Journal of Governance and Local Politics (JGLP)
Vol. 8, No. 2, November 2026, pp. 338-348
Received Sep 28, 2026 Revised Oct 23, 2026 Accepted Oct 26, 2026

Institutional Capacity as an Enabling Condition for Integrative Governance in Extreme Poverty Alleviation at Jeneponto Regency

Widyawati[1*], Herlina Sakawati[2]
[1]Universitas Sembilanbelas November Kolaka, Jl. Pemuda No. 339, Kolaka
[2]Universitas Negeri Makassar, Sulawesi Selatan, Jl. Andi Pangerang Pettarani, Makassar
Corresponding Author: wiwidyawati150305@gmail.com

Keyword:
Institutional Capacity; Integrative Governance; Extreme Poverty; Cross-sectoral Governance

Abstract: Extreme poverty alleviation is a cross-sectoral issue that requires linking institutional capacities across various levels of governance. However, studies on institutional capacity still tend to treat capacity as a fixed level, so the relationship between capacities and their implications for the integrative governance process remains poorly explained. This study aims to analyze the interconnections of institutional capacities at the individual, organizational, inter-organizational, and public governance levels, and to examine how these connections enable or constrain the operationalization of integrative governance in extreme poverty alleviation efforts in Jeneponto Regency. A qualitative case study design was employed, utilizing data gathered through document analysis, semi-structured interviews, and secondary sources. The analysis involved coding capacities across different levels, identifying interdependencies and fragmentation among them, and interpreting findings through the lenses of responsive networks, integrative collaboration, and facilitative coordination. The results indicate that while capacities have been established at various governance levels, they lack consistent interconnection. Individual relational capacities have not been fully institutionalized at the organizational level; some activities implemented in 2024 did not fully align with the annual action plan; and agencies used different beneficiary databases (P3KE, DTKS, and Dapodik). These disconnects constrain network responsiveness, the institutionalization of collaboration, and the coordination function, which should serve as a process for deliberation, evaluation, learning, and adjustment of action. The study demonstrates that the operationalization of integrative governance is capacity-bound; it depends not merely on the existence of institutional capacities, but crucially on the ability to link capacities across levels and functions to create a capacity for collective action.

INTRODUCTION

Extreme poverty remains one of the most pressing global development challenges. It is estimated that over 435 million people could be living in extreme poverty by 2030 (Roser, 2023; World Bank, 2025), indicating that efforts to eradicate extreme poverty continue to face significant hurdles. These challenges are further compounded by the aftermath of COVID-19, geopolitical conflicts, and climate change, all of which heighten the vulnerability of populations living in extreme poverty (HelpAge International, 2020; Singh et al., 2025; Tian, 2025). In this context, economic constraints often coincide with limited access to necessities, social protection, decent work, education, healthcare, and adequate housing. Such conditions render extreme poverty a multidimensional and cross-sectoral "wicked problem," making the quality of governance and institutional capacity critical factors in implementing policies aimed at its eradication (Jacquet et al., 2020; Spicker, 2016).

In developing countries, the challenge of eradicating extreme poverty extends beyond policy formulation to the governance system's ability to translate policies into coordinated action. Previous research has examined poverty alleviation through policy implementation and program reforms (Cai & Tang, 2023; Nugroho et al., 2021), fiscal and resource constraints (Bolch et al., 2022; Siburian, 2022), and inter-organizational deliberation (Jacquet et al., 2020). However, how capacities distributed across individual, organizational, inter-organizational, and public

governance levels become connected to sustain cross-sectoral action in extreme poverty alleviation remains insufficiently explained.

The agenda to eradicate extreme poverty in Indonesia positions local governments as key players in implementing national policy. This process encompasses not only social protection programs but also development planning, budgeting, target setting, economic empowerment, and inter-organizational coordination. The involvement of such diverse functions and organizations demonstrates that eradicating extreme poverty at the local level is cross-sectoral, requiring a more complex implementation process than that of single-sector policies. In this context, the interplay between the national policy mandate and its implementation at the local level warrants critical examination, particularly to understand how local governments manage the engagement of diverse actors and functions in efforts to alleviate extreme poverty.

Jeneponto Regency offers a relevant empirical context for examining the challenges of implementing extreme poverty eradication at the local level. Although the government established a policy to accelerate the alleviation of extreme poverty in 2022, formalized in Presidential Instruction No. 4/2022, the Jeneponto Regency Government did not incorporate this policy into its regional development planning documents until 2024. Annual poverty alleviation action plans were unavailable in 2022 and 2023, while some activities implemented in 2024 did not fully align with the annual plan and agencies used different target databases. This phenomenon demonstrates that implementation challenges at the local level cannot be adequately explained solely by the presence or absence of a policy; rather, they must be analyzed through the lens of the institutional capacity that underpins the relationships among functions and actors during implementation.

The institutional capacity perspective provides a basis for explaining the challenge of eradicating extreme poverty, as capacity encompasses not only rules, structures, or resources but also the ability of actors and organizations to perform functions and sustain cross-organizational working relationships. The gap between formal institutional forms and functional capabilities has been elucidated through the concept of capability traps, a condition in which improvements in problem-solving capabilities do not accompany the adoption of institutional forms (Andrews et al., 2017). However, many studies on capacity still tend to treat individual or organizational capabilities as relatively isolated units of analysis. In the context of extreme poverty eradication, the core issue lies in how capacities at the individual, organizational, inter-organizational, and public-governance levels interact to shape cross-sectoral action capabilities.

The interlinkages among these capacities align with the Integrative Governance framework (Stout & Love, 2019), which positions responsive networks, integrative collaboration, and facilitative coordination as key processes for managing interdependence in complex public issues. These three processes require not only relationships among actors but also capacities that enable information exchange, role sharing, decision implementation, and the maintenance of collective action. However, the Integrative Governance literature has not sufficiently explained how these integrative processes operate when institutional capacities are dispersed across multiple governance levels and not fully interconnected. This gap provides the basis for examining how the interrelationships among capacities shape the operational possibilities and limits of networks, collaboration, and coordination in the effort to alleviate extreme poverty.

Based on the issues raised, this study aims to analyze the interrelationships among institutional capacities at the individual, organizational, inter-organizational, and public governance levels in relation to alleviating extreme poverty in Jeneponto Regency and to examine how these relationships influence the operationalization of the integrative governance approach in this context. The study extends the operational interpretation of Integrative Governance by specifying how cross-level capacity linkages enable or constrain responsive networks, integrative collaboration, and facilitative coordination in sustaining collective action.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study employs a qualitative case study design to analyze the governance dynamics of extreme poverty alleviation in depth and in context. This approach was chosen because it

allows exploration of interactions among actors, cross-sector coordination mechanisms, and institutional capacity across various levels of governance that cannot be understood solely through quantitative measures (Creswell, 2019; Creswell & Poth, 2018). Jeneponto Regency was chosen as a critical case because it illustrates a distinct gap between the national mandate to eradicate extreme poverty and the local government's ability to translate that mandate into policy, planning, coordination, and program implementation. High levels of extreme poverty and the delayed institutionalization of the national agenda at the local level make Jeneponto a relevant setting for examining how institutional capacity influences the operationalization of Integrative Governance within a local government context.

Research data were obtained through document analysis, semi-structured interviews, and secondary data. The documents analyzed included the 2018–2023 Regional Medium-Term Development Plan, the 2024–2026 Regional Development Plan, the 2024 Regional Poverty Alleviation Annual Action Plan, Presidential Instruction No. 4 of 2022, Decree of the Coordinating Minister for Human Development and Culture No. 32 of 2022, Jeneponto Regency Regional Regulation No. 16 of 2018 concerning Poverty Alleviation, Minister of Home Affairs Regulation No. 90 of 2019, the decree establishing the Regional Poverty Alleviation Coordination Team, and regional policies regarding the determination of extreme poverty target data. Document analysis was used to examine the relationships between national mandates, regional policies, planning, the division of responsibilities, and program implementation. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with officials from the Regional Development Planning Agency (Bappeda), members of the Regional Poverty Alleviation Coordination Team, and regional apparatus organizations involved in extreme poverty alleviation to explore experiences regarding coordination, role allocation, data usage, program implementation, monitoring, evaluation, and inter-organizational working relationships. Secondary data comprising P3KE (Acceleration of Extreme Poverty Eradication) data, regional poverty statistics, sectoral information, and budget tagging were used to support the analysis of program targets, information management, and the link between budget allocation and program implementation.

Data analysis was conducted in stages through coding and qualitative interpretation. The first stage focused on identifying institutional capacity at the individual, organizational, interorganizational, and public-governance levels. Coding was applied to evidence on actors' ability to bridge organizations, the capacity of formal structures to perform coordination functions, cross-organizational working mechanisms, and the ability of local governments to translate national mandates into policy and implementation. A capacity framework served as the initial analytical category, yet the coding process remained open to empirical patterns emerging from documents and interviews.

The second stage analyzes the relationships between capacities to identify forms of interdependence and institutional fragmentation. The analysis focuses on the linkages among policy, organizational, informational, budgetary, monitoring, and evaluation capacities. Particular attention is paid to situations where capacity at one level is not supported by capacity at other levels, for example when individual capabilities have not been institutionalized at the organizational level, coordination structures have not resulted in joint action between organizations, or data and budgets have not been linked to evaluation and decision-making mechanisms. This stage explains how the presence or absence of linkages among capacities affects actors' and organizations' ability to sustain cross-sectoral action.

The third stage interprets the findings through the Integrative Governance framework. The analysis focuses on three processes: responsive networks, integrative collaboration, and facilitative coordination. Responsive networks are analyzed based on the capacity for information exchange, feedback, and cross-organizational action adjustment; integrative collaboration is examined through the capacity to institutionalize the sharing of roles, resources, and joint responsibilities; and facilitative coordination is assessed via the capacity of coordination forums to perform functions of deliberation, evaluation, learning, and action adjustment. An iterative analysis is conducted, bridging empirical evidence and the theoretical framework, to evaluate how institutional capacity enables or constrains the operationalization of these three processes.

The validity of the findings was ensured through source triangulation by comparing information from documents, interviews, and secondary data. Findings regarding policy, program implementation, coordination, data, and budgeting were cross-checked across sources to minimize reliance on a single type of evidence. The analysis process was also conducted iteratively, comparing coding results, empirical evidence, and the theoretical framework until consistent patterns emerged regarding institutional capacity, fragmentation, and the operationalization of Integrative Governance.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Institutional Capacity Across Governance Levels

At the public governance level, the central government has established a policy framework to eradicate extreme poverty through Presidential Instruction No. 4 of 2022 and the Coordinating Minister for Human Development and Cultural Affairs Decree No. 32 of 2022. However, the capacity of the Jeneponto Regency Government to translate this mandate into local policy instruments remains limited. Of the six required supporting policies, only the policy regarding the provision of target data has been stipulated through the Decree of the Regent of Jeneponto No. 100.3.3.2/401/2023. Five other policies, related to increasing economic growth, the integration and synergy of cross-sector programs, the integration of population-based programs, increasing human resource capacity, standardizing services, and inclusive planning and budgeting, had not yet been established by the time the research concluded in May 2025.

The capacity of the Jeneponto Regency Government to integrate the agenda on extreme poverty into the regional planning system remains limited. Extreme poverty was only explicitly designated as a priority in the 2024–2026 Regional Development Plan. In contrast, the Annual Action Plan for Regional Poverty Alleviation was unavailable in 2022 and 2023 and was only drafted in 2024. Information from the Head of the Regional Development Planning Agency indicates that previous planning documents utilized general poverty terminology and did not treat extreme poverty as a distinct agenda item. The time lag between shifts in the national agenda and their institutionalization in regional documents highlights the region's limited capacity to incorporate new agendas into the planning cycle.

The alignment between regional planning and program implementation varied across agencies. The 2024 Annual Action Plan outlines programs, activities, and sub-activities targeting people with low incomes and the extremely poor (Table 1). Of the 13 regional apparatus organizations identified as directly involved in extreme poverty alleviation, six were recorded as implementing relevant programs in 2024. Furthermore, some of the activities realized did not fully align with the programs listed in the Annual Action Plan (Table 2). Agency roles in poverty alleviation differ according to sectoral mandates, program targets, available resources, and implementation obligations. The incomplete correspondence between planned and realized activities suggests limitations in aligning their contributions within cross-sectoral implementation.

Table 1. Poverty Alleviation Programs, Activities, and Sub-activities in Jeneponto Regency, 2024

No	Program/Activity/Sub-activity	Target Group	Regional Apparatus Organizations
1	Providing access to basic education and health services.	Extremely poor individuals with chronic illnesses	Social Affairs Office
2	Social Protection and Security Program (Management of Poor Data Covering District/City Areas; and Facilitation of Family Welfare Social Assistance)	Poor population in the DTKS and the extremely poor (P3KE)	
3	Program for the Provision of Individual and Public Health Services (Provision of health services for Public Health Efforts and Individual Health Efforts,	Poor population in the DTKS and the extremely poor (P3KE)	Health Affairs Office

	including district/city-level referral services)		
4	Community Empowerment Program in the Health Sector		
5	Program for Enhancing Community Food Diversification and Resilience (Provision and Distribution of Staple Foods or Other Foodstuffs According to Regency/City Needs to Stabilize Food Supply and Prices)	Poor population in the DTKS and the extremely poor (P3KE)	Food Security Office
6	Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprise (MSME) Empowerment Program (empowerment of micro-enterprises carried out through data collection, partnerships, streamlined licensing, institutional strengthening, and coordination with stakeholders)	Poor population in the DTKS and the extremely poor (P3KE)	Cooperatives and Small and Medium Enterprise (SMEs) Office
7	MSME Development Program (Micro-enterprise development aimed at scaling up to small enterprises)		
8	Job Training and Workforce Productivity Program (Training Implementation Based on Competency Units)	Poor population in the DTKS and the extremely poor (P3KE)	Manpower and Transmigration Office
9	Job Placement Program (Job Placement Services in Regency/City Areas; and Job Market Information Management)		
10	Domestic Product Use and Marketing Program (Implementation of Promotion, Marketing and Increased Use of Domestic Products)	Poor population in the DTKS and the extremely poor (P3KE)	Industry and Trade Office
11	Capture Fisheries Management Program (provision of capture fisheries business infrastructure; capacity building for small-scale fishers; and facilitation of funding assistance and partnership-based business financing assistance).	Impoverished fishers listed in the DTKS and P3KE	Marine and Fishery Office
12	Drinking Water Supply System Management and Development Program (Management and Provision of Drinking Water Supply Systems)	Poor population in the DTKS and the extremely poor (P3KE)	Public Works and Public Housing Ofiice
13	Residential Area Program (Quality Improvement of Slum Areas Under 10 Hectares)	Poor population in the DTKS and the extremely poor (P3KE)	Housing, Residential Areas, and Land Affairs Office
14	Housing and Slum Settlement Program		

Table 2. Extreme Poverty Alleviation Programs in Jeneponto Regency

No	Programs	Regional Apparatus Organizations	Years
1	Barista Training: Basics of Making Various Coffee Recipes	Cooperatives and Small and Medium Enterprise (SMEs) Office	2024
2	Vocational Ecoprint Training for Beginner Entrepreneurs		2024
3	Sewing Training		2024
4	Carpentry Assistance	Industry and Trade Office	2024
5	Barista Equipment Assistance		2024
6	Livestock Assistance	Agriculture Office	2024
7	Laying Duck Assistance		2023

8	Gillnet Assistance	Marine and Fishery Office	2023
9	Uninhabitable Housing	Housing, Residential Areas, and Land Affairs Office	2023 and 2024
10	Social Assistance	Social Affairs Office	2023 and 2024
11	Scholarship	Education and Culture Office	2023 and 2024
12	School Uniform Assistance		2023 and 2024

Capacity at the public governance level can be further examined by looking at the relationship between regulatory mandates and the basis for program formulation. An analysis of the 2024 Annual Work Plan (RAT) reveals that the programs listed therein are grounded in Regional Regulation No. 16 of 2018 on Poverty Alleviation and Ministry of Home Affairs Regulation No. 90 of 2019 (Table 1); however, Coordinating Ministry for Human Development and Cultural Affairs Decree No. 32 of 2022 is not cited as an additional reference for formulating strategies and programs to alleviate extreme poverty. Three national strategies that include reducing the burden on community expenditure, increasing community income, and reducing pockets of poverty have also not been explicitly adopted in the 2024–2026 Regional Development Plan. These findings indicate that the existence of national-level mandates has not yet been fully matched by local capacity to translate them into policies, planning, and programs consistently.

Findings in the realm of policy and planning also demonstrate that public governance capacity is determined not merely by the existence of regulatory mandates, but also by the ability to translate those mandates into planning, the division of responsibilities, resource allocation, and implementation. This aligns with the literature on policy capacity, which identifies the analytical and operational capabilities of actors and organizations as crucial to the performance of policy functions (Wu et al., 2015). In Jeneponto Regency, while national-level policy instruments are in place, the capacity to consistently integrate them into local planning and implementation cycles remains limited. Consequently, the implementation gap reflects not only administrative delays but also disparities in capacity across different levels of governance.

Differences in capacity are also evident between the individual and organizational levels. In the Barista program, for instance, coordination across Regional Apparatus Organizations is enabled by specific actors who can link resources and services from multiple organizations. The Industry and Trade Office provides equipment, and the Manpower and Transmigration Office delivers training and certification. At the same time, beneficiary information can be utilized by the Social Affairs Office to support subsequent interventions. This pattern demonstrates an individual-level capacity to establish cross-organizational relationships; however, these relationships remain dependent on communication between actors and lack the backing of institutionalized working mechanisms at the organizational level.

Relational capacity at the individual level has not yet been fully institutionalized into organizational capacity. The ability of actors to connect information, resources, and services across organizations can be conceptually understood as a boundary-spanning function. From the perspective of collaborative governance, communication, leadership, trust, and inter-actor relationships are regarded as crucial elements in fostering joint action (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Emerson et al., 2012). However, this ability requires organizational support to evolve into a sustainable working pattern. In Jeneponto Regency, in the eradication of extreme poverty, cross-Regional Apparatus Organization relations have not been consistently supported by cross-sector Standard Operating Procedures, referral mechanisms, division of responsibilities, integration of target data, or joint performance indicators. Consequently, the individual capacity to bridge organizational boundaries has not yet been fully institutionalized as organizational capacity.

At the organizational level, capacity is reflected in a formal structure's ability to execute assigned functions. The Jeneponto Regency Regional Poverty Alleviation Coordination Team was established in 2024 via Regent Decree No. 100.3.3.2/2024 to serve as a formal structure for cross-sectoral coordination. However, the establishment of this structure has not yet been fully accompanied by clarity regarding functions and collaborative work routines. One member of the Regional Poverty Alleviation Coordination Team did not yet fully understand the role to be

carried out. At the same time, routine coordination meetings focused more on P3KE data than on program implementation, evaluation, and adjustments.

Organizational capacity limitations are also evident in the discrepancy between formal structures and coordination practices. In implementing extreme poverty alleviation efforts, the Regional Development Planning Agency serves as the lead agency. In contrast, within the Regional Poverty Alleviation Coordination Team structure, it occupies a secretariat role. This gap between formal status and actual practice indicates that a clear distribution of functions and authority has not fully aligned with the structure's existence. Thus, the Regional Poverty Alleviation Coordination Team demonstrates that establishing a coordination structure represents a form of formal capacity; however, its effectiveness ultimately depends on the organization's ability to execute the coordination functions inherent in that structure.

At the inter-organizational level, capacity is still characterized by working relationships that rely on communication between actors and the execution of specific activities. Interactions among Regional Apparatus Organizations have facilitated information exchange and cross-organizational resource use, as evidenced by the Barista Program. However, this pattern has not yet developed into a stable collaborative working mechanism through cross-organizational procedures, role sharing, referral systems, or shared performance indicators. Consequently, the existence of inter-organizational relationships does not necessarily signify the establishment of institutionalized inter-organizational capacity.

Findings at these various levels demonstrate that institutional capacity is not uniform. Drawing on (Willems & Baumert, 2003), capacity can exist at the individual, organizational, inter-organizational network, public governance, and societal levels. In the case of Jeneponto, relational capacity is evident at the individual level; coordination structures are in place at the organizational level; working relationships have been established at the inter-organizational level; and a regulatory framework exists at the public governance level. However, each level exhibits varying degrees of capability in performing the functions necessary for extreme poverty alleviation.

Thus, the findings of this study reveal not only weak institutional capacity but also diverse capacities across various levels of governance. At the public governance level, limitations are primarily evident in the translation of national mandates into regional policies and planning; at the organizational level, in the ability of formal structures to perform coordination functions; and at the individual level, relational capacity has emerged through the ability to bridge organizations; meanwhile, at the inter-organizational level, cross-sectoral working practices have been established but lack the support of stable collaborative mechanisms.

Capacity Interdependence and Institutional Fragmentation

Capacity interdependence is evident when the capabilities at one level of governance require capacity support from another level to function effectively. For instance, individuals' ability to build cross-sector relationships requires organizational mechanisms capable of sustaining them. Similarly, the mere existence of organizational structures is insufficient to support cross-sector work unless accompanied by inter-organizational mechanisms that govern role division, information exchange, and joint follow-up actions. Thus, institutional capacity is determined not only by the capabilities available at each level but also by the interconnectedness between those levels.

The distinction between organizational and inter-organizational capacity is evident in the coordination efforts of the Regional Poverty Alleviation Coordination Team. At the organizational level, each Regional Apparatus Organization has functions, programs, resources, and responsibilities according to its authority. However, at the inter-organizational level, the ability to integrate these functions and resources into concerted, joint action remains limited. Although the Regional Poverty Alleviation Coordination Team serves as a formal coordination forum, coordination meetings have not consistently resulted in the allocation of follow-up tasks, the implementation of joint programs, or structured cross-sectoral evaluations. Each Regional Apparatus Organization still tends to run programs according to its sectoral domain, while ongoing cross-Regional Apparatus Organization work relies more on informal communication.

This finding shows that the existence of capacity within each organization has not been fully matched by inter-organizational capacity that integrates roles, resources, and actions across Regional Device Organizations to alleviate extreme poverty.

The relationship between organizational capacity and joint action clarifies the limitations of relying solely on formal structures to foster collaboration. Within the framework of collaborative governance, principled engagement, shared motivation, and the capacity for joint action are interconnected components in the formation of collaboration (Emerson et al., 2012). Research findings from Jeneponto Regency regarding extreme poverty alleviation indicate that the capacity for joint action cannot be established merely through the existence of forums and interactions among actors. This capacity also requires a division of responsibilities, follow-up mechanisms, and organizational support to ensure cross-sector decisions are implemented consistently. Consequently, institutional fragmentation stems not only from limited interaction among regional apparatus governance but also from the absence of mechanisms that sustain joint action.

Capacity interdependence is also seen in information management. P3KE data has been available as a target basis for extreme poverty alleviation, but Regional Apparatus Organizations use different data sources in program implementation. The Social Affairs Office relies on the DTKS, survey results, data from other agencies, and social media information. The Cooperatives and Small and Medium Enterprise (SMEs) Offices use survey results and P3KE data; the Education and Culture Office uses Dapodik; and other agencies use data from the Regional Development Planning Agency or sectoral data tailored to their specific program requirements. Furthermore, information gathered through interviews indicates that the available data requires further verification, as it does not always align with the participant characteristics required by specific programs.

The diversity of data sources regarding extreme poverty alleviation in Jeneponto Regency reveals that data availability has not yet been fully matched by the institutional capacity to establish an interconnected information base. This discrepancy is particularly evident in the reported figures for extreme poverty. At the end of 2024, regional verification results recorded around 966 people, or 0.9%, while central government data showed a much higher figure. These disparities demonstrate that the information challenge involves not merely the volume or availability of databases, but also the consistency of definitions, verification and validation procedures, and the utilization of data for cross-organizational decision-making.

Institutional information capacity is established when data can be verified, exchanged, and consistently utilized as a basis for collective decision-making. In Jeneponto Regency, the existence of multiple data sources has yet to yield an integrated information base among regional government agencies. These findings expand the discourse on evidence-based governance by demonstrating that the use of evidence in governance depends not only on data availability but also on the institutional capacity to link the processes of information collection, validation, exchange, and utilization across organizations.

The link between information capacity and organizational capacity is increasingly evident in the monitoring and evaluation process. Each Regional Apparatus Organization is still carrying out evaluation, while cross-sector success indicators and an integrated reporting system are not yet available. Furthermore, reporting on agency activities to the Regional Poverty Alleviation Coordination Team lacks a consistent, formal mechanism. These limitations hinder the organization's ability to utilize monitoring results as a basis for program adjustments and shared learning. Consequently, the available data is not yet fully integrated with evaluation mechanisms that would enable the use of information to adjust cross-sector interventions.

Furthermore, budgeting capacity exhibits a similar pattern of interdependence regarding information, planning, implementation, and evaluation. The Jeneponto Regency Government has conducted budget tagging for extreme poverty alleviation, amounting to Rp191,844,449,632. However, the budget tagging was carried out at the activity or sub-activity level, where the nomenclature did not specifically distinguish the extreme poor from other target groups. A single activity might encompass multiple beneficiary groups, while for certain activities, only a portion

of the allocation was directly aimed at the extreme poor. This situation makes it difficult to consistently trace the relationships between target groups, interventions, budget utilization, and program outcomes. Consequently, the budgeting function relies on its interconnectedness with other capacities. Budget tagging cannot serve as a performance control instrument if information on targets, program design, implementation, and evaluation is not consistently linked. Under these conditions, budget tagging merely reflects the existence of a fiscal allocation rather than the local government's ability to align resources with targets and cross-sectoral program outcomes.

Institutional fragmentation in Jeneponto Regency regarding extreme poverty alleviation ultimately stems from inter-capacity relationships that have not functioned consistently. Policy mandates have not been fully translated into implementation capacity; coordination structures have failed to generate mechanisms for collective action; data availability has not fully supported cross-organizational decision-making; and budget allocations have not been consistently aligned with program targets and outcomes. This pattern reveals a gap between the existence of formal institutional structures and the actual ability to execute governance functions.

The gap between formal structures and the functional capacity to alleviate extreme poverty in Jeneponto Regency relates to the concept of "capability traps" proposed by (Andrews et al., 2017), situations in which improvements in problem-solving capabilities do not accompany the adoption of formal institutional forms. In Jeneponto Regency, the issue lies not merely in the presence or absence of regulations, structures, data, and budgets, but in the inter-capacity linkages that fail to integrate planning, coordination, information management, budgeting, and evaluation. Thus, institutional fragmentation is reflected not only in the functional separation of local government agencies but also in the weak linkages among the capacities needed to generate cross-sectoral action consistently.

Operationalizing Integrative Governance

The operationalization of integrative governance relies on institutional capacity that enables relationships among actors to evolve into sustained cross-organizational actions. Stout and Love view integration as a relational process of managing interdependence through situation-specific authority distribution, facilitative leadership, and collective learning. Within this framework, responsive networks, integrative collaboration, and facilitative coordination serve as processes that enable actors to link information, resources, authority, and actions to address issues that transcend organizational boundaries. Findings from Jeneponto Regency regarding extreme poverty alleviation indicate that while some supporting conditions for these three processes are present, their operationalization remains constrained by institutional capacities that lack consistent interconnection.

Responsive networks require the capacity to exchange information, generate feedback, and adapt actions across organizations. Relationships among Regional Apparatus Organizations in Jeneponto Regency to alleviate extreme poverty have been established through program implementation and coordination forums. Still, these relationships are not yet supported by an integrated information, monitoring, and evaluation system. The use of different data sources, evaluations still conducted on a sectoral basis, and the lack of cross-organizational feedback mechanisms limit the network's ability to produce joint responses. This finding shows that the mere existence of interorganizational relationships does not, by itself, form responsive networks. Network responsiveness requires an information capacity that allows data to be exchanged, interpreted, and used together as a basis for adjusting actions.

Integrative collaboration requires the capacity to transform relationships between actors into a division of roles and sustainable joint actions. Cross-organizational work practices within the Barista Program demonstrate that actors from various regional apparatus organizations can integrate equipment, training, certification, and beneficiary information into a unified intervention sequence. However, these practices lack consistent support through shared responsibilities, joint working procedures, referral mechanisms, and cross-organizational performance indicators. Consequently, while collaboration may occur during specific activities, its sustainability remains contingent upon the actors' ability to establish and maintain inter-organizational relationships.

Limitations in the operationalization of integrative collaboration indicate that relational capacity has not yet fully evolved into institutionalized collaborative capacity. (Ansell & Gash, 2008) place dialogue, trust, commitment, and shared understanding as important elements in collaborative processes, while (Emerson et al., 2012) emphasize the capacity for joint action as a key component of collaborative regimes. Findings from Jeneponto Regency suggest a different nuance. Although relational ties can facilitate joint work on specific activities, the sustainability of collaboration requires organizational support to structure role allocation, resource utilization, and cross-sectoral responsibilities. Thus, integrative collaboration depends not only on the actors' ability to build relationships but also on the organizational capacity to institutionalize those relationships into joint action.

Facilitative coordination requires the capacity to steer coordination forums toward deliberation, evaluation, learning, and the adjustment of joint actions. While Regional Poverty Alleviation Coordination Teams have established a formal structure for cross-sector coordination, their coordination functions remain largely focused on data discussion and administrative matters. Mechanisms for cross-agency follow-up, shared outcome indicators, and cross-sector evaluation have not been consistently developed, nor has community involvement in planning and evaluation processes been systematically institutionalized. These findings indicate that the mere existence of a formal forum is insufficient to generate facilitative coordination if coordination fails to link joint discussions to decisions, evaluations, and adjustments to cross-sector actions.

The primary contribution of this research is demonstrating that Integrative Governance in extreme poverty alleviation is capacity-bound. This characteristic refers not merely to the adequacy of institutional capacity, but crucially to the ability to link capacities across governance levels and functions. From this perspective, strengthening Integrative Governance should focus not simply on adding coordination structures, but on reinforcing functional linkages among authority, information, resources, the division of responsibilities, and mechanisms for evaluation and feedback. These findings position institutional capacity as a condition that enables or constrains the development of integration from inter-actor relationships into institutionalized collective action.

CONCLUSSION

Integrative governance in extreme poverty alleviation is determined not merely by the existence of coordination structures, inter-organizational networks, or institutional resources, but by the ability to connect capacities distributed across various levels of governance. In Jeneponto Regency, capacities have been established at the individual, organizational, inter-organizational, and public governance levels, yet their interconnectedness remains limited. Consequently, the available capacity has not yet been fully translated into consistent, cross-sectoral collective action.

This study demonstrates that institutional fragmentation stems not only from the separation of functions across organizations but also from weak linkages among capacities related to policy, organization, information, budgeting, monitoring, and evaluation. Such disconnection limits the network's ability to mount a collective response, hinders the institutionalization of cross-organizational collaboration, and constrains the coordination function as a space for deliberation, learning, evaluation, and adjustment of actions. Thus, the effectiveness of responsive networks, integrative collaboration, and facilitative coordination depends on the institution's ability to connect available capacities into a capacity for joint action.

The primary contribution of this research is demonstrating that Integrative Governance in extreme poverty alleviation is capacity-bound. This characteristic refers not merely to the adequacy of institutional capacity, but crucially to the ability to link capacities across governance levels and functions. From this perspective, strengthening Integrative Governance should focus not simply on adding coordination structures, but on reinforcing functional linkages among authority, information, resources, the division of responsibilities, and mechanisms for evaluation

and feedback. These findings position institutional capacity as the determinant of how far integration can evolve from inter-actor relationships into institutionalized collective action.

REFERENCES

Andrews, M., Pritchett, L., & Woolcock, M. (2017). *Building State Capability*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/9780191994982.003.0004

Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative governance in theory and practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *18*(4), 543–571. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mum032

Bolch, K. B., Ceriani, L., & López-Calva, L. F. (2022). The arithmetics and politics of domestic resource mobilization for poverty eradication. *World Development*, *149*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2021.105691

Cai, C., & Tang, N. (2023). China's Campaign-Style Implementation Regime: How is "Targeted Poverty Alleviation" being achieved locally? *Journal of Chinese Political Science*, *28*(4), 645–669. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11366-022-09823-1

Creswell, J. W. (2019). *Research Design: Pendekatan Metode Kualitatif, Kuantitatif dan Campuran*. Pustaka Pelajar.

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). Qualitative Inquiry Research Design, Choosing Among Five Approaches. In *Penambahan Natrium Benzoat Dan Kalium Sorbat (Antiinversi) Dan Kecepatan Pengadukan Sebagai Upaya Penghambatan Reaksi Inversi Pada Nira Tebu*.

Emerson, K., Nabatchi, T., & Balogh, S. (2012). An integrative framework for collaborative governance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *22*(1), 1–29. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mur011

HelpAge International. (2020). Income security for all older people in Bangladesh during COVID-19 and beyond. *HelpAge International*.

Jacquet, N., Van Haute, D., De Corte, J., Nisen, L., Vandenbroeck, M., & Roets, G. (2020). Dealing with the wicked issue of child poverty: Inter-organizational networks as forums for collective debate and reflection. *Social Policy and Administration*, *54*(7), 1081–1095. https://doi.org/10.1111/spol.12586

Nugroho, A., Amir, H., Maududy, I., & Marlina, I. (2021). Poverty eradication programs in Indonesia: Progress, challenges and reforms. *Journal of Policy Modeling*, *43*(6), 1204–1224. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpolmod.2021.05.002

Roser, M. (2023). *Extreme poverty: How far have we come, and how far do we still have to go?* Our World in Data. https://ourworldindata.org/extreme-poverty-in-brief

Siburian, M. E. (2022). The link between fiscal decentralization and poverty – Evidence from Indonesia. *Journal of Asian Economics*, *81*, 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asieco.2022.101493

Singh, S., Das, J., Goyal, A. K., & Mohanty, S. K. (2025). Spatial pattern of climatic exposure and multidimensional poverty in districts of India. *Sustainable Cities and Society*, *130*, 106530. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2025.106530

Spicker, P. (2016). Poverty as a wicked problem. *CROP Poverty Brief*, *35*, 1–4.

Stout, M., & Love, J. (2019). *Integrative Governance : Generating Sustainable Responses to Global Crises* (Issue October). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315526294

Tian, J. (2025). Vulnerability to Adverse Climate Change: Evidence from Rural Bangladesh. *The European Journal of Development Research*, *37*(4), 765–791. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41287-025-00705-9

Willems, S., & Baumert, K. (2003). Institutional Capacity And Climate Actions. In *Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development International*.

World Bank. (2025). Global Economic Prospects, Juni 2025. In *The World Bank Group* (Issue June). https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt183pb3w.5

Wu, X., Ramesh, M., & Howlett, M. (2015). Policy capacity: A conceptual framework for understanding policy competences and capabilities. *Policy and Society*, *34*(3–4), 165–171. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polsoc.2015.09.001