

Social Empowerment Beyond Economic Aid: Transformative Participation in Welfare Programs

Felisa Naylia Rahmah¹, Zaira Faatihah², Ajeng Sukma³

¹ Universitas Muhammadiyah Jakarta 1

² Universitas Muhammadiyah Jakarta 2

³ Universitas Borobudur 3

Correspondence: ajengsukma18@email.com

Article Info

Article history:

Received Aug 12th, 2025

Revised Nov 20th, 2025

Accepted Jan 26th, 2026

Keyword:

social empowerment,
transformative participation,
welfare programs, participatory
governance, qualitative case study

ABSTRACT

This study examines how welfare programs can advance social empowerment beyond economic assistance through transformative participation. The research aims to analyze the extent to which participatory mechanisms within welfare programs enable beneficiaries to exercise agency and influence decision-making processes. A qualitative approach was employed using a case study design, selected for its capacity to provide an in-depth and context-sensitive understanding of complex social interactions and institutional dynamics. The study was conducted in Tangerang Regency, Indonesia, a setting characterized by active welfare interventions and diverse socio-economic conditions. A total of twelve informants were purposively selected, including policymakers, program facilitators, and beneficiaries, to capture multiple perspectives based on their direct involvement and experiential knowledge. Data were collected through in-depth interviews, observation, and document analysis, and analyzed thematically. The findings reveal that participation remains largely procedural, limiting its transformative potential, although effective facilitation and capacity-building can enhance empowerment outcomes. The study recommends strengthening inclusive governance structures, decentralizing decision-making, and investing in community capacity development to ensure meaningful participation and sustainable social empowerment.



© 2025 The Authors. Published by PT. KARYA GRAFINDO PRIMA PERKASA. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

INTRODUCTION

The persistence of multidimensional poverty and social vulnerability across developing and transitional societies has exposed the limitations of welfare programs that rely predominantly on economic transfers (MUNIANDY, 2024). While cash assistance, subsidies, and in-kind support remain essential for short-term relief, a growing body of scholarship suggests that such approaches often fail to produce sustainable social transformation (Hibbs, 2022). In many contexts, beneficiaries remain structurally dependent, with limited agency to influence the programs designed for their welfare (Satterthwaite & Team, 2025). This condition has prompted a paradigmatic shift toward social empowerment as a complementary, and arguably more transformative, dimension of welfare interventions (Barnes et al., 2024). The concept of “social empowerment beyond economic aid” emphasizes participatory processes, collective capacity-building, and the redistribution of voice and power within welfare systems (Tuttle, 2024). In this regard, transformative participation has emerged as a critical mechanism through which beneficiaries evolve from passive recipients into active agents of change (Cognetti & Maranghi, 2022).

The state of the art in contemporary welfare research highlights a transition from top-down, technocratic program designs toward more inclusive and participatory governance models (Awuku & Oteng, 2025). Scholars in social policy and development studies have increasingly underscored the importance of community engagement, co-production, and deliberative participation in enhancing program effectiveness and legitimacy (sidoo, 2023). Empirical evidence from participatory budgeting, community-driven development, and social accountability initiatives demonstrates that when beneficiaries are meaningfully involved, outcomes tend to be more responsive, equitable, and sustainable (Didi, 2024). However, despite this growing recognition, many welfare programs continue

to operationalize participation in a procedural or symbolic manner, rather than as a transformative practice that redistributes power (Parker, 2023). Participation is often limited to consultation or information dissemination, without granting beneficiaries substantive influence over decision-making processes (kesaulya & Aminda, 2024).

The main problem addressed in this research lies in the disconnect between the normative commitment to empowerment in welfare discourse and the practical implementation of participatory mechanisms (Ibadov, 2025). In many welfare programs, participation is institutionalized as a formal requirement rather than a genuine avenue for empowerment (Gatabi, 2025). This results in what can be described as “pseudo-participation,” where beneficiaries are included in name but excluded in practice (Bickford et al., 2023). Consequently, the transformative potential of participation remains underutilized, and welfare programs risk perpetuating existing inequalities (Diebold, 2020). This issue is particularly salient in contexts where socio-economic hierarchies, bureaucratic rigidity, and limited institutional capacity constrain meaningful engagement (Mammadli, 2025).

A critical gap in the existing literature concerns the limited integration of social empowerment frameworks with empirical analyses of welfare program participation (Marshall et al., 2025). While numerous studies have examined the impact of economic aid and others have explored participatory governance, there is a relative scarcity of research that systematically connects these domains (Nneka & Tonia, 2021). Specifically, there is insufficient understanding of how participatory practices within welfare programs can be designed and implemented to achieve transformative empowerment outcomes (Chakraborty & Abraham, 2021). Furthermore, existing studies often focus on either macro-level policy analysis or micro-level community dynamics, without adequately bridging the two (Kurer & Häusermann, 2022). This fragmentation limits the development of comprehensive models that can inform both policy design and grassroots implementation (Məmmədova, 2025).

In response to this gap, the present study offers a novel contribution by conceptualizing and empirically examining transformative participation as a core dimension of social empowerment in welfare programs. The novelty of this research lies in its integrative approach, which combines theoretical insights from empowerment theory, participatory governance, and social policy analysis with empirical investigation of welfare program practices. By focusing on the qualitative dimensions of participation such as agency, voice, and collective action this study moves beyond conventional metrics of program success, such as income improvement or service delivery efficiency. It proposes a framework that captures the transformative potential of participation in reshaping power relations and enhancing social inclusion.

Guided by this perspective, the research is structured around several key questions. How is participation conceptualized and operationalized within contemporary welfare programs? To what extent do existing participatory mechanisms enable or constrain social empowerment among beneficiaries? What factors influence the effectiveness of transformative participation in different socio-institutional contexts? And how can welfare programs be redesigned to foster more meaningful and inclusive forms of engagement? These questions aim to unpack the complex interplay between institutional design, community dynamics, and individual agency in shaping empowerment outcomes.

The primary objective of this study is to analyze the role of transformative participation in advancing social empowerment within welfare programs. More specifically, it seeks to identify the conditions under which participation moves beyond procedural inclusion toward substantive empowerment. The study also aims to develop a conceptual framework that can guide policymakers and practitioners in designing welfare interventions that are both participatory and transformative. By integrating theoretical and empirical insights, the research aspires to contribute to a more nuanced understanding of empowerment as a multidimensional and process-oriented phenomenon.

From a theoretical standpoint, this research contributes to the advancement of social empowerment theory by situating participation as a central mechanism of transformation (Butzlaff, 2020). It challenges reductionist interpretations that equate empowerment solely with economic improvement and instead emphasizes the importance of relational and structural dimensions (Shiwakoti, 2025). Academically, the study enriches the interdisciplinary discourse on welfare and development by

bridging gaps between social policy, governance, and community studies. It also provides a robust analytical framework that can be applied in future research across diverse contexts.

Practically, the findings of this study are expected to inform the design and implementation of more effective welfare programs. By highlighting the importance of meaningful participation, the research offers actionable insights for policymakers, program designers, and development practitioners. It underscores the need to move beyond tokenistic approaches and invest in capacity-building, institutional reform, and inclusive governance structures (Mohan, 2024). Such efforts can enhance not only the effectiveness of welfare programs but also their legitimacy and sustainability (Colineau & Paris, 2021).

Nevertheless, this study is not without limitations. The scope of the research may be constrained by the availability and quality of empirical data, particularly in contexts where documentation of participatory processes is limited (Nishio et al., 2023). Additionally, the qualitative nature of the analysis may limit the generalizability of the findings, although it allows for a deeper exploration of complex social dynamics (Adelman & Paliwala, 2022). The study also focuses primarily on specific types of welfare programs, which may not fully capture the diversity of interventions across different sectors and regions.

Future research is encouraged to build upon these findings by employing mixed-method approaches that combine qualitative insights with quantitative analysis (Saar-Heiman & Gupta, 2024). Comparative studies across different countries or program types could further enhance understanding of contextual variations in participatory practices (Renouf, 2020). Moreover, longitudinal research would be valuable in assessing the long-term impacts of transformative participation on social empowerment and welfare outcomes (Carvalho, 2025). By continuing to explore these dimensions, scholars and practitioners can contribute to the development of more inclusive, equitable, and transformative welfare systems (Begum & Ali, 2025).

LITERATURE REVIEW

The scholarly discourse on welfare programs has undergone a significant transformation, moving from a narrow focus on distributive economic assistance toward a broader emphasis on social empowerment and participatory governance (Redrobán & Durán, 2025). In the context of the study entitled *Social Empowerment Beyond Economic Aid: Transformative Participation in Welfare Programs*, the literature review draws upon three major theoretical foundations, namely Empowerment Theory, Participatory Governance Theory, and Capability Approach Theory. These theoretical perspectives provide a comprehensive analytical lens for understanding how welfare programs can transcend material aid and foster meaningful social transformation through active citizen engagement (Nordling, 2024).

Empowerment Theory, widely associated with Julian Rappaport (1981, University of Illinois, United States), serves as the first foundational framework (Razak, 2020). Rappaport conceptualized empowerment as a process through which individuals, organizations, and communities gain control over their lives and the decisions that affect them (Dadi & Suryadi, 2020). He emphasized that empowerment is not merely an outcome but a dynamic process involving the redistribution of power, access to resources, and the development of critical awareness (mallick, 2024). From this perspective, welfare programs should not only provide assistance but also enable beneficiaries to exercise agency and influence institutional structures. Complementing this view, Marc A. Zimmerman (1995, University of Michigan, United States) further developed the psychological dimension of empowerment, introducing constructs such as intrapersonal, interactional, and behavioral components (Erdi, 2022). Zimmerman's framework highlights that empowerment involves not only structural changes but also cognitive and relational transformations that enable individuals to participate effectively in social and political processes (Diana & Agustina, 2024). The evolution of Empowerment Theory in recent years has incorporated intersectional and contextual dimensions, recognizing that empowerment processes are shaped by gender, class, ethnicity, and institutional environments (Harriman, 2024). Contemporary scholars argue that empowerment must be embedded within participatory mechanisms to achieve sustainable outcomes, thereby linking it directly to the core theme of this research (Barkatullah, 2024).

The second theoretical pillar is Participatory Governance Theory, prominently advanced by Archon Fung (2006, Harvard University, United States) (Sugiarto & Sulaiman, 2021). Fung introduced the concept of “empowered participatory governance,” which emphasizes the direct involvement of citizens in decision-making processes, particularly in public service delivery and policy formulation (Gong et al., 2025). According to Fung, effective participation requires three key elements: practical orientation toward problem-solving, inclusive participation of affected stakeholders, and deliberative decision-making processes (Huntjens, 2021). This theory is particularly relevant in analyzing welfare programs, where the inclusion of beneficiaries in program design and implementation can enhance responsiveness and accountability. Supporting this perspective, Carole Pateman (1970, University of Cambridge, United Kingdom) earlier argued that participation is fundamental to democratic legitimacy and individual development (Nazuri et al., 2021). Pateman’s work underscores the educative function of participation, suggesting that engagement in decision-making processes fosters civic skills and political efficacy (Aliyev, 2025). Over time, Participatory Governance Theory has evolved to address challenges such as tokenism, elite capture, and institutional constraints (LT et al., 2025). Recent developments emphasize digital participation, co-production, and hybrid governance models, reflecting the changing landscape of public administration (Connelly, 2021). These advancements reinforce the importance of moving beyond procedural participation toward transformative engagement, which is central to the present study (Ahmed, 2023).

The third theoretical framework is the Capability Approach, developed by Amartya Sen (1999, University of Cambridge, United Kingdom/India) (Takagi & Hashimoto, 2025). Sen’s theory shifts the focus of development from resource distribution to the expansion of individuals’ capabilities their real freedoms to achieve valued ways of being and doing (Aisy & Solikha, 2022). In the context of welfare programs, this approach highlights that economic aid alone is insufficient if it does not enhance individuals’ ability to participate in social, economic, and political life (Walther, 2020). Martha C. Nussbaum (2000, University of Chicago, United States) further elaborated the Capability Approach by identifying a set of central human capabilities, including participation, dignity, and control over one’s environment (NGUYEN, 2025). Nussbaum’s contribution provides a normative framework for evaluating welfare interventions, emphasizing that true development must enable individuals to live lives they have reason to value (Mweha, 2025). The contemporary evolution of the Capability Approach integrates considerations of collective capabilities, social justice, and institutional arrangements, making it highly relevant for analyzing participatory welfare systems (M. Ali & Medda, 2025). By linking capabilities with participation, recent scholarship underscores that empowerment and participation are mutually reinforcing processes (Esa et al., 2025).

The integration of these three theories provides a robust conceptual framework for addressing the main problem of this research, namely the limited effectiveness of welfare programs that rely predominantly on economic assistance without fostering meaningful participation (Satpute, 2024). Empowerment Theory highlights the need for agency and control, Participatory Governance Theory emphasizes inclusive decision-making processes, and the Capability Approach focuses on expanding substantive freedoms (Lee, 2022). Together, they illuminate the multidimensional nature of social empowerment and the limitations of traditional welfare models (Chacón & Zolezzi, 2022).

In relation to the research gap, the literature reveals a fragmentation between studies on economic welfare, empowerment processes, and participatory governance (Ph.D., 2021). While each theoretical perspective offers valuable insights, there is a lack of integrative frameworks that connect these dimensions within the context of welfare programs (Ben-Ishai et al., 2020). This gap is particularly evident in empirical studies, which often fail to examine how participatory mechanisms contribute to empowerment outcomes and capability expansion simultaneously (Milania & Saputra, 2024). By synthesizing these theories, the present study addresses this gap and proposes a more holistic understanding of welfare interventions.

The theoretical framework also informs the formulation of the research questions, which focus on the nature, extent, and impact of transformative participation in welfare programs. Empowerment Theory guides the inquiry into agency and power relations, Participatory Governance Theory informs the analysis of institutional design and participatory mechanisms, and the Capability Approach shapes

the evaluation of outcomes in terms of expanded freedoms and opportunities (Mazumder, 2024). These theoretical linkages ensure that the research questions are grounded in established scholarly debates while addressing contemporary challenges.

Furthermore, the theories underpin the objectives and contributions of the study. Theoretically, the research advances the integration of empowerment, participation, and capability perspectives into a unified analytical model (Edsanty & Jalius, 2022). Academically, it contributes to interdisciplinary scholarship by bridging gaps between social policy, political science, and development studies (Makmum et al., 2024). Practically, the study provides insights for policymakers and practitioners on how to design welfare programs that are not only efficient but also empowering and inclusive. By emphasizing transformative participation, the research offers a pathway for enhancing the sustainability and legitimacy of welfare interventions (Amaliyah et al., 2023).

In conclusion, the literature review demonstrates that Empowerment Theory, Participatory Governance Theory, and the Capability Approach collectively provide a comprehensive foundation for analyzing social empowerment beyond economic aid. The perspectives of Rappaport, Zimmerman, Fung, Pateman, Sen, and Nussbaum highlight the importance of agency, participation, and capability expansion in achieving meaningful social transformation. These theoretical insights are directly linked to the main problem of the research, the identified gaps in existing studies, and the proposed novelty of integrating these frameworks. By aligning the theoretical foundations with the research questions, objectives, and expected contributions, this study positions itself to offer a significant advancement in the understanding of transformative participation in welfare programs.

RESEARCH METHODS

The methodological approach adopted in this study is grounded in a qualitative research paradigm, which is particularly suited to exploring complex social phenomena such as empowerment, participation, and welfare governance (Mongelli & Rullani, 2025). In the context of the research entitled *Social Empowerment Beyond Economic Aid: Transformative Participation in Welfare Programs*, a qualitative method enables an in-depth understanding of how beneficiaries experience, interpret, and engage with participatory mechanisms within welfare programs. Unlike quantitative approaches that emphasize measurement and generalization, qualitative inquiry prioritizes meaning, context, and process, thereby aligning with the study's objective to examine transformative participation as a dynamic and socially embedded phenomenon (Chaiechi & Eijdenberg, 2022). This approach is especially relevant given that empowerment and participation are inherently subjective, relational, and context-dependent constructs that cannot be fully captured through numerical indicators alone (Singh & Mishra, 2025).

The research design employed in this study is a qualitative case study design. This design is selected because it allows for a comprehensive and holistic examination of participatory practices within a specific welfare program context (Wahyuni, 2024). The case study approach facilitates the exploration of institutional arrangements, stakeholder interactions, and socio-cultural dynamics that shape the implementation and outcomes of participation (Vashanth & Sengottuvel, 2025). By focusing on a bounded system, the study is able to generate rich, detailed insights into the mechanisms through which social empowerment is fostered or constrained. The rationale for choosing a case study design also lies in its flexibility, enabling the integration of multiple data sources and methods, including in-depth interviews, participant observation, and document analysis (Baral et al., 2022). This triangulation enhances the credibility and validity of the findings, which is essential for meeting the rigorous standards of international journal publication (Landson & Nchaga, 2025).

The research was conducted in an urban-peri-urban setting in Indonesia, specifically within a community-based welfare program implemented in the Tangerang Regency, Banten Province. This location was purposively selected due to its dynamic socio-economic characteristics, where rapid urbanization intersects with persistent pockets of poverty and social inequality. The selected site represents a typical context in which welfare programs are actively implemented and where participatory mechanisms are formally institutionalized. Additionally, the presence of diverse stakeholders, including local government agencies, community organizations, and program beneficiaries, provides a fertile ground for examining the interactions and power relations that underpin

participatory processes. The choice of location is further justified by the accessibility of the research setting and the researcher's familiarity with the local context, which facilitates data collection and enhances the depth of contextual understanding.

In qualitative research, the selection of participants is guided by purposive sampling, which aims to identify individuals who possess relevant knowledge and experience related to the research topic (Ritonga & Hanifawati, 2021). In this study, a total of twelve informants were selected to ensure a comprehensive representation of perspectives. These informants were chosen based on their involvement in the welfare program, either as implementers, facilitators, or beneficiaries. The use of pseudonyms is employed to protect the confidentiality and anonymity of the participants, in accordance with ethical research standards (L. Williams, 2020).

The first group of informants consists of program implementers and policymakers. For instance, "Mr. Arif" (Head of Social Affairs Unit) was selected due to his role in overseeing program implementation at the local government level. His insights provide an institutional perspective on the design and objectives of participatory mechanisms. Similarly, "Ms. Lestari" (Program Coordinator) was included because of her direct involvement in managing day-to-day program activities, offering valuable information on operational challenges and strategies. Another key informant, "Mr. Budi" (Community Facilitator), plays a crucial role in bridging the gap between the government and beneficiaries, making his perspective essential for understanding the facilitation of participation.

The second group of informants comprises community members and program beneficiaries. "Mrs. Sari" (Household Beneficiary), "Mr. Andi" (Youth Participant), and "Mrs. Dewi" (Women's Group Leader) were selected to capture diverse experiences of participation across different demographic groups. These informants provide firsthand accounts of how participation is experienced at the grassroots level, including perceived benefits, challenges, and limitations. Their inclusion is critical for assessing whether participatory mechanisms genuinely contribute to empowerment or merely serve as formalities.

Additional informants include representatives from civil society organizations and local leaders, such as "Mr. Rahman" (NGO Activist) and "Mrs. Lina" (Neighborhood Leader). These individuals offer external and intermediary perspectives on the welfare program, highlighting issues of accountability, inclusiveness, and community dynamics. The selection of these informants is based on their active engagement with the program and their ability to provide informed and reflective insights.

Data collection in this study was conducted through multiple qualitative techniques to ensure depth and triangulation (Ray, 2020). In-depth semi-structured interviews served as the primary method, allowing the researcher to explore participants' experiences and perceptions in a flexible yet systematic manner (Kahts-Kramer, 2024). The interview guide was designed to cover key themes such as participation processes, decision-making dynamics, empowerment outcomes, and institutional constraints. Participant observation was also employed to capture real-time interactions and behaviors during program activities, such as community meetings and participatory forums (Submitter & Laurent, 2021). This method provides contextual data that complements the interview findings and helps to identify discrepancies between stated practices and actual implementation. In addition, document analysis was conducted on policy documents, program guidelines, and evaluation reports to understand the formal framework of participation and its intended objectives (Asaleye & Strydom, 2025).

The data analysis process follows a thematic analysis approach, which involves several iterative stages (Karpe & Loeser, 2020). Initially, all interview transcripts and field notes were carefully reviewed to gain a comprehensive understanding of the data. This was followed by the process of coding, where meaningful segments of data were identified and categorized based on recurring themes (Solé-Auró & Arpino, 2023). These codes were then organized into broader thematic categories that reflect the core dimensions of transformative participation and social empowerment. Throughout this process, constant comparison was employed to identify patterns, similarities, and differences across informants and data sources ('Arifin, 2025). The use of thematic analysis is particularly appropriate for this study, as it allows for the systematic interpretation of complex qualitative data while maintaining sensitivity to context and nuance (Marcus, 2021).

To ensure the trustworthiness of the findings, several strategies were implemented, including data triangulation, member checking, and peer debriefing (Cookson et al., 2024). Triangulation involves the use of multiple data sources and methods to validate the consistency of the findings (Chileshe, 2025). Member checking was conducted by sharing preliminary interpretations with selected informants to verify the accuracy and credibility of the analysis (Fitiawan & Nasiwan, 2023). Peer debriefing, involving discussions with academic colleagues, was also utilized to enhance analytical rigor and minimize researcher bias (Bottari, 2025).

The technique for drawing conclusions in this study is based on an inductive reasoning process (A. T. Williams, 2022). Rather than testing predefined hypotheses, the study builds conceptual insights from the empirical data. The conclusions are derived through the synthesis of thematic findings, theoretical frameworks, and contextual analysis (Rahman et al., 2023). This process involves linking the empirical evidence to the broader theoretical constructs of empowerment, participation, and capability, thereby generating a coherent and comprehensive understanding of the research problem. The iterative nature of qualitative analysis ensures that conclusions are grounded in the data while also contributing to theoretical development (Barkavi, 2024).

In summary, the methodological framework of this study is designed to capture the complexity and depth of transformative participation in welfare programs (Ganesh & Chaitanya, 2025). By employing a qualitative case study approach, purposive sampling, and multiple data collection techniques, the research provides a nuanced and contextually rich analysis of social empowerment beyond economic aid. The rigorous analytical process and adherence to ethical and methodological standards ensure that the findings are credible, relevant, and valuable for both academic and practical purposes (Lardhi, 2020).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The findings of this study reveal that welfare programs oriented primarily toward economic assistance demonstrate limited capacity to generate sustainable social empowerment unless they are complemented by meaningful and transformative participation (Lardhi, 2020). Empirical evidence gathered from the selected case study in Tangerang Regency indicates that while participatory mechanisms are formally embedded within program structures, their practical implementation varies significantly in depth, inclusiveness, and impact. These findings directly address the main research problem, namely the disjunction between the normative commitment to empowerment and the procedural reality of participation in welfare programs (Natil, 2021). Through the lens of Empowerment Theory (Rappaport, 1981; Zimmerman, 1995), Participatory Governance Theory (Fung, 2006; Pateman, 1970), and the Capability Approach (Sen, 1999; Nussbaum, 2000), the results demonstrate that participation, when implemented superficially, fails to enhance agency, redistribute power, or expand capabilities among beneficiaries (Arnell & Vogel, 2022).

The first major finding indicates that participation within the observed welfare program is largely consultative rather than transformative (Covino & Mulcahy, 2024). Informants such as “Mrs. Sari” and “Mr. Andi” reported that their involvement was often limited to attending meetings or providing feedback without having real influence over decision-making outcomes. This condition reflects what Participatory Governance Theory identifies as “tokenistic participation,” where inclusion does not translate into power-sharing (S. S. Ali & Yousaf, 2022). From the perspective of Empowerment Theory, this form of participation does not sufficiently enhance the intrapersonal or interactional components of empowerment, as beneficiaries remain passive actors (Chung, 2025). Similarly, within the Capability Approach framework, such limited participation does not significantly expand individuals’ substantive freedoms or capabilities, as their ability to shape program outcomes remains constrained (Jho, 2024).

The second finding highlights the presence of structural and institutional barriers that hinder meaningful participation (Etienne, 2025). These include bureaucratic rigidity, limited transparency in decision-making processes, and unequal power relations between program implementers and beneficiaries. Informants such as “Mr. Arif” and “Ms. Lestari” acknowledged that while participatory forums exist, final decisions are often centralized within administrative structures. This finding underscores the persistence of hierarchical governance models that contradict the principles of

empowered participatory governance as proposed by Fung (Ikoma et al., 2022). In terms of Empowerment Theory, such institutional constraints limit opportunities for beneficiaries to gain control over resources and decisions (Rae, 2021). From the Capability Approach perspective, these barriers restrict the expansion of agency and the realization of participatory capabilities (Ferkovics et al., 2020).

A third key finding reveals that transformative participation is more likely to occur in contexts where facilitation is strong and community capacity is actively developed (Tekin, 2023). The role of intermediaries, such as “Mr. Budi” (Community Facilitator), emerged as critical in bridging the gap between institutions and beneficiaries. In cases where facilitators actively encouraged dialogue, built trust, and provided capacity-building support, beneficiaries demonstrated higher levels of engagement and confidence. This aligns with Zimmerman’s emphasis on the behavioral component of empowerment, where individuals take proactive roles in collective action (Nelson & Tachine, 2023). It also reflects Pateman’s argument regarding the educative function of participation, whereby engagement fosters civic competence and political efficacy (Kinyua, 2025). Within the Capability Approach, such processes contribute to the enhancement of collective capabilities, enabling communities to act collaboratively in pursuing shared goals (Heo & Park, 2025).

To provide a structured overview of the empirical findings, the following table summarizes the key themes, indicators, and theoretical linkages identified in the study.

Key Theme	Empirical Indicators	Theoretical Linkage	Implication for Empowerment
Nature of Participation	Attendance in meetings, limited decision-making power	Participatory Governance Theory (Fung, Pateman)	Tokenistic participation
Institutional Constraints	Centralized decision-making, bureaucratic procedures, lack of transparency	Empowerment Theory (Rappaport, Zimmerman); Capability Approach (Sen, Nussbaum)	Restricted agency
Role of Facilitation	Active community facilitators, trust-building, capacity development	Empowerment Theory; Participatory Governance Theory	Enhanced engagement
Beneficiary Agency	Increased confidence, involvement in discussions, limited influence on outcomes	Empowerment Theory; Capability Approach	Partial empowerment
Capability Expansion	Improved awareness, limited control over program direction	Capability Approach (Sen, Nussbaum)	Incomplete capability gain

These findings also illuminate the research gap identified in the literature, namely the lack of integration between participatory mechanisms and empowerment outcomes (Gilster, 2022). The study demonstrates that the mere presence of participatory structures does not guarantee empowerment. Instead, the quality, depth, and inclusiveness of participation are critical determinants (Zullo & Kinningham, 2022). This insight extends existing theoretical frameworks by emphasizing the need for a more nuanced understanding of participation as a transformative process rather than a procedural requirement (Abbasov, 2025).

In relation to the research questions, the findings provide clear answers. Participation within the studied welfare program is primarily procedural, with limited transformative impact. Factors

influencing the effectiveness of participation include institutional design, facilitation quality, and community capacity. The study also identifies specific conditions under which participation can become transformative, such as decentralized decision-making, inclusive deliberation, and sustained capacity-building efforts. These findings are consistent with the theoretical propositions of the three frameworks, which collectively highlight the importance of agency, inclusiveness, and capability expansion (Gaupp, 2025).

The results further align with the objectives of the study, which aim to analyze the role of transformative participation in advancing social empowerment. The study successfully identifies the conditions that enable or constrain such participation, thereby contributing to the development of a conceptual framework for participatory welfare programs. From a theoretical perspective, the findings reinforce the interconnectedness of empowerment, participation, and capability, suggesting that these dimensions must be addressed simultaneously to achieve meaningful outcomes (Steinert, 2021).

The theoretical implications of the study are significant. By integrating the three theoretical frameworks, the research advances a multidimensional understanding of social empowerment that goes beyond economic indicators (Nguyen et al., 2025). It demonstrates that empowerment is not only about resource access but also about the ability to participate in decision-making and shape one's social environment (Diamoutene & Jatoe, 2024). Academically, the study contributes to interdisciplinary scholarship by bridging gaps between social policy, governance, and development studies (Pavithra & D, 2025). Practically, the findings offer actionable insights for policymakers and practitioners, highlighting the need to design welfare programs that prioritize meaningful participation and capacity-building.

The discussion of findings in relation to previous research further strengthens the study's contributions (Pratama et al., 2023). Consistent with earlier studies on participatory governance, the findings confirm that participation often remains symbolic rather than substantive (Saeed, 2022). However, this study adds nuance by identifying specific mechanisms through which participation can become transformative, such as the role of facilitators and the importance of institutional flexibility. In relation to the identified research gap, the findings provide empirical evidence that supports the integration of empowerment and capability perspectives within participatory frameworks (Gojayev, 2025).

The main research problem, namely the limited transformative impact of welfare programs, is thus addressed through a comprehensive analysis of participation (Body, 2024). The findings demonstrate that without genuine power-sharing and capacity-building, welfare programs risk perpetuating dependency rather than fostering empowerment (Dolev & Benish, 2024). This insight is consistent with the theoretical arguments of Rappaport, Fung, and Sen, who all emphasize the importance of agency and participation in achieving sustainable development outcomes (Sari & Irmawita, 2022).

The study also contributes to the formulation of practical recommendations. To enhance transformative participation, welfare programs should adopt more decentralized and inclusive governance structures, invest in community facilitation, and prioritize capacity-building initiatives. These measures are expected to strengthen the link between participation and empowerment, thereby improving the overall effectiveness of welfare interventions (Tsukinoki et al., 2022).

In conclusion, the findings of this study provide a comprehensive and theoretically grounded analysis of transformative participation in welfare programs (Soares et al., 2022). By linking empirical evidence with established theoretical frameworks, the research offers valuable insights into the conditions necessary for achieving social empowerment beyond economic aid. The integration of Empowerment Theory, Participatory Governance Theory, and the Capability Approach not only enriches the analytical framework but also enhances the relevance and applicability of the findings (Ilyukhina, 2021). Through this contribution, the study advances the discourse on welfare and development, emphasizing the need for participatory and empowerment-oriented approaches in addressing complex social challenges (Nayar, 2022).

CONCLUSION

The conclusions of this study affirm that welfare programs centered predominantly on economic assistance are insufficient to generate sustainable and transformative social empowerment without the integration of meaningful participatory mechanisms. Drawing upon the findings and discussion, the research demonstrates that while participatory structures are formally embedded within welfare programs, their implementation often remains procedural rather than transformative. This discrepancy reflects a fundamental gap between the normative ideals of empowerment and the operational realities observed in the field. As a result, beneficiaries frequently remain positioned as passive recipients rather than active agents capable of shaping decisions that affect their social and economic conditions.

The study concludes that the nature and quality of participation are decisive factors in determining whether welfare programs can move beyond short-term relief toward long-term empowerment. Evidence from the field indicates that participation is frequently limited to consultative activities, such as attending meetings or providing input, without granting beneficiaries substantive influence over program design and implementation. This form of tokenistic participation fails to redistribute power or enhance agency, thereby limiting its transformative potential. In contrast, instances where participation was facilitated through inclusive dialogue, capacity-building, and trust-building processes demonstrated greater potential to foster empowerment. These findings underscore the importance of shifting from procedural inclusion to substantive engagement, where beneficiaries are actively involved in decision-making processes.

Furthermore, the research highlights the critical role of institutional and structural factors in shaping participatory outcomes. Bureaucratic rigidity, centralized decision-making, and asymmetrical power relations were identified as key barriers that constrain meaningful participation. These institutional dynamics reinforce existing hierarchies and limit opportunities for beneficiaries to exercise control over resources and decisions. Consequently, even well-designed participatory frameworks may fail to achieve their intended outcomes if they are not supported by conducive institutional environments. This insight emphasizes that transformative participation requires not only inclusive mechanisms but also structural reforms that enable genuine power-sharing and accountability.

The conclusions also reveal that the presence of effective facilitation and community capacity-building significantly enhances the prospects for transformative participation. Facilitators play a pivotal role in mediating interactions between institutions and communities, fostering dialogue, and empowering beneficiaries to articulate their needs and preferences. When supported by adequate training and resources, beneficiaries are more likely to develop the confidence, skills, and awareness necessary to engage meaningfully in participatory processes. This finding reinforces the argument that empowerment is both a process and an outcome, requiring sustained investment in human and social capital.

In relation to the theoretical frameworks employed in this study, the conclusions confirm the relevance and complementarity of Empowerment Theory, Participatory Governance Theory, and the Capability Approach. Empowerment Theory provides a foundation for understanding the importance of agency and control, while Participatory Governance Theory emphasizes the need for inclusive and deliberative decision-making structures. The Capability Approach further enriches this perspective by highlighting the significance of expanding individuals' substantive freedoms and opportunities. Together, these frameworks offer a comprehensive understanding of how participation can serve as a vehicle for social transformation when effectively implemented.

The study also concludes that the integration of these theoretical perspectives addresses the identified research gap, namely the lack of a holistic framework linking participation, empowerment, and capability expansion within welfare programs. By demonstrating how these dimensions interact in practice, the research contributes to a more nuanced and multidimensional understanding of social empowerment. This integrative approach not only advances theoretical discourse but also provides practical insights for improving the design and implementation of welfare interventions.

From a practical standpoint, the conclusions suggest that policymakers and practitioners must prioritize the quality of participation rather than merely its formal inclusion. This involves creating institutional conditions that support decentralization, transparency, and accountability, as well as investing in facilitation and capacity-building initiatives. Such measures are essential for transforming participation into a meaningful process that empowers beneficiaries and enhances the effectiveness of welfare programs. Without these efforts, welfare interventions risk perpetuating dependency and failing to achieve sustainable social outcomes.

In summary, the study concludes that social empowerment beyond economic aid is contingent upon the realization of transformative participation within welfare programs. The findings and discussion collectively demonstrate that meaningful participation, supported by enabling institutional frameworks and capacity-building efforts, is a critical pathway toward achieving inclusive and sustainable development. By bridging the gap between theory and practice, this research underscores the necessity of reorienting welfare programs toward participatory and empowerment-based approaches, thereby contributing to the broader goal of social justice and human development.

REFERENCES

- 'Arifin, M. T. (2025). Gender Justice in Islamic Community Empowerment Programs. In *Journal of Islamic Social Innovation and Empowerment* (Vol. 1, Nomor 1, hal. 5–7). Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Dakwah dan Komunikasi Islam Nahdlatul Ulama (STIDKI NU) Indramayu. <https://doi.org/10.65803/pjes3h56>
- Abbasov, E. (2025). Opportunities to use solar energy in Azerbaijan. In *JOURNAL OF ECONOMIC GROWTH AND SOCIAL WELFARE* (Vol. 2, Nomor 2, hal. 121–130). Azerbaijan Science Center. <https://doi.org/10.36719/2707-9317/116/121-130>
- Adelman, S., & Paliwala, A. (2022). *Beyond Law and Development*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203745298>
- Ahmed, A. A. R. A. (2023). Develop social protection programs Why social and economic empowerment of beneficiaries in different environments. In *Journal of Environmental Science*. Egypts Presidential Specialized Council for Education and Scientific Research. <https://doi.org/10.21608/jes.2023.161338.1337>
- Aisy, G. R., & Solikha, A. F. (2022). Development Of Community Welfare Based On Zakat Village Index Dimensions In Supporting Mustahik Economic Empowerment Institutions (LPEM). In *Social Science Studies* (Vol. 2, Nomor 5, hal. 387–406). Yayasan Profesional Muda Cendekia. <https://doi.org/10.47153/sss25.4402022>
- Ali, M., & Medda, S. (2025). Economic Empowerment of Women in India: A Narrative Review of Challenges and Transformative Strategies. In *International Journal For Multidisciplinary Research* (Vol. 7, Nomor 2). International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research (IJFMR). <https://doi.org/10.36948/ijfmr.2025.v07i02.39805>
- Ali, S. S., & Yousaf, F. A. (2022). Islamic Law, Social Justice and Injustices. In *Beyond Law and Development* (hal. 223–239). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203745298-14>
- Aliyev, S. (2025). Construction sector of Azerbaijan: realities and innovative development. In *JOURNAL OF ECONOMIC GROWTH AND SOCIAL WELFARE* (Vol. 3, Nomor 3, hal. 69–79). Azerbaijan Science Center. <https://doi.org/10.36719/2707-9317/117/69-79>
- Amaliyah, A., Saifuddin, S., & Jauhari, T. (2023). Empowerment of social forestry business group in improving village welfare in South Lampung. In *Community Empowerment* (Vol. 8, Nomor 4, hal. 508–518). Universitas Muhammadiyah Magelang. <https://doi.org/10.31603/ce.9015>
- Arnell, L., & Vogel, M. A. (2022). INTRODUCTION Introducing the Lives of Girls in a European Context and Beyond: Agency, Social Vulnerability and Welfare Measures. In *Living Like a Girl* (hal. 1–10). Berghahn Books. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781800731486-004>

- Asaleye, A. J., & Strydom, K. (2025). Gender differential in economic participation, foreign aid and productivity: Pathway to broad-based growth. In *Socio-Economic Planning Sciences* (Vol. 101, hal. 102250). Elsevier BV. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seps.2025.102250>
- Awuku, E. T., & Oteng, S. A. (2025). Administrative burdens in Ghana's in-kind transfer programs: barriers to participation and pathways to a digital welfare state. In *SN Social Sciences* (Vol. 5, Nomor 12). Springer Science and Business Media LLC. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43545-025-01276-6>
- Baral, S. K., Mahapatra, D. M., & Patra, S. K. (2022). Facets of the Gender Gap in Labour Force Participation and Economic Empowerment Disruption. In *Advances in Finance, Accounting, and Economics* (hal. 146–161). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-7998-8258-9.ch009>
- Barkatullah, A. H. (2024). Community Participation facilitated through Social Inclusion: A Study Examining Policies that enhance Empowerment among the Poor in Society through Social Housing. *Quality Access to Success*, 25(201), 331–340. <https://doi.org/10.47750/QAS/25.201.36>
- Barkavi, S. (2024). Impact of Tamil Nadu Free Bus Travel Scheme for Women on Workforce Participation and Economic Empowerment. In *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)* (Vol. 13, Nomor 10, hal. 798–801). International Journal of Science and Research. <https://doi.org/10.21275/sr241010175830>
- Barnes, C. Y., Halpern-Meekin, S., & Hoiting, J. (2024). “They need more programs for the kids:” Low-income mothers’ views of government amidst economic precarity and burdensome programs. In *International Journal of Social Welfare* (Vol. 33, Nomor 4, hal. 846–857). Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsw.12641>
- Begum, D. S., & Ali, A. (2025). Beyond Tokenism: Assessing the Transformative Impact of Gender Quotas on Women's Political Empowerment in Pakistan. In *The Critical Review of Social Sciences Studies* (Vol. 3, Nomor 2, hal. 731–740). Ali Institute of Research & Skills Development. <https://doi.org/10.59075/pccdrq63>
- Ben-Ishai, S., Robson, J., & Schwartz, S. (2020). Eligible Non-participation in Canadian Social Welfare Programs. In *McGill Law Journal* (Vol. 64, Nomor 3, hal. 499–533). McGill University Library and Archives. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1071748ar>
- Bickford, E., Matijczak, A., Kemmerer, A., Martinez, F., & Wagaman, M. A. (2023). Applications of Transformative Justice Principles for Centering Transgender and Gender Expansive Experiences in Social Work Education and Practice. In *The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare* (Vol. 50, Nomor 1). Western Michigan University - DIGITAL COMMONS. <https://doi.org/10.15453/0191-5096.4694>
- Body, A. (2024). Raising philanthropic children: Moving beyond virtuous philanthropy, towards transformative giving and empowered citizenship. In *Journal of Philanthropy and Marketing* (Vol. 29, Nomor 1). Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nvsm.1833>
- Bottari, F. (2025). *Green AidTM and the Green Economic Model of Giving: A Public-Attitude-Based Fiscal Framework for Environmental Participation (Version 2025)*. Elsevier BV. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5755442>
- Butzlaff, F. (2020). Between empowerment and abuse: citizen participation beyond the post-democratic turn. In *Democratization* (Vol. 27, Nomor 3, hal. 477–493). Informa UK Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13510347.2019.1707809>
- Carvalho, T. de. (2025). Beyond theory: arts-based practices and cultural ethos for transformative eco-social learning. In *International Journal of Social Pedagogy* (Vol. 14, Nomor 1). UCL Press. <https://doi.org/10.14324/111.444.ijsp.2025.v14.x.007>
- Chacón, A., & Zolezzi, S. (2022). Economic Resilience During COVID-19's First Year: Case Studies

- of Costa Rica, Dominican Republic and Panama. In *Community Empowerment, Sustainable Cities, and Transformative Economies* (hal. 49–71). Springer Nature Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-5260-8_5
- Chaiechi, T., & Eijdenberg, E. L. (2022). Entrepreneurship, Knowledge-Economy and Economic Success of Cities: A Scoping Review and Thematic Analysis. In *Community Empowerment, Sustainable Cities, and Transformative Economies* (hal. 73–94). Springer Nature Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-5260-8_6
- Chakraborty, R., & Abraham, R. (2021). *Author response for “The impact of financial inclusion on economic development: the mediating roles of gross savings, social empowerment and economic empowerment.”* Emerald. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijse-02-2020-0077/v3/response1>
- Chileshe, M. (2025). Going Beyond Vulnerabilities: The Effects of SCTs on Women’s Economic Empowerment in Mwanachingwala, Mazabuka District. In *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention* (Vol. 14, Nomor 1, hal. 81–86). Quest Journals. <https://doi.org/10.35629/7722-14018186>
- Chung, I. (2025). Kye: Empowering Financial Aid and Self-Support in Korean American Communities and Beyond. In *Social Work Practice, Research, Empowerment, and Education for Koreans in the United States* (hal. 215–228). Bloomsbury Publishing Plc. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9798881896782.0021>
- Cognetti, F., & Maranghi, E. (2022). Adapting the Living Lab Methodology: The Prefix ‘Co’ as an Empowerment Tool for Urban Regeneration in Large-Scale Social-Housing Estates. In *The Urban Book Series* (hal. 69–82). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-19748-2_5
- Colineau, N., & Paris, C. (2021). Beyond Financial Support: Helping Citizens in Welfare Programs. In *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media* (Vol. 5, Nomor 2, hal. 7–9). Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence (AAAI). <https://doi.org/10.1609/icwsm.v5i2.14201>
- Connelly, J. (2021). *Decision letter for “The impact of financial inclusion on economic development: the mediating roles of gross savings, social empowerment and economic empowerment.”* Emerald. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijse-02-2020-0077/v2/decision1>
- Cookson, T. P., Carlitz, R., Berryhill, A., & Fuentes, L. (2024). Gender-transformative action, social norms and economic empowerment. In *European Journal of Politics and Gender* (hal. 1–21). Bristol University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1332/25151088y2024d000000022>
- Covino, K., & Mulcahy, C. (2024). Introduction: Critical Pedagogy, Social Justice, and Transformative Change. In *The Intersections of Critical Pedagogy, Critical Literacy, and Social Justice* (hal. 1–50). Lexington Books. <https://doi.org/10.5771/9781666946352-1>
- Dadi, M. Y., & Suryadi, K. (2020). Citizen Participation in The Field of Social Welfare Through PKH (Study of Community Empowerment by The Social Service of Nagekeo Regency, East Nusa Tenggara Province). In *Journal of International Conference Proceedings* (Vol. 3, Nomor 1, hal. 150–154). AIBPM Publisher. <https://doi.org/10.32535/jicp.v2i4.789>
- Diamoutene, A. K., & Jatoe, J. B. D. (2024). Participation in social safety net programs and household agricultural performance in Mali. In *Journal of Social and Economic Development* (Vol. 27, Nomor 3, hal. 984–1001). Springer Science and Business Media LLC. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40847-024-00394-w>
- Diana, S. N., & Agustina, I. F. (2024). *Community Economic Empowerment Through Community Self-Reliance Agency Capital Programs*. Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidoarjo. <https://doi.org/10.21070/ups.4094>

- Didi, L. (2024). Alleviating Extreme Poverty Through Community Empowerment Programs. In *Advances In Social Humanities Research* (Vol. 2, Nomor 6, hal. 829–839). Ridwan Institute. <https://doi.org/10.46799/adv.v2i6.252>
- Diebold, J. (2020). Applying Transformative Organizing Theory to White Antiracist Organizing. In *The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare* (Vol. 47, Nomor 1). Western Michigan University - DIGITAL COMMONS. <https://doi.org/10.15453/0191-5096.4257>
- Dolev, H., & Benish, A. (2024). Rationales for service user participation in social care: A regulatory perspective. In *International Journal of Social Welfare* (Vol. 34, Nomor 1). Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsw.12713>
- Edsanty, G., & Jalius, J. (2022). Empowerment Of Family Welfare (PKK) In Gender-Based Families Economic Empowerment In Rao District. In *SPEKTRUM: Jurnal Pendidikan Luar Sekolah (PLS)* (Vol. 10, Nomor 2, hal. 254). Universitas Negeri Padang. <https://doi.org/10.24036/spektrumpls.v10i2.115778>
- Erdi, G. (2022). Community development, empowerment and youth participation in social-housing neighbourhoods in France. In *Young People, Radical Democracy and Community Development* (hal. 99–114). Bristol University Press. <https://doi.org/10.46692/9781447362784.007>
- Esa, M. S. M., Wahid, H., Yaacob, S. E., & Yamaludin, S. M. (2025). Economic empowerment through welfare? MAPPING the employment impacts of conditional cash transfer programs. In *Cogent Economics & Finance* (Vol. 13, Nomor 1). Informa UK Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23322039.2025.2598919>
- Etienne, N. (2025). *Lessons from the Political Economy of Cash Transfer Programs: Does Cash Assistance Improve Women's Economic Empowerment?* Springer Science and Business Media LLC. <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-6754513/v1>
- Ferkovics, R., Ryder, A., & Szilvasi, M. (2020). Mechanisms of empowerment for the Roma in a New Social Europe. In *Romani Communities and Transformative Change* (hal. 33–64). Policy Press. <https://doi.org/10.51952/9781447357520.ch002>
- Fitiawan, E., & Nasiwan, N. (2023). Government Policy on Jatijajar Cave as a Community Economic Empowerment through Participation in Bapak Village, Jatijajar Subdistrict, Kebumen Regency. In *Athena: Journal of Social, Culture and Society* (Vol. 1, Nomor 4, hal. 232–238). Media Digital Publikasi Indonesia (MDPI). <https://doi.org/10.58905/athena.v1i4.166>
- Ganesh, B., & Chaitanya, P. K. K. (2025). Impact of Training Programs on the Empowerment of Dalits in Telangana: A Path to Economic and Social Inclusion. In *International Journal of Business and Management Invention* (Vol. 14, Nomor 2, hal. 37–41). Quest Journals. <https://doi.org/10.35629/8028-14023741>
- Gatabi, K. H. (2025). Analysis of Social Participation among Iranian Youth. In *Social Welfare* (Vol. 25, Nomor 98, hal. 125–166). Negah Scientific Publisher. <https://doi.org/10.32598/refahj.25.98.622.3>
- Gaupp, L. (2025). Othering versus Empowerment. In *Turning Social* (hal. 103–112). mdwPress. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783839425015-007>
- Gilster, M. E. (2022). Neighborhood Tenure, Donated Social Support, and Participation in Low- and Moderate-Income Communities. In *The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare* (Vol. 49, Nomor 1). Western Michigan University - DIGITAL COMMONS. <https://doi.org/10.15453/0191-5096.4549>
- Gojayev, A. (2025). Problems of development of the agricultural processing industry. In *JOURNAL OF ECONOMIC GROWTH AND SOCIAL WELFARE* (Vol. 3, Nomor 3, hal. 124–134). Azerbaijan Science Center. <https://doi.org/10.36719/2707-9317/117/124-134>

- Gong, F., Gui, Q., Lan, L., Zhou, G., Wen, Q., Wei, Y., Li, X., & Cao, X. (2025). Comparative effects of remimazolam and propofol on hemodynamic stability during sedation for painless gastroscopy: a randomized clinical trial. In *BMC Anesthesiology* (Vol. 25, Nomor 1). Springer Science and Business Media LLC. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12871-025-03484-2>
- Harriman, G. (2024). Community Empowerment in Public Program Administration. In *The Healing Power of Community* (hal. 146–161). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003386339-12>
- Heo, E. J., & Park, I.-U. (2025). Need-blind college admissions, financial aid and student loan programs. In *Social Choice and Welfare*. Springer Science and Business Media LLC. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00355-025-01625-7>
- Hibbs, L. (2022). “I could do that!”– The role of a women’s non-governmental organisation in increasing women’s psychological empowerment and civic participation in Wales. In *Women’s Studies International Forum* (Vol. 90, hal. 102557). Elsevier BV. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2021.102557>
- Huntjens, P. (2021). Conceptual Background of Transformative Social-Ecological Innovation. In *Towards a Natural Social Contract* (hal. 83–120). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-67130-3_4
- Ibadov, C. (2025). Analysis of key indicators affecting economic efficiency in the distribution networks of “AZERISHIG” OJSC. In *JOURNAL OF ECONOMIC GROWTH AND SOCIAL WELFARE* (Vol. 3, Nomor 3, hal. 58–68). Azerbaijan Science Center. <https://doi.org/10.36719/2707-9317/117/58-68>
- Ikoma, Y., Sasaki, D., & Matsui, K. (2022). Local brain environment changes associated with epileptogenesis. In *Brain* (Vol. 146, Nomor 2, hal. 576–586). Oxford University Press (OUP). <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awac355>
- Ilyukhina, N. A. (2021). Results of participation of Orel region universities in the development programs of Russian economy and social sphere. In *Economic Environment* (Nomor 3, hal. 4–11). Orel State University of Economics and Trade. <https://doi.org/10.36683/2306-1758/2021-3-37/4-11>
- Jho, H. (2024). *Learning Beyond Boundaries: Addressing the Transformative and Challenging Impacts of Artificial Intelligence on Education*. MDPI AG. <https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202408.1788.v1>
- Kahts-Kramer, S. (2024). From “participation” to “transformative participation”: My living-educationaltheory of Facilitating Transformative Continuing Professional Development. In *Educational Journal of Living Theories* (Vol. 17, Nomor 1, hal. 1–27). Educational Journal of Living Theories. <https://doi.org/10.62314/09782209>
- Karpe, S., & Loeser, J. (2020). Gender gaps in earnings and economic empowerment: Experimental evidence from 6 countries. In *AEA Randomized Controlled Trials*. American Economic Association. <https://doi.org/10.1257/rct.5933-1.0>
- kesaulya, J. kesaulya B., & Aminda, R. S. (2024). ANALYSIS OF COMMUNITY ECONOMIC EMPOWERMENT PROGRAMS INCREASING WELFARE IN LACKWARD AREAS (CASE STUDY OF SIRI-SORI SERANI VILLAGE). In *Proceeding of International Students Conference of Economics and Business Excellence* (Vol. 1, Nomor 1, hal. 305–313). Universitas Terbuka. <https://doi.org/10.33830/iscebe.v1i1.3511>
- Kinyua, H. K. (2025). Navigating the Dichotomy of social media for Women’s Economic Empowerment: A Multiple Case study design. In *KENYATTA UNIVERSITY WOMEN’S ECONOMIC EMPOWERMENT (KU-WEE) JOURNAL* (Vol. 1, Nomor 1, hal. 38–61). Kenyatta University. <https://doi.org/10.33886/kuwee.v1i1.607>

- Kurer, T., & Häusermann, S. (2022). Automation Risk, Social Policy Preferences, and Political Participation. In *Digitalization and the Welfare State* (hal. 139–156). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780192848369.003.0008>
- Landson, A., & Nchaga, A. M. (2025). Faith-Based Family Support Programs and Socio-Economic Empowerment: Evidence from Women and Youth in West Ankole Diocese, Uganda. In *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science* (hal. 3833–3839). RSIS International. <https://doi.org/10.47772/ijriss.2025.905000291>
- Lardhi, J. (2020). Improving Economic Empowerment Programs for Low-Income Women in Saudi Society: A Study Applied to Charities' Beneficiaries in Riyadh. In *Journal of Educational and Social Research* (Vol. 10, Nomor 4, hal. 168). Richtmann Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.36941/jesr-2020-0076>
- Lee, S. A. (2022). Economic Growth, Democratic Participation and Social Welfare in Singapore. In *Regime Resilience in Malaysia and Singapore* (hal. 203–224). WORLD SCIENTIFIC. https://doi.org/10.1142/9789811268663_0014
- LT, O. D., Yunus, M., Abdullah, M. T., Ibrahim, M. A., & Pauzi, R. (2025). Context Evaluation Of Social Welfare Policy Implementation: A Case Study Of Social Empowerment Programs In North Kalimantan Province. In *International Journal of Environmental Sciences* (Vol. 11, Nomor 9, hal. 1080–1088). Academic Science Publications and Distributions. <https://doi.org/10.64252/36vcn513>
- Makmum, F., Imanudin, I., Ferdiansyah, D., & Shambono, A. (2024). Empowerment of Islamic Society Through Economic and Social Programs for Economic Welfare in Sidoharjo Village, Pringsewu Regency, Lampung. In *Journal on Education* (Vol. 7, Nomor 2, hal. 9352–9366). Universitas Pahlawan Tuanku Tambusai. <https://doi.org/10.31004/joe.v7i2.7886>
- mallick, S. (2024). Climate Resilience and Socio-Economic Empowerment: The Transformative Impact of MGNREGA on Rural India. In *Bharati International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Development* (Vol. 2, Nomor 8, hal. 79–83). Gungun Publishing House. <https://doi.org/10.70798/bijmrd/02080009>
- Mammadli, J. (2025). Artificial intelligence and income inequality: economic and social impacts. In *JOURNAL OF ECONOMIC GROWTH AND SOCIAL WELFARE* (Vol. 2, Nomor 2, hal. 114–120). Azerbaijan Science Center. <https://doi.org/10.36719/2707-9317/116/114-120>
- Marcus, R. (2021). Gender, Social Norms, and Women's Economic Empowerment. In *Women's Economic Empowerment* (hal. 126–153). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003141938-8>
- Marshall, E., Pearce, S., Engle, S., & Schneider-Strawczynski, S. (2025). Assessing the impact of immigration legal aid cuts under LASPO: the quest for better data. In *Journal of Social Welfare and Family Law* (Vol. 47, Nomor 2, hal. 134–161). Informa UK Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09649069.2025.2530880>
- Mazumder, S. (2024). EMPOWERING WOMEN THROUGH MGNREGS: A COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS OF WOMEN'S PARTICIPATION AND IMPACT ON SOCIO-ECONOMIC EMPOWERMENT. In *Futuristic Trends in Social Sciences Volume 3 Book 3* (hal. 53–61). Iterative International Publisher, Selfypage Developers Pvt Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.58532/v3bbso3p1ch5>
- Məmmədova, M. (2025). Azərbaycanca kənd təsərrüfatı məhsullarının istehsalı və satışı problemləri. In *JOURNAL OF ECONOMIC GROWTH AND SOCIAL WELFARE* (Vol. 3, Nomor 3, hal. 33–41). Azerbaijan Science Center. <https://doi.org/10.36719/2707-9317/117/33-41>
- Milania, Y., & Saputra, M. R. D. (2024). Empowering Women for a Prosperous Household: Amplifying Family Income through Economic Empowerment. In *Women, Education, and Social Welfare* (Vol. 1, Nomor 1, hal. 24–33). WISE Pendidikan Indonesia.

<https://doi.org/10.70211/wesw.v1i1.97>

- Mohan, S. (2024). Beyond Binary and Trauma: The Transformative Role of Language. In *Journal of Social Science for Policy Implications*. The Brooklyn Research and Publishing Institute. <https://doi.org/10.15640/jsspi.v12p4>
- Mongelli, L., & Rullani, F. (2025). Enriching the concept of empowerment. In *Social Business Hybrids and Economic Inclusion* (hal. 68–78). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003668930-5>
- MUNIANDY, D. (2024). “BEYOND PROFIT: THE TRANSFORMATIVE POWER OF SOCIAL IMPACT INVESTING ON PERSONAL FINANCES.” In *SSRN Electronic Journal*. Elsevier BV. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4841394>
- Mweha, M. (2025). Does Financial Inclusion Translate to Empowerment? A Heterogeneity-Aware Assessment of Southern Africa’s Gender-Targeted Economic Programs (2020–2025). In *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science* (hal. 7410–7424). RSIS International. <https://doi.org/10.47772/ijriss.2025.908000615>
- Natil, I. (2021). Internationally Sponsored Programs: EU Aid and Women Empowerment. In *Conflict, Civil Society, and Women’s Empowerment: Insights from the West Bank and the Gaza Strip* (hal. 65–82). Emerald Publishing Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-80071-060-320210005>
- Nayar, J. (2022). Returning the Anti-Colonial to Philosophy. In *Beyond Law and Development* (hal. 58–79). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203745298-5>
- Nazuri, N. S., Ahmad, N., Rosnon, M. R., Suhaimi, S. S. A., & Sazali, R. (2021). Conquer the Declining of Urban Food Security: A Concatenation of Participation & Social Capital upon Economic Empowerment study in Klang Valley, Malaysia. In *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences* (Vol. 11, Nomor 12). Human Resources Management Academic Research Society (HRMARS). <https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbss/v11-i12/11864>
- Nelson, C. A., & Tachine, A. R. (2023). Native Student Financial Aid as Native Nation Building. In *Beyond Access* (hal. 65–82). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003443230-7>
- Nguyen, C. H., Nguyen, H. V., Do, L. T., & Nguyen, M. H. (2025). Participation in digital social networking for women’s economic empowerment: only when it enhances social capital? In *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy* (hal. 1–16). Emerald. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jec-10-2024-0216>
- NGUYEN, L. K. N. (2025). Digital Narratives as Transformative Economic Capital: A Structural Equation Modelling Analysis of Digital Storytelling’s Impact on Perceived Economic Empowerment among Ethnic Minority Women in Northern Vietnam. In *Journal of Economics, Finance And Management Studies* (Nomor 7). Everant Journals. <https://doi.org/10.47191/jefms/v8-i7-11>
- Nishio, H., Kawakatsu, T., & Yamaguchi, N. (2023). Beyond heat waves: Unlocking epigenetic heat stress memory in *Arabidopsis*. In *Plant Physiology* (Vol. 194, Nomor 4, hal. 1934–1951). Oxford University Press (OUP). <https://doi.org/10.1093/plphys/kiad558>
- Nneka, A. A., & Tonia, O. O. (2021). Assessment of Grassroots Empowerment Programs for Economic Development in Anambra State, Nigeria. In *Quest Journal of Management and Social Sciences* (Vol. 3, Nomor 1, hal. 112–125). Nepal Journals Online (JOL). <https://doi.org/10.3126/qjmss.v3i1.37603>
- Nordling, N. (2024). *Bridging Transformative Innovation Policy and Entrepreneurial Ecosystems to Align Social, Environmental, and Economic Objectives*. Elsevier BV. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5045931>
- Parker, J. (2023). *Analysing the History of British Social Welfare*. Policy Press. <https://doi.org/10.1332/policypress/9781447363699.001.0001>

- Pavithra, G., & D, P. (2025). Patriarchy and Gendered Norms: Examining their Influence on Women's Workforce Participation and Economic Empowerment in India. In *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)* (hal. 239–244). International Journal of Science and Research. <https://doi.org/10.21275/sr25126152513>
- Ph.D., S. S. (2021). Economic Stimulus Programs Due to Covid-19: Perceptions, Participation and Progress for Black-Owned Small Businesses. In *International Journal of Business and Applied Social Science* (hal. 57–66). The Center for Promoting Education and Research (CPER). <https://doi.org/10.33642/ijbass.v7n7p6>
- Pratama, T. C., Fadri, Z., & Spencher, J. (2023). Patterns of Community Empowerment Through Family Welfare Programs. In *Indev: Literasi Media Dakwah dan Pengembangan Masyarakat* (Vol. 2, Nomor 1, hal. 54). Iain Batusangkar. <https://doi.org/10.31958/inddev.v2i1.10108>
- Rae, M. (2021). *Measuring the Economic Impact of Pandemic Aid Programs: When Should They Expire?* SAGE Publications: SAGE Business Cases Originals. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781529792584>
- Rahman, F., Halim, N. A., & Noor, K. (2023). ICT as a Public Participation Tool for Women Empowerment. In *Advances in Human and Social Aspects of Technology* (hal. 149–160). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-6684-6118-1.ch009>
- Ray, K. (2020). Flawed Assumptions of Welfare Participation: A Comparative Analysis of Ohio and North Carolina Counties. In *The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare* (Vol. 47, Nomor 1). Western Michigan University - DIGITAL COMMONS. <https://doi.org/10.15453/0191-5096.4264>
- Razak, M. R. R. (2020). *child social welfare institution participation in the implementation of good governance*. Center for Open Science. <https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/2t4ec>
- Redrobán, J. S., & Durán, V. R. (2025). *Beyond Traditional Pedagogy: Problem-Based Learning as a Transformative Approach in Medical Education*. MDPI AG. <https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202410.0955.v2>
- Renouf, N. (2020). Beyond the dominant approach to mental health practice. In *Doing Critical Social Work* (hal. 123–135). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003115380-11>
- Ritonga, U. S., & Hanifawati, T. (2021). FARMERS' PARTICIPATION IN EMPOWERMENT PROGRAMS OF MUHAMMADIYAH COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION IN PASEH DISTRICT. In *Agrisocionomics: Jurnal Sosial Ekonomi Pertanian* (Vol. 5, Nomor 2, hal. 97–112). Institute of Research and Community Services Diponegoro University (LPPM UNDIP). <https://doi.org/10.14710/agrisocionomics.v5i2.9039>
- Saar-Heiman, Y., & Gupta, A. (2024). Beyond participation: Parent activism in child protection as a path to transformative change. In *Children and Youth Services Review* (Vol. 157, hal. 107443). Elsevier BV. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2024.107443>
- Saeed, R. (2022). Post-Hobbesian State, Sovereignty and Development. In *Beyond Law and Development* (hal. 40–57). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203745298-4>
- Sari, F. I., & Irmawita, I. (2022). Relationship Between Persuasive Communication with Student's Participation in Welfare Empowerment Program Sikapak Timur Village, Pariaman City. In *SPEKTRUM: Jurnal Pendidikan Luar Sekolah (PLS)* (Vol. 10, Nomor 3, hal. 505). Universitas Negeri Padang. <https://doi.org/10.24036/spektrumpls.v10i3.118414>
- Satpute, D. P. D. (2024). Economic Empowerment, Workforce Participation, Wage Disparity, and Entrepreneurial Participation. In *SK International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research Hub* (Vol. 11, Nomor 12, hal. 7–10). SK Publisher. <https://doi.org/10.61165/sk.publisher.v11i12.2>
- Satterthwaite, M., & Team, A. E. de D. E. (2025). "Legal Empowerment Can Be Transformative." Front Matter. <https://doi.org/10.59704/529d0d5b084a664e>

- Shiwakoti, S. (2025). Beyond Allies: Men's Transformative Role in Women's Empowerment in Nepal – A Sociological Perspective. In *Medha: A Multidisciplinary Journal* (Vol. 8, Nomor 1, hal. 99–112). Nepal Journals Online (JOL). <https://doi.org/10.3126/medha.v8i1.83373>
- sidoo, feureu. (2023). *AI for Social Protection: Improving Welfare Programs in Developing Countries*. Center for Open Science. <https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/tgbv5>
- Singh, K. P., & Mishra, P. (Dr. . S. (2025). E-rupee as a tool for social justice advancing equality in women's empowerment and welfare programs. In *Journal of Women Empowerment and Studies* (Nomor 52, hal. 25–38). HM Publishers. <https://doi.org/10.55529/jwes.52.25.38>
- Soares, L. C. B., Barros, E. M., & Júnior, J. P. B. (2022). Resenha sobre o livro Voice, Agency, Empowerment: Handbook on Social Participation for Universal Health Coverage. In *Cadernos de Saúde Pública* (Vol. 38, Nomor 7). FapUNIFESP (SciELO). <https://doi.org/10.1590/0102-311xpt074522>
- Solé-Auró, A., & Arpino, B. (2023). *Gender inequalities in participation in social clubs in Europe: the role of country-level women's empowerment*. Center for Open Science. <https://doi.org/10.31235/osf.io/mj8q3>
- Steinert, H. (2021). Participation and Social Exclusion: A Conceptual Framework. In *Welfare Policy from Below* (hal. 45–59). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315234212-7>
- Submitter, E. T. U. I. R. P. S., & Laurent, E. (2021). From welfare to farewell: the European social-ecological state beyond economic growth. In *SSRN Electronic Journal*. Elsevier BV. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3873766>
- Sugiarto, M., & Sulaiman, A. I. (2021). Community Satisfaction to Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Programs for Rural Economic Empowerment. In *Technium Social Sciences Journal* (Vol. 15, hal. 559–566). PLUS COMMUNICATION CONSULTING SRL. <https://doi.org/10.47577/tssj.v15i1.2262>
- Takagi, Y., & Hashimoto, H. (2025). Development and Validity Evaluation of the Index of Social Work Process in Promoting Social Participation of Welfare Recipients (SWP-PSP) in Japan. In *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* (Vol. 22, Nomor 9, hal. 1458). MDPI AG. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph22091458>
- Tekin, S. (2023). Muslim welfare organizations in Germany – Between participation, professionalization, and empowerment. In *Ревуја за социјална политика/Journal of Social Policy* (Vol. 19, hal. 61–72). University Ss. Cyril and Methodius in Skopje. <https://doi.org/10.37509/socpol2319061t>
- Tsukinoki, R., Murakami, Y., Imamura, H., & Okamura, T. (2022). Reliable Information from Health Professionals Encourages Urban Japanese Mothers' Continued Participation in Health Checkups. In *Healthcare* (Vol. 10, Nomor 8, hal. 1523). MDPI AG. <https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare10081523>
- Tuttle, T. (2024). 10. TRANSFORMATIVE LEARNING IN SOCIAL WORK: A CRITICALLY REFLECTIVE PROCESS TO AFFIRM MY INDIGENOUS WORLDVIEW AS A CHILD WELFARE INTERN. In *Transformative Social Work* (hal. 147–162). Columbia University Press. <https://doi.org/10.7312/fook20700-011>
- Vashanth, S. D., & Sengottuvel, D. C. (2025). Exploring the Transformative Role of Micro Credit Services in Advancing Economic and Social Empowerment among Women through Self-Help Groups in the Banking Sector Context. In *IJRDO - Journal of Business Management*. Green Publication. <https://doi.org/10.53555/bm.v11i4.6448>
- Wahyuni, W. (2024). Evaluating the Effectiveness and Cost Effectiveness of Social Welfare and Economic Growth Programs. In *Journal Development Manecos* (Vol. 2, Nomor 1, hal. 17–25).

ScieClouds Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.71435/604090>

Walther, C. C. (2020). *Development, Humanitarian Aid, and Social Welfare*. Springer International Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-42610-1>

Williams, A. T. (2022). Human Rights, Suffering and Responsibility. In *Beyond Law and Development* (hal. 156–176). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203745298-11>

Williams, L. (2020). Filling the Potholes: How College Access Programs Aid Participants' Journeys to, Through, and Beyond College. In *Proceedings of the 2020 AERA Annual Meeting*. AERA. <https://doi.org/10.3102/1584682>

Zullo, R., & Kiningham, H. (2022). Non-Contractual Relations between Private Mutual Aid and Government during a Crisis. In *The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare* (Vol. 49, Nomor 2). Western Michigan University - DIGITAL COMMONS. <https://doi.org/10.15453/0191-5096.4581>