SUB DISTRICT ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENT
IN JAMBI CITY, JAMBI PROVINCE

Fernandes Simangunsong and Imelda Hutasoit
Institut Pemerintahan Dalam Negeri,
Jl. Raya Bandung-Sumedang Km. 20 Jatinangor
email: kisankiel@yahoo.co.id, imeldahutasoit77@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The Research on sub-district administrative Arrangement in the City of Jambi-Jambi Province aims to analyse the ability level of the region, especially in 7 (seven) Kelurahan (Sub-Urban Area) in the City of Jambi in encouraging the success of democratization, development and public services as well as understanding public aspirations about the possibility of regional development and its expansion. This study applies an approach that bringing the characteristics of the application of measurement and evaluation models to measure the ability of the region in these following areas: Kenali Besar, Penyengat Bawah, Bagan Pete, Mayang Mengurai, Kenali Asam Bawah, Talang Bakung and Eka Jaya. This article accordingly will describe and explain how the strength or influence of the observed variables on the successful implementation of regional autonomy policies, especially in the development or administrative restructuration.

Key words; Regional Arrangement, Village, Community Aspirations

INTRODUCTION

The position of the kelurahan or sub-district on Local Government Bill no. 23 year 2014 is different from the previous law, although the position of the district head is still similar. At the time when the Bill Number 22 Year 1999 and later the Bill Number 32 Year 2004 came into effect, the sub-district head was no longer the head of the region, but as a regional apparatus/ civil servant. Article 120 paragraph (2) of the Bill Number 32 Year 2004 states that the district/city apparatus consists of the regional secretariat, the DPRD secretariat, regional offices, regional technical institutions, sub-districts and sub-districts. So, legally the position of the district leader or named camat is equal to that of the heads of regional offices and village heads. Such positioning makes the sub-district and village heads have full and autonomous authority in the implementation of political decision-making in their regions.

Furthermore, Article 208 paragraph (1) of the Bill no. 23/2014 stipulates that regional heads and DPRDs in carrying out government affairs are assisted by Regional Apparatus. Furthermore, according to Article 209 paragraph (2) states that the District/City Regional Apparatus consists of: a) Regional Secretariat, b) DPRD Secretariat, c) Inspectorate, d) Service, e) Agency, and f) District. kelurahan is not included in it. This means that the kelurahan is no longer part of the regional apparatus. This is different when compared to the provisions in the two previous Regional Government Laws which explicitly state the kelurahan as a regional apparatus. As a result, administrative and political delegations of authority from districts/ cities to sub-districts have changed.

Table 1. The differences between Kelurahan as SKPD (regional apparatus) and Non-SKPD

No	Aspect	Kelurahan as a Regional Apparatus Law no. 32 of 2004	Kelurahan Not a Regional Apparatus Law no. 23 of 2014
1	Juridical provisions	Article 120 paragraph (2) of Law No. 32 of 2004, as a regional apparatus together with the regional secretariat, DPRD	Article 209 paragraph (2) of Law No. 23 of 2014, the kelurahan is not a regional apparatus

		secretariat, regional offices, regional technical institutions, districts.	
2	Definition of kelurahan or sub-district	**Permendagri No. 36/2007 on** the work area of the village head as the district / city apparatus in the subdistrict working area.	The definition is not stated other than the provisions for its formation through a regional regulation (Article 229 paragraph (1))
3	Authority	Implementing political decentralization (devolution-delegation of authority) and Carrying out government affairs delegated by regents / mayors **(Article 2 Permendagri No. 36 of 2007 concerning the Delegation of District / City Government Affairs to village heads)**	Only up to the District level must carry out Government Affairs which fall under the authority of the Region and assistance tasks (Article 209 (3))
4	The task of the village head	**In Law no. 32 of 2004, namely the** implementation of village government activities, community empowerment, community service, implementation of general peace and order, and maintenance of public service infrastructure and facilities. **In the Minister of Home Affairs Regulation No. 36 of 2007 that the** Kelurahan is the Work Area of the Lurah as a Regency / City Apparatus in the District Work Area (Article 1), the Lurah Has the Task of Organizing Government, Development, and Social Affairs (Article 2 Paragraph (1)), Lurah Carrying out the Government Affairs delegated by the Regent / Mayor. (Article 2 Paragraph (2)), Regents / Mayors Delegate Government Affairs to Village Heads according to Village Needs, Pay Attention to Efficiency and Accountability (Article 3), Regency / City	**In Article 229 of Law No. 23 of 2014** mentioned tasks headman help camat in Implementing K egiatan Government Village, Mel akukan Community Empowerment, Mel aksanakan Community Services, Maintaining serenity and Order Works, Maintaining infrastructure of a Dan Facilities General Services, Carry Duty Elsewhere Provided By Camat, Carrying Out Other Tasks in Accordance with the Provisions of the Prevailing Laws.

		Government Affairs Delegated by Regent / Mayor to Lurah Are Obligatory Affairs And Optional Account (Article 5 Paragraph (1)), and Provisions Further Regulated in the Upati / Mayor Regulation (Article 5 Paragraph (2)).	
5	Planning	Have the autonomy to compile their own Plans and Strategies (Renstra) according to community needs	Does not have the autonomy to compile its own Strategic Plan. The strategic plan made is part of the district strategic plan
6	Budgeting	Have the autonomy to budget themselves according to needs and Strategic Planning	It depends on the availability of funds and the Strategic Plan owned by the District
7	Authority	The authority is given by the regent / mayor according to the needs of the village head, both compulsory and optional affairs	Limited to carrying out tasks assigned by the camat

The objectives of the regional autonomy policy as contained in Law Number 23 of 20 1 4 are improving services and better welfare of the community, developing a life of democratization, justice and equity, as well as maintaining harmonious relations between the center and regions as well as between regions in order to maintain the integrity of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia.

In line with that, regional autonomy is placed in its entirety in regency / city regions, and the granting of autonomy authority to district / city regions is based on the broad, real and responsible decentralization principle. The achievement of the objectives of the regional autonomy policy is largely determined by the level of capacity of the village / kelurahan as the smallest and closest government unit to the community in providing public services, implementing development and increasing democratization .

Law Number 23 Year 20 14 states that a sub-district can be formed in a sub-district with a regional regulation guided by a Government Regulation. PP Number 17 of 2018 concerning Recognition, further stipulates that the formation of a new kelurahan is obliged to pay attention to the population, area, socio-culture, potential of the village, government facilities and infrastructure.

This provision opens the opportunity to form a new kelurahan by means of a sub-district solution as long as there are aspirations of the community and the formation of a sub-district can fulfill the objectives of creating effective governance, public services, development and democratization of the smallest government units. In order to fulfill these objectives, it is necessary to measure and assess the potential of a sub-district that is owned and can be used as a basis for whether or not to form a new village.

The measurement results pay attention to the main factors consisting of the accumulated population and number of family heads and supporting factors which are a certain number of scores from the potential ability level which is the basis for assessing whether a kelurahan is feasible or not to be divided. Assessment of the level of potential capacity in the context of solving a sub-district is an assessment of the potential of the main village and plans to form a village. The results of the assessment can be categorized into 3 (three) levels of the results of the assessment ,

namely passing / deserving, passing conditionally / quite feasible and not passing / not worthy. The results of the assessment which constitute a policy recommendation are as follows:

1. If the candidate for the main kelurahan and the candidate for kelurahan solving meets the requirements according to the main factor and passes / is eligible according to the supporting factors, then the choice of action taken is to propose the settlement of the kelurahan or the establishment of a new kelurahan;

2. If the candidate for the main village and the candidate for sub-district solution meet the requirements according to the main factors and pass conditionally / quite feasible or do not pass / do not qualify according to the supporting factors, then the choice of action taken is to propose solving the sub-district or the formation of a new kelurahan, followed by developing its potential towards pass / deserve within a certain period of time;

3. If one of the candidates for the main kelurahan and candidates for the kelurahan solving does not meet the requirements according to the main factors and passes / deserves, passes conditionally / is quite feasible or does not pass / does not qualify according to the supporting factors, then it

cannot be proposed to solve the kelurahan or the formation of a new kelurahan.

METHOD

This research is an application of measurement and evaluation models of regional capabilities, especially the 7 (seven) Kelurahan in Jambi City, namely Kenali Besar Village, Penyengatendah Village, Bagan Pete Village, Mayang Mengurai Village, Kenali Asam Bawah Village, Talang Bakung Village and Eka Jaya Village. which will describe and explain the level of strength or influence of the observed variables on the successful implementation of regional autonomy policies. However, due to article journal policy, the report will be analysing 2 kelurahan only, and those are: Penyengat Rendah and Kenali Besar. The operationalization of the variable for the development and structuring of the Kelurahan in Jambi City will be limited according to the space for development and regional arrangement with an elaborative format based on PP 129 of 2000 and Government Regulation Number 78 of 2008 in lieu of PP 129 of 2000 and Law no. 23 of 2014 along with PP No. 17 of 2018 concerning the District. The development and arrangement of the Kelurahan in Jambi City uses 19 supporting factors which are used as research variables as follows:

Table 2. Factors and Indicators of Sub District Evaluation

No	Factors And Indicators
1.	**Demographics**
	1. Total Population.
	2. Number of Households
	3. Area.
	4. Number of Rukun Warga
	5. Number of Family Heads
	6. Total Population Density
2.	**Orbitation**
	1. Mileage from RW to Kelurahan
	2. Travel Time from RW to Kelurahan
3.	**Education**
	1. Number of Educational Facilities
	2. The ratio of the number of illiterate people
	3. Ratio of population dropping out of school
	4. Ratio of population who have completed general education.
	5. Skills institute index
4.	**Health**

No	Factors And Indicators
	1. Number of health facilities, medical personnel, infant and under-five mortality rates.
	2. Ratio of infant and toddler immunization participants
	3. Poor nutritional status index
	4. The ratio of family latrines
	5. The ratio of the number of underprivileged families
	6. The ratio of drinking water facilities
	7. House / residence condition index
5.	**Religious**
	1. Number of Worship Facilities
6.	**Sports Facilities**
	1. Comparison of Sports Facility Index with Total Population
7.	**Transportation**
	1. Comparison of the index of the number of means of transportation
8.	**Communication**
	1. Index comparison of the number of means of communication
9.	**General Information**
	1. Number of Electricity Customers
	2. Total other general lighting
10.	**Political Awareness**
	1. Number of voting rights
	2. Number of users with the right to vote
	3. Number of Political Parties
	4. Number of CSOs / NGOs and other community organizations
11.	**Kamtibmas**
	1. Number of means of security
	2. Number of security personnel
12.	**Agriculture**
	1. Comparison of indices for each area, yield, and ownership of plantation area, secondary crops, vegetables, fruit, rice fields.
	2. Number of Agricultural Groups, irrigation managers, and rice fields and garden facilities.
13.	**Fishery**
	1. The area of aquaculture area
	2. Fishery yield and total ownership
14.	**Ranch**
	1. Large and medium livestock
	2. Poultry
15.	**Employment**
	1. Total working population
	2. Total population looking for work
	3. Total population not working / unemployed
	4. Number of large, medium and small companies.
	5. Number of agricultural companies
16.	**Socio-cultural**
	1. The number of art facilities

No	Factors And Indicators
	2. Number of Social Institutions
	3. Number of tourism facilities
1 7 .	**Community Economy**
	1. Means of Shopping
	2. Banking Financial Institutions
	3. Non-banking financial institutions
18 .	**Community Social Conditions**
	1. The number of people with physical disabilities
	2. The number of people who have problems and become a burden to the government.
19 .	**Governance Aspects**
	1. UN
	2. Village Original Income
	3. Other Village Income
	4. Number of Kelurahan officials
	5. Village Decree
	6. Village Regulations

The qualitative data will be analyzed through the content and depth approach of translating a phenomenon to 19 supporting research variables. The way to accommodate qualitative analysis is to stimulate various trends in qualitative answers from respondents to this phenomenon. From a list of open-ended question structures, then complemented by a compilation of in-depth interviews, then with field observations the variables will be compiled through a structured file. However, some of the qualitative data was renovated into quantitative data through non-parametric processes. Meanwhile, quantitative data will be categorized, classified and processed as a basis for measurement and analysis to provide an explanation and assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the research variables.

Assessment categories are based on a certain scale and are determined according to the classification of pass, conditional pass and fail based on a certain number of representative scores. Each category of assessment becomes the basis for the choice of action to divide and / or not divide the Village/ Kelurahan and the utilization of its potential. The valuation method is determined through the distribution method, namely the average method that takes into account the distribution of data. The score calculation using this method is adjusted to the slope and tapering of the data distribution curve. Each sub-indicator has a score of 1 for the smallest score and a score of 6 for the largest value. How to make a scoring by:

Calculates the mean, standard deviation, and coefficient of kurtosis / skewness.

Calculating boundary 2 (value 2 x kurtosis / skewness x standard deviation), and limit 1 (value 1 x kurtosis x standard deviation) and;

Defines the index class for scoring:

1) If the indicator score> average + limit 2, it gets a score of 6;

2) If average + limit 2 ☐ indicator value <average + limit 1, get a score of 5;

3) If average + limit 1 ☐ indicator value <average, get a score of 4;

4) If the average ☐ of the indicator value <average - limit 1, get a score of 3;

5) If average - limit 1 ☐ indicator value <average limit 2, get a score of 2;

6) If the value of the indicator ☐ average - limit 2, got a score of 1;

The assumptions used in the weighting are that each variable or criterion has a different weight according to its role and urgency in governance, development and society. The weight for basic services such as health and education facilities is 1 1, the economic weight of the community,

transportation, communication and public information is 7, the weight for demography, orbit, political awareness, agriculture and socio-culture is 5, the weight for facilities , the weight for religion, sports, social security, fisheries, livestock, and manpower is 3, while the weight of the social conditions of the community is 2. The minimum passing score is

the total number of sub-indicator scores on each criterion variable/ group multiplied by the score above the average for each criterion variable or group times the weight for each indicator group. The calculation of the maximum and minimum total score of each and all variables can be seen in the following table:

Table 3. Action Options Category

No	Category	Interval Score Total	Conclusion
1	*2*	*3*	*4*
1	High Potential	$1,008 \le TS < 1,680$	It deserves to be expanded
2	Enough Potential	$644 \le TS < 1,008$	It is quite feasible that the Kelurahan to be expanded followed by the development of its potential within a certain time
3	Low Potential	$280 \le TS < 644$	It is not feasible for Kelurahan to be expanded, so its ensuing pot is developed to go to the Fairly Adequate category

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Based on the criteria set above, the results of assessment can be seen as follows:

1. **Expansion of   Kelurahan Penyengat Rendah**

The result studies show that Kelurahan Penyengat Rendah based on 19 variables on each community unit at Kelurahan Penyengat Rendah hit the score of 1.024 or 104,2% from minimal standard (1.008), in other words, this region is having low potentials.

Table 4. Community Unit Potentials at Penyengat Rendah

No	Kelurahan	Community Unit	Total Score	Score Interval	Category
1	Penyengat	1	955	$644 \le TS < 1.008$	Decent enough
2	Rendah	2	1.008	$644 \le TS < 1.008$	Decent
3		3	1.052	$1.008 \le TS < 1.680$	Decent
4		4	1.134	$1.008 \le TS < 1.680$	Decent
5		5	1.117	$1.008 \le TS < 1.680$	Decent
6		6	1.073	$1.008 \le TS < 1.680$	Decent
7		7	1.126	$1.008 \le TS < 1.680$	Decent
8		8	992	$644 \le TS < 1.008$	Decent enough
9		9	1.145	$1.008 \le TS < 1.680$	Decent
10		10	1.153	$1.008 \le TS < 1.680$	Decent
11		11	1.133	$1.008 \le TS < 1.680$	Decent
12		12	1.155	$1.008 \le TS < 1.680$	Decent
13		13	1.195	$1.008 \le TS < 1.680$	Decent
14		14	968	$644 \le TS < 1.008$	Decent enough
15		15	1.107	$1.008 \le TS < 1.680$	Decent

16		16	984	$644 \le TS < 1.008$	Decent enough
17		17	1.037	$1.008 \le TS < 1.680$	Decent
18		18	959	$644 \le TS < 1.008$	Decent enough
19		19	1.042	$1.008 \le TS < 1.680$	Decent
20		20	958	$644 \le TS < 1.008$	Decent enough
21		21	1.003	$644 \le TS < 1.008$	Decent enough
22		22	1.015	$1.008 \le TS < 1.680$	Decent
23		23	1.010	$1.008 \le TS < 1.680$	Decent
24		24	974	$644 \le TS < 1.008$	Decent enough
25		25	1.070	$1.008 \le TS < 1.680$	Decent
26		26	867	$644 \le TS < 1.008$	Decent enough
27		27	902	$644 \le TS < 1.008$	Decent enough
28		28	1.034	$1.008 \le TS < 1.680$	Decent
29		29	939	$644 \le TS < 1.008$	Decent enough
30		30	816	$644 \le TS < 1.008$	Decent enough
31		31	819	$644 \le TS < 1.008$	Decent enough
Total Score			**31.742**		
Average			**1.024**		
Minimum Total Score			**816**		
Maximum Total Score			**1.195**		

Source: Data Analysis by authors

The majority of people agree to an expansion of the Village well from community leaders, religious leaders, youth leaders, women leaders and education leaders. One of the forms of community aspirations in supporting the expansion of the kelurahan is the inclusion of the community's aspirations in determining the capital of the Kelurahan and the plan for the name of the kelurahan in the event of a sub - district expansion.

2. The Expansion of Kelurahan Kenali Besar

The results of the study on the potential of the Kenali Besar Village area through scoring on 19 (nineteen) research variables on RTs/ Community Unit in the Kenali Besar Village obtained a score of 1,011 or 103.6 % of the minimum standard of the graduation category (1,008).

Tabel 5. Community Unit Potentials at Kelurahan Kenali Besar

No	Kelurahan	RT	Total Score	Score Interval Skor	Category
1	Kenali Besar	1	916	$644 \le TS < 1.008$	Decent enough
2		2	1.054	$1.008 \le TS < 1.680$	Decent
3		3	1.027	$1.008 \le TS < 1.680$	Decent
4		4	982	$644 \le TS < 1.008$	Decent enough
5		5	1.045	$1.008 \le TS < 1.680$	Decent
6		6	1.015	$1.008 \le TS < 1.680$	Decent
7		7	1.017	$1.008 \le TS < 1.680$	Decent
8		8	981	$644 \le TS < 1.008$	Decent enough
9		9	1.029	$1.008 \le TS < 1.680$	Decent
10		10	1.083	$1.008 \le TS < 1.680$	Decent
11		11	969	$644 \le TS < 1.008$	Decent enough
12		12	1.036	$1.008 \le TS < 1.680$	Decent
13		13	1.074	$1.008 \le TS < 1.680$	Decent

No	Kelurahan	RT	Total	Score Interval Skor	Category
14		14	1.032	$1.008 \leq TS < 1.680$	Decent
15		15	1.049	$1.008 \leq TS < 1.680$	Decent
16		16	1.075	$1.008 \leq TS < 1.680$	Decent
17		17	965	$644 \leq TS < 1.008$	Decent enough
18		18	1.037	$1.008 \leq TS < 1.680$	Decent
19		19	1.036	$1.008 \leq TS < 1.680$	Decent
20		20	974	$644 \leq TS < 1.008$	Decent enough
21		21	941	$644 \leq TS < 1.008$	Decent enough
22		22	985	$644 \leq TS < 1.008$	Decent enough
23		23	963	$644 \leq TS < 1.008$	Decent enough
24		24	963	$644 \leq TS < 1.008$	Decent enough
25		25	985	$644 \leq TS < 1.008$	Decent enough
26		26	1.028	$1.008 \leq TS < 1.680$	Decent
27		27	1.055	$1.008 \leq TS < 1.680$	Decent
28		28	1.026	$1.008 \leq TS < 1.680$	Decent
29		29	1.031	$1.008 \leq TS < 1.680$	Decent
30		30	1.017	$1.008 \leq TS < 1.680$	Decent
31		31	1.040	$1.008 \leq TS < 1.680$	Decent
32		32	1.027	$1.008 \leq TS < 1.680$	Decent
33		33	993	$644 \leq TS < 1.008$	Decent enough
34		34	988	$644 \leq TS < 1.008$	Decent enough
35		35	1.004	$644 \leq TS < 1.008$	Decent enough
36		36	1.032	$1.008 \leq TS < 1.680$	Decent
37		37	1.050	$1.008 \leq TS < 1.680$	Decent
38		38	1.027	$1.008 \leq TS < 1.680$	Decent
39		39	936	$644 \leq TS < 1.008$	Decent enough
40		40	1.067	$1.008 \leq TS < 1.680$	Decent
41		41	994	$644 \leq TS < 1.008$	Decent enough
42		42	1.064	$1.008 \leq TS < 1.680$	Decent
43		43	1.122	$1.008 \leq TS < 1.680$	Decent
44		44	1.014	$1.008 \leq TS < 1.680$	Decent
45		45	994	$644 \leq TS < 1.008$	Decent enough
46		46	1.018	$1.008 \leq TS < 1.680$	Decent
47		47	992	$644 \leq TS < 1.008$	Decent enough
48		48	957	$644 \leq TS < 1.008$	Decent enough
49		49	938	$644 \leq TS < 1.008$	Decent enough
50		50	1.048	$1.008 \leq TS < 1.680$	Decent
51		51	1.040	$1.008 \leq TS < 1.680$	Decent
52		52	1.042	$1.008 \leq TS < 1.680$	Decent
53		53	979	$644 \leq TS < 1.008$	Decent enough
54		54	946	$644 \leq TS < 1.008$	Decent enough
55		55	986	$644 \leq TS < 1.008$	Decent enough
56		56	980	$644 \leq TS < 1.008$	Decent enough
57		57	986	$644 \leq TS < 1.008$	Decent enough
58		58	938	$644 \leq TS < 1.008$	Decent enough
59		59	986	$644 \leq TS < 1.008$	Decent enough
60		60	996	$644 \leq TS < 1.008$	Decent enough

No	Kelurahan	RT	Total	Score Interval Skor	Category
61		61	969	644 ≤ TS < 1.008	Decent enough
62		62	1.021	1.008 ≤ TS < 1.680	Decent
63		63	1.004	644 ≤ TS < 1.008	Decent enough
64		64	1.005	644 ≤ TS < 1.008	Decent enough
65		65	1.023	1.008 ≤ TS < 1.680	Decent
66		66	1.041	1.008 ≤ TS < 1.680	Decent
67		67	1.005	644 ≤ TS < 1.008	Decent enough
68		68	1.138	1.008 ≤ TS < 1.680	Decent
69		69	1.004	644 ≤ TS < 1.008	Decent enough
70		70	998	644 ≤ TS < 1.008	Decent enough
71		71	1.012	1.008 ≤ TS < 1.680	Decent
72		72	1.001	644 ≤ TS < 1.008	Decent enough
73		73	1.011	1.008 ≤ TS < 1.680	Decent
Total			**73.806**		
Average			**1.011**		
Minimum Total Score			**916**		
Maximum Total Score			**1.138**		

Source: Data Analysis by authors, 2019

It can be seen that in principle, the majority of the community agrees with the expansion of the Kelurahan both from community leaders, religious leaders, youth leaders, women leaders and educational leaders. One form of community aspirations in supporting the expansion of the kelurahan is the inclusion of the aspirations of the community in determining the capital of the Kelurahan and the plan for the name of the sub-district if there is an expansion of the kelurahan.

CONCLUSION

The balance between the real capabilities and the potential of each of the sub - districts that will be formed and the candidate Expansion village should not result in the candidate villages parent later becomes weak or tid ak capable of exercising their autonomy and the difference between the candidates ability villages to be established and prospective urban parent after the division should not have sharp inequality;

The balance of real capabilities and potential that each village has between the sub - district to be formed and the candidate for the main village after the expansion occurs, the flow is relatively maintained and the expansion for the main village after the expansion must be relatively maintained. Therefore, the choice of action should be based on the difference between the lowest total score. Expansion villages should also ensure an increase in public services, democratization and wellbeing of the candidate villages to be established and prospective urban parent after bloomed. Expansion priority options villages should be determined according to criteria based on the lowest margin of candidates villages division results both for the prospective village to be established and prospective urban village that will bloomed / candidate villages parent after bloomed, with the aspirations of the people. These criteria were selected based on the following considerations:

must ensure an increase in public services, democratization and community welfare both for the prospective kelurahan to be formed and the prospective kelurahan parent after expansion.

REFERENCES

Pamudji, Surparni. Penerapan Prinsip-prinsip Desentralisasi dan Otonomi Daerah dalam Sistem Administrasi Negara Kesatuan Republik Indonesia. Jakarta

Indonesia: Departemen Dalam Negeri, 1985.

Simangunsong, Fernandes. Transformasi Organisasi Perubahan Status Desa Menjadi Wilayah Kota (Kelurahan). Bandung Indonesia: Alfabeta, 2014.

Simangunsong, Fernandes. Metodologi Penelitian Pemerintahan. Bandung Indonesia: Alfabeta, 2016.

Wasistiono, Sadu. Hakikat Undang-Undang Nomor 22 Tahun 1999 tentang Pemerintahan Daerah (Bunga Rampai). Jatinangor Indonesia: Alqaprint, 2001.

Wasistiono, Sadu. Capita Selekta Implementasi Pemerintah Daerah, Edisi Keempat. Bandung Indonesia: Fokusmedia, 2004.

Government Regulation/Peraturan Pemerintah No. 73 year 2005 on Kelurahan.

The Bill No. 32 year 2004 on Local Government

The Bill No. 23 year 2014 on Local Government