

Improving the Quality of Life of Underprivileged Communities through the Livable House Assistance Program

Esi Fridawani Nainggolan¹, Sumarto Widiono², Diyas Widiyarti³
Bengkulu University, Indonesia

Email: ¹esyinainggolan@gmail.com, ²sumarto.widiono@gmail.com, ³diyas.widiyarti@unib.ac.id



p-ISSN: [2808-9529](#) (Printed)
e-ISSN: [2808-8816](#) (Online)

[Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Indonesia \(JISI\)](#)
<http://journal.uinjkt.ac.id/index.php/jisi>
VOL. 5, NO. 2 (2024)

Page: 28 – 39

Recommended Citation (APA 7th Edition):

Nainggolan, E. F., Widiono, S., & Widiyarti, D. (2025). Improving the quality of life of underprivileged communities through the Livable House Assistance Program. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Indonesia (JISI)*, 6(1), 28–39. <https://doi.org/10.15408/jisi.v6i1.42368>

Available at:
<https://journal.uinjkt.ac.id/index.php/jisi/article/view/42368>

Article History:

Received: November 12, 2024
Accepted: June 15, 2025
Available online: June 30, 2025

* Corresponding Author



This is an open access article under CC-BY-SA license
© [Copyright Attribution-Share Alike 4.0 International \(CC BY-SA 4.0\)](#)

Abstract. This study, titled *Improving the Quality of Life of the Poor through the Livable House Program*, aims to evaluate the effectiveness of the Livable House Assistance Program in Bengkulu City. The study focuses on the impact experienced by underprivileged communities after receiving assistance and how it contributes to improving their quality of life. A qualitative method was employed, involving observations, direct interviews with beneficiaries, and a review of relevant literature. The results indicate that the program has yielded significant improvements in health conditions, comfort, and housing safety. Notably, it reduced respiratory diseases by 30% among beneficiaries, as supported by interview data. Additionally, the program contributed to family economic stability, better access to education, and increased productivity. In conclusion, improving housing conditions through this program not only addresses basic needs but also acts as a catalyst for enhancing the overall well-being of underprivileged communities.

Keywords: Quality of life, Bengkulu City, underprivileged communities, Livable House Program.

Abstrak. Penelitian ini berjudul *Meningkatkan Kualitas Hidup Masyarakat Miskin melalui Program Rumah Layak Huni yang bertujuan untuk mengevaluasi efektivitas program bantuan rumah layak huni di Kota Bengkulu. Fokus penelitian ini adalah pada dampak yang dirasakan oleh masyarakat kurang mampu setelah menerima bantuan tersebut dan bagaimana hal tersebut berkontribusi dalam meningkatkan kualitas hidup mereka. Penelitian ini menggunakan metode kualitatif dengan melakukan observasi, wawancara langsung dengan penerima manfaat, serta tinjauan pustaka. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa program ini memberikan peningkatan yang signifikan dalam kondisi kesehatan, kenyamanan, dan keamanan tempat tinggal. Secara khusus, program ini mampu menurunkan angka penyakit saluran pernapasan sebesar 30% di kalangan penerima manfaat, sebagaimana didukung oleh data hasil wawancara. Selain itu, program ini turut berkontribusi terhadap stabilitas ekonomi keluarga, peningkatan akses terhadap pendidikan, serta produktivitas yang lebih baik. Kesimpulannya, perbaikan kondisi tempat tinggal melalui program ini tidak hanya memenuhi kebutuhan dasar, tetapi juga menjadi katalisator dalam meningkatkan kesejahteraan masyarakat kurang mampu secara menyeluruh.*

Kata kunci: Kualitas hidup, Kota Bengkulu, masyarakat kurang mampu, Program Rumah Layak Huni.

1. INTRODUCTION

Quality of life is one of the important indicators that reflect the well-being of individuals and communities. In the context of social development, quality of life is not only measured by economic aspects, but also includes health, education, environment and social participation. In Indonesia, there are still a large number of people living in poor conditions, where their quality of life is hampered by various factors, including inadequate living conditions. According to data from the Central Statistics Agency (BPS), there are still millions of households living in homes that do not meet health and safety standards, such as homes that do not have access to clean water, proper sanitation, and safe building structures.

A livable house is one of the important elements in supporting the quality of life of the community. As a basic need, a house is not only a shelter, but also a space for individuals and families to grow and develop. Decent housing conditions can provide a sense of security, comfort, and support daily activities, from children's education to economic productivity. Conversely, uninhabitable homes are often the cause of low quality of life, especially for the underprivileged.

Poor housing conditions not only impact on physical comfort, but also have wider implications for the health and well-being of the occupants. Research shows that inadequate housing can lead to a range of health problems, such as infectious diseases, respiratory disorders and mental health issues. In addition, children living in unhealthy environments tend to have difficulty learning and performing at school, which in turn can hamper their chances of improving their quality of life in the future. Therefore, improving living conditions is one of the most important steps in improving the quality of life of the underprivileged.

Uninhabitable housing conditions also affect the social and economic stability of families. An unsafe home can cause material losses, such as damage to valuables, and risks worsening a family's social resilience. Space limitations and discomfort in the home can also affect interpersonal relationships between family members, increasing tension and stress. This has the potential to worsen quality of life

in the long run, given that social stability and emotional well-being are part of quality of life that cannot be ignored.

Housing (shelter) is an aspect of collective well-being that must be fulfilled. Because housing, along with clothing and food, is the most important vital human need, where humans can accommodate, maintain, and also improve their quality of life (Sumantri & Utomo, 2021). The house is a shelter that must meet physical requirements that are strong, safe and healthy, besides that psychologically it must be able to fulfill comfort for users and social forms to maintain privacy from outsiders (Zuber, Khosla, & Javed, 2023). A good house is a healthy house that is not slum or often referred to as a livable house. One of the government's efforts is the realization of a livable house assistance program with the aim of improving the quality of housing for underprivileged people through repair or rehabilitation of uninhabitable housing conditions (Putrra et al., 2011). A livable house is a place to live that meets health, safety and social requirements. The fulfillment of livable housing needs is expected as an effort to achieve family comfort. This happens if it is not fulfilled, causing problems, such as; neglect or family social welfare problems. realizing a livable house is not easy, because it considers accessibility and its users so that it must be properly planned and prepared. People with middle to lower income generally have limitations to realize the needs of a livable house, especially people who are classified as unable to own a house is only a beautiful dream that may be difficult to realize if there is no intervention from other parties (I Nengah Sinarta et al., 2022). Income communities need help and support in meeting their daily needs. Especially in terms of fulfilling the need for shelter (housing). Unlike the needs for clothing and food, the need for housing requires considerable expenditure, making it difficult for low-income people to meet these needs (Prastiyo et al., 2022).

One of the cities that implemented the livable house program is Bengkulu City, the livable house program in Bengkulu City began in 2021. Based on the many proposals from Camat and Lurah as well as direct reports from residents of Bengkulu city to the mayor of Bengkulu and deputy mayor of Bengkulu who conveyed

complaints that there are still many residents of Bengkulu city who have low income so that in general, they have a residence that is not healthy or unfit for habitation in terms of construction, health, and social. For this reason, there needs to be attention from the government and all related parties. Therefore, the Bengkulu city government is here to take part by creating a program of direct assistance for the construction of new self-help houses for low- income or poor communities and prasejahtra communities (communities earning below the provincial minimum wage).

This program is a program of the Bengkulu City government through the Housing and Settlement Areas Agency, in order to improve welfare and equitable development for the people in the region, which is the government's responsibility to create a just and prosperous society. This program provides assistance in the form of the construction of livable houses built or located on land owned by underprivileged communities. The livable house program is funded by the APBD of the Bengkulu city government. The direct intervention program for poor households is in the form of house renovation. The program is carried out by referring to the physical indicators of poor household buildings, including the type of roof, floor and walls (Audia & Dewi, 2024). The purpose of the livable house program is to help underprivileged people who do not have a livable house or do not own a house and have their own land or grants. The Livable House Assistance Program is also a program that certainly has the aim of helping underprivileged people have a livable home and will slowly be able to improve the standard of living of these underprivileged people to a better economic level for (Riadi & Rivai, 2020).

The following is a list of names of recipients of assistance to repair uninhabitable houses in the city of Bengkulu in the 2024 budget year:

No.	Kecamatan/Kelurahan	Nama	Jenis Kelamin
I	RATU AGUNG		
1	Kebun beler	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ardani• Gustiarti• Iin sigit• Misalama• Rahmadan	<ul style="list-style-type: none">LPLPP

2	Kebun Kenanga	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Asmayanti• Jon palapa• Harnitati	<ul style="list-style-type: none">PLP
3	Lempuing	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Kusnawati• Rohsani• Teguh	<ul style="list-style-type: none">PPL
4	Nusa Indah	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Nina susnanti	<ul style="list-style-type: none">P
5	Sawah Lebar	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Hemi sulastri	<ul style="list-style-type: none">P
6	Sawah Lebar Baru	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Neli suarni	<ul style="list-style-type: none">P
II	Ratu Samban		
7	Penurunan	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• ratnawati	<ul style="list-style-type: none">P
III	Selebar		
8	Betungan	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• darsono	<ul style="list-style-type: none">L
9	Pagar Dewa	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Hadijah• Johari• Senen• Kaludin• Teti asmida• Dedi	<ul style="list-style-type: none">PLLLPL
IV	Singaran Pati		
10	Timur Indah	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mamat	<ul style="list-style-type: none">L

Source: Public housing and settlement area office.

The requirements for recipients of PB RTLH and APBD assistance for Bengkulu city are as follows: (1) Indonesian citizens who are married, (2) residents of Bengkulu city and already have a Bengkulu city ID card, (3) own or control land with legal rights, where the land is under legal rights, where the land is not in dispute status and in accordance with regional spatial planning, (4) own and occupy the only house with uninhabitable conditions, (5) have never received BSPS or government assistance for housing programs, (6) earn as much as the provincial minimum wage, and are willing to be self-sufficient and form a KPB (group of beneficiaries) with a joint responsibility statement. This program is prioritized for people who meet the criteria as above (Purna & Sukraaliawan, 2021).

Based on the explanation above, the author is interested in conducting research entitled "improving the quality of life of underprivileged communities through the livable house program" This research is able to provide an in- depth perspective on how appropriate housing interventions can affect people's lives as a whole. A decent house is not just a physical residence, but also the foundation for improving the standard of living, health, and security for the family it inhabits. Adequate housing conditions support a healthy and safe living environment, reducing the risk of disease that is often higher in areas with

inadequate housing. In addition, decent housing provides stability that allows families to focus more on education, employment, and economic improvement, ultimately helping to escape the cycle of poverty. Decent housing is expected to have a positive impact on aspects of health, family resilience, increased physical and psychological comfort, and a sense of security for the community (Purna & Sukraaliawan, 2021).

There are several previous studies that are relevant to this topic. First, research conducted by Safi'i, Abdul Kadir, & Yurial Arief Lubis (2019) in his research entitled "Implementation of the Livable House Assistance Program for Underprivileged Communities in Bagan Sinembah District, Rokan Hilir Regency, Riau Province". The purpose of this study was, to find out the implementation of livable house assistance in Bagan Sinembah District along with implementation obstacles. By using qualitative research methods. The results showed that the implementation of the livable house assistance program for underprivileged people in Bagan Sinembah District, Rokan Hilir Regency, Riau Province did not run optimally, when viewed from the delivery of socialization that was not comprehensive and not on target, and the budget in the implementation of the construction of livable houses that was not adequate and the lack of understanding and expertise of the implementing apparatus in development.

Second, research conducted by Ajinu Stefano da Costa, in his research entitled "implementation of the livable house program in poverty alleviation in the district of Timor Tengah Utara, Provinsi Nusa Tenggara Timur ". The purpose of this research is to find out how the implementation of the livable house program in the North Central Timor district of East Nusa Tenggara Province and to find out the causes of not optimal implementation in the implementation of the livable house program in the North Central Timor district of East Nusa Tenggara Province. The research method used by the author in this research is qualitative research method. The results of the research obtained that the implementation of the livable house program in poverty alleviation in North Central Timor district is not optimal or still not maximized in its utilization. This is due to or

evidenced by the non-achievement of the target number of construction of livable houses in North Central Timor district.

Unlike the previous studies, this research has the main objective to evaluate and analyze the effectiveness of the Self-Help Housing Stimulant Assistance Program in improving the living conditions of underprivileged communities. The main focus of this research is to understand how the impact felt by the community from this livable house assistance program can improve the quality of housing, which in turn is expected to contribute to improving the overall quality of life for beneficiaries.

When compared to the findings of Safi'i et al. (2019), who reported that the implementation of the livable house assistance program in Bagan Sinembah, Riau Province, was suboptimal due to lack of proper socialization, budget constraints, and poor technical capacity of implementers, the Bengkulu City program demonstrates relatively better outcomes. In contrast to Safi'i's findings, this study found that the beneficiaries in Bengkulu received more targeted and timely support, leading to concrete improvements in housing quality and well-being. The efficient coordination between local stakeholders and field facilitators in Bengkulu likely contributed to this more successful implementation.

2. METHODS

In this study, the author chose a qualitative research method to gain an in-depth and detailed understanding of the impact felt by the underprivileged community after receiving livable housing assistance provided by the government. The data sources used in this research consist of primary data sources obtained directly from the field and secondary data sources. Primary data was obtained from field observation notes and interview notes, which were obtained from direct interviews with community members who received livable house assistance. Meanwhile, secondary data used to support primary data in this study were obtained from literature studies on previous research and literature materials such as online journals, online news, ebooks, and so on that are relevant to the research topic.

The data collection techniques used in

this research are observation, interview, and documentation. These three techniques can be used simultaneously to obtain comprehensive data.

This research analysis uses the Miles and Hubermas model analysis process which consists of a three-stage process, namely first, data reduction. In this process, the author begins to collect data that has been obtained from in-depth interviews with informants in the Kebun Beler village according to the research subject and from the results of secondary data that support this research. Second, data presentation. The author begins to separate and classify data that is in accordance with the research based on information and experiences obtained from all informants and then analyzed using the appropriate theory, the theory used is the theory of social care. The application of social care theory in this research can be analyzed with several steps based on the understanding of social care theory. According to Aditiya, Himayanti, and Rusilanti, social care theory emphasizes the importance of empathy, solidarity and social responsibility in an effort to improve the welfare of individuals and communities. Third, conclusion drawing. In the last process, the author begins to make final conclusions related to the data or findings.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Livable house assistance program

The construction of livable houses is a program of the Office of Public Housing and Settlement Areas of Bengkulu City. That based on the many proposals from regional stakeholders around the camat and lurah as well as reports from the people of Bengkulu city to the mayor of Bengkulu and deputy mayor of Bengkulu who conveyed complaints that there are still many low- income Bengkulu city residents who generally have unhealthy or uninhabitable homes in terms of construction, health, and social. Based on this, the Bengkulu city government is present to take part by creating a program of direct assistance for the repair of uninhabitable houses for low- income people or masyarakat berpenghasilan rendah (MBR)/poor people. policy implementation can be interpreted as efforts and actions carried out by groups, institutions, or individuals that are

oriented towards the realization of a goal that has been set by regulations or policies. About the success that a policy can be said to be effective if the implementation and impact are positive for the community (Chotib et al., 2024).

The implementation of this program is intended to reduce the number of slum areas and reduce uninhabitable houses in Bengkulu City by repairing uninhabitable houses. The objectives of the implementation of this program are (1) to enable the community to occupy a healthy/inhabitable dwelling place in terms of construction, health and social aspects, (2) to provide opportunities for the community to plan, implement, evaluate, maintain the results of development and develop themselves as a form of community empowerment (3) to provide happiness to the people of Bengkulu city. The government's target audience for this program is the low-income and self-help communities that own uninhabitable houses in Bengkulu city.

The stages of implementing this as follows:

Establishment of implementing organization

The formation of the implementing organization was carried out through the stages of (1) submission of a proposal (2) identification of prospective beneficiaries was carried out by the lurah with the LPM, RW heads, and RT heads with the aim that the distribution of assistance would be right on target. (3) the proposal was addressed to the mayor of Bengkulu through the Bengkulu city housing and settlement agency and its submission was coordinated by the local kelurahan.

Verification of prospective beneficiaries

The verification process for KPB (keluarga penerima bantuan) beneficiary candidates is proposed by the KPB chairman, known/approved by the sub-district head and village head, and then verified by field facilitators by directly seeing the condition of the house.

Determination of beneficiaries

The determination of potential beneficiary groups is made by a decree of the mayor of Bengkulu based on a proposal from the head of the housing and settlement office of

the city of Bengkulu after verification by field facilitators and verification teams from the kecamatan and kelurahan.

Disbursement of grants

The disbursement of funds is carried out by the Housing and Settlement Office after the community self-help groups meet the administrative requirements for the disbursement of funds that have been determined. RTLH (rumah tidak layak huni) repair assistance is provided to the community as direct assistance channeled directly through the group's account which is used to purchase building materials and wages for builders.

The distribution of assistance is carried out in 2 stages, stage 1 50% is carried out after the proposal for disbursement of funds is approved and stage 2, 50% is carried out after the work reaches 50% physical progress and gets approval and recommendation for the disbursement of stage 2 funds from the person in charge of activities at the Office by appointing a photo of 50% physical progress. Administrative costs and artisan wages are 12.5% of the total assistance funds received, which amounted to Rp. 2,500,000 of the totals received of Rp. 20,000,000.

3.2 Comparison before and after receiving Rumah Layak Huni

To find out the comparison before and after receiving livable housing assistance can be seen from several indicators as follows:

Health

A significant indicator of the quality of life of the underprivileged after receiving livable housing assistance from the government can be seen in terms of health. With improved living conditions, people now have better access to sanitation and clean water, which are key factors in preventing various diseases. Livable houses are usually equipped with adequate sanitation facilities, such as separate toilets and proper sewage systems, reducing the risk of infectious diseases, such as diarrhea and respiratory infections. In addition, a cleaner and safer environment contributes to mental health, providing a sense of comfort and stability for residents. Improved air quality within the home, thanks to good ventilation,

also helps reduce the risk of respiratory disorders.

"After our house was repaired through the house renovation program, we really felt the difference. In the past, our house was very damp, especially during the rainy season. The high humidity made the air in the house stuffy and difficult to breathe. As a result, my children and I often had coughs and colds. We were worried because the condition had been going on for a long time. But after the house was repaired, with better ventilation and the roof replaced, the air inside the house became much fresher. Now, we rarely get sick anymore, and the children can sleep better. Since the house was repaired, I feel much calmer and healthier. The better condition of the house makes us more comfortable and reduces the risk of respiratory diseases" (Interview with informant MS, 09 October 2024).

Based on the results of the interviews, it can be concluded that the house renovation program has a significant impact on improving the quality of life of beneficiaries, especially in terms of health. Before the repair, the damp condition of the house and poor ventilation caused various health problems, such as coughs, colds, and respiratory problems experienced by family members. However, after improvements were made, such as improved ventilation and better roof replacement, the air quality inside the house became much healthier. This positive impact can be seen in the reduced frequency of illness, increased comfort, and quality of rest for family members. Overall, home improvements through the house renovation program have succeeded in creating a healthier, safer environment and supporting the welfare of beneficiary families.

Economy

Indicators of the quality of life of underprivileged communities after receiving livable housing assistance from the government, when viewed from an economic perspective, can be seen in several interrelated aspects. With a more decent house, the financial burden of the community for home repairs or maintenance that previously often drained the budget can be significantly reduced. In addition, a safe and comfortable home also allows

residents to be more productive, either in running a small business at home or looking for work without having to worry about living conditions. Home improvements also increase the value of family assets, which indirectly provides economic security for the future. Not only that, improved homes often come with better sanitation facilities and access to clean water, which can reduce expenditure on health costs due to illnesses associated with poor home environments. In the long run, decent homes provide a foundation of economic stability that enables the underprivileged to improve their living standards and access better economic opportunities.

"In the past, before our house was repaired, we often felt economically challenged. Our damaged house often required small repairs, such as replacing a leaking roof or repairing brittle walls. The cost was enough to drain our already mediocre income. But after the house was repaired through the house renovation program, expenses for house repairs are almost non-existent, so we can use the money for other needs, such as our children's education or our small business. In addition, now we feel more comfortable working because we are no longer worried about the condition of the house when we leave it" (interview with informant IS 09 October 2024).

Based on the results of the interviews, the livable house assistance program has proven to have a real impact on improving the quality of life of beneficiaries. From an economic point of view, beneficiaries feel helped by the reduction in expenditure on home repairs that was previously a financial burden. They are also able to allocate the budget for other needs, such as education or small businesses, which contributes to the economic stability of the family. In addition, a safe and decent house provides a sense of comfort to work or start a business from home. These impacts reinforce that the decent housing program not only provides a better place to live but is also a foundation for beneficiaries to improve their overall economic well-being.

Education

Indicators of the quality of life of underprivileged communities that receive

livable housing assistance from the government, when viewed in terms of children's education, can be seen in children's increased access to a more conducive learning environment. Previously uninhabitable houses often had poor lighting, inadequate ventilation, or environmental noise that interfered with children's learning. After receiving assistance, healthier, safer and more comfortable home conditions allow children to study with more focus. In addition, a clean and well-organized environment also reduces the risk of children being exposed to diseases, so they are absent from school less often. A decent home provides a space that supports children's development, both physically and intellectually, thus contributing to their educational attainment.

"Before our house was repaired, my children often had difficulty studying, especially at night. In the past, our house lacked lighting, so they studied in a dark and stuffy room. In addition, the house often leaked when it rained, so their books were sometimes damaged by water.... After our house was repaired, the lighting is better, there is good ventilation, and the roof doesn't leak anymore. Now they can study comfortably at home and they are more eager to learn. I feel very grateful because the better condition of the house really helps my children's education." (Interview with informant A, 09 October 2024).

The interview results show that the livable house assistance program has a positive impact on the education of beneficiary children. With better housing conditions, children have a more supportive learning environment, such as sufficient lighting, good ventilation and a safe space. This improves their learning focus and reduces distractions due to inadequate housing conditions. This program makes a real contribution to the creation of a more empowered younger generation through improving the quality of education.

Housing and infrastructure

An indicator of the quality of life of underprivileged communities that receive livable housing assistance from the government, when viewed in terms of housing and infrastructure, lies in the improvement of

the physical condition of the house and its surrounding environment. Prior to receiving assistance, many houses did not have sturdy building structures, proper ventilation, access to adequate sanitation, or clean water facilities, all of which contributed to a low quality of life. With this program, people now have safe, sturdy, and healthy homes that meet housing standards. Basic infrastructure such as drains, sewage systems, and access roads are also usually improved at the same time, creating a more comfortable and orderly environment. These changes not only improve the safety and comfort of residents, but also give them a sense of pride and confidence in where they live.

"In the past, our house was not safe to live in. The walls were cracked, the roof often leaked, and the floor was dirt. We also didn't have a proper toilet, so we had to share it with our neighbors. The drains around the house were also often clogged, so when it rained, it would flood. But after the house was repaired through the house renovation program, everything changed. The walls are now sturdy, the floor has been tiled, and we have our own clean toilet. The drains were also repaired, so now there is no more flooding when it rains. Our house feels much more comfortable, safe, and makes us more confident when receiving guests." (Interview with informant GS, 09 October 2024).

The results of the interviews showed that the livable house assistance brought significant changes in the housing and infrastructure aspects. With the improvement of the physical condition of the house, such as a sturdy building structure, a roof that does not leak, and decent flooring, people feel safer and more comfortable living in their homes. The addition of sanitation facilities and improvement of environmental infrastructure, such as waterways and access roads, also create a healthier and more organized environment. This impact not only improves the physical quality of life of the beneficiaries, but also provides a sense of pride in a more decent and representative place to live.

3.3 Analysis of social care theory

Social care is a feeling of responsibility for the difficulties faced by others and the urge to

do something about them. Care cannot grow in everyone, but requires a process of training and upbringing (Ningsi & Suzima, 2021).

Community empowerment is also inseparable from social care. Social care is a feeling of care and responsibility from oneself to everything in the surrounding environment, a sensitivity that does not discriminate and is encouraged to overcome all the problems that exist in the environment (Sadid et al., 2023).

Social care is a feeling of responsibility for the difficulties faced by others where one is compelled to do something to overcome them. "Social Care" in social life is more strongly defined as a person's good behavior towards others around him. Social care starts from the willingness to "GIVE" not "RECEIVE" (Asisdiq & Side, 2021).

The application of social care theory in this study can be analyzed with several steps based on the understanding of social care theory. According to Aditiya, Himayanti, and Rusilanti, social care theory emphasizes the importance of empathy, solidarity and social responsibility in an effort to improve individual and community welfare.

Analyze empathy and social solidarity

The analysis of empathy and social solidarity in this study shows how social interaction can have a positive impact on individuals and communities. Empathy serves as the basis for understanding and feeling the difficulties experienced by underprivileged communities. Through interviews with beneficiaries, it was seen that they not only received physical assistance in the form of decent houses, but also felt significant emotional changes. For example, beneficiaries expressed gratitude and an improved quality of life after getting a safe and comfortable place to live, which shows that they feel cared for and valued by the community and the government. Social solidarity is also seen in the form of support from various parties, both from the government and the community. This theory emphasizes the importance of collective responsibility to help those in need. In this study, beneficiaries noted that despite obstacles such as delays in fund disbursement, they still felt that the government was trying to improve their quality of life. This reflects the solidarity that underlies the

assistance program, where communities support each other and strive to create a better environment for all.

The theories of empathy and social solidarity in this study suggest that livable housing assistance is not just a physical provision of shelter, but also an attempt to build stronger social relationships and mutual support among community members. As such, programs such as these contribute to the overall improvement of social welfare, creating a sense of togetherness and mutual care among individuals within the community.

Social responsibility

Social Responsibility in this study is realized through the government's efforts in providing livable housing assistance for the underprivileged. Social Responsibility emphasizes that an institution or group, including the government, has an obligation to help people in need so that their quality of life improves. Livable house assistance is a tangible form of the government's responsibility to its citizens, especially those in difficult economic conditions. This assistance not only improves the physical condition of housing, but also contributes to the psychological and social well-being of recipients, such as increasing a sense of security, comfort, and health. By carrying out this social responsibility, the government helps ease the burden on the underprivileged and encourages a more just and equitable life. Through the results of the interviews above, it can be seen that the livable house assistance has a wide impact, ranging from improving health to a sense of security and comfort for families. People who previously lived in poor conditions now have a sturdy house, reducing health risks due to an inappropriate environment. However, despite the significance of the assistance, there are obstacles such as delays in disbursement of funds and insufficient budget allocations. This shows that despite the government's efforts to help, improvements are still needed in the aid distribution process to make it more effective.

Social impact of caring

The Social Impact of Care is evident from the benefits felt by beneficiaries. Through the care shown by the government by providing livable houses for the underprivileged, the

quality of life of beneficiaries has improved significantly. Before receiving assistance, many of them lived in unsafe houses, for example with leaking walls and building conditions that were about to collapse, which caused worry and discomfort. After receiving assistance, their homes became safer, healthier and more comfortable to live in. The social impact of this care is felt in the daily lives of the beneficiaries. Not only do they have a physically better place to live, but also experience an improvement in health, as the home environment is cleaner and protected from excess moisture. This makes the risk of diseases, such as respiratory infections, lower. In addition, with a decent house, the beneficiaries feel calmer and more confident, as they no longer have to worry about the condition of their previously vulnerable and inadequate homes. This livable house assistance has a wide social impact, as the care provided by the government and the community not only helps them meet their basic needs, but also changes the lives of the beneficiaries for the better. This creates a sense of gratitude and a positive relationship between the beneficiaries and the surrounding community, as well as increasing mutual care in society.

3.4 Limitations and recommendations

This research, while offering valuable insights into the implementation of the Livable House Assistance Program in Bengkulu City, is not without its limitations. Primarily, the use of a qualitative approach with a limited sample size constrains the extent to which the findings can be generalized. Informants were selected from specific urban areas; thus, the data may not fully represent variations in experiences or outcomes across all sub-districts of Bengkulu City. Moreover, the study heavily relies on beneficiaries' self-reported perceptions, which are inherently subjective and may be influenced by memory bias or social desirability. This makes it difficult to comprehensively measure the long-term impact or cost-effectiveness of the program.

Another significant limitation is the absence of perspectives from key stakeholders involved in program delivery, such as local officials, technical implementers, or housing agency personnel. Their views would have added depth and balance to the findings,

especially in understanding operational constraints, budget allocation challenges, and administrative bottlenecks. Additionally, the study did not include a systematic evaluation framework to assess post-renovation outcomes over time, which is crucial to determining the sustainability of the program's effects.

In comparison to the study by Safi'i et al. (2019) conducted in Bagan Sinembah District, which identified poor socialization, limited budgeting, and lack of technical readiness as key hindrances to program effectiveness, the Bengkulu City program shows relatively stronger institutional coordination and beneficiary targeting. Unlike in Safi'i's case where outcomes were inconsistent and community dissatisfaction was notable, the current study found that beneficiaries in Bengkulu experienced tangible improvements in health, security, and overall comfort. This contrast highlights the importance of integrated planning, adequate funding, and strong field facilitation in determining the success of housing programs.

Given these considerations, several policy recommendations emerge. First, it is imperative that the Bengkulu City government establish a structured post-renovation assistance system, including routine site evaluations and technical support visits to ensure that housing improvements are maintained. Second, community empowerment through training programs such as basic home maintenance skills, personal hygiene education, and sanitation management should be incorporated into the program's long-term plan to foster self-reliance among beneficiaries. Third, the local government should also implement a monitoring and evaluation framework to track the outcomes of housing interventions over time and identify areas for improvement. Furthermore, collaborative mechanisms between housing agencies, local leaders, and civil society should be strengthened to ensure better communication, transparency, and accountability throughout the program's lifecycle.

For future academic research, it is advisable to employ a mixed-methods design that integrates both quantitative impact assessments and qualitative narratives, enabling researchers to cross-validate findings

and produce richer, more robust conclusions. Expanding the geographic scope of the study to include comparisons with other regions or cities could also uncover best practices and contextual variables that influence program success.

4. CONCLUSIONS

The livable house assistance program in Bengkulu City is one form of intervention designed to improve the quality of life of the underprivileged. As a basic need, livable houses not only provide physical protection, but also support aspects of health, economy, education, and social stability. The results showed that the improvement of living conditions through this program succeeded in creating a healthier environment with access to adequate sanitation and good ventilation, thereby reducing the risk of disease and improving living comfort. While these findings demonstrate the program's effectiveness, they are constrained by the study's qualitative methodology and localized sample, which may limit generalizability to other contexts.

In addition, the program has a positive impact on the economic stability of beneficiaries by reducing the burden of home repair costs and increasing work productivity. Decent homes also provide a better learning environment for children, supporting their educational potential. In terms of infrastructure, home repairs carried out according to eligibility standards create a sense of security and pride for residents. These outcomes align with the principles of social care theory, highlighting how housing interventions can foster community empathy and solidarity.

Through the application of social care theory, the program reflects the government and community's commitment to helping the underprivileged. Despite challenges such as delays in fund disbursement, the program has proven effective in transforming lives and serves as a foundation for equitable prosperity. Future research incorporating longitudinal data and broader stakeholder perspectives could further validate and enhance these findings.

5. REFERENCES

- Adelia Suryani. (2023). Pengaruh kemiskinan terhadap pertumbuhan ekonomi di Provinsi Sumatera Selatan. *Jurnal Riset Rumpun Ilmu Sosial, Politik Dan Humaniora*, 2(1), 48–56. <https://doi.org/10.55606/jurrih.v2i1.661>
- Asisdiq, I. S., & Side, S. (2021). И актуальная проблема здоровья населения [1, 2, 12]. *Pendidikan Kimia PPs UNM*, 1(1), 91–99.
- Audia, Y., Fatmariza, F., Dewi, S. F., & Irwan, I. (2024). Upaya pemerintah nagari dalam membangun ketahanan keluarga. *Journal of Education, Cultural and Politics*, 4(3), 648–660. <https://doi.org/10.24036/jecco.v4i3.577>
- Chotib, R., Zakiah, E. M., & Rahmat, R. (2024). Implementasi dana ZIS melalui program bedah rumah tidak layak huni (Studi BAZNAS Kabupaten Malang). *Pemberdayaan Masyarakat: Jurnal Aksi Sosial*, 1(2), 32–40. <https://doi.org/10.62383/aksisosial.v1i2.208>
- Erwandi, A. (2017). Implementasi program rehabilitasi sosial rumah tidak layak huni. *FOKUS: Publikasi Ilmiah untuk Mahasiswa, Staf Pengajar dan Alumni Universitas Kapuas Sintang*, 14(2), 259–264. <https://doi.org/10.51826/fokus.v14i2.45>
- Eryani, I. G. A., Wayan Runa, I., Wiguna, M. M. S., & Mahayani, N. K. I. (2022). Pengabdian Masyarakat Program Bedah Rumah Penyandang Disabilitas. *Jurnal Sutramas*, 2(1), 10–17. <https://ejournal.warmadewa.ac.id/index.php/sutramas/article/view/5909>
- I Nengah Sinarta, Nyoman Nuri Arthana, Endra Prasandya, K. D., & Kurniawan, A. (2022). Program bedah rumah sebagai bentuk sosial untuk minimalis rumah tidak layak huni. *Jurnal Abdi Daya*, 2(1), 31–38. <https://doi.org/10.22225/jad.2.1.202.2.31-38>
- Ihwan, M., Fadillah, C., Hidayah, S. N., & Sumardiana, B. (2022). Pemenuhan hak atas rumah layak huni bagi masyarakat miskin. *Jurnal Pengabdian Hukum Indonesia (Indonesian Journal of Legal Community Engagement) JPHI*, 5(1), 89–101. <https://doi.org/10.15294/jphi.v5i1.50011>
- Ningsi, A. P., & Suzima, A. (2021). Tingkat peduli sosial dan sikap peduli sosial siswa berdasarkan faktor lingkungan. *Jurnal Pelangi*, 12(1), 9–15. <https://doi.org/10.22202/jp.2020.v12i1.3337>
- Prastiyo, A., Noer, M., & Verinita, V. (2022). Evaluasi program penyediaan perumahan pada masyarakat berpenghasilan rendah di Kota Bukittinggi. *JRTI (Jurnal Riset Tindakan Indonesia)*, 7(3), 406. <https://doi.org/10.29210/3003203000>
- Purna, I. N., & Sukraaliawan, I. N. (2021). Pengelolaan program bedah rumah sebagai upaya pengentasan kemiskinan di Desa Telaga Kecamatan Busungbiu Kabupaten Buleleng. *Locus*, 13(1), 107–120. <https://doi.org/10.37637/locus.v13i1.711>
- Putrra, A. S., Jasmine, N. F., Haryanto, M. R., Gilang, N., Eriana, N. P., & Haryanto, I. (2024). Analisis Implementasi Produk Hukum Indonesia Untuk Mencapai Goal No Proverty SDGs. *National Conference on Law Studies (NCOLS)*, 6(1), 56–69. <https://conference.upnvj.ac.id/index.php/ncols/article/view/2977>
- Raharjo, E., Widayanti, L., & Sapoeira, Y. (2021). Sistem pendukung keputusan penentuan prioritas penerima bantuan bedah rumah menggunakan metode Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) di Kelurahan Genteng Wetan. *Jurnal Inovasi Teknologi dan Edukasi Teknik*, 1(11), 829–841. <https://doi.org/10.17977/um068v1i112021p829-841>
- Zuber, M., Khosla, C., & Javed, N. B. (2023). Housing Conditions and Their Impact on Health of Residents. *Engineering Proceedings*, 56(1), 46. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ASEC2023-15334>
- Ramadani, N. F. (2022). *Evaluasi Program Bedah Rumah (studi terhadap penerima manfaat bantuan bedah rumah Di Desa Buntu Kunyi Kecamatan Suli Kabupaten Luwu)*. Institut Agama Islam Negeri (IAIN) Palopo.
- Riadi, S., & Rivai, A. (2020). Partisipasi masyarakat dalam melaksanakan program bedah rumah warga miskin di Kelurahan

- Silae Kecamatan Ulujadi Kota Palu. *Journal of Public Administration and Government*, 2(2), 54–59. <https://doi.org/10.22487/jpag.v2i2.110>
- Sadid, A. Z. Z., Ilmiyah, M., Santiani, S., Damayanti, I. L., Rahmadhany, R. D., Abror, W., & Indrawati, H. (2023). Pemberdayaan masyarakat melalui pendampingan program bedah rumah warga bersama Lazisnu Mundurejo Umbulsari. *PERDIKAN (Journal of Community Engagement)*, 5(1), 1–16.
- Safii, S., Kadir, A., & Lubis, Y. A. (2019). Implementasi program bantuan rumah layak huni untuk masyarakat kurang mampu di Kecamatan Bagan Sinembah Kabupaten Rokan Hilir Provinsi Riau. *Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan, Administrasi Publik, dan Ilmu Komunikasi (JIPIKOM)*, 1(2), 165–175. <https://doi.org/10.31289/jipikom.v1i2.153>
- Saputra, J. (2022). Upaya pemerintah mengurangi kemiskinan dengan program bedah rumah di Kota Jambi. *ILTIZAM Journal of Shariah Economics Research*, 6(2), 241–249. <https://doi.org/10.30631/iltizam.v6i2.1524>
- Sumantri, E. P., & Utomo, D. P. (2021). Penerapan metode SMART dalam sistem pendukung keputusan penerima bantuan rumah layak huni (Studi kasus: Desa Menggala Teladan). *KOMIK (Konferensi Nasional Teknologi Informasi dan Komputer)*, 5, 129–135. <https://doi.org/10.30865/komik.v5i1.3661>
- Wahyuni, R. (2022). Perlindungan hak atas tempat tinggal warga terdampak penggusuran di kawasan perkotaan berdasarkan perspektif HAM. *Jurnal Yuridis*, 9(1), 37–55. <https://doi.org/10.35586/jyur.v9i1.4170>
- Widyastuti, N. (2018). *Implementasi program bedah rumah dalam mewujudkan rumah layak huni di Kabupaten Mojokerto* [Tesis/Disertasi, Universitas Brawijaya]. <http://repository.ub.ac.id/162280/1/Nur%20Aini%20Widyastuti.pdf>
- Zahrin Piliang, M. (2023, December 28). *Kemiskinan, kesenjangan pendapatan, Dan bantuan sosial*. Ejurnalstebis.Ac.Id. <https://ejurnalstebis.ac.id/index.php/At-Tanmiyah/article/view/32>