

## Analysis On The Utilization Of Village Funds In Cash For Work Program In Bulukumba Regency, South Sulawesi Indonesia

<sup>1</sup>Umar Nain,<sup>2</sup>Andi Agustang,<sup>3</sup>Jumadi.S

<sup>1</sup> Institute of Home Affairs, South Sulawesi Campus, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup> State University of Makassar Indonesia.

<sup>3</sup> State University of Makassar, Indonesia. Corresponding author

### Abstract

*This study aims to analyze the utilization of Village Funds in cash for work program in Villages. The program is interesting to be analyzed because it is claimed by the government as the empowerment of marginal community involved in the development of infrastructure in Villages. This study used qualitative approach with descriptive analysis. Then selected 3 villages, namely Kambuno, ara and Bulolohe Village as the locus of research because the three villages have complexity of problems in the implementation of cash for work in Bulukumba Regency. The selection of informants used purposive sampling technique. The total amount of informants in every village selected 6 people, from the head of village, activities executor and representativeness of society from the head of builder, construction worker and unemployed residents in the village. Data collection was done by observation, interview and documentation techniques. Data analysis was done through 3 stages, namely data reduction, data presentation and verification and conclusion. The results showed that the utilization of village funds in cash for work programs in the village was not yet fully an activity of community empowerment, because it only involved labor in the village at the implementation stage. Efforts have not been made to increase the capacity of the community to live independently, thus when infrastructure development is complete they have the potential to become unemployed again. In addition, the stipulation of 30% of work wages evenly and uniformly in every infrastructure development in the village has implications for community self-reliance. The implication is to reduce community participation because they want to be involved in village development, especially infrastructure development, if they are given maximum wages.*

**Keywords :** village funds, cash for work, empowerment and community self-reliance.

### INTRODUCTION

Through the development of the periphery, the government wants to make the backyard become the front yard of the country, making the area that was previously avoided its pace of development become excellent. (Kumolo, 2017; Suzetta, 2007). In addition, the government wishes to make villages the main pillar of development (Fauzi Asni, 2013; Ministry of Finance of the Republic of Indonesia, 2017). Empirically, so far the funds absorbed for village development are considered to be very minimum and only sufficient for village government operational expenditure. Based on the results of a potential survey conducted by the Central Statistics Bureau (Central Statistics Bureau, 2013) showed that the average village only manages a budget of Rp.254,000,000 (two hundred fifty four million rupiah). In response to the limitations of the village development budget, the government allocated Village Funds to 74,910 villages in Indonesia. The allocation of Village Funds from 2015 until now has experienced a significant increase. In 2015 the Village Fund of Rp. 20.7 trillion rose to Rp. 46.9 trillion in 2016. (Aziz, 2016: 200). The Village Fund allocated for each village in 2015 amounted to Rp.280.3 million / village, then increased to Rp.643.6 million / village in 2016 and for 2017 it continued to experience an increase of Rp.800.4 million / village and in 2018 it did not increase because it was the same as the village fund in 2017 (Akbar,2016: 15).

Regardless of whether or not the Village Fund allocation target has been achieved in 2018, an interesting thing to review is the government policy for the use of the Village Fund in cash for work program in the village. Conceptually, cash intensive labor in villages is an activity of empowering marginal / poor communities that are productive based on the use of natural resources, labor and local

technology in order to reduce poverty, increase income and reduce stunting.(Bebbington, Dharmawan, Fahmi, & Guggenheim, 2006; Mulyadi, 2018). The allocation of the Village Fund is slightly different from before because in 2018 the use of the Village Fund for infrastructure development in the village is directed at least 30% must be used to pay community wages in order to create jobs in the village. Simply put, infrastructure is commonly conceived of as physical facilities and their service systems. Infrastructure is commonly divided into two categories, namely: (1) public utilities such as telecommunication facilities, clean water pipes, gas pipes, sanitation and sewage treatment, etc., and (2) public works such as roads, bridges, railroads, ports, airports, dams, irrigation canals, drainage channels and so on (Usman, 2015). Infrastructure development in rural areas financed by the Village Fund such as clean water pipelines, bore wells, village roads and bridges, village irrigation, drainage, talud, village reservoir, boat moorings, village markets and others.

That one of the marginal / poor segments of society is unemployment. The government policy to empower groups that are categorized as unemployed in the village is through a cash for work program in the village. This program involves local workers who are unemployed in the village in any infrastructure development funded by the Village Fund. In the implementation of the program the government claims that the program is an activity that empowers the poor and such still needs to be discussed. The response of the village government and the Activity Implementation Team in the village are quite varied in the field.

In the implementation of cash for work program in the village not long ago in each village, but the government has claimed that it is already quite successful seen from the results of the visit of the Minister of Villages, Disadvantaged Regions and Transmigration when reviewing the implementation of cash for work projects in Pangkalan Gelebak Village, Banyuasin Subdistrict, South Sumatra. With a cash for work program, it also creates jobs and increases economic growth in the village(Fauzi, 2018). As for the money that was poured out, it could continue to revolve in the village and revive the economy in the village. Furthermore, from the cash for work program wages, local villagers will get a new source of income from the Village Fund project, therefore the income can be used for daily expenses and the effect can drive the economy in the village.

Although the government has claimed the success of the cash for work program in the village as described above, but from observations in 3 villages in Bulukumba Subdistrict, namely in Kambuno Village, Ara Village and Bulolohe Village, various problems were encountered in the field, namely: First, the implementation of cash for work in the village found 30% of the workforce was compulsory and uniformly determined by the central government. The obstacle faced by the Activity Implementation Team (TPK) in the village is related to the amount of work wages that must be adjusted to the Provincial Minimum Wage (UMP) stipulations. When referring to the UMP, the payment of work wages in the village is considered quite high because it must follow the standard of work wages in the city, thus in order to meet 30% of the worker's wages the consequence is to reduce the volume of activities. However, if the payment of wage labor is not in accordance with the UMP but the amount is set based on village deliberations, then the empowerment of the poor can be seen from their involvement in infrastructure work in the village is not running optimally. This is because the wages received by workers are far from expectations for a decent life hat they cannot improve their welfare. The activity implementation team faces a dilemma problem because on one hand it wants to follow the existing rules, but on the other hand if it ignores the rules from above, the empowerment of the poor cannot be realized because the wages received are not optimal; Second, the stipulation of 30% of work wages that must be paid in full in the construction of infrastructure in the village, it can be ensured that community self-reliance in rural development is difficult to realize. This is because the community involved in every infrastructure development activity in the village receives wages in cash, making it the contribution in the form of labor that has been quite effective in village development begun to fade. Community contributions to contribute thoughts, energy and finance in this development are called community self-reliance (Soetomo, 2012: 31). Village development which should rely on the strength of community self-reliance began to experience a shift because of development resources that rely on strength from outside the village (supradesa).

In connection with the problem on the stipulation of 30% of the work wages uniformly from the government as described earlier, it appears that the village is positioned as a political object. Refusing an order is the same as defying or opposing a legitimate government and can be sanctioned to anyone who is considered a dissident (Eko & Krisdyatmiko, 2006: 3). The village head and the implementation team of the activities as the executors of the cash for work program in the village are powerless in correcting the policy let alone resisting, so when it starts being implemented it is predicted to cause various problems.

A common problem that occurs in every village in Bulukumba Regency in the implementation of cash for work program is the basic rules regarding the implementation of payment of work wages in the village. This is because the Government of the Regency of Bulukumba does not have a stipulation on the amount of the Regency Minimum Wage to be used as the basis for payment of wages. The guidelines for implementing cash for work program are strictly regulated, that for district governments without wage councils, the basis for payment of wages refers to the Minimum Wage of the province. As an illustration, in South Sulawesi Province, not all Regencies / Cities have wage councils, except for Pangkep Regency and East Luwu Regency, thus in the two Regencies in carrying out the payment of wages the work refers to the Regency Minimum Wage.

Starting from a number of problems in implementing cash for work program in Bulukumba Regency, this article will analyze the use of Village Funds in cash for work program in the Village and their implications for empowering the poor and community self-reliance in village development.

## **METHOD**

This study uses qualitative approach with descriptive analysis. Although all villages in Bulukumba Regency have implemented the program of cash for work where it sourced from the Village Fund. However, the selection of the 3 villages became the locus of research, namely Kambuno Village Bulukumpa Subdistrict, Ara Village Bontobahari Subdistrict and Bulolohe Village Rilau Ale Subdistrict, because the three villages have problem complexity that can't be found many of other references in other villages in Bulukumba Regency. In this study, it used purposive sampling technique, namely a technique of sampling basing on particular considerations (Sugiyono, 2016). The informants selected were people who understood and master information as well as involved directly in the implementation of cash for work program in the village. The total number of informants in every village selected 6 people, namely 1 person from the head of village apparatus, executor of cash for work 2 people consisted of the head and member and representativeness of the people 3 people consisted of the head of builder, construction workers and unemployed workers in the village. Data collection was done through observation, interview and documentation techniques. Data analysis was done through 3 stages, namely data reduction, data presentation and verification and conclusion drawing.

## **RESEARCH RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

When analyzed profoundly, the effort of decreasing the poor through cash for work program in village can be explained through exchange theory approach. In the exchange theory according to (Homans, 1958) that social action is seen as equivalent to economic action. An action is rational based on the calculation of profit and loss. Community participation in infrastructure development in the village is driven by the economic benefits to be gained in the form of wages. In the context of the participation of workers, both construction workers and builders, the rewards received besides economic benefits are also non-economic benefits because workers receive recognition or appreciation from the community as productive labor and not unemployed category..

### **Empowerment of the Poor**

In connection with the cash for work program in the village, work wages as a reward received in cash either daily or weekly in accordance with the Budget Plan (RAB), can increase community

participation, especially workers involved in infrastructure development in the village. the work paid turned out to be incompatible with the Provincial Minimum Wage (UMP). Before there was a cash for work program in the village, the existence of construction workers in the village seemed to be buried in the structure of rural communities along with the stretching of development in the village. The process of neglecting the existence of construction workers in villages is a longstanding phenomenon. Based on observations in 3 villages in the research location in Bulukumba regency, it was shown that almost every infrastructure development activity in the village such as road construction, irrigation channels and clean water pipelines worked on in the village used more labor from outside the village. Especially infrastructure works whose sources of funds come from the District Revenue and Expenditure Budget (APBD) and the State Revenue and Expenditure Budget (APBN) that enters the village. The neglect of the local workforce has an impact on the strengthening of the marginalization of labor in the village, especially construction workers. The approach made for labor in the village is more on the economic aspect alone, not yet done on social and political aspects that can increase its capacity as a local workforce.

Based on field findings, labor payment is quite varied, namely: First, payment of labor wages is in accordance with the Provincial Minimum Wage, as was done by the Activity Implementation Team (TPK) in Kambuno Village, Bulukumba Regency. Payment of wages made by the TPK in accordance with the UMP, which is only through estimation because when preparing the RAB both the village head and the TPK do not know the amount of the UMP that applies in 2018. As an illustration, it can be seen from the South Sulawesi Governor's Decree Number: 2628 /X/ Year 2017 Concerning South Sulawesi Province Minimum Wage Determination, Rp.2,647,767.- (Two million six hundred forty seven thousand seven hundred sixty seven rupiah). With a UMP of Rp. 2,477,767, - then the payment of work wages paid according to the RAB is Rp. 90,000 for laborers and Rp. 100,000 for workers on a workday basis. The amount of the workforce budget is Rp.34,570,000, - from the infrastructure development activity budget of Rp.171,876,000. The infrastructure development carried out is the maintenance of roads in the form of concrete rebates with a size of 244m x 4m x 0.15m. The implementation of payment of work wages is carried out on a weekly basis in accordance with the implementation time of infrastructure development in the village; second, payment of labor wages above the UMP is carried out by the TPK in Ara Village, Bulukumba Regency. Based on interviews with the Head of Ara Village, information was obtained that the payment of work wages in his village was paid above the UMP, namely for construction workers in the amount of Rp.100,000, and craftsmen Rp.125,000, - each workday paid weekly. Payment of wages above the UMP occurs because at the time the RAB was prepared for 30% of the worker's wages, the TPK was not aware of the provisions of the UMP so that the amount of the work wage was only based on the results of village deliberations and had an impact on the high wage in the village; as carried out in Bulolohe Village, Bulukumba Regency. In the RAB for road pavement activities a labor wage of Rp.75,000 is set and a worker's wage is Rp.85,000 per workday. Based on information from the Head of Bulolohe Village, that the payment of wages is slightly below the UMP because at the time of the preparation of the RAB for pavement activities the Activity Implementation Team was not aware of the wage provisions based on the UMP in force in 2018.

In addition there are also other cost components in addition to laborers and workers' wages, such as the 5% TPK honorarium, the foreman fees and taxes. Of all the components of the costs incurred enough to affect the amount of wages so that the TPK considers it reasonable, if the payment of wages in the village is slightly below the UMP. The UMP that applies as the basis for payment of wages is Rp.2, 647,767. - (Two million six hundred and forty seven thousand seven hundred and sixty seven rupiah). From the UMP provisions, this should be the District Government's reference in the implementation of cash intensive labor related to the amount of work wages in the village. In its realization in the village there are those who obey these rules and some are less obedient.

In the case of varied wage payments as described from 3 (three) villages implementing cash-intensive programs, it is equally important to analyze the mechanism for payment of wages. Daily or weekly wage payment is acknowledged as being able to empower local workers because the wages received are in accordance with the Cost Budget Plan. However, if the payment of work wages with a

piece rate system for certain construction works is sometimes detrimental to workers because of the greater number of working days which is not used thus workers receive wages that are not in accordance with the Budget Plan. Therefore, so that construction workers and builders do not become victims in cash for work program, social audits are needed as long as physical work takes place in the field. A social audit is to raise public awareness so that they can control payment of wages therefore they are paid according to the provisions, timely and in the right amount.

According to (Rudito, 2007) that social audit is a collection of social information carried out at any time and can be said to be a monitoring process, usually carried out for 12 months. Through social audits the community can participate in monitoring the implementation of infrastructure development in the village, especially to overcome the development of the management mechanism with a wholesale system. The contracting system is considered not in accordance with the provisions in the implementation of cash for work program, because in the implementation guidelines stipulated payment of wages on a weekly or daily basis. In addition to ensuring that the wages received by workers both construction workers and builders are in accordance with the UMP thus they are not disadvantaged in cash for work program in their villages.

If carefully analyzed the implementation of cash for work program in the village, there was actually a dilemma on the use of the number of workers. Technically, infrastructure development in villages such as village road pavement activities can use a workforce of 30 people for 60 effective working days. But because it prioritizes social aspects so that the workforce involved involves 50 people with the same working day. If the Activity Implementation Team in the village takes a technical approach, there will be enough workers who are not involved in infrastructure development activities in the village. However, if the social approach is implemented, it can actually accommodate a significant number of workers beyond the technical requirements required in village infrastructure work. This phenomenon can lead to inefficiencies due to excess labor usage, so there is a hidden interest in the implementation of cash for work in the village..

Hidden interests can only be understood through what C. Wright Mills calls "sociological imagination", namely the ability to be able to capture and understand what is hidden behind a phenomenon (Nasikun, 2002). By referring to the sociological imagination, the hidden interests are shown by accommodating the workforce in the village to be involved in infrastructure development in the village, even though ignoring efficiency. Behind a phenomenon, factually it shows that the excess labor in infrastructure development in the village actually creates disguised unemployment.

The emergence of excess of labor, there are complaints by many Village Heads in Bulukumba Regency. This is because behind the government's efforts to open up employment opportunities, in reality, it incurs disguised unemployment. By looking at the high wage of work that must be accommodated along with increasing the number of workers involved in infrastructure development in the village, it is recommended that the workforce budget can be reduced and diverted for social activities. Other activities such as assistance for house renovations, additional Indonesia Healthy Cards (KIS) and Smart Indonesia Cards (KIP) as well as village community skills training for independent living.

These facts show that efforts to involve local workers in the implementation of infrastructure development in the village do not seem to be compatible with the empowerment of the poor / marginal, especially for unemployment in the village. This is because the cash for work program is limited to involving local workers who are temporary in the implementation phase of the activity in exchange for wages from the Village Fund. Empowerment is not only seen from physical involvement in implementation, but far more important is that they have access starting from planning, implementation, supervision and enjoying the results of development. Community empowerment should ideally be able to increase the capacity of the poor to be able to exploit the potential in their environment independently. Even by quoting Sumarsono's opinion, it is increasingly clear that the involvement of laborers and artisans as local workers in infrastructure development in the village is still far from empowerment activities because community development has not yet been carried out. According to Sumarsono (Kumolo, 2017), village community empowerment is defined as a process of building through the development of the capabilities of the community. Efforts to develop community independence and

prosperity are carried out in various ways, for example by holding trainings to improve the knowledge and skills of potential village human resources.

The same opinion was expressed by (Soetomo, 2013) that empowerment contains authority and ability. Both cannot be separated, because even though they have obtained authority but if the community has not or does not have the ability to carry out and carry out that authority, empowerment has not yet been realized. Communities need the ability to be able to actualize their authority in the form of concrete actions. If the use of local labor is claimed by the government as empowerment, it should be followed by activities that lead to the improvement of the skills of the poor. The goal is to avoid stagnation after infrastructure activities are finished because they can work in other fields so they do not return unemployed. However, if the workers do not have the skills it is feared that unemployed groups will reappear in the village, that if they are unable to work in their villages then they urbanize. Workforce empowerment only lasts as long as there are infrastructure development activities in the village because they are not supported by the skills they have to work in other activities in the village.

### **Village Community Self-Reliance**

In connection with community participation, especially marginal / poor communities in cash for work program in the village, it appears that community participation is artificial participation. Work in accordance with the length of work. Community self-reliance in the form of labor contributions began to decline because they will come to work if paid. Local wisdom in the culture of mutual cooperation in the village slowly and surely began to fade along with the strengthening of rural capitalization. Then comes rational-calculative participation because it is driven by rewards (Latief, 2002).

The compensation in question is the work wages in the village which must be issued 30% of the infrastructure development budget in the village. The habit of providing compensation in emergency or short-term conditions can be done, but in the long run it is not appropriate to do so because it does not educate the community to live independently. It can even have implications for the emergence of a permanent dependency on the remuner. The relation between the provider of the recipient and the recipient of the reward can create an exploitative patron-client. It is recognized that quite a number of village heads have difficulty in mobilizing community self-reliance. This is because the stipulation of 30% of the workers' wages have implications for the increased use of workers in wages, thus community involvement in self-reliance contributes energy in village development, does not seem to be running optimally anymore in the village.

Based on information from the Head of Bulolohe Village, Bulukumba Regency, that community self-reliance in his village is difficult, because the community already knows that every activity or physical work in the village has a budget. Therefore, they do not want to be involved if the workers' wages are not paid. Contributions to self-reliance in developing villages appear to be declining because the community has been influenced by the popularity of Village Fund, which is quite spectacular in value. The popularity of Village Funds originating from the APBN was so popular that it defeated the existence of the Village Fund Allocation originating from the Regency APBD. In each discussion about the village, what develops populist is the issue of the Village Fund. Village development which should rely on the strength of the community self-reliance begins to shift with the decreasing power of the community to be self-reliance. This is because the village development resources, especially in terms of the budget rely more on strength from outside the village or from the supradesa government.

For villages with a high level of participation, wages for working in infrastructure development in villages should not be set uniformly by 30% from the government. Villagers who are accustomed to participating in village development, such as in village infrastructure development, will reduce the motivation to build villages. Because all forms of participation are valued by money in the form of wages.

Based on interviews with the Head of Kambuno Village, Bulukumba Regency, it was shown that although it was not required to allocate 30% of work wages in every infrastructure development in the village, physical construction was still ongoing. This is because the community has often participated in the construction of their villages. Even further, the Head of Kambuno Village stated that the success of his village won the village competition in South Sulawesi Province because of the high level of

community self-reliance, both in the form of funds and voluntary labor. The pattern of community self-reliance that has been institutionalized in the community is expected to be maintained or improved, not co-opted because of a new program that has entered the village.

Community self-reliance in village development is not something that has just been discussed in Indonesia. According to (Suryadi, 1979) that village community development is a process in which village community members first discuss and determine their desires, then plan and work together to meet the wishes of the whole community. From this definition actually settled in the community self-reliance because of the independence to carry out village development from planning to implementation of village development. This is relevant to the opinion of (Soetomo, 2013) that self-reliance emphasizes more on the independence of the community in deciding what the problems and needs are and what will be done for the future.

Based on the two opinions above in the context of village development, community participation is a determinant factor in realizing community self-reliance. According to Kannan (Ife & Tesoriero, 2008) that participation must include the ability of the people to influence activities in such a way that they can improve their welfare. Participation is considered important to develop the ability of the community in managing development programs, because in essence participation can build a sense of belonging within the community itself (Sulistiyowati, 2005).

## CONCLUSION

In general, in 2018 all villages in Bulukumba Regency implemented cash for work program in the village. The program is not yet fully an activity of community empowerment because it only involves labor in the village at the implementation stage. Efforts have not been made to increase the capacity of the community to live independently, therefore when infrastructure development is complete they have the potential to become unemployed again. In addition, the stipulation of 30% of work wages evenly and uniformly in infrastructure development in the village has implications for community self-reliance, because it can reduce community participation thus the community wants to be involved in village development, especially infrastructure development in the village if given maximum wages.

## REFERENCES

1. Akbar, B.(2016). *Dashboard Keuangan Daerah*,Dipresentasikan dalam BPK Goes to Campus, IPDN Kampus Sulawesi Selatan.
2. Badan Pusat Statistik. (2013). Statistik Indonesia 2013. In *Katalog BPS*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13398-014-0173-7.2>
3. Bebbington, A., Dharmawan, L., Fahmi, E., & Guggenheim, S. (2006). Local Capacity, Village Governance, and the Political Economy of Rural Development in Indonesia. *World Development*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2005.11.025>
4. Eko, S & Krisdyatmiko (2006). *Kaya Proyek Miskin Kebijakan: Membongkar Kegagalan Pembangunan Desa*, Yogyakarta: IRE Yogyakarta.
5. Fauzi Asni, F. A. (2013). The Management of the Village Fund Allocation as an Instrument towards Economic Independence Village (Case Studies in 2 villages in Siak Regency, Province Riau). *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*. <https://doi.org/10.9790/487x-1040109>
6. Fauzi, P. (2018). *Sistem Padat Karya Tunai*.
7. Homans, G. C. (1958). Social Behavior as Exchange. *American Journal of Sociology*. <https://doi.org/10.1086/222355>
8. Ife, J., & Tesoriero, F. (2008). *Community Development: Alternatif Pengembangan Masyarakat di Era Globalisasi*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

9. Kementerian Keuangan Republik Indonesia. (2017). Buku Pintar Dana Desa. *Buku Pintar Dana Desa*.
10. Kumolo, T. (2017). *Nawa Cita Untuk Kesejahteraan Rakyat Indonesia: Integrasi Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional dan Daerah*. Jakarta: PT Kompas Media Nusantara.
11. Latief, M. S. (2002). *Protes Pilkades: Perlawanan Rakyat Terhadap Hegemoni Negara, dalam Dinamika Pedesaan dan Kawasan*. Yogyakarta: Pusat Studi Pedesaan dan Kawasan Universitas Gadjah Mada.
12. Mulyadi, M. (2018). Strategi Pemerintah Dalam Penanganan Kemiskinan Dan Kesenjangan. *Pusat Penelitian Badan Keahlian DPR RI*.
13. Nasikun. (2002). *Hukum, Kekuasaan dan Kekerasan : Suatu Pendekatan Sosiologis, dalam Dinamika Pedesaan dan Kawasan*. Yogyakarta: Pusat Studi Pedesaan dan Kawasan Universitas Gadjah Mada.
14. Rudito, B. (2007). *Audit Sosial*. Bandung: Rekayasa Sains.
15. Soetomo.(2012).*Keswadayaan Masyarakat : Manifestasi Kapasitas Masyarakat Untuk Berkembang Secara Mandiri*, Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar
16. Soetomo. (2013). *Pemberdayaan Masyarakat: Mungkinkah Muncul Antitesisnya*,Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
17. Sugiyono. (2016). Metode Penelitian dan Pengembangan (Research and Development/R&D). In *Bandung: Alfabeta*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drudis.2010.11.005>
18. Sulistyowati, F. (2005). *Ruang Publik Desa: Ruang Partisipasi Yang “Kosong” dalam Komunikasi Pemberdayaan*. Yogyakarta: APMD Press Yogyakarta.
19. Suryadi. (1979). *Pembangunan Masyarakat Desa*. Bandung: Alumni.
20. Suzetta, P. (2007). Perencanaan Pembangunan Indonesia. *Indonesian Development Planning*']. <http://ditpolkom.bappenas.go.id/basedir/Artikel/094.%20Perencanaan%20Pembangunan>.
21. Usman, S. (2015). *Esai-Esai Sosiologi Perubahan Sosial*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.