

Implementation of Urban Village Fund Policy for Infrastructure Development and Community Empowerment in Karangasem Urban Village

Ida Nyoman Astawa^{1)*}, Ida Ayu Putu Sri Widnyani²⁾, I Made Sumada³⁾
^{1,2,3)} Master of Public Administration, Universitas Ngurah Rai, Denpasar, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author
Email: mankoyo@gmail.com

Abstract

The central government allocates budgets to sub-districts through the Additional Allocation of General Allocation Funds (Additional DAU) scheme. At the same time, the regional government of Karangasem Regency also provides financial support to sub-districts as part of its commitment to fostering local development. The allocation of these funds is guided by Minister of Home Affairs Regulation Number 130 of 2018, which pertains to the development of sub-district facilities, infrastructure, and community empowerment. This study evaluates and analyzes sub-district fund policies' effectiveness in infrastructure development and community empowerment within the Karangasem Sub-district. Specifically, it seeks to identify whether implementing these policies is optimal and, if not, to determine the underlying causes of any sub-optimal performance and propose solutions to address these issues. The methodology employed for data analysis is qualitative descriptive analysis. The findings indicate that implementing sub-district fund policies in the Karangasem Sub-district is sub-optimal due to several impediments. According to the C. Edwards III model, only the disposition indicator is satisfactory, while communication, resources, and bureaucratic structure need improvement. Key issues include poor communication between the government and community, insufficient employee understanding of new policies, low community participation, the inadequate role of societal institutions like LPM, and the lack of standard operating procedures (SOPs) or technical guidance. Solutions include enhancing communication and coordination, providing training and educational opportunities, encouraging community involvement, and strengthening the role of societal institutions.

Keywords: *Community, Infrastructure Development, Policy Implementation*

INTRODUCTION

Development is a deliberate process of transformation across all aspects of life, guided by a specific plan. Its main objective is to enhance the community's standard of living, both spiritually and materially (Sudarmanto et al., 2020).

As an archipelagic nation, Indonesia is composed of thousands of villages and urban villages, which presents a significant challenge in achieving equitable development across the country (Dulkiah et al., 2023). The sheer number of these communities requires thoughtful and effective government policies to ensure that national development is balanced and leads to widespread prosperity. To address these challenges, government policies must empower villages and urban villages, allowing them to be the recipients of development initiatives and active participants in the development process.

Recognizing this need, President Joko Widodo enacted Law Number 6 of 2014 concerning Villages (Komisi V, 2023). This legislation is a testament to the government's commitment to accelerating development and enhancing community welfare. The law aims to strengthen village autonomy, enabling local communities to have greater control over their development priorities and resources. By empowering villages as key agents of development, the law seeks to promote more sustainable and inclusive growth, ensuring that the benefits of development reach all corners of the nation.

This policy has empowered villages to flourish by enabling them to manage governmental affairs and address issues under their jurisdiction. As a result, significant progress in village development has been observed across various domains, including governance,

infrastructure, and community empowerment. The impact of these advancements is evident in the improving Village Development Index (IDM) scores, particularly in Bali Province. The IDM is a comprehensive measure derived from three key components: the Social Resilience Index, the Economic Resilience Index, and the Village Ecological Resilience Index (Alhaqi, 2022).

In 2021, Bali Province achieved an IDM score of 0.8037, earning an “Advanced” status and securing the top position nationally. By 2022, Bali further improved its standing with an IDM score of 0.8269, attaining “Independent” status—the only province in Indonesia to do so (S., 2022). This remarkable achievement highlights Bali's effective implementation of village development policies and commitment to fostering sustainable growth and resilience in its communities. The progress reflects enhanced administrative capabilities and infrastructure and strengthened economic and ecological systems, contributing to the overall well-being and prosperity of its residents.

Since its inception in 2015, the village fund policy has significantly advanced development in rural areas; however, it has created disparities for urban communities in urban villages (Rahmah & Rifka, 2018). The central government's allocation of village funds (DD) and village fund allocations (ADD) is perceived as unfair, leading to resentment among urban residents who also need financial support for community development. Local governments struggle to provide adequate funding due to limited regional financial resources. Urban areas in urban villages, facing challenges like slums, unemployment, poverty, education, health, crime, and infrastructure deficits, need more attention (Shodiq, 2022). The progress of these urban communities is vital for overall city development. Therefore, urban villages must enhance public services and infrastructure to improve community welfare, similar to efforts in villages. Urban village governments require adequate financial support to address these issues and empower communities.

Karangasem Regency in Bali Province receives additional general allocation funds (DAU) to aid in village funding. By Government Regulation Number 17 of 2018, the Karangasem Regency Government has implemented a budget policy that allocates village funds through the regional budget (APBD) (Dana et al., 2021). According to field data collected during the research, funding assistance for urban villages from the Additional DAU has been declining, with each urban village receiving consistent funding each year. In 2021 and 2022, the central government did not allocate Additional DAU funds for urban villages due to the financial constraints imposed by the COVID-19 pandemic. However, in 2023, the central government resumed financial support to urban villages and cities, allocating IDR 200,000,000 to each city to fulfill funding obligations for urban villages through the Additional DAU. This renewed funding aims to address the financial needs of urban villages and support their development initiatives. The budget allocation for each urban village is uniform, regardless of funding from Additional DAU or the Karangasem Regency APBD. This contrasts with the central government's approach to DD and ADD, where funding varies proportionally based on needs. This equal distribution among urban villages has led to dissatisfaction, as communities perceive it as unfair, especially when urban villages with greater needs receive the same amount as those with fewer needs. This situation highlights a communication gap between the government and the community, leading to misunderstandings about the urban village fund policy.

Based on the background, problem identification, and formulation, the objectives of this study are:

1. To assess whether the implementation of village fund policies in Karangasem Urban Village has been effective in advancing infrastructure development and community empowerment. This involves a detailed analysis of how well these policies have met their intended goals and whether they have achieved optimal results.
2. To identify and analyze the factors contributing to the less-than-ideal execution of village fund policies in Karangasem Urban Village. This includes examining any issues or

challenges that have hindered the successful application of these policies in infrastructure and community empowerment efforts.

To explore and recommend strategies to address and resolve the issues identified as barriers to effective policy implementation. This involves suggesting practical solutions to enhance the impact of village fund policies and ensure that they contribute more effectively to infrastructure development and community empowerment in Karangasem Urban Village.

RESEARCH METHODS

The research uses a qualitative approach, which focuses on providing a narrative description of the subject matter to gain a comprehensive understanding (Sevilla-Liu, 2023). Qualitative research is rooted in post-positivist philosophy and is suited for studying natural subjects. In this approach, the authors serve as the key instrument for data collection, often employing triangulation, which combines multiple methods to gather data. Qualitative research aims to generate detailed and in-depth descriptions of observable behaviors, speech, or writings from individuals, groups, communities, or specific organizations (Antwi & Hamza, 2015). In this study, the authors also employed a descriptive approach to analyze how village fund policies are implemented to develop infrastructure and empower the community in Karangasem Urban Village.

This research was conducted in Karangasem Urban Village, located on Jalan Kartini, Amlapura, chosen for its larger environment and population compared to Subagan and Padangkerta Villages. Despite receiving the same village fund allocation as other villages, disparities arose due to differing perceptions about fund distribution not matching the region's workload. This led to challenges in implementing urban village fund policies for infrastructure development and community empowerment, such as a lack of understanding among residents and employees about fund allocation and new policies, low community participation, and the suboptimal role of community institutions (LPM).

Quantitative data consists of numerical information that can be measured objectively, such as population figures or unemployment rates, and is utilized for statistical analysis (Ranganathan, 2019). The quantitative data used in this study includes information on the number of employees, the population size, and other data relevant to analyzing the implementation of village fund policies for infrastructure development and community empowerment in Karangasem Urban Village. In contrast, qualitative data is descriptive and not quantifiable, concentrating on gaining a deep understanding of concepts, opinions, or experiences, such as findings from interviews or observation notes (Naeem et al., 2023). The qualitative data utilized in this study comprises a general overview of Karangasem Urban Village, along with data gathered from observations and interviews. Quantitative data aids in measuring and validating hypotheses using an objective approach, whereas qualitative data offers deeper insights through the interpretation and description of phenomena. These two data types are frequently combined to provide a more comprehensive understanding of research.

The primary data in this study consists of interviews conducted with 10 research informants regarding the analysis of urban village fund policy implementation for infrastructure development and community empowerment in Karangasem Urban Village. The secondary data comprises information obtained from documents in Karangasem Urban Village

volcanic rocks and elevation. All households have access to clean water, mainly through the water drink company (PAM) Karangasem pipes and local springs. The water quality is considered good, being odorless, tasteless, and colorless. Despite high development and population growth, Karangasem Urban Village maintains healthy air quality, partly due to the presence of city parks and green spaces that help absorb and reduce pollution. The absence of community health reports related to air quality issues, like respiratory illnesses, supports this assessment.

According to Table 1, Karangasem Urban Village has a population of 19,449, consisting of 9,731 men, 9,718 women, and 5,934 households. The Dangin Sema I area has the highest population, with 1,400 people, while the Dukuh Bukit Ngandang area has the lowest, with 275 people. This indicates that the population distribution in Karangasem Urban Village is uneven.

Table 1. Demographic Composition of Karangasem Urban Village

No	Region	Total Number of Households	Total of Population		
			M	F	M+F
1	Ujung Desa Bali	116	185	186	371
2	Ujung Desa Islam	90	127	149	276
3	Segarakaton	250	463	424	887
4	Pebukit	389	668	662	1330
5	Bangras	226	381	365	746
6	Karanglangko	203	342	331	673
7	Dangin Sema II	124	207	224	431
8	Dangin Sema I	412	723	677	1400
9	Batanha I	324	458	480	938
10	Batanha II	208	370	360	730
11	Kodok Darsana	127	192	215	407
12	Karangtohpati	178	289	291	580
13	Celuk Negara	107	153	159	312
14	Tampuagan I	139	188	214	402
15	Ampel	248	424	436	860
16	Tampuagan II	121	183	183	366
17	Taman I	276	398	389	787
18	Taman II	201	367	339	706
19	Pekandelan	176	279	254	533
20	Pendem	255	379	419	798
21	Belong	256	408	420	828
22	Susuan	311	548	556	1104
23	Juukmanis	251	465	438	903
24	Gelumpang	261	436	434	870
25	Pangi	116	177	185	362
26	Batannyuh Kelod	121	222	206	428
27	Batannyuh Kaler	130	195	226	421
28	Penaban	233	372	353	725
29	Dukuh Bukit Ngandang	85	132	143	275
	Total	5,934	9,731	9,718	19,449

Results

Regional autonomy is a system that allows local populations to actively participate in and create their policies independently of central government directives (Djunaidi, 2023). Autonomous regions are those that the central government has granted authority to manage and govern specific areas or issues. Karangasem Regency receives Additional DAU to enhance funding for autonomous villages. Within Karangasem District, there are three villages. The Karangasem Regency Government has implemented a budget policy for these villages, allocating funds through the APBD as required by Government Regulation 17 of 2018.

According to George C. Edward III's theory (Laary et al., 2022), policy implementation is influenced by four variables: communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure.

Communication

According to interviews with the Head of Karangasem Urban Village, the management of village funds follows several regulations: Government Regulation Number 17 of 2018 on Districts, Minister of Home Affairs Regulation Number 130 of 2018 on Infrastructure Development and Community Empowerment, and Minister of Finance Regulation Number 187/PMK.07/2018 on Village Fund Disbursement Procedures from the 2019 State Budget, along with Minister of Finance Regulation Number 212/PMK.07/2022 on Regional Performance Indicators and Allocation Fund Guidelines for the 2023 Budget Year. The objectives of the village fund allocation are to first enhance development by improving local infrastructure for basic social services, thereby directly improving the community's quality of life, and second, to boost community empowerment by strengthening the community's capacity and utilizing their potential and resources. Similar findings were reported by the Secretary of Karangasem Urban Village, who indicated that enhancing public services through local infrastructure development supports community service delivery and boosts community empowerment. The primary focus of this village fund allocation policy is the Karangasem Urban Village community.

This indicates that the primary target of the village fund allocation policy is the Karangasem Urban Village community. Cooperation and clear communication among various parties are essential to ensure the policy is implemented effectively. It is important for village staff to understand the new policy regarding village fund allocations fully. The insufficient understanding among Karangasem Urban Village employees about the new allocation policy stems from varying educational backgrounds and levels of comprehension. The Secretary of Karangasem Urban Village noted that a lack of skilled human resources, specifically village employees, hampers the full implementation of the policy program. The implementation process involves various parties, including the neighborhood heads, who inform the community about village fund allocations. The community can submit proposals for funded activities, which are chosen and decided upon through deliberation. However, not everyone is aware of the village fund policy.

Routine communication with the community and involvement of all parties is essential to enhance participation in the village fund allocation policy. Interview results indicate that the policy aims to boost development through local infrastructure and community empowerment, ultimately improving community welfare. Effective implementation requires both internal and external communication. However, this process needs evaluation as village employees and residents often lack a clear understanding of the new policy due to insufficient education and periodic socialization, leading to low community participation.

Resources

The quality of human resources and employees in Karangasem Urban Village is still lacking. This is evident from the fact that several employees do not yet understand the implementation of new policies, such as the village fund allocation policy. Interviews with various sources reveal that formal education is not the primary factor in assessing the performance quality of Karangasem Urban Village employees. Instead, the potential expertise, skills, competencies, and the employees' insight and work experience are more critical. The performance of Karangasem Urban Village employees is evaluated based on the quality of services they provide to the community about policy programs.

Besides the lack of preparedness among Karangasem Urban Village employees for the new village fund allocation policy, the success of the policy program is also influenced by the availability of facilities and infrastructure resources. This situation indicates that while the facilities and infrastructure at the village level are generally sufficient, improvements are still needed at the environmental level. For example, Posyandu activities are currently held in

borrowed spaces, such as at the Balai Banjar or the Mosque. Infrastructure development at the environmental level has been underway, though it is not yet fully optimized. This development includes public-interest projects such as building connecting roads, installing street lights, and other similar improvements.

Interviews on resource use in implementing village fund allocation policies reveal a need for further evaluation and enhancement. Human resources require improvement to understand better and implement new policies effectively. Infrastructure resources also need upgrading at the community level. Additionally, the village fund allocation budget from the government is insufficient to cover all 29 environments in Karangasem Urban Village.

Disposition

Disposition refers to the qualities and characteristics of the implementer (Malkab et al., 2015). If the implementer has a positive disposition, they are more likely to execute the policy effectively as intended by the policymakers. For the village fund allocation policy to be successfully implemented according to its goals and targets, it requires a commitment from all involved parties and sufficient resources.

An interview with one of the sources reveals that the village head is committed to implementing the village fund allocation policy in line with its goals and targets and making effective use of the available resources. This indicates that village employees are dedicated to properly executing the village fund allocation policies, with each assigned specific responsibilities related to the policy's implementation and taking accountability for these duties. Each employee strives to perform their tasks to the best of their abilities. Alongside the commitment of the Village Head and village employees, the LPM chairman is also committed to supporting the successful implementation of the policy.

Furthermore, the head of the environment is committed to supporting the implementation of this policy to ensure that the community experiences its benefits. The support from the head of the environment is also closely linked to the commitment of community members, including integrated health post cadres or POSYANDU, community leaders, and the general public, who contribute to and engage in the policy's implementation, particularly in community empowerment activities.

The interview results described above suggest that the urban village head and employees, LPM, neighborhood heads, and the community are collectively committed to ensuring the effective implementation of the urban village fund allocation policy in accordance with its goals and objectives.

Bureaucratic structure

The organizational structure responsible for implementing policies plays a crucial role in the effectiveness of policy execution (Sager & Gofen, 2022). A key component of any organization's structure is the presence of standard operating procedures (SOPs), which serve as guidelines for implementers. Karangasem Urban Village has an organizational structure that outlines each employee's duties, authorities, and responsibilities, ensuring they complete their tasks according to their job descriptions. The organizational structure of Karangasem Urban Village is regulated by Karangasem Regent Regulation Number 28 of 2023, as the Head of Karangasem Urban Village.

Additionally, the Head of the Environment is a key component of the organizational structure, reporting directly to the Head of Karangasem Urban Village. Each Head of the Environment is responsible for their assigned tasks and understands their specific duties and functions. The LPM, positioned as a village partner, also plays a role in communicating government programs to the community. This organizational structure is illustrated by the organizational chart displayed on the village wall. However, the lack of clear SOPs and technical instructions for using village funds suggests that there are no well-defined procedures for their use.

Based on the interview results, it can be concluded that Karangasem Urban Village possesses a well-defined organizational structure that details the duties, authorities, and responsibilities of each employee according to their job descriptions. However, the management of village fund allocations lacks SOP or technical instructions. Currently, fund management relies on Permendagri Number 130 of 2018, which covers Village Facilities Infrastructure Development and Community Empowerment. This indicates that while the organizational structure is established, operational procedures need to be developed to enhance fund management in alignment with existing guidelines.

Discussion

Implementing the village fund allocation policy in Karangasem Urban Village encounters several key challenges that need to be addressed for improved effectiveness.

Effective communication is crucial for successfully implementing the village fund allocation policy. Interviews reveal that while the policy aims to enhance infrastructure and community empowerment, communication with the community and among various stakeholders is insufficient. This lack of effective communication hampers understanding and participation. Regular updates, clear information dissemination, and training for village staff are necessary to ensure that everyone involved understands the policy and their roles in its implementation.

The quality of human resources in Karangasem Urban Village is a significant concern. Many employees lack a clear understanding of the new policies, which affects their ability to implement them effectively. Improvement is needed in terms of training and capacity-building for village employees and upgrading infrastructure at the community level. Facilities such as Posyandu, which operate in borrowed spaces, need permanent, well-equipped locations. Additionally, the existing budget from the village fund allocation is insufficient to cover all 29 environments in Karangasem Urban Village, necessitating an increase in funding or a reallocation to ensure broader coverage and impact.

The commitment of stakeholders, including the Village Head, employees, and community members, plays a crucial role in the successful implementation of the policy. These individuals' positive disposition and dedication are evident, but ongoing support and active involvement from all parties are essential. This includes encouraging community engagement and ensuring all stakeholders are committed to achieving the policy's goals and objectives.

While Karangasem Urban Village has a clear organizational structure, it lacks detailed SOPs and technical instructions for managing village funds. The current reliance on Permendagri Number 130 of 2018 provides some guidance, but the development and implementation of comprehensive SOPs are necessary to establish clear procedures and improve fund management. This will ensure that the allocation and utilization of village funds align with regulatory requirements and best practices.

In summary, to enhance the effectiveness of the village fund allocation policy in Karangasem Urban Village, it is essential to focus on improving communication, investing in human and infrastructural resources, fostering stakeholder commitment, and developing clear operational procedures. Addressing these areas will help ensure that the policy meets its objectives of improving infrastructure, empowering the community, and ultimately contributing to overall development.

CONCLUSION

Analyzing village fund policies for infrastructure development and community empowerment in Karangasem Urban Village reveals several critical issues affecting their effectiveness. Using C. Edwards III's model, the evaluation shows that while communication is one of the indicators that needs improvement, other factors—such as resources, disposition,

and bureaucratic structure—remain significantly lacking. Specifically, communication with stakeholders is inadequate, human resources are underprepared, infrastructure development is insufficient, and bureaucratic processes lack clear technical guidelines.

The main obstacles contributing to suboptimal policy implementation include communication gaps between the government and the community, insufficient understanding of new policies by village employees, low community participation, and the ineffective role of local institutions like LPM. Moreover, the absence of standard operating procedures (SOPs) and technical guidelines further hampers the smooth execution of these policies.

To optimize the implementation of village fund policies, several solutions are recommended:

1. Enhanced communication channels and regular updates to all stakeholders (including the community) are vital. This could involve creating platforms for direct communication, such as village newsletters, social media updates, or more frequent community meetings.
2. Investing in targeted training programs to improve understanding of new policies, policy implementation, and community engagement will strengthen the capacity of village employees. Partnerships with local universities could also help to address recruitment gaps and provide ongoing professional development.
3. Encouraging greater community involvement in decision-making, particularly through strengthening the role of LPM and community empowerment organizations, will improve policy outcomes.
4. Creating clear standard operating procedures (SOPs) and technical guidelines for the management and utilization of village funds will ensure compliance with regulations and improve transparency in fund allocation.
5. Evaluating the village's budget allocation and seeking opportunities for alternative funding sources—such as public-private partnerships—will allow for more equitable resource distribution and greater coverage of the 29 environments in Karangasem Urban Village.

By focusing on these areas—improving communication, investing in human resources, fostering community engagement, and developing operational frameworks—Karangasem Urban Village can better achieve its goals of infrastructure development and community empowerment, ultimately contributing to the region's broader development objectives.

REFERENCES

- Alhaqi, R. N. (2022). Pengaruh Dana Desa terhadap Perkembangan Kemandirian Desa di Kecamatan Gantung. *Jurnal Bisnis, Manajemen Dan Ekonomi*, 3(2), 75–97.
- Antwi, S. K., & Hamza, K. (2015). Qualitative and Quantitative Research Paradigms in Business Research: A Philosophical Reflection. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 7(3), 217–225.
- Dana, I. G., Suastika, I. W., Sumardi, I. N., Kertiana, I. M. A., & Parka, I. W. P. (2021). *Kebijakan Umum Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja Daerah (KUA) Tahun Anggaran 2022*.
- Djunaidi. (2023). Regional Autonomy and Development in South Sumatera. *Jurnal Manajemen, Kepemimpinan, Dan Supervisi Pendidikan*, 8(1), 439–450.
- Dulkiah, M., Simon, J. C., Widoyo, H., Brontowiyono, W., Ruhana, F., & Sapiroto, R. (2023). Community Participation Forms in Indonesian Villages to Support the Sustainable Development Goals Program. *Journal of Law and Sustainable Development*, 11(11), 1–24.
- Komisi V. (2023). *Hamid Noor Yasin: Pengesahan RUU Desa di 2023 Bisa Jadi “Legacy” Pemerintahan Saat Ini*. Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Republik Indonesia.

[https://www.dpr.go.id/berita/detail/id/45403/t/Hamid Noor Yasin: Pengesahan RUU Desa di 2023 Bisa Jadi 'Legacy' Pemerintahan Saat Ini](https://www.dpr.go.id/berita/detail/id/45403/t/Hamid%20Noor%20Yasin%3A%20Pengesahan%20RUU%20Desa%20di%202023%20Bisa%20Jadi%20%27Legacy%27%20Pemerintahan%20Saat%20Ini)

- Laary, Y., Tulus, F. M. G., & Dengo, S. (2022). Implementasi Kebijakan Keamanan dan Ketertiban di Desa Baru Kecamatan Ibu Selatan Kabupaten Halmahera Barat. *Jurnal Administrasi Publik*, 8(120), 60–67.
- Malkab, M., Nawawi, J., Mahmud, A., & Sujiono, E. H. (2015). The Implementer Disposition of Teacher Certification Policy in Indonesia. *International Education Studies*, 8(5). <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v8n5p54>
- Naeem, M., Ozuem, W., Howell, K., & Ranfagni, S. (2023). A Step-by-Step Process of Thematic Analysis to Develop a Conceptual Model in Qualitative Research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069231205789>
- Rahmah, M., & Rifka, M. D. (2018). Kebijakan Penggunaan Dana Desa dalam Pemberdayaan Masyarakat di Dusun Rantaupandan Kecamatan Rantaupandan Kabupaten Bungo Provinsi Jambi. *Jurnal Kebijakan Pemerintahan*, 1(2), 137–154.
- Ranganathan, P. (2019). An Introduction to Statistics – Data Types, Distributions and Summarizing Data. *Indian Journal of Critical Care Medicine*, 23(S2), 169–170. <https://doi.org/10.5005/jp-journals-10071-23198>
- S., A. (2022). Akhirnya Bali Muncul sebagai Satu-Satunya Provinsi Mandiri. *JurnalDesa.Id*. <https://jurnalDesa.id/akhirnya-bali-muncul-sebagai-satu-satunya-provinsi-mandiri/>
- Sager, F., & Gofen, A. (2022). The polity of implementation: Organizational and institutional arrangements in policy implementation. *Governance*, 35(2), 347–364. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gove.12677>
- Sevilla-Liu, A. (2023). The theoretical basis of a functional-descriptive approach to qualitative research in CBS: With a focus on narrative analysis and practice. *Journal of Contextual Behavioral Science*, 30, 210–216. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcbs.2023.11.001>
- Shodiq, D. E. (2022). Analisis Proporsi Populasi Penduduk terhadap Rumah Tangga dengan Hunian Layak dan Terjangkau. *Jurnal Sains Edukatika Indonesia (JSEI)*, 4(1), 23–28.
- Sudarmanto, E., Revida, E., Zaman, N., Simarmata, M. M., Purba, S., Bachtiar, S. E., Faried, A. I., Nasrullah, Marzuki, I., Mastutie, F., & Susilawaty, A. (2020). *Konsep Dasar Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat: Pembangunan dan Pemberdayaan* (1st ed.). Yayasan Kita Menulis.