Implementation of the Gender Mainstreaming Program in South Kalimantan Province

Nadzira Auliya Mudzrika[1]*, Irwansyah[2], Muhammad Riduansyah Syafari[3]
Lambung Mangkurat University, Indonesia[1]
Lambung Mangkurat University, Indonesia[2]
Lambung Mangkurat University, Indonesia[3]
Corresponding Email: nadzauliya@gmail.com*

Abstract

This study aims to examine the implementation of the Gender Mainstreaming Program (PUG) in South Kalimantan Province by exploring stakeholders' understanding, institutional awareness of the importance of gender perspectives, and the key challenges that affect the effectiveness of the program. It also seeks to explain how institutional capacity, structural factors, and cultural dynamics support or hinder the success of PUG. A qualitative approach with a case study design was used. Data were collected through in-depth interviews with key informants from relevant agencies (DP3AKB, BAPPEDA, BPKAD, and the Inspectorate), document analysis, and review of planning documents and Gender Responsive Budgeting (PPRG) evaluations for the 2023–2024 fiscal year. Data were analysed thematically using George C. Edwards III's policy implementation framework, which includes communication, resources, disposition of implementers, and bureaucratic structure. The findings indicate that most agencies demonstrate an awareness of the importance of integrating gender into development policies, although such awareness remains largely normative and has yet to reach a transformative level. Key obstacles include limited human resource capacity, insufficient sex-disaggregated data, weak cross-sectoral coordination, and bureaucratic cultures that are not yet fully gender-inclusive. In conclusion, the implementation of PUG in South Kalimantan remains at a procedural stage and requires strengthened institutional capacity, improved gender data systems, and enhanced regulatory and cross-sector coordination to ensure its sustainable and effective implementation.

Keywords: PUG, gender mainstreaming, institutional capacity, public policy, South Kalimantan.

Introduction

Human resource development has long been a priority in Indonesia's national development strategy, aiming to accelerate economic growth and improve societal welfare

(Oktari et al., 2021). In recent decades, the Indonesian government has increasingly recognized that high-quality human resources are essential to face the intensifying global competition. The quality of human capital is regarded as the foundation for building a productive, competitive, and capable society—both in local and global contexts (dos Muchangos & Vaughter, 2019). This is particularly crucial for Indonesia, which is transitioning toward becoming a developed country while contending with the challenges of technological change and globalization.

One of the main challenges in human development in Indonesia is ensuring equal access for women and men across all sectors (Peterson & Jordansson, 2022). Gender equality is a key component of inclusive and sustainable development. Despite numerous policies introduced, gender disparity remains a pressing issue in the national development process. According to the 2021 Global Gender Gap Report, Indonesia ranked 101 out of 156 countries, reflecting significant gaps in women's access to education, labor market participation, and political representation.

In 2022, Indonesia's female Labor Force Participation Rate (LFPR) was only 54.56%, considerably lower than the male LFPR of 82.97%. While female educational attainment has improved, women remain underrepresented in higher education, limiting their presence in sectors requiring specialized skills and education (White, 2023). To address gender inequality, the Indonesian government has adopted various strategies, including the Gender Mainstreaming (PUG) Program. PUG is a global strategy to ensure equal benefits for women and men in all development policies and programs, emphasizing the integration of gender perspectives in every stage of the development process.

Presidential Instruction No. 9 of 2000 mandates gender mainstreaming in all areas of national development, seeking to institutionalize gender equality principles into public policies and ensure equitable benefits across genders (Gupta et al., 2023). However, implementation remains challenging at local levels, often due to limited human resources, funding, and inter-sectoral coordination. Data limitations further complicate efforts to measure PUG outcomes at both national and regional levels.

In South Kalimantan Province, similar challenges persist. Although there has been progress in gender-related indicators such as the Gender Development Index (GDI) and Gender Empowerment Index (GEI), gender gaps remain visible in labor and political participation. Based on data from the Central Statistics Agency (BPS), South Kalimantan's GDI rose from 88.86 in 2022 to 89.04 in 2023, and GEI improved from 74.58 to 76.33 during the same period. The Gender Inequality Index (GII) also declined from 0.514 in 2022 to 0.507 in 2023.

Women's representation in politics increased, with the percentage of female legislative members rising from 20.00% in 2022 to 21.82% in 2023. However, these figures still fall short of national targets, highlighting the need to strengthen PUG efforts. In contrast, female labor force participation in South Kalimantan remains low at 51.90%, significantly below male participation. Cultural norms, workplace discrimination, and limited access to higher education and skills training continue to hinder women's economic engagement.

Moreover, only 55.08% of the 118 Regional Government Work Units (SKPD) in South Kalimantan have prepared gender-responsive planning and budgeting documents. This gap between policy and implementation underscores the need for deeper analysis of the obstacles in gender-responsive budgeting. The provincial Office of Women's Empowerment, Child Protection, and Family Planning (DP3AKB) plays a key role in PUG implementation, but limited gender mainstreaming awareness at district and municipal levels hinders effective program delivery.

Effective implementation requires careful planning, consistent execution, and continuous evaluation. According to Mahmudi (2010), program success is determined by the organization's capacity to allocate and manage resources efficiently. Ultimately, implementation can be considered effective if the process from input to output demonstrates a significant contribution to program goals (Moser, 2012).

Several studies in other regions provide insights into PUG implementation. For example, Azmy and Pertiwi (2021) assessed gender mainstreaming in education in Bogor, highlighting limited local policy implementers' understanding and weak inter-sector coordination. Ilham and Velianto (2022) evaluated Surabaya's PUG performance based on seven national indicators, noting the need to improve human resources and sex-disaggregated data. In Bukittinggi, Annisa et al. (2021) found that gender equality in reproductive health programs required more balanced male participation. In Semarang, Kertati (2019) emphasized the importance of fulfilling the seven prerequisites of PUG, including commitment, institutional support, and public participation.

These studies underline the need for comprehensive evaluations of PUG that examine both policy and grassroots implementation. However, there remains a gap in understanding how PUG intersects with local socio-economic contexts, particularly regarding women's participation in economic and social spheres.

Therefore, investigating the implementation of the Gender Mainstreaming Program in South Kalimantan is essential to assess its effectiveness in achieving gender equality (Alston, 2014). This study aims to identify key supporting and inhibiting factors, analyze the program's impact at policy and community levels, and offer recommendations for more effective strategies. Specifically, this study seeks to answer the following research question: How is the implementation of the Gender Mainstreaming Program (PUG) carried out in South Kalimantan Province?

Literature Review

Development is broadly defined as a planned process of change aimed at improving the quality of life through various dimensions such as the economy, society, politics, environment, and sustainability (Subandi, 2011; Harun, Rochajat, & Ardianto, 2011). Siagian (1994) and Kartasasmita (1994) emphasize that development must be people-centered, enabling individuals to become creative, secure, and free from fear. Human development, thus, becomes the cornerstone of a nation's progress.

Gender-based development arises from the recognition that traditional development paradigms often exclude or marginalize women and vulnerable groups. Gender, unlike sex which is biologically determined, is a social construct shaped by cultural norms and societal expectations (Oakley, 1972; Tasrif, 2003; Sovitriana, 2020). Gender inequality manifests in limited access to education, employment, healthcare, and political representation—areas where women remain disadvantaged despite formal progress.

To address this, three influential approaches have emerged: Women in Development (WiD), Women and Development (WaD), and Gender and Development (GaD) (Mosse, 1993; Boserup, 1997). WiD, rooted in modernization theory, seeks to incorporate women into existing development processes but has been criticized for being co-optative and liberal feminist in orientation. WaD, influenced by neo-Marxist feminism, argues that women's marginalization is structurally embedded in socio-political systems (Mosse, 1993). GaD, arising in the 1980s, views women as agents of change and focuses on transforming social structures through empowerment and collective organization (Mosse, 1996).

Gender Mainstreaming (PUG) was institutionalized in Indonesia through Presidential Instruction No. 9 of 2000 and Ministerial Regulation No. 15 of 2008. It is a comprehensive strategy to achieve gender justice by incorporating the experiences, needs, and aspirations of both women and men into all development stages—planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation (Inpres No. 9/2000; Permendagri, 2008; Sasongko, 2009; UN ECOSOC, 1997). According to Nugroho (2008) and Santoso (2016), PUG ensures equal access, participation, control, and benefit-sharing between genders across political, economic, and social domains.

The implementation of gender mainstreaming can be analyzed using the model proposed by George C. Edwards III, which identifies four essential factors for policy success: communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure (Widodo, 2011). Supporting this, scholars such as Ikhwan (2017) and Usman (2002) argue that systematic planning, institutional capacity, and goal alignment are crucial for program effectiveness. Programs should be evaluated not only by their outputs but also by how well they address structural inequalities and empower marginalized communities.

Research Method

This study employs a qualitative approach to systematically, factually, and accurately describe the social phenomenon of gender mainstreaming implementation. A qualitative method was chosen to provide a deep and comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon within its natural context, where data are not quantified but presented as they are (Moleong, 2006). This method allows for broader and deeper exploration of data sources relevant to how the Gender Mainstreaming Program (PUG) is implemented in South Kalimantan, thereby producing rich and meaningful insights.

The type of research is explanatory, aiming to answer the "why" and "how" questions related to policy implementation. As stated by Gray (in Boru, 2018), explanatory research seeks to uncover the reasons and processes behind certain phenomena. This design is ideal for

identifying internal and external factors influencing PUG implementation, including the relationships among policy, institutional commitment, community participation, and structural support.

The research was conducted in South Kalimantan Province, chosen for its unique socio-cultural characteristics and significant gender disparities. This region presents a relevant case for analyzing the effectiveness and challenges of PUG implementation in a non-Java region of Indonesia. The location also offers access to stakeholders and relevant data, making it suitable for field-based qualitative research.

The data sources consist of primary and secondary data. Primary data were collected through purposive sampling from key informants (Suryabrata, 2018). The key informants in this study include heads of agencies and departments at the provincial level involved in PUG, such as the Office of Women's Empowerment, Child Protection, and Family Planning (DP3AKB), the Regional Development Planning Agency (BAPPEDA), Regional Financial Management Agency and the Provincial Inspectorate of South Kalimantan. Secondary data were obtained through supporting documents from each of these institutions.

The researcher serves as the main instrument of data collection (Sugiyono, 2009), responsible for determining the research focus, selecting informants, collecting and analyzing data, and drawing conclusions. Supporting tools such as field notes, audio recorders, and cameras assist in this process.

Data collection methods include in-depth interviews, document analysis, and participant observation. Unstructured interviews provide flexibility and depth (Sugiyono, 2009), while observation is used to gather contextual behavioral insights (Suharsaputra, 2012).

Data analysis follows the Miles and Huberman model, which consists of data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing/verification (Silalahi, 2009). Triangulation techniques are used to ensure the validity of data by comparing data from various sources and methods (Moleong, 2009; Nasution, 2003). Conclusions are continuously refined as patterns and relationships emerge.

To ensure data credibility, various validation techniques are applied, including prolonged engagement, persistent observation, source and method triangulation, referential adequacy, and member checking (Sugiyono, 2009). The criteria of transferability, dependability, and confirmability are also considered to establish trustworthiness and the applicability of findings in other contexts.

Result and Discussion

Policy implementation is a critical phase in the public policy process, focusing on how formulated decisions are translated into concrete actions. In the context of the Gender Mainstreaming Program (PUG) in South Kalimantan Province, implementation is not merely an administrative task—it reflects the extent to which organizational structures can transform policy into real and measurable outcomes. George C. Edwards III (1980) identifies four key

variables that influence the success of implementation: communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure. This section systematically analyzes these four variables in relation to empirical findings from the field.

Conceptually, implementation refers to the execution of a planned policy intended to achieve defined objectives. Van Meter and Van Horn (1975) describe implementation as actions by individuals or groups directed at policy goals. Edwards (1980) views implementation as a dynamic process influenced by interrelated factors, while Usman (2002) and Setiawan (2004) emphasize that it is a structured and systematic activity involving purposeful interaction between goals and actions.

In this study, the institutional framework has been formalized through a Governor Decree, official circulars, and the establishment of technical teams and cross-sectoral focal points.. However, practical challenges persist, particularly regarding technical understanding, human resource capacity, and inter-stakeholder synergy.

Using Edwards' model, this analysis explores how communication, resources, implementers' attitudes, and bureaucratic structures influence the outcomes of PUG. Success in implementation is contingent not only on planning but also on the optimization of these interdependent factors. A weakness in any single element may undermine the entire process, making it essential to examine these four factors as core analytical components.

a. Communication

Communication is a fundamental element in the successful implementation of public policy, serving as the medium through which policy intentions are conveyed from decision-makers to implementers. According to Edwards (in Widodo, 2011), effective communication requires clarity, consistency, and the establishment of a two-way relationship between policymakers and those responsible for implementing policies at various levels. Without a strong communication strategy, even well-designed policies are at risk of being misunderstood, misapplied, or not implemented at all.

In the case of the Gender Mainstreaming Program (PUG) in South Kalimantan, the main communication mechanism is facilitated through formal institutional channels. These channels include governor's circular letters, inter-agency coordination forums, and technical assistance meetings spearheaded by the Office of Women's Empowerment and Child Protection (DP3AKB) as the leading sector. The formalization of this process reflects the provincial government's administrative commitment to PUG. DP3AKB has actively disseminated information about the obligation of gender mainstreaming (PUG) at every stage of development to various Regional Work Units (SKPD).

However, field data reveal several communication gaps that hinder the full internalization and operationalization of PUG throughout the provincial bureaucracy. First, the communication flow remains largely top-down and one-directional. The dissemination of policies and instructions tends to be administrative in nature—focused on compliance and reporting rather than promoting shared conceptual understanding or collaborative planning.

Informants from BAPPEDA and BPKAD expressed concerns about the limited depth of technical discussion in inter-agency meetings. They noted that discussions on PUG often do not delve into gender-responsive planning with broader development goals in mind. This indicates a communication culture that is more bureaucratic than deliberative, as the horizontal dialogue used in inter-agency communication does not yield optimal feedback, thereby reducing the space for critical reflection or mutual learning among stakeholders.

In addition, the Inspectorate, which plays a key role in internal oversight and evaluation, tends to only be involved during the document collection phase for gender-responsive planning. Their involvement is limited to the early stages of policy planning and to evaluating SKPDs that fail to submit gender-responsive planning documents. This reactive engagement further illustrates a fragmented communication system in which institutional learning and corrective mechanisms during gender development monitoring stages are underutilized.

The absence of a clear, continuous, and dialogical communication strategy has led to a fragmented understanding of PUG among SKPD staff. For instance, some agencies perceive PUG merely as a reporting obligation or an additional bureaucratic burden, rather than as an integral part of inclusive development planning. This misunderstanding stems not only from technical knowledge gaps but also from communication failures in articulating the strategic relevance and developmental value of gender mainstreaming in local governance.

Furthermore, there is a lack of an integrated knowledge-sharing platform that allows institutions to exchange best practices, discuss challenges, and develop joint solutions. This absence reduces opportunities for capacity development and institutional synergy, especially at the technical and operational levels. Although some isolated training and socialization events have been held, these activities have not been conducted intensively and are often not followed up with mentoring sessions or peer learning.

To address this issue, communication within the PUG framework in South Kalimantan must evolve beyond formal directives and administrative compliance. Communication should encompass an inclusive, participatory, and iterative process that not only conveys information but also fosters mutual understanding and institutional commitment. The formation of cross-sectoral working groups, the organization of thematic workshops on gender analysis, and the inclusion of regular reflection sessions in coordination forums are practical steps to build a more responsive and dynamic communication ecosystem.

In conclusion, although there is a formal structure for communication in the implementation of PUG in South Kalimantan, this structure is insufficient to foster the deep understanding and inter-agency collaboration needed for transformative gender mainstreaming.

Without improvements in the quality and interactivity of communication processes, policies risk becoming merely symbolic compliance, rather than serving as catalysts for equitable development. Therefore, strengthening communication is not a technical add-on, but a strategic necessity for realizing the goals of PUG.

b. Resources

According to Edwards (1980), resources are not limited to financial allocations but also include the availability of physical infrastructure, institutional support mechanisms, and—most importantly—qualified human capital. The absence, scarcity, or misalignment of these resources often results in stagnation or symbolic implementation, where policies are formally adopted but fail to produce substantive impact.

In the case of the Gender Mainstreaming Program (PUG) in South Kalimantan, empirical findings indicate that resource limitations remain a fundamental constraint to effective implementation. One of the most pressing challenges is the inadequacy of human resource capacity. The number of trained facilitators for Gender Responsive Planning and Budgeting (PPRG) is limited, and there are considerable difficulties in mobilizing existing facilitators across agencies due to structural and logistical barriers. Many SKPDs (local government agencies) lack staff who not only possess basic awareness of gender issues but also the technical competence to operationalize gender analysis within planning and budgeting processes.

Furthermore, informants repeatedly pointed out that capacity-building initiatives—such as workshops and training sessions—are often conducted ineffectively. As noted by oversight officials responsible for implementing PUG, many programs within the responsible SKPDs tend to be ceremonial in nature, focused more on fulfilling administrative agendas than on deepening technical capacity. When forums are held, participants often do not attend consistently, as those designated as focal points in each SKPD are not always present and fail to follow up by sharing PUG-related information obtained during the sessions. Forum participants also frequently attend without the necessary planning documents and disaggregated data required to produce gender analysis documents such as the Gender Analysis Pathway (GAP), Gender Budget Statement (GBS), and Terms of Reference (KAK), or to integrate gender indicators into performance-based budgeting. The misalignment between the content of training and the preparedness of human resources in the relevant SKPDs results in ineffective programs and contributes to a shallow understanding of PUG among bureaucrats.

Budget allocation is another important dimension of the resource-related challenges. Although the existence of GAP, GBS, and KAK documents is a formal requirement for SKPDs, the quality and substance of these documents are often questionable. Many GAP, GBS, and KAK submissions are generic, templated, and not based on rigorous gender needs assessments, while the budget allocated for PUG capacity-building remains minimal. The tendency to treat the preparation of GAP, GBS, and KAK as a compliance task rather than a strategic planning tool reflects a deeper institutional weakness in understanding the value of Gender Responsive Budgeting (GRB).

In addition, the implementation of PUG lacks a clear incentive structure that could motivate institutions to make meaningful commitments. There are no performance-based rewards for agencies that effectively implement PUG, nor are there sanctions for agencies that neglect or sideline gender considerations. The absence of such accountability mechanisms hampers innovation and fails to generate the institutional pressure needed to embed gender perspectives into core planning and budgeting functions.

Findings in South Kalimantan reflect a broader trend observed in other regions of Indonesia, where the institutionalization of gender-responsive planning often stalls at the technical level due to resource gaps. Nugroho (2008) and Santoso (2016) argue that without strong commitment to invest in human and financial capital, gender mainstreaming efforts risk becoming mere rhetoric. The concept of "mainstreaming" requires more than just policy diffusion—it demands internal capacity, political will, and a sustainable flow of resources.

It is also worth noting that inter-agency fragmentation exacerbates the resource-related problems. For instance, although the DP3AKB is responsible for PUG advocacy and technical guidance, it does not have the authority to enforce cross-sectoral resource commitments. This institutional gap weakens efforts to coordinate resource planning, especially when BAPPEDA and financial institutions do not prioritize gender considerations in the budgeting cycle.

To address these gaps, a strategic reconfiguration of the resource framework is required. First, human resource development should be redirected toward building substantive capacity, with a focus on problem-based learning, mentoring, and field-based technical assistance. Second, budget guidelines should mandate the use of sex-disaggregated data and gender-based needs assessments as prerequisites for budget approval. Third, performance-based incentive and sanction systems should be introduced to promote accountability and institutional commitment.

In conclusion, the effective implementation of PUG in South Kalimantan heavily depends on the strategic availability and allocation of resources. Addressing the deficiencies in human resources, the relevance of training, and budgeting practices is essential to transforming PUG from a mere formal requirement into a transformative tool for inclusive development. As emphasized by Edwards (1980), even the most coherent policy framework will falter if not supported by the necessary resources to realize it.

c. Disposition (Implementers' Attitudes)

Disposition refers to the attitudes, beliefs, motivation, and level of commitment held by implementers toward a particular policy. According to Edwards (1980), even policies that are well-resourced and clearly communicated cannot be effectively implemented if those tasked with implementation do not support or understand the policy's objectives. The disposition of implementers functions as a psychological and behavioral filter that determines how policies are interpreted, prioritized, and enacted in practice. In many cases, the success or failure of implementation depends less on technical design and more on human factors such as will, belief, and sustained motivation.

In the case of the Gender Mainstreaming Program (PUG) in South Kalimantan, field data show that implementers' dispositions vary widely across institutions, affecting the uneven quality of implementation. The Office of Women's Empowerment and Child Protection (DP3AKB), as the program's leading sector, demonstrates a relatively high level of commitment and ownership toward the goals of PUG. This is reflected in their consistent efforts to coordinate with other agencies, provide guidance, and advocate for gender-sensitive planning. DP3AKB staff often act as informal PUG champions, driven by both personal and institutional commitment to gender equality.

However, this strong stance is not reflected across all local government institutions (SKPDs). Many OPDs view PUG merely as an administrative obligation—an additional reporting burden separate from their core planning mandate. This perception is often reinforced by the absence of updated regulations mandating clear roles and responsibilities for PUG at the sectoral level. The lack of strong incentives, combined with minimal technical training, contributes to a passive attitude toward the program. As a result, PUG implementation becomes symbolic or procedural, with limited integration into actual planning and budgeting processes.

Frequent staff rotations and transfers in government institutions cause discontinuity in institutional knowledge. New personnel are often unfamiliar with the concept of gender mainstreaming and lack historical understanding of ongoing programs. Without systematic knowledge transfer mechanisms or orientation sessions for newly appointed officials, institutional memory regarding PUG weakens, and implementation is hindered. These dynamics underscore the fragility of disposition as a variable—highly sensitive to organizational culture, leadership changes, and institutional incentives.

Moreover, the lack of a shared sense of urgency among policy implementers hampers the potential for cross-sectoral collaboration. While some sectors, such as health or social services, may naturally align with gender goals, other sectors like technical, education, or finance often sideline PUG, viewing it as irrelevant to their technical mandates. This narrow sectoral mindset prevents the internalization of gender as a cross-cutting development issue and isolates implementation responsibility within "gender offices," rather than promoting it as a shared institutional goal.

These disposition gaps not only affect coordination but also weaken the legitimacy and perceived importance of PUG. In some institutions, PUG is delegated to mid-level staff without strategic decision-making authority, further signaling that gender is not a high-priority issue. As Lipsky (1980) argued in his theory of street-level bureaucracy, the behavior and discretion of frontline actors significantly shape policy outcomes. In the case of South Kalimantan Province, where dispositions are uneven, policies risk being implemented selectively or half-heartedly depending on the attitudes of individuals or departments.

To strengthen disposition, sustained advocacy, leadership engagement, and institutionalization of gender-responsive values are necessary. High-level commitment from governors, mayors, and agency heads must be visible and continuous. Recognition and rewards for institutions or units demonstrating innovation and impact in gender mainstreaming can also foster a culture of motivation. Furthermore, integrating PUG objectives into performance indicators and evaluation metrics can help shift attitudes from mere compliance to genuine commitment.

In conclusion, disposition plays a critical role in the implementation of the Gender Mainstreaming Program in South Kalimantan. Although structural and resource-based challenges are significant, they are exacerbated or mitigated by the attitudes and beliefs of those responsible for implementation. Without concerted efforts to cultivate positive disposition—through leadership, incentives, and capacity development—the risk of PUG implementation remaining fragmented, symbolic, and ultimately ineffective will persist.

d. Bureaucratic Structure

The bureaucratic structure plays a crucial role in determining how efficiently and effectively a policy can be implemented across different levels of government. According to Edwards (1980), a well-functioning bureaucratic structure is characterized by clear division of roles, efficient standard operating procedures, and strong coordination mechanisms between units. Conversely, ambiguity in authority, overlapping responsibilities, or overly hierarchical arrangements tend to slow down implementation and create fragmentation in policy execution.

In the case of the Gender Mainstreaming Program (PUG) in South Kalimantan, a formal bureaucratic framework has been established through the issuance of a gubernatorial decree of South Kalimantan, a circular letter from the Provincial Secretary of South Kalimantan on gender-responsive budgeting, the formation of a PUG Technical Team, as well as focal points in each Regional Work Unit (SKPD) and a driving team at the provincial level. This formal structure reflects the normative commitment of the provincial government to institutionalize PUG within the administrative system. However, empirical findings show that this structure is not yet supported by strong and functional operational mechanisms.

Although the Office of Women's Empowerment and Child Protection (DP3AKB) has taken an active role as the main implementer of PUG, the expected leadership from the Regional Development Planning Agency (BAPPEDA), as the head of the technical team, has not materialized in practice. BAPPEDA's involvement is mostly limited to coordination and procedural documentation, with little proactive engagement in guiding or synchronizing cross-sectoral PUG activities. This has led to the concentration of responsibility in DP3AKB, which, although committed, does not have full cross-sectoral authority to mandate or enforce implementation across other SKPDs.

In addition, the absence of regular coordination meetings, joint monitoring systems, and integrated evaluation mechanisms reflects the operational weaknesses of the current structure. Without structured and periodic interagency forums, opportunities to align efforts, share best practices, and address implementation obstacles are lost. The lack of such mechanisms contributes to isolated implementation, where each institution operates independently without a unifying strategy or feedback loop.

This situation is further exacerbated by the limited function of PUG focal points within regional institutions. Although these focal points have been formally appointed, their roles are often poorly defined, and they rarely receive specific training or institutional support to effectively carry out gender mainstreaming functions. In some agencies, the focal point position is designated as an additional administrative duty with no clear linkage to performance targets or organizational priorities. As a result, many focal points lack the authority and resources to meaningfully influence policy processes within their respective institutions.

Another critical gap lies in the role of the Inspectorate. Although the Inspectorate is mandated to monitor and evaluate policy implementation, its involvement in PUG has thus far been limited to administrative compliance and document reviews. There is limited evidence of

in-depth audits or performance-based evaluations that assess the qualitative aspects of PUG outcomes. This reflects a broader pattern in which bureaucratic oversight mechanisms are not aligned with the transformative goals of gender mainstreaming.

These findings affirm Edwards' assertion that bureaucratic structure must go beyond formal arrangements—it must become an operational system with clearly articulated roles, dynamic coordination, and accountability measures. As Grindle (1980) noted, successful implementation depends not only on policy clarity but also on the ability of institutions to manage interdependencies among actors through rules, routines, and incentives.

To improve bureaucratic effectiveness, the South Kalimantan government should consider several reforms. First, clarify and strengthen the mandate of the technical team—comprising BAPPEDA, DP3AKB, BPKAD, and the Inspectorate—to coordinate and integrate PUG across all planning documents, ensuring that gender equality is embedded in strategic development agendas.

Second, formalize the roles and performance indicators for PUG focal points in all SKPDs, accompanied by regular training and technical assistance. Third, institutionalize coordination forums that bring together various stakeholders on a quarterly basis to evaluate progress, address challenges, and realign strategies. Lastly, expand the scope of the Inspectorate's oversight to include substantive evaluations of gender outcomes, not just administrative procedures.

In conclusion, although the bureaucratic structure for PUG in South Kalimantan exists formally, it lacks the operational coherence, distribution of authority, and collaborative mechanisms necessary for sustainable and impactful implementation. Strengthening this structure is essential to ensure that gender mainstreaming is not confined to a single agency, but becomes a collective and institutionalized mandate across the provincial bureaucracy.

Conclusion

The implementation of the Gender Mainstreaming Program (PUG) in South Kalimantan Province reflects both the progress achieved and the structural and operational challenges that remain. By applying the framework of George C. Edwards III, this study finds that each of the four key variables—communication, resources, the disposition of implementers, and bureaucratic structure—plays a significant role in determining the success or limitations of PUG implementation.

Communication has yet to facilitate the kind of dialogical two-way exchange necessary to build mutual understanding and collaboration among institutions. Resources, particularly in terms of skilled personnel and meaningful budget allocations, remain inadequate to drive impactful action. Meanwhile, the varying levels of commitment among institutional leaders and motivation among implementers highlight the need for stronger institutional support and sustained capacity development. In addition, although the bureaucratic structure formally exists, it lacks the functional integration and coordination mechanisms necessary to maintain effective policy implementation.

To enhance PUG implementation, it is crucial to strengthen inter-agency communication, invest in targeted human resource development, reinforce the commitment of institutional leaders through supportive policies and incentive structures, and operationalize bureaucratic roles through routine coordination and monitoring. A comprehensive and integrated approach is essential to ensure that gender mainstreaming moves beyond symbolic compliance and achieves its goal of fostering gender-equitable development outcomes in South Kalimantan and beyond.

References

Abdurahmat. (2003). *Pengertian Efektivitas.* Jakarta: PT. Rineka Cipta.

Alston, M. (2014). Gender mainstreaming and climate change. *Women's Studies International Forum*, *47*(PB). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2013.01.016

Arikunto, S. (2010). *Evaluasi Program Pendidikan.* Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.

Boru,T. (2018). *Chapter Five Research Design Methodology 5.1 Introduction Citation: Lelissa TB (2018); Research Methodology.* South Africa: Thesis: University of South Africa.

Connell, R. (2012). *Gender: In World Perspective*. Polity Press.

Boserup, E. (1997). *Women's Role in Economic Development.* London: Earthscan.

Djatmiko, P. (2014). *Kamus Bahasa Indonesia Lengkap.* Surabaya: Anugrah.

dos Muchangos, L. S., & Vaughter, P. (2019). Gender Mainstreaming in Waste Education Programs: A Conceptual Framework. *Urban Science*, *3*(1). https://doi.org/10.3390/urbansci3010029

Edwards, G. C. III. (1980). *Implementing Public Policy*. Congressional Quarterly Press.

Ginanjar, K. (1994). *Pembangunan Untuk Rakyat, Memandukan Pertumbuhan Dan Pemerataan.* Jakarta: PT Pustaka CIDES INDO.

Griffin, E. (2006). *A First Look At Communication Theory.* New York: Mc Graw Hil.

Gupta, G. R., Grown, C., Fewer, S., Gupta, R., & Nowrojee, S. (2023). Beyond gender mainstreaming: transforming humanitarian action, organizations and culture. *Journal of International Humanitarian Action*, *8*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41018-023-00138-1

Harun, Rochajat, & Ardianto, E. (2011). *Komunikasi Pembangunan dan Perubahan Sosial.* Jakarta: Raja Grafinfo Persada.

Hidayat. (1986). *Teori Efektifitas Dalam Kinerja Karyawan.* Yogyakarta: Gajah Mada University Press.

Howlett, M., & Ramesh, M. (2020). *Studying Public Policy* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.

Hudson, B., Hunter, D., & Peckham, S. (2019). Policy failure and the policy-implementation gap. *Public Policy and Administration*, 34(3), 209–229.

Ikhwan, A. (2016). Manajemen Perencanaan Pendidikan Islam (Kajian Tematik Al-Qur'an dan Hadist). *EDUKASI, Jurnal Pendidikan Islam, Vol. 04, No. 01*.

Ikhwan, A. (2017). Metode Simulasi Pembelajaran dalam Perspektif Islam. *ISTAWA: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam,Vol. 02, No. 02*.

Inpres. (2000). *Instruksi Presiden Republik Indonesia.* Diambil kembali dari Nomor 9 Tahun 2000 Tentang Pengarusutamaan Gender Dalam Pembangunan Nasional: https://www.djkn.kemenkeu.go.id/pug/assets/files/informasi/Inpres_No.9_Thn_2000_-_PUG_dalam_Pembangunan_Nasional.pdf

Lombardo, E., & Mergaert, L. (2016). Resistance in gender training and mainstreaming processes. *Politics & Gender*, 12(1), 1–22.

Mahmudi. (2010). *Manajemen Kinerja Sektor Publik.* Yogyakarta: Penerbit UUP STIM YKPN.

Mardalis. (1999). *Metode Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Proposal.* Jakarta: PT. Bumi Aksara.

Moleong, L. J. (2006). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif.* Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.

Moleong, L. J. (2009). *Metodeologi Penelitian Kualitatif.* Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.

Mosse, J. C. (1993). *Gender dan Pembangunan.* Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

Mosse, J. C. (1996). *Gender dan Pembangunan, terj. Hartian Silawati.* Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

Moser, C., & Moser, A. (2005). Gender mainstreaming since Beijing: A review of success and limitations. *Gender and Development*, 13(2), 11–22.

Moser, C. (2012). Mainstreaming women's safety in cities into gender-based policy and programmes. *Gender and Development*, *20*(3). https://doi.org/10.1080/13552074.2012.731742

Mukhopadhyay, M. (2022). *Mainstreaming Gender in Development: Institutional and Political Change*. Routledge.

Napitupulu, S. S. (2022). *Implementasi Pengarusutamaan Gender di Dinas Pemberdayaan Perempuan dan Perlindungan Anak Provinsi Sumatera Utara.* Medan: Program Studi Administrasi Publik Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik Universitas Medan Area.

Nasution. (2003). *Metode Penelitian Naturalistik Kualitatif.* Bandung: Rosdakarya.

Nelli, J. (2015). Eksistensi Perempuan pada Lembaga Politik Formal dalam Mewujudkan Kesetaraan Gender: Studi Terhadap Anggota Legislatif di Provinsi Riau. *Jurnal Syariah dan Ilmu Hukum XIV (2)*, 254-276.

Nona, A. D. (2022). Kesetaraan Gender Melalui Strategi Pengarusutamaan Gender Di P4TK TK Dan PLB Bandung. *Jurnal Spektrum Analisis Kebijakan Pendidkan, Vol. 11 (1), Edisi Maret 2022*, pp.46-63.

Noviani, M. (2022). Analisis Hambatan Pengarusutamaan Gender Dalam Perencanaan Pembangunan Provinsi Jawa Tengah Tahun 2018 – 2023. *Journal of Politic and Government Studies, Vol. 12, No. 1*, pp. 269-283.

Nugroho, R. (2008). *Gender dan Administrasi Publik.* Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

Oktari, R. S., Kamaruzzaman, S., Fatimahsyam, F., Sofia, S., & Sari, D. K. (2021). Gender mainstreaming in a Disaster-Resilient Village Programme in Aceh Province, Indonesia: Towards disaster preparedness enhancement via an equal opportunity policy.

International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction, 52. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2020.101974

OECD. (2019). *Fast Forward to Gender Equality: Mainstreaming, Implementation and Leadership*.

Pauzia, R. (2021). Pembangunan Berbasis Gender. *Musawa, Volume 13, No.2*, 227-242.

Pekei, B. (2016). *Konsep dan Analisis Efektivitas Pengelolaan Keuangan Daerah di Era Otonomi. Buku 1*. Jakarta Pusat: Taushia.

Permendagri. (2008). *Pedoman Umum Pelaksanaan Pengarusutamaan Gender Di Daerah*. Diambil kembali dari Peraturan Menteri Dalam Negeri (Permendagri) Nomor 15 Tahun 2008: https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Details/126342/permendagri-no-15-tahun-2008

Peterson, H., & Jordansson, B. (2022). Gender mainstreaming in Swedish academia: translating policy into practice. *Journal of Gender Studies*, *31*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/09589236.2021.2004539

Riyadi, & Deddy, S. B. (2005). *Perencanaan Pembangunan Daerah*. Jakarta: PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Rao, A., & Kelleher, D. (2015). *Gender at Work: Theory and Practice for 21st Century Organizations*. Routledge.

Samodra, G. P., & Amy, Y. S. (2021). Implementasi Kebijakan Pengarusutamaan Gender di Kepolisian Negara Republik Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmu Kepolisian, Volume 15 Nomor 3*, 206-216.

Santoso, W. (2016). *Penelitian dan Pengarusutamaan Gender: Sebuah Pengantar*. Jakarta: LIPI Press.

Sasongko, S. S. (2009). *Konsep dan Teori Gender*. Jakarta: Pusat Pelatihan Gender dan Peningkatan Kualitas Perempuan, BKKBN.

Setiawan, G. (2004). *Implementasi dalam Birokrasi Pembangunan*. Jakarta: Balai Pustaka.

Siagian, S. P. (1994). *Administrasi Pembangunan*. Jakarta: Gedung Agung.

Silalahi, U. (2009). *Metode Penelitian Sosial*. Bandung: PT Refika Aditama.

Soehartono, I. (2004). *Metode Penelitian Sosial Suatu Teknik Penelitian Bidang Kesejahteraan Sosial dan Ilmu Sosial Lainnya*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.

Sovitriana, R. (2020). *Kajian Gender dalam Tinjauan Psikologi Cet.I.* Ponorogo: Uwais Inspirasi Indonesia.

Subandi. (2011). *Ekonomi Pembangunan Cetakan Kesatu*. Bandung: Alfabeta.

Sugiyono. (2009). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif dan R & D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.

Sugiyono. (2024). Analisis Perencanaan dan Penganggaran Responsif Gender (Studi Kasus Dinas Koperasi, UKM Provinsi Kalimantan Selatan). *Jurnal Widyaiswara Indonesia Vol. 4, No. 4, Desember 2023*, pp.143-156.

Tasrif, M. (2003). Teologi Gender dalam Islam: Esai Bibliografis Karya-Karya Intelektual Muslim Indonesia. *Dialogia Jurnal Studi Islam dan Sosial (Ponorogo: Jurusan Ushuluddin STAIN Ponorogo, 2003)*, 1-12.

Tazkia, A., Listyaningsih, & Juliannes, C. (2022). Implementasi Pengarusutamaan Gender dalam Pembangunan di Kabupaten Pandeglang. *Jurnal Administrasi PublikVolume XVIII(1)*, 25-44.

True, J., et al. (2022). *Global Women, Peace and Security Index 2022/23*. Georgetown University.

UN Women. (2021). *Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment in Public Administration: Transformative Approaches*.

UNDP. (2020). *Institutionalizing Gender in Public Administration: A Framework for Transformative Change*.

Usman, N. (2002). *Konteks Implementasi Berbasis Kurikulum.* Jakarta: Grasindo.

Werimon, S. D. (2007). Pengaruh Partisipasi Dan Transparansi Kebijakan Publik Terhadap Hubungan Antara Pengetahuan Dewan Tentang Anggaran Dengan Pengawasan Keuangan Daerah. *Jurnal SNA X, 1-22*.

Willett, G., & Friedner, M. (2023). Reimagining Bureaucracies for Gender-Just Governance. *Gender & Development*, 31(2), 189–205.

Widoyoko, E. P. (2015). *Evaluasi Program Pembelajaran: Panduan Praktis Bagi Pendidikan Dan Calon Pendidik.* Yogyakarta: Pustaka Belajar.

White, J. (2023). Gender in Countering Violent Extremism Program Design, Implementation and Evaluation: Beyond Instrumentalism. *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism*, *46*(7). https://doi.org/10.1080/1057610X.2020.1818435