting Accuracy	Significant mismatch between beneficiaries' prior skills and program offerings; limited needs assessment prior to enrollment	Not Met
3. Time Management	Activity schedules were generally followed; occasional disruptions due to client behavioral issues	Partially Met
4. Goal Attainment	Program objectives were not fully achieved; recidivism rates remained elevated; limited evidence of sustained skill use post-discharge	Not Met
5. Visible Behavioral Change	Some clients demonstrated observable improvements in social behavior and self-care; however, long-term behavioral outcomes were not systematically tracked	Partially Met

Program Comprehension

Interview data indicated that beneficiaries' understanding of program content varied substantially. While instructors made efforts to convey vocational skills in practical, hands-on formats, the diversity of educational backgrounds—ranging from illiteracy to junior secondary school completion—meant that a single pedagogical approach was insufficient. This aligns with Andrews and Bonta's (2010) responsiveness principle, which holds that interventions must be adapted to the learning styles and capacities of individual participants. The absence of a systematic baseline assessment of beneficiary literacy and cognitive capacities was identified as a structural deficit in the program's design.

Targeting Accuracy

A significant finding of this study concerns the mismatch between the vocational programs offered and the profiles and preferences of beneficiaries. Several clients expressed disinterest in the available program tracks—particularly sewing and batik, which were perceived as gender-typed or economically unviable in their home communities. This finding resonates with Giguere and Frisken (2004), who note that vocational programs for marginalized populations achieve better outcomes when participants have genuine input into program selection. The static, non-updated curriculum did not reflect current labor market demands, a deficiency consistent with findings from comparative studies of Indonesian social rehabilitation centers (Sumantri, Pikri, & Lubis, 2018).

Time Management

Program scheduling was largely adhered to, representing a relative strength of the institution's operational management. Activity logs and interview data confirmed that scheduled training sessions were conducted as planned in approximately 85 percent of cases. Disruptions arose primarily from client behavioral issues—including unauthorized absences

and, in some instances, clients leaving the facility—rather than from institutional failures. This pattern of client-driven disruption has been documented elsewhere in the literature on voluntary and involuntary rehabilitation programs (Lipsky, 2010).

Goal Attainment

The degree to which program goals were achieved was assessed through triangulated data from staff reports, beneficiary interviews, and documentary records. Results indicated that while participants generally acquired some procedural knowledge of their chosen skill track, the development of market-ready competencies was limited for a significant proportion of clients. This finding is consistent with research by Holzer et al. (2003), who note that short-duration vocational programs rarely produce employment-grade competencies in the absence of supplementary support. Moreover, the absence of formal post-discharge follow-up mechanisms meant that program impact beyond the institutional setting could not be reliably assessed.

Visible Behavioral Change

Behavioral changes were most observable in structured dimensions of social functioning—personal hygiene, adherence to daily schedules, and interpersonal conduct within the facility. However, the sustainability of these changes following reintegration into community settings remained uncertain. Social workers noted that clients who returned to their communities without employment, housing, or social support tended to revert to previous behavioral patterns within a short period. This pattern is consistent with findings from the broader desistance literature (Maruna, 2001) and underscores the importance of community-based aftercare as an integral component of effective rehabilitation.

Supporting Factors

Three primary supporting factors were identified through the research. First, the availability of qualified and committed instructors was identified as a significant asset. Instructors demonstrated technical proficiency in their respective fields and, in most cases, genuine engagement with their beneficiary groups. Human capital quality among frontline program staff is consistently identified as a critical success factor in rehabilitation program research (Dvoskin & Heilbrun, 2001).

Second, the facility possessed adequate physical infrastructure, including dedicated training rooms, equipment for sewing and batik production, a kitchen facility for catering training, and a hairdressing station. Adequate facilities reduce a common barrier to program implementation in resource-constrained settings (Holzer et al., 2003).

Third, a notable proportion of beneficiaries demonstrated intrinsic motivation to engage in program activities. Despite their challenging circumstances, many clients expressed appreciation for structured daily activities and the opportunity to acquire new skills. Intrinsic motivation is recognized as a robust predictor of learning outcomes and behavioral change

(Deci & Ryan, 2000), and its presence among a segment of the client population represents a significant programmatic asset that could be more effectively leveraged.

Inhibiting Factors

Four inhibiting factors emerged as particularly significant. First, person-program mismatch was the most pervasive structural barrier. The limited range of vocational tracks, combined with the absence of individualized needs assessment and client-centered program planning, meant that many beneficiaries were enrolled in programs that did not align with their interests, capacities, or future employment prospects.

Second, low intrinsic motivation among a subset of clients—particularly those who had been placed at the facility through enforcement operations (*razia*) rather than voluntary admission—represented a significant implementation challenge. This finding is consistent with the broader literature on involuntary treatment, which consistently shows lower engagement and poorer outcomes among coerced participants (Wild et al., 2006).

Third, curriculum stagnation was identified as a systemic issue. Program content and methods had not been updated to reflect contemporary labor market realities or the availability of new vocational opportunities in the digital economy. This represents a public policy design failure, as effective vocational programs require continuous curriculum review aligned with evolving employment landscapes (ILO, 2017).

Fourth, the absence of structured post-rehabilitation follow-up and case management severely limited the program's ability to sustain outcomes. Without post-discharge support—including employment placement assistance, social network strengthening, and access to micro-capital—skill acquisition alone was insufficient to prevent recidivism. This finding aligns with Andrews and Bonta's (2010) risk-need-responsivity model and with the "what works" literature on correctional and rehabilitative programming (Lipsey & Cullen, 2007).

Public Policy Implications

Viewed through the lens of public policy implementation theory, the findings suggest that the RSBK Pasuruan program faces challenges across multiple dimensions of the implementation framework articulated by Mazmanian and Sabatier (1983). The policy mandate is reasonably clear, but the causal theory linking program activities to social reintegration outcomes is underdeveloped in institutional practice. Resource adequacy is broadly sufficient at the facility level, but human resource management and curriculum development capacities require strengthening. The tractability of the target population—characterized by heterogeneous needs, variable motivation, and complex social circumstances—presents inherent implementation challenges that demand adaptive, individualized approaches.

From a CIPP evaluation perspective (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007), context analysis reveals a genuine and pressing social need that the program addresses. Input evaluation identifies adequate physical resources but deficits in needs assessment infrastructure and curriculum currency. Process evaluation highlights implementation strengths in scheduling

and instructor commitment, alongside weaknesses in pedagogical adaptation and motivational support. Product evaluation reveals partial achievement of immediate learning outcomes but insufficient impact on longer-term social reintegration.

5. Conclusion

This study has evaluated the effectiveness of the vocational training program at UPT Rehabilitasi Sosial Bina Karya Pasuruan from a public policy perspective, applying Sutrisno's (2007) five-indicator effectiveness framework within the broader context of CIPP evaluation theory and public policy implementation analysis. The principal finding is that the program has not yet achieved an effective level of implementation across the five effectiveness dimensions. Targeting accuracy and goal attainment represent the most significant areas of deficiency, while time management reflects a relative institutional strength. Supporting factors—including instructor quality, facility adequacy, and beneficiary motivation among engaged clients—provide a foundation for programmatic improvement.

This study proposes the following policy recommendations: (1) institutionalize systematic needs assessment and individualized service planning prior to program enrollment; (2) expand and diversify the vocational program portfolio to include digital economy skills, entrepreneurship, and other demand-aligned tracks; (3) implement structured motivational enhancement interventions, particularly for involuntarily placed clients; (4) establish a post-discharge follow-up and case management system with defined performance indicators; and (5) develop inter-agency partnerships with private sector employers, microfinance institutions, and community organizations to support sustainable social reintegration. This study is limited by its single-site focus and cross-sectional design; longitudinal and comparative multi-site research would strengthen generalizability. Future research should also examine the role of family involvement and community-based support structures in shaping post-rehabilitation outcomes.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, A.P.; Methodology, A.P.; Investigation, A.P.; Data curation, A.P.; Writing—original draft preparation, A.P.; Writing—review and editing, A.P.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Data Availability Statement: Data are available upon reasonable request from the corresponding author.

Acknowledgments: The author thanks the leadership and staff of UPT Rehabilitasi Sosial Bina Karya Pasuruan for facilitating access to the research site, and the beneficiary informants for their willingness to share their experiences.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

- Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (2010). *The psychology of criminal conduct* (5th ed.). Anderson Publishing.
- Anggriana, T. M., & Dewi, N. K. (2016). Identifikasi permasalahan gelandangan dan pengemis di UPT Rehabilitasi Sosial Gelandangan dan Pengemis. *INQUIRY: Jurnal Ilmiah Psikologi*, 7(1), 30–40. <https://doi.org/10.51353/inquiry.v7i1.78>
- Becker, G. S. (1993). *Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis, with special reference to education* (3rd ed.). University of Chicago Press.
- Cahyadi, B. B. N., Puspitasari, N. Z., Britania, D. A., & Wahyudi, K. E. (2021). Efektivitas program pelayanan kesejahteraan sosial anak jalanan di UPTD Kampung Anak Negeri Kota Surabaya. *Jurnal Indonesia Sosial Teknologi*, 2(5), 731–742. <https://doi.org/10.36418/jist.v2i5.153>
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The ‘what’ and ‘why’ of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227–268. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01
- Dunn, W. N. (2012). *Public policy analysis* (5th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Dvoskin, J. A., & Heilbrun, K. (2001). Risk assessment and release decision-making: Toward resolving the great debate. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*, 29(1), 6–10.
- Fadri, Z. (2019). Upaya penanggulangan gelandangan dan pengemis (Gepeng) sebagai penyandang masalah kesejahteraan sosial di Yogyakarta. *Komunitas*, 10(1), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.20414/komunitas.v10i1.1070>
- Giguere, S., & Frisken, F. (Eds.). (2004). *Managing decentralisation: A new role for labour market policy*. OECD Publishing.
- Holzer, H. J., Raphael, S., & Stoll, M. A. (2003). Employment barriers facing ex-offenders. *The Urban Institute Reentry Roundtable*. <https://www.urban.org/research/publication/employment-barriers-facing-ex-offenders>
- ILO. (2017). *Skills training for vulnerable groups: Issues and approaches*. International Labour Organization.
- Lipsey, M. W., & Cullen, F. T. (2007). The effectiveness of correctional rehabilitation: A review of systematic reviews. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, 3, 297–320. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.lawsocsci.3.081806.112833>
- Lipsky, M. (2010). *Street-level bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the individual in public service* (30th anniversary expanded ed.). Russell Sage Foundation.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. SAGE Publications.
- Maruna, S. (2001). *Making good: How ex-convicts reform and rebuild their lives*. American Psychological Association.
- Mazmanian, D. A., & Sabatier, P. A. (1983). *Implementation and public policy*. Scott Foresman.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Patton, M. Q. (2008). *Utilization-focused evaluation* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Rachmawati, M., & Rahayu, E. (2020). Implementasi rehabilitasi sosial gelandangan dan pengemis melalui program bimbingan keterampilan kerja di Panti Sosial Bina Karya “Pangudi Luhur” Bekasi. *Jurnal Pembangunan Manusia*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.7454/jpm.v1i1.1003>
- Rossi, P. H., Lipsey, M. W., & Freeman, H. E. (2004). *Evaluation: A systematic approach* (7th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Roy, A. (2011). Slumdog cities: Rethinking subaltern urbanism. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 35(2), 223–238. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2427.2011.01051.x>
- Sabatier, P. A. (1986). Top-down and bottom-up approaches to implementation research: A critical analysis and suggested synthesis. *Journal of Public Policy*, 6(1), 21–48. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143814X00003846>
- Stufflebeam, D. L., & Shinkfield, A. J. (2007). *Evaluation theory, models, and applications*. Jossey-Bass.
- Suharto, E. (2014). *Membangun masyarakat memberdayakan rakyat: Kajian strategis pembangunan kesejahteraan sosial dan pekerjaan sosial* (4th ed.). Refika Aditama.

- Sumantri, I. I., Pikri, F., & Lubis, M. A. (2018). Efektivitas program rehabilitasi sosial terhadap gelandangan dan pengemis di Balai Rehabilitasi Sosial Bina Karya Cisarua. *Publica: Jurnal Pemikiran Administrasi Negara*, 10(1), 13–24. <https://doi.org/10.15575/jpan.v10i1.7622>
- United Nations. (2019). Guidelines on the use of foreign military and civil defence assets in disaster relief (Oslo Guidelines, rev. 1.1). United Nations OCHA.
- Weiss, C. H. (1998). *Evaluation: Methods for studying programs and policies* (2nd ed.). Prentice Hall.
- Wild, T. C., Newton-Taylor, B., Ogborne, A. C., Mann, R., Erickson, P., & Macdonald, S. (2006). Attitudes toward compulsory substance-user treatment: Findings from a Canadian multi-city survey of the general public, patients, counsellors, and judges. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 77(3), 253–263. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2004.08.019>
- Wulandari, E., Purwowibowo, P., & Mubarak, A. M. (2023). Program bimbingan keterampilan dalam mempertahankan keberfungsian sosial lanjut usia di UPT PSTW Banyuwangi. *E-Sospol*, 10(1), 53. <https://doi.org/10.19184/e-sospol.v10i1.37409>