

THE SUPRA-VILLAGE GOVERNMENT'S ELITE DOMINATION IN VILLAGE DEVELOPMENT PLANNING IN BULUKUMBU SOUTH SULAWESI INDONESIA

¹Umar Nain

Abstract---*Village development planning plays an important role because through good planning it is expected that the implementation of village development is more directed and sustainable and is beneficial to the village community both now and in the future. The purpose of this study was to analyze the dominance of the supra-village government elite in village development planning in Bulukumba Regency. The method used in this study through a qualitative approach with descriptive data analysis of 20 numbers of informants. The results showed that the strengthening of the domination of the supra-village government elite (District and District Governments) implied that the village development planning was not accommodated in Bulukumba District development planning. Through this domination, the community experiences the village experiencing powerlessness in village development planning.*

Keywords:*Elite domination, supra-village government, empowerment, village development planning*

INTRODUCTION

The village in Indonesia is a nation entity that is at the lowest level of government bureaucracy in the regency that forms the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia (NKRI). Sociologically, a village could be described as a form of community of people who live and settle in an environment, where they know each other and their life style is relatively homogeneous, and much depends on the benefits of nature (Brindley, 2003; Catassi & Yachha, 2008; Christie, 1996; Turner, 2018). Village as a community has autonomous boundaries in governing and managing the interests of the community seems dealing with various problems such as backwardness, poverty and disparity

¹Institut Pemerintahan Dalam Negeri, South Sulawesi Campus Indonesia
E-mail: umarnain1388@ipdn.ac.id

(Bebbington, Dharmawan, Fahmi, & Guggenheim, 2006; Dewi, Belcher, & Puntodewo, 2005; Garai, Maity, Hossain, Roy, & Rana, 2017; Hao, Sliuzas, & Geertman, 2011).

In an effort to strengthen villages in Indonesia, the government has realized its political policies through allocating the village development budget sourced from the State Budget (APBN), known as the Village Fund. The allocation of village funds sourced from the APBN is a form of government consistency in responding to the order of Article 72 of the Village Law, which states that one source of village income, is derived from the allocation of the state budget. Village funds are accommodated in the APBN because so far the village has only received limited development funds and are not sufficient to finance the sustainable development of the village. The management of village funds should be democratic, fair, transparent, efficient, effective and accountable principles are requirement as more rational village planning (Menkhoff & Rungruxsivorn, 2011; Oruwari, Cherry, Jones, & Beane, 1986; Rustiarini & Denpasar, 2016; Tsamboulas & Kapros, 2003). The rational approach in the planning process requires a sufficient amount of knowledge to be able to make logical decisions in examining all alternatives, so the rational approach is often referred to as a comprehensive approach (Mahi & Trigunarso, 2017). Planning plays an important role in village development because through good planning it is expected that the implementation of village development will be more directed, sustainable, and beneficial to the village community both now and in the future. This is in line with what was stated by (Conyers, 1992; Edwards, 1954; Lepora, 2018; Saaty, 2002; Snowden & Boone, 2007) that planning involves matters relating to decision-making or choices regarding how to make the best use of available resources achieve certain goals or realities that exist in the future.

Based on this understanding, there are 4 (four) basic elements of planning, namely: planning means choosing, planning is a means of allocating resources, planning is a means of achieving goals, and planning to achieve the future. One of the most significant implications of the interrelationship between planning, policy-making and implementation is the fact that planning cannot be considered separate from the social environment. In Law Number 6 of 2014 concerning Villages, using 2 (two) approaches, namely, villages to build and build villages that are integrated in village development planning. As the implication of village development, it means that villages formulate plans according to their authority by referring to district development plans. The approach taken in the sense of developing villages is a participatory approach and a bottom up approach.

District and sub-district government officials are the elite of the district government who are given authority as a Steering Team in development planning meetings (Musrenbang) at the village, sub-district, and district levels. It is said to be a bureaucratic elite because they are the chosen employees who get legitimacy from their institutions, to facilitate the community in making plans. The supra-village government elite in the Bulukumba Regency representing the Local Government Organization (OPD) were determined as the Steering Team at the Village Musrenbang, District to District. In carrying out their functions, they often dominate the implementation of the Musrenbang and do not provide space for the community to express their voice and access to decision making. The phenomenon of the dominance of the district and sub-district government elites has implications for the lack of accommodation in village development planning in district development planning. Inadequate accommodation of community proposals shows that villagers experience powerlessness in village planning. This powerlessness took

place in the village, sub-district, and district Musrenbang forums, due to the strengthening dominance of the District and District Government elites as the Musrenbang Steering Team.

METHODOLOGY

This study uses a qualitative approach to data collection techniques through observation, interviews, and Focus Group Discussion (FGD). The research location was carried out in Bulukumba Regency by selecting 2 (two) villages, namely Bialo Village and Kambuno Village. The two villages were chosen as study locations because they had the same problem, both of which had proposals for village planning activities that were not accommodated as regional development activities. As for the informants in this study were the supra-village elite (the District and District officials) as the Musrenbangdesa Steering Team, Team nine as the RKPDesa Village Compiler, village delegates as village representatives in the subdistrict Musrenbang and village government and representatives of the poor and women. While the data analysis technique is carried out through 3 (three) processes namely data reduction, data presentation and conclusion drawing / verification (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Qualitative data are grouped / classified related to the form of supra-village government elite domination in village development planning such as oppression, control, coercion and co-optation and community powerlessness seen from the power relations between the government and the village community.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Historically, village development planning began with a top down approach that was set centrally and built in the ideology of a blueprint. The blue print is a detailed planning document and village development framework that contains goals, objectives, activity agendas, instruments, monitoring and evaluation as well as implementation instructions and technical instructions for the region. This top down approach lasted quite a long time during the new order and until now, it is still ongoing in the current reform era. Empirically in village development planning it still follows the approach from the top (top down) and the approach from the bottom (bottom up planning). When viewed from the existing reality it appears that precisely the top down approach has a greater influence in preparing village development planning.

The implementation of the Village Fund in Bulukumba Regency follows the policies of the central government, which began in 2015 until 2019. The allocation of village funds until 2019 showed a significant increase. Based on Bulukumba Regent Regulation Number 41 Year 2015 Regarding Procedures for Distribution and Determination of the Details of Village Funds for Each Village in Bulukumba Regency for the 2015 Fiscal Year, of the 109 villages that received the lowest amount of Village Funds of Rp.267,937,000, and a maximum of Rp. 315,690,000, - Allocation of village funds in 2015 found that there were still some villages that had not reached the target and there were villages that exceeded the target, because the target of village funds in 2015 was Rp.280.3 million per village.

The same thing in 2016 according to Bulukumba Regent Regulation Number 55 Year 2016, the village that received the lowest amount of village funds was Rp.601,154,000 and the highest was Rp.708,756,000, with a target in 2016 of Rp.643 6 million per village. In 2017 according to Bulukumba Regent Regulation No. 5 of 2017, the lowest distribution of village funds was Rp.764, 105,000 and the highest was Rp.896,400,000 from the target set at

Rp.800.4 million per village. While for 2018, the target of channeling village funds is the same as 2017, amounting to Rp.800.4 million per village. In the distribution of village funds in Bulukumba District there were villages that received below the target and there were villages that received beyond the target. The allocation of village funds for 2018 as stipulated in the Regulations of the Regent of Bulukumba Number 5 of 2018, the lowest distribution of village funds received by villages amounted to Rp.727,843,000, and the highest was Rp.1,100,334,000. By looking at the increasing development of village funds from 2015 to 2018 in Bulukumba, which amounts to billions of rupiah, it can be an entry point to support the reduction in the number of poor people who in 2017 were still 33,100 people. From the total budget of the village fund, it can be utilized to support the implementation of village planning and budgeting, which is a unity in the implementation of village development.

The increase in the allocation of village funds in Bulukumba Regency from 2015 to 2018 in its use has not been optimal in terms of planning and budgeting because in general in 109 villages in Bulukumba District is more dominant for infrastructure development activities and still less for empowerment activities. Village planning accommodates activities from above that are regulated according to the technical guidelines for using village funds. Village planning does not accommodate the needs of the community so that the use of the village budget and other funds needs to be done carefully to match its purpose in meeting the community's needs.

The village development plans that have been prepared in the form of the Village Medium Term Development Plan and the Village Government Work Plan are expected to be accommodated in regional development planning so that community proposals are not distorted. However, the facts show that not all community proposals contained in village planning documents can be accommodated as Bulukumba District development planning. The villagers' proposal was not accommodated in the Bulukumba District development planning because it was assumed that there was an elite domination of the supra-village government (District and District Government) in each Village, District and District Musrenbang forum. Regarding the form of supra-village government elite domination, among others; 1) co-optation, 2) oppression, 3) power domination, and 4) coercion in village development planning.

In the village development planning in Bialo Village, Gantarang District and Kambuno Village, Bulukumba District, various community proposals were found that were not accommodated in regional development planning. Based on the Bialo Village Regulation Number 02 of 2017 concerning the 2017 Village Government Work Plan, it is stated that there are 6 proposed priority activities that are the real needs of the Bialo Village community but the Village Government is unable to implement them. This is because besides being not a local authority on a village scale, the village is also unable to fund so the planned activity is proposed to the Government of the Regency of Bulukumba. The 6 proposed activities are: 1) Laston work (Barabba and Mattoanging village), 2) Construction of Batuloe-Mateko Axis Farm Road, 3) Construction of SMPN 5 Bulukumba fence, 4) Construction of paddy bore wells, 5) Construction of yard / fence SDN 226 Toroliya, and 6) Development of a soccer field. Of the 6 proposed activities after going through Musrenbang in subdistrict, district, and Regency. Only 2 activities is accommodated in the village, namely the Construction of the Batuloe-Mateko Axis Farm Road and the Development of the SDN yard / fence. 226 Toroliya. There are 4 planned activities that cannot be accommodated in regional development planning. By looking at the reality that occurred in Bialo Village, the percentage of proposed activities accommodated in regional development planning reached 33% and 67% were not accommodated.

The same problem also occurs in Kambuno Village, Bulukumpa District. Based on Kambuno Village Regulation Number 01 of 2017 Regarding the 2017 Village Government Work Plan, it is stated that there are 11 priority activities proposed in the Village, Sub-District and District Musrenbang that cannot be financed through the Village Budget, so they are proposed to the Government of the Regency of Bulukumba. The planned activities include: 1) Road paving, 2) Ambo Jia Road concrete rebate, 3) Concrete Bandu-Hongkong Road Axis rebate, 4) Hongkong Road Axle concrete rebate, 5) Barugae Hamlet concrete rebate, 6) Construction of Temba Axle drainage , 7) Construction of Bandu-Barugae Axle drainage, 8) Making Bandu-Barugae Axis Talud Drainage, 9) Mannyaha-Assipettunge Shaft Drainage, 10) Making Temba-Mannyaha Axis Talud, and 11) Making Salodua Jeri-Jeri Axis Drainage Drainage. Of the 11 proposed activities, only 1 activity was accommodated as regional development activities in the village, namely asphaltting the Temba-Assipettunge laston axis road. There are 10 planned activities that are not accommodated in the development planning of Bulukumba Regency. Whereas in accordance with the reality in Kambuno Village, it was shown that the proposed activities accommodated were only 9% and 91% of the proposed activities were not accommodated in regional development planning.

By looking at the reality in Bialo Village and Kambuno Village, it shows that the number of proposed activities submitted is inversely proportional to the number of proposed activities that are accommodated in regional development planning. Based on empirical facts in the 2 villages in Bulukumba District which are the locus in this study, it appears that the more community activity proposals submitted in the village, sub-district and district Musrenbang, the results are very little accommodated in regional development planning. Not accommodating village development planning in regional development planning in Bulukumba Regency has been going on for a long time in village development. So it has implications for community participation. The participation of villagers in the implementation of the Musrenbang in Bulukumba District was only a physical involvement but was not involved in voicing their aspirations. Thus the village planning that was prepared did not fit the needs of the community, but more represented the interests of the elite, both the supra-village government elite and the village elite.

The phenomenon of the supra-village government's elite dominance in village development planning shows that the village is only in the position of being considered unable to carry out development so that the district government continues to dominate the village and create village dependence on the district. If during the New Order administration, village dependence was more on the central government, from the village to the center, and then in the reform era the village's dependence changed in line with regional autonomy, namely the dependence of the village government on the district government.

That the village development planning was not accommodated because the proposed activities of the Regional Government Organization (OPD) in Bulukumba Regency were prioritized, so that if the OPD activity proposal was discussed it only counted the number of proposals from the village that had to be issued so that the OPD proposal would still be accommodated in the regional development planning. This fact shows that the top down approach is far more dominant when compared to the bottom up mechanism in planning. In the context of planning that, the strengthening of the top down approach is related to the intervention of district and sub-district government officials. District and sub-district government officials are the elite of the district government who are given authority as a Steering Team in development planning meetings (Musrenbang) at the village, sub-district and district levels. It is

said to be a bureaucratic elite because they are the chosen employees who get legitimacy from their institutions, to facilitate the community in making plans. The supra-village government elite in the Bulukumba Regency representing the Local Government Organization (OPD) was determined as the Steering Team at the Village Musrenbang, District to District. In carrying out their functions, they often dominate the implementation of the Musrenbang and do not provide space for the community to express their voice and access to decision making.

Historically, village development carried out so far has been dominated by the role of government as a representation of the role of the state, both in planning and implementation, so that the community is only an object of development. Starting from the historical aspect, the critical perspective seeks to free society from domination and provide community trust according to the ability to make their own decisions relating to the improvement of their lives (Tandon & Fernandes, 1987). In a critical perspective, then to analyze the phenomenon of supra-village government elite domination in village development planning the researcher chose the elite theory from Vilfredo Pareto. According to Pareto, the elite are those who have and get more than what is owned and obtained by others, there are those who hold power (governing elite) and some who are outside of power (non governing elite) (Varma, 2007). After World War I, theories about the elite, groups and power seem to have been loved by the main in America and each claim to be the most sophisticated. Elite theory asserts, that society is in fact divided into two parts which include; a small group of people who are capable and therefore in a position to govern.

While on the other hand, there are a number of people who are destined to be governed. Every society is governed by a small group of people who have the qualities needed for their presence in full socio-political power. Those who can reach the center of power are always the best actors and they are called the elite. Elites are people who are successful and able to occupy high positions in society (Sherman & Kolker, 1987). The ability to occupy an honorable position is based on the human attributes inherent in a person, which he refers to as sentiments or residues. To explain the concept of residues, Pareto uses class theory in society. Class one, which is a class that is still at the level of the instinct of combination, is a society that wrestles at the level of ideas, ideas and ideals for power. Class two, namely the position consolidation stage, in Pareto language is called the persistence of aggregates. Class three, the class that has placed these ideas, ideas and ideals permanently in an order or policy (Parry, 2016). Based on knowledge of residues, we can distinguish between the types of people who form elites and those who form non-elites. From the elite division according to Pareto, which consists of two groups, namely: the government elite and the non-government elite. If the government elite is formed from humans whose main characteristics are dominated by the instinct to join, then the change will take place quickly. However, if the government elite is formed from people whose main characteristics are always gathered then stability tends to apply (Lauer, 2001).

Aside from the elite theory proposed by Pareto, to deepen the analysis of the supra-village government's elite dominance in village development planning in Bulukumba Regency, it is enriched with other elite theories. One such elite theory is the elite theory of (Grusky & Mills, 2018), Mills explains the link between the elite and power. Mills is of the opinion that elites are individuals who occupy command positions at the top of the main institutions in society. Because of their main institutional position, the elite can make decisions that are binding on all members of the community. They occupy command positions in economic, military, and political institutions. Mills tried to analyze the structure of power found in America by linking it to these three institutions. Individuals who are at the

top of these three institutions in turn form integrated and integrated power elites, whose decisions determine the basic structure and direction of American society. These elite decisions shape the lives of all people who are in the lower levels of power. The decisions and activities of the individuals who belong to the elite group reflect their own interests in efforts to maintain their dominance rather than show genuine efforts to improve the well-being of many people. Mills continued his discussion by explaining that individuals who belong to an elite group are relatively highly integrated, homogeneous, and closely related to one another. Those who occupy top positions in the economic, military, and political fields come from relatively similar social backgrounds and worldviews. Their views of life show many similarities because most of them have the same educational and religious background and often meet in gatherings organized by the same social groups.

The forms of domination that often occur in society that can be used in this study are:

First; co-optation, is an act of control by not recognizing the validity of local institutions in the village, because it is not in accordance with the wishes of the government. In the extreme sense is the government replacing local institutions that have been institutionalized in society with new institutions. Another form of co-optation is the bureaucratization of village procedures, the channel that is supposed to be the voice of the village to the state turns into a channel of command from the state towards villagers (Mas'oe'd, 1994). In the view (Moeljarto, 2012) that many functions that have traditionally been the responsibility of villages are then taken over by the government.

Second; oppression, is an action taken by supra-village government elites by limiting or not providing opportunities for villagers to express their aspirations and opinions in participatory meetings, especially in preparing village development plans. The process of limiting people's aspirations in development is one form that hurts public participation. The Musrenbang forum as a public sphere as a place for exchanging ideas, ideas and suggestions is based on a familial nature and does not distinguish a person's social and cultural background, seems to only be container for oppression. In the implementation of village Musrenbang in Bulukumba Regency, which is facilitated by the Steering Team of the Sub-district officials often, does not provide an opportunity to express their aspirations, thereby reducing community participation in decision-making. According to LAN and BPKP (2000) participation is that every citizen has a voice in decision making, both directly and through the intermediation of legitimate institutions that represent their interests. This participation is built based on freedom of association and speaking and participating constructively. The biggest challenge in the participation process is how the voices of those left behind can be heard and influences the decisions taken.

Third, domination of power, through science, people learn to know humans in order to better master it, so it is clearly seen that the aim of knowledge is nothing but power (Haryatmoko, 2014). The behavior exhibited by supra-village elites in controlling village communities, due to gaps in understanding planning knowledge. Such knowledge is like participatory planning techniques that start from problem identification to problem solving actions that are only understood by the supra-village elite and are not well understood by the village community. The strengthening of the mastery was because almost all planning knowledge was less socialized to the village community, so that local knowledge of the community was defeated by the knowledge of the supra-village elite because it was considered more rational. We can see this from the knowledge of the community, which cannot distinguish between

the proposed activities, which are only the people's desire, and not the needs. In practice, the proposed community activities show a wish list rather than community needs.

Fourth; coercion, is an act of violence that is not physical, but verbal violence and symbolic violence. Verbal violence in the form of words in the form of threats such as the threat of the district government to the village head to use the services of the preparation of the Village RPJM and Village RKP and the threat of delaying the disbursement of village fund allocations (Gustomy, 2016). Planning from the village is not approved for evaluation of the sub-district regulation draft if it does not accommodate the wishes of the Regency. Regarding symbolic harshness raised by Bourdeau as coercion of a system of symbolism and meaning (for example culture) against groups or classes in such a way that it is experienced as something legitimate. Its legitimacy reinforces the power relations that have forced coercion (Jenkins, 2014). Implementing the district and district priority scale in planning at the supra-village level is a form of symbolic violence whose legitimacy is legitimate despite coercion therein. The priority scale becomes an element of coercion so that not all community proposals can be accommodated into village development activities. The village community as a ceremonial activity that is routinely carried out every year considers the impact of Musrenbangdesa.

The transformation of traditional institutions in the village into new institutions which are the products of the government, not without interests. In the community there is a local institution called Tudang Sipulung as a forum to discuss community problems, in the form of delivering aspirations, solving problems between residents, and solving village problems in general (Riadi, 2017). In its development, the institution has lost its legitimacy because the government in the village Musrenbang has integrated its role. The existence of the Musrenbangdesa is recognized as the only forum, which is a formal institution in the preparation of village development planning. Thus, the co-optation of local institutions in the village can be one element that weakens community participation in village development planning.

IMPLICATION

That the lack of accommodation in the village development planning in Bulukumba Regency development planning shows that the village community experienced powerlessness in village development planning. This powerlessness took place in the village, sub-district and district Musrenbang forums, due to the strengthening dominance of the District and District Government elites as the Musrenbang Steering Team. The forms of supra-village government elite domination in Bulukumba Regency are seen by the co-optation, oppression, power domination, and coercion in village development planning.

REFERENCES

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>

- Brindley, T. (2003). The social dimension of the urban village: A comparison of models for sustainable urban development. *Urban Design International*. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.udi.9000093>
- Catassi, C., & Yachha, S. K. (2008). The global village of celiac disease. *Pediatric and Adolescent Medicine*. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000128610>
- Christie, N. (1996). The Global Village. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000486589602900209>
- Conyers, D. (1992). *Perencanaan Sosial Di Dunia Ketiga: Suatu Pengantar*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.
- Dewi, S., Belcher, B., & Puntodewo, A. (2005). Village economic opportunity, forest dependence, and rural livelihoods in East Kalimantan, Indonesia. *World Development*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2004.10.006>
- Edwards, W. (1954). The theory of decision making. *Psychological Bulletin*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0053870>
- Garai, R., Maity, P., Hossain, R., Roy, P., & Rana, T. K. (2017). Smart village. *2017 1st International Conference on Electronics, Materials Engineering and Nano-Technology, IEMENTech 2017*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/IEMENTECH.2017.8077008>
- Grusky, D., & Mills, C. W. (2018). The Power Elite. In *Inequality in the 21st Century*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429499821-16>
- Gustomy, R. (2016). *Partisipasi untuk Desa : Sebuah Pembacaan Kritis dalam Bintoro Wardiyanto, Siti Aminah, Ucu Martanto (ed).2016, Percikan Pemikiran Tata Kelola dan Pembangunan Desa*. Surabaya: Airlangga University Press.
- Hao, P., Sliuzas, R., & Geertman, S. (2011). The development and redevelopment of urban villages in Shenzhen. *Habitat International*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.habitatint.2010.09.001>
- Haryatmoko. (2014). Etika Politik dan Kekuasaan. In *PT Kompas Media Nusantara*. Jakarta: PT KoOmpas Media Nusantara.
- Jenkins, R. (2014). Social Identity. In *Social Identity*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315887104>
- Lauer, R. K. (2001). *Perspektif tentang Perubahan Sosial*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Lepora, N. F. (2018). Decision making. In *Living Machines: A Handbook of Research in Biomimetic and Biohybrid Systems*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780199674923.003.0028>
- Mahi, A. K., & Trigunarso, S. I. (2017). *Perencanaan Pembangunan Daerah*. Depok: Kencana.
- Mas'oed, M. (1994). *Politik, Birokrasi dan Pembangunan*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Menkhoff, L., & Rungruxsirivorn, O. (2011). Do village funds improve access to finance? Evidence from Thailand. *World Development*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2010.09.002>
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). Qualitative data analysis.pdf. *Qualitative Data Analysis*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10071-013-0700-5>
- Moeljarto, T. (2012). Pembangunan Dilema Dan Tantangan. In *Pembangunan*.
- Oruwari, B., Cherry, J., Jones, D., & Beane, W. (1986). Peran Perangkat Desa Dalam Akuntabilitas Pengelolaan Keuangan Desa (Studi Pada Desa Karang Sari Kecamatan Sukodono). *British Journal of ...*

<https://doi.org/10.1079/BJN19860067>

- Parry, G. (2016). *Political Elits*. London: George Allen and Unwin LTD.
- Peraturan Desa Bialo Nomor 02 Tahun 2017 Tentang Rencana Kerja Pemerintah Desa Tahun 2017.*
- Peraturan Desa Kambuno Nomor 01 Tahun 2017 Tentang Rencana Kerja Pemerintah Desa Tahun 2017.*
- Riadi, S. (2017). *Kepemimpinan Pemuda dalam Mewujudkan Reformasi Birokrasi Desa dalam Potrett Politik dan Ekonomi Lokal di Indonesia: Dinamika, Demokratisasi, Pengembangan Ekonomi dan Kawasan Pedesaan*. Yogyakarta: IRE Yogyakarta.
- Rustiarini, N. W., & Denpasar, U. M. (2016). Good Governance dalam Pengelolaan Dana Desa. *Simposium Nasional Akuntansi*.
- Saaty, T. L. (2002). Decision making with the Analytic Hierarchy Process. *Scientia Iranica*.
- Sherman, A. K., & Kolker, A. (1987). *The Sosial Based of Politics*. California: Worsworth Publishing Company.
- Snowden, D. J., & Boone, M. E. (2007). A leader's framework for decision making. *Harvard Business Review*.
<https://doi.org/10.1109/MCDM.2007.369449>
- Tandon, R., & Fernandes, W. (1987). *Riset Partisipatoris Riset Pembebasan*. Yogyakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Tsamboulas, D. A., & Kapos, S. (2003). Freight village evaluation under uncertainty with public and private financing. *Transport Policy*. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0967-070X\(03\)00002-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0967-070X(03)00002-7)
- Turner, J. S. (2018). Global village. *Rijksmuseum Bulletin*.
- Undang-Undang Nomor 6 Tahun 2014 tentang Desa*.
- Varma, S. (2007). *Teori Politik Modern*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.

CATATAN

AFFILIASI : PROGRAM DOKTOR ILMU SOSIOLOGI DI UNIVERSITAS NEGERI MAKASSAR SULAWESI SELATAN INDONESIA. DAN LEKTOR FAKULTAS POLITIK ILMU PEMERINTAHAN INSTITUT PEMERINTAHAN DALAM NEGERI KAMPUS SULAWESI SELATAN(KAMPUS INDUK INSTITUT PEMERINTAHAN DALAM NEGERI JATINANGOR-SUMEDANG, JAWA BARAT.

AUTHOR ID SINTA : 6668773

DAN GOGLE SCHOLAR ID : ZAF2zLMAAAAJ