P. Nas

L. Darmayanti

F. Sjamsir

A classification of kabupatens in Indonesia for regional development planning

In: *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 135 (1979), no: 1, Leiden, 128-150

This PDF-file was downloaded from <http://www.kitlv-journals.nl>

A CLASSIFICATION OF *KABUPATENS* IN INDONESIA FOR REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLANNING *

1. *Introduction*

Regional development planning continues to grow in importance. Indonesia is attempting to promote planning on both the national and regional levels. One of the main problems in regional development planning is the establishment of regional development areas. The creation of these areas is intended to guarantee a more equal distribution of development incentives over the whole country and especially to halt the rapid growth of Jakarta.

Several authors, including A. Madjid Ibrahim (1976), Mochtar Naim (1977) and Benny Hoessein (1978), have written about these development areas. Benny Hoessein focuses especially on the boundaries of the administrative areas. According to him these areas sometimes are either too large or too small, causing difficulties in horizontal administrative cooperation. Therefore he suggests a change of boundaries. To illustrate the problems Benny Hoessein gives two examples.

* This study has been sponsored by the Pusat Penelitian Masalah Perkotaan dan lingkungan DKI Jakarta, the Fakultas Ilmu-Ilmu Sosial Universitas Indonesia and the Nuffic project RUL 27. We would like to express our gratitude towards Mr. Soetjipto Wirosardjono and Mr. Bianpoen for their remarks on the first draft of this article and their readiness to help. We also wish to thank Mr. Yuwono of the Bagian Pengolahan Data Biro Pusat Statistik and Mr. Dasril Amri of the Pusat Pengolahan Data DKI Jakarta, who rendered valuable services in processing the data.

PETER J. M. NAS holds an M.A. in sociology from the University of Nijmegen (1969) and a Ph.D. in social sciences from the University of Leiden (1976). He is currently an Associate Professor in urban anthropology at the Institute of Cultural and Social Studies, University of Leiden, Stationsplein 10, Leiden, Netherlands.

LINDA DARMAYANTI holds a B.A. in sociology from the University of Indonesia.

FARIDA SJAMSIR is a member of the Research Centre for Urban and Environmental Problems, Jl. Medan Merdeka Selatan 8-9, Jakarta, Indonesia.

The province of Moluccas consists of more than twenty islands. This makes for a diffusion of administrative power which is hindering the coordination of the implementation of sectoral and regional development projects. The area of the city of Jakarta, on the other hand, is far too restricted. Jabotabek, incorporating Jakarta, Bogor, Tangerang and Bekasi, has thus had to be developed as a planning unit to cope with some of the problems of Indonesia's main metropolis.

A. Madjid Ibrahim stresses the need to demarcate subprovincial development areas by clustering *kabupatens*, which are the administrative areas directly under the provinces. The boundaries of such areas, according to him (and also to Mochtar Naim), should be chosen so as to create a certain unity with regard to geographical and cultural characteristics. He suggests that these subprovincial development regions could favor development cooperation, and that they could function alongside the existing development areas based on clusters of provinces.

The purpose of the present article is to propose a classification of *kabupatens* in Indonesia for the demarcation of regional development areas. Until now the discussion has been mainly theoretical. Our aim is thus rather to provide an empirical analysis of important social and economic characteristics of the *kabupatens*. We are using an approach which is also found in the classification of cities by scholars like Moser and Scott (1961), Hadden and Borgotta (1965), Mabogunje (1968) and Verbaken and Nas (1976). After classifying the *kabupatens* by means of factor analysis, we will cluster them into regional development area models. Before doing so, however, it will be necessary to comment on the units of research, the variables and the data to be used.

2. *The Kabupatens and their Characteristics*

This research is based on data from the Data Bank of the Central Bureau of Statistics at Jakarta. It refers to the 233 *kabupatens* in Indonesia. The choice of variables was limited to the available data in the Data Bank. Forty-four relevant variables relating to demography, religion, health, education, economy, finance and agricultural production were chosen from the *User's Guide Kabupaten/Kotamadya Data Bank* (BPS, 1976). The quality of the data is discussed in detail for each variable in this Guide, to which we shall refer also on this point. For a number of *kabupatens*, data on the variables were lacking. Because of these missing data, 50 of the 233 *kabupatens* were left out of the analysis. Table 1 sets out the total number of *kabupatens* and the number of *kabupatens* left out per region. It can

be seen from this that Bali, Nusatenggara and the Moluccas are completely, and Java and Sulawesi almost completely included in the study. In Sumatra and Kalimantan about half the number of *kabupatens* is included, while Irian Jaya is not represented at all.

TABLE 1

Total number of *kabupatens* in the different regions and the number of *kabupatens* excluded because of lack of data.

Region	Total number of <i>kabupatens</i>	Number of <i>kabu- patens</i> excluded
Sumatra	51	18
Java	82	5
Bali	8	0
Nusatenggara	18	0
Kalimantan	28	16
Sulawesi	33	2
Moluccas	4	0
Irian Jaya	9	9
Total	233	50

The variables chosen were the following:

Demography

1. Total population, 1971.
2. Percentage of the population living in urban areas, 1971.
3. Population density per square km., 1971.
4. Percentage increase (decrease) in population, 1961—1971.
5. Sex ratio, 1971.
6. Urban sex ratio, 1971.
7. Child dependency ratio, 1971.
8. Dependency ratio, 1971.¹
9. Divorce ratio, 1971.
10. Percentage of non-Indonesian citizens, 1971.

Religion

11. Percentage of Moslems, 1971.
12. Percentage of Christians, 1971.

13. Percentage of Confucians and Buddhists, 1971.

Health

14. Number of health facilities per 10,000 population, ca. 1971.
15. Number of hospital beds per 10,000 population, ca. 1971.

Education

16. Percentage of cohorts aged 5—14 years enrolled in elementary schools, 1972.
17. Percentage of cohorts aged 15—24 years enrolled in secondary schools, 1972.
18. Percentage of females enrolled in elementary schools, 1973.
19. Percentage increase in elementary school enrollment, 1971—1973.
20. Percentage of the population aged 10 and over with no or less than elementary education, 1971.
21. Percentage of the population aged 10 and over with elementary education, 1971.
22. Percentage of the population aged 10 and over with junior secondary school education, 1971.
23. Percentage of the population aged 10 and over with senior secondary school education, 1971.
24. Percentage of the population aged 10 and over with senior vocational education, 1971.
25. Percentage of the population aged 10 and over with higher education, 1971.
26. Elementary schools per 1000 population aged 5—14 years, 1971.
27. Junior secondary schools per 1000 population aged 10—14 years, 1971.
28. Senior secondary schools per 1000 population aged 10—14 years, 1971.
29. Elementary student-teacher ratio, 1972.²
30. Junior secondary school student-teacher ratio, 1972.³
31. Senior secondary school student-teacher ratio, 1972.⁴
32. Percentage of "qualified" elementary teachers, 1972.

Economy

33. Employment-unemployment ratio of the economically active population, 1971.⁵
34. Percentage of the economically active population in the primary sector, 1971.

35. Percentage of the economically active population in the secondary sector, 1971.
36. Percentage of the economically active population in the tertiary sector, 1971.⁶
37. Percentage of the unemployed economically active population in the primary sector, 1971.
38. Percentage of the unemployed economically active population in the secondary sector, 1971.
39. Percentage of the urban economically active population in the manufacturing sector working in large firms, 1973.

Finance

40. Land tax assessment per ha. of land in smallhold and large-scale plantation agriculture, 1973.
41. Percentage of land tax realized from the rural sector, 1973.

Agricultural production

42. Food supply in average number of daily calories per capita, ca. 1971.
43. Average production of rice per 1000 population, ca. 1971.
44. Percentage increase (decrease) in sawah land, 1963—1973.

The location of the *kabupatens* is indicated in appendix 1. In appendix 2 the list of *kabupatens* is presented and the 50 *kabupatens* not included in the analysis are indicated.

3. Analysis of the Differences between Kabupatens

By applying a principal component analysis to the 44 variables we aim to discover the main components or factors underlying the data. These factors represent the principal dimensions for understanding the differences between *kabupatens*. They will be named and the relation between the dimensions and the different *kabupatens* will be traced.

The analysis will result in a factor matrix which can be considered an adjustment of the original correlation matrix and which comprises the correlations between the variables and the above-mentioned dimensions in order of decreasing importance.⁷ This factor matrix is presented in table 2 and includes five main factors which explain 47,6 % of the total variance.

TABLE 2
Factor Matrix.

	I	II	III	IV	V
1. Total population	-0.12	0.72	-0.02	0.04	-0.03
2. Percentage of the population living in urban areas	0.26	0.01	0.00	0.00	-0.03
3. Population density	0.00	0.79	-0.02	0.01	0.04
4. Percentage increase (decrease) in population	-0.75	0.05	0.19	-0.04	-0.08
5. Sex ratio	0.09	-0.06	-0.01	-0.03	-0.04
6. Urban sex ratio	0.28	-0.15	0.05	0.00	0.03
7. Child dependency ratio	0.12	-0.20	-0.03	0.06	-0.11
8. Dependency ratio	0.36	-0.03	0.00	-0.04	0.91
9. Divorce ratio	-0.07	0.10	0.00	-0.02	0.03
10. Percentage of non-Indonesian citizens	-0.01	-0.07	0.05	0.00	-0.02
11. Percentage of Moslems	-0.33	0.42	-0.27	-0.13	0.02
12. Percentage of Christians	0.09	-0.32	0.37	0.24	-0.06
13. Percentage of Confucians and Buddhists	-0.02	0.06	0.01	0.01	0.05
14. Number of health facilities per 10,000 population	0.41	-0.41	0.01	-0.13	0.00
15. Number of hospital beds per 10,000 population	0.46	-0.24	-0.02	-0.01	0.00
16. Percentage of cohorts aged 5-14 years enrolled in elementary schools	0.11	-0.18	0.35	-0.12	-0.05
17. Percentage of cohorts aged 15-24 years enrolled in secondary schools	0.18	0.08	0.71	0.36	-0.06
18. Percentage of females enrolled in elementary schools	0.02	-0.08	0.08	0.00	-0.07
19. Percentage increase in elementary school enrollment	0.13	0.06	-0.14	-0.07	0.02
20. Percentage of the population aged 10 and over with no or less than elementary education	-0.28	-0.04	-0.16	-0.05	-0.06
21. Percentage of the population aged 10 and over with elementary education	0.18	-0.05	0.05	0.02	-0.03
22. Percentage of the population aged 10 and over with junior secondary school education	0.73	0.09	0.08	0.21	-0.07

	I	II	III	IV	V
23. Percentage of the population aged 10 and over with senior secondary school education	0.87	-0.27	-0.01	0.01	0.00
24. Percentage of the population aged 10 and over with senior vocational education	0.90	0.06	-0.03	0.08	0.02
25. Percentage of the population aged 10 and over with higher education	0.87	0.08	-0.04	-0.01	0.08
26. Elementary schools per 1000 population aged 5-14 years	0.23	-0.38	0.08	0.05	-0.04
27. Junior secondary schools per 1000 population aged 10-14 years	-0.09	-0.04	0.92	0.00	-0.04
28. Senior secondary schools per 1000 population aged 10-14 years	-0.12	-0.03	0.91	0.03	-0.01
29. Elementary student-teacher ratio	-0.33	0.07	-0.10	-0.27	0.12
30. Junior secondary school student-teacher ratio	0.02	0.06	0.11	0.12	-0.08
31. Senior secondary school student-teacher ratio	0.08	-0.03	0.02	0.03	0.02
32. Percentage of "qualified" elementary teachers	0.10	0.15	0.06	-0.02	0.00
33. Employment-unemployment ratio of the economically active population	0.08	-0.02	-0.07	0.00	0.00
34. Percentage of the economically active population in the primary sector	-0.17	-0.16	-0.09	-0.04	0.92
35. Percentage of the economically active population in the secondary sector	0.05	0.51	0.00	0.05	0.47
36. Percentage of the economically active population in the tertiary sector	0.04	0.40	-0.03	0.01	0.86
37. Percentage of the unemployed economically active population in the primary sector	0.04	-0.06	0.06	0.96	-0.02
38. Percentage of the unemployed economically active population in the secondary sector	0.08	0.08	0.10	0.95	-0.01
39. Percentage of the urban economically active population in the manufacturing sector working in large firms	-0.01	0.02	0.04	0.10	-0.04
40. Land tax assessment per ha. of land in smallhold and large-scale plantation agriculture	0.05	0.77	0.00	-0.01	0.08

	I	II	III	IV	V
41. Percentage of land tax realized from the rural sector	-0.28	0.24	0.07	0.11	-0.01
42. Food supply in average number of daily calories per capita	0.21	0.06	0.06	0.00	0.06
43. Average production of rice per 1000 population	-0.27	-0.11	-0.03	0.07	-0.04
44. Percentage increase (decrease) in sawah land	-0.01	0.04	-0.03	0.00	0.01
Percentage of variance	17.3 %	10.1 %	8.0 %	6.2 %	6.0 %
Cumulative percentage	17.3 %	27.4 %	35.4 %	41.6 %	47.6 %

The first factor concerns the percentage of the population aged 10 and over with a senior vocational school education (0.90), the percentage of the population aged 10 and over with a higher education (0.87), the percentage of the population increase (decrease) (-0.75), and the percentage of the population aged 10 and over with a junior secondary school education (0.73). This factor may therefore be termed "mid-higher education". *Kabupatens* with a high score on this factor include relatively more people with a middle and higher education than *kabupatens* with a low score. The *kabupatens* with a higher score also are characterized by a relatively lower increase (or even a decrease) in population, which can possibly be explained by migration from these areas to the cities. Examples of *kabupatens* with a high score are Timor Tengah Selatan, Minahasa, Goa, Badung and Deli Serdang. The *kabupatens* of Tanjung Jabung, Gianyar, Probolinggo, Kutai and Pasir have a low score.

The second factor constitutes the urban characteristics factor. The most important variables here are population density (0.79), land tax assessment per ha. of land in smallhold and large-scale plantation agriculture (0.77), total population (0.72), and the percentage of economically active population in the secondary sector (0.51). *Kabupatens* with a comparatively high score on this factor possess relatively more urban characteristics than those with a lower score, in particular a higher population density, a larger total population and a stronger manufacturing sector. Examples of *kabupatens* with a high score on this factor are Klaten, Bantul, Bandung, Tanggerang and Sidoarjo. These are all *kabupatens* on the island of Java. A low score is found for the *kabupatens* of Timor Tengah Utara, Ngada, Hulu Sei Tengah, Pontianak and Sanggau. These *kabupatens* are situated in Nusa Tenggara Timur and Kalimantan.

For the third factor three variables are of prime importance, namely the number of junior secondary schools per 1000 population aged 10—14 (0.92), the number of senior secondary schools per 1000 population aged 14—24 (0.91), and the percentage of cohorts aged 15—24 enrolled in secondary schools (0.71). This factor can be designated the secondary school factor. A high score on this factor means a relatively high number of junior and senior secondary schools and a high senior secondary school enrollment. A low score indicates the reverse. The *kabupatens* of Maluku Tenggara, Purworejo, Minahasa, Kulon Progo and Dairi are examples of a high score. A low score on this factor is found in the *kabupatens* of Muna, Pamekasan, Probolinggo, Jenepono and Agam.

The fourth factor refers to unemployment and is based mainly on two variables: the percentage of unemployed economically active population in the primary sector (0.96), and the percentage of unemployed economically active population in the secondary sector (0.95). *Kabupatens* with a high score on this factor, and a relatively high rate of unemployment in the primary and secondary sectors, are Tapanuli Utara, Donggala, Purbolinggo, Bekasi and Belu. A low score and relatively low unemployment in both sectors is found in the *kabupatens* of Simalungun, Maluku Tenggara, Jembrana and Bolang Mangondow.

Factor number five is the primary-tertiary sector factor. Most important for understanding this factor are the following variables: the percentage of economically active population in the primary sector (0.92), the dependency ratio (0.91), and the percentage of economically active population in the tertiary sector (0.86). *Kabupatens* with a high score are those which have many workers in agriculture and commerce as well as relatively many people who are dependent on the working population; a low score means the opposite in both respects. We find a high score on this factor in the *kabupatens* of Probolinggo, Blora, Muna, Pekalongan and Bantul, for example, and a low score in Karo, Dairi, Tapanuli Selatan, Deli Serdang and Labuhan Batu.

The factors resulting from the analysis reflect the main differences between *kabupatens* in Indonesia as far as our data are concerned. The first and second factors, those of education and urban characteristics, are statistically of the highest importance, explaining 27.4% of the total variance.⁸ Education and urbanization do constitute key items in regional planning. Therefore we shall combine these two factors for our classification of *kabupatens*, although the same exercise could be made by combining other factors.

4. Regional Development Area Models

The combination of factors I and II is presented in figure 1. It is clear that there is no clustering of *kabupatens* in regard to these factors; it is impossible to distinguish groups of *kabupatens*. It is possible, however, to distinguish *kabupatens* with extreme scores. More or less arbitrarily, $+0.3$ and -0.3 are chosen as limits of extremity. This means that there are four extreme types of *kabupaten* to be found, with as scores on factors I and II: high high, high low, low high or low low. The location of these extreme types of *kabupaten* is given in map 1.

Figure 1: Squattergram of factor scores on factors I and II.

With the help of this typology of *kabupatens*, regional development areas can be defined. First, however, the principles that will be used will have to be discussed. These principles are based on development theories about the relation of centre and periphery. Here a distinction between two approaches should be made, namely between the harmony and the conflict approach.⁹

MAP 1:

LOCATION OF EXTREME KABUPATENS BASED ON FACTORS I AND II.

Legend

- = Mid-higher education high and urban characteristics high
- x = Mid-higher education high and urban characteristics low
- o = Mid-higher education low and urban characteristics high
- v = Mid-higher education low and urban characteristics low

The harmony approach results in two models. In the first model, presented in map 2, the *kabupatens* are clustered in four regions, each having a central *kabupaten* with a high high score, without considering the scores of the other *kabupatens*. The second model, presented in map 3, has been constructed in such a way that, besides one (or two) central

MAP 2:

THE HARMONY MODEL OF GROWTH POLES.

Legend

- = Mid-higher education high and urban characteristics high
- x = Mid-higher education high and urban characteristics low
- o = Mid-higher education low and urban characteristics high
- v = Mid-higher education low and urban characteristics low

MAP 3:
THE COMPLETE HARMONY MODEL.

Legend

- = Mid-higher education high and urban characteristics high
- x = Mid-higher education high and urban characteristics low
- o = Mid-higher education low and urban characteristics high
- v = Mid-higher education low and urban characteristics low

kabupatens, at least one *kabupaten* of the other three extreme types (high low, low high, low low) is included in the regions. This second model therefore is considered more complete than the first one. The idea behind these two harmony models is that the regional development areas, incorporating central and peripheric *kabupatens*, function as a system in which incentives for development are spread from the centre to the periphery. The principle of the harmony approach is the absence of contradicting interests between the extremes in the system. There are no fundamental conflicts, and the central and peripheric areas both profit from the same development or modernization processes.

By contrast the conflict approach supposes a clash of interests between the central area and its surroundings. The central *kabupatens* which possess a higher level of development try to attract as many development incentives as possible for themselves. They are only interested in developing other, weaker areas if this favors their own advancement. This tends to keep the peripheral areas where they are: poor. In the conflict approach, therefore, the more developed areas are brought together and separated from the less developed areas, so as to make the conflicting interests as clear as possible in the structural organization of the regions. We thus distinguish strong and weak areas which each have to defend their own interests. The strong areas do not represent the weak ones, and the latter can oppose their exploitation by the former. In the conflict approach we also make a distinction between two models. The first is

based on localized cultural differences. The strong and weak areas are separated from each other by cultural background and per island. The second is based only on differences in development, reflecting differences in power. These models, called model 3 and model 4, are found in maps 4 and 5.

MAP 4:

THE CULTURE CONFLICT MODEL.

Legend

- = Mid-higher education high and urban characteristics high
- x = Mid-higher education high and urban characteristics low
- o = Mid-higher education low and urban characteristics high
- v = Mid-higher education low and urban characteristics low

MAP 5:

THE POWER CONFLICT MODEL.

Legend

- = Mid-higher education high and urban characteristics high
- x = Mid-higher education high and urban characteristics low
- o = Mid-higher education low and urban characteristics high
- v = Mid-higher education low and urban characteristics low

It is difficult to make a choice between the models thus constructed, for such a choice requires a thorough knowledge of the development planning process in Indonesia, and can in fact best be made by the central and regional governmental and planning bodies themselves. Further a multi-level decision process is necessary to make the chosen model work. In other words, we believe that the choice must not be made by one or just a few specialists, and so we do not want to stress our own preference too much. To us the conflict approach seems the most attractive. The cultural model (III) is perhaps less valuable, because the extreme ethnic and cultural complexity of Indonesia could lead to a breakdown of regional areas into units that are too small. The power model (IV) for the Indonesian case comprises three strong and three weak regions, and for this reason this conflict model could be quite attractive.

5. Conclusion

In this study an analysis has been made of the differences between *kabupatens* in Indonesia. The data were obtained from the Central Bureau of Statistics in Jakarta and refer to 44 variables relating to demography, religion, health, education, economy, finance and agricultural production in the years 1971 to 1973. Factor analysis resulted in the distinction of five important dimensions underlying these data: the mid-higher education factor, the urban characteristics factor, the secondary school factor, the unemployment factor and the primary-tertiary sector factor. The relations between the *kabupatens* and these factors are known. It appears that there are no groups of *kabupatens* which differ fundamentally; differences between *kabupatens* have a gradual character, however.

In Indonesia much has already been written about regional development areas. Generally such articles are not based on empirical data. In this article a combination of the mid-higher education and urban characteristics factor is made for the classification of *kabupatens*. Using the harmony and conflict approaches, four models are presented:

- I. the harmony model of growth poles,
- II. the complete harmony model,
- III. the culture conflict model,
- IV. the power conflict model.

The most interesting of these four models seems to be model IV, which comprises an equal number of strong and weak regions. The choice of a

regional planning area model, however, must be made in a political process in which all of the main decision-making levels are represented. We hope that this empirical analysis will contribute to the discussion on regional development planning areas in Indonesia.

Jakarta, May 1978.

NOTES

1	Dependency ratio:	$\frac{\text{Total population}}{\text{Employed population aged 10 years and over.}}$
2	Elementary student-teacher ratio:	$\frac{\text{Elementary school students}}{\text{Elementary school teachers.}}$
3	Junior secondary school student-teacher ratio:	$\frac{\text{Junior secondary school students}}{\text{Junior secondary school teachers.}}$
4	Senior secondary school student-teacher ratio:	$\frac{\text{Senior secondary school students}}{\text{Senior secondary school teachers.}}$
5	Employment-unemployment ratio of the economically active population:	$\frac{\text{Economically active population}}{\text{unemployed}}$ $\frac{\text{Population aged 10 years and over economically active.}}{\text{unemployed}}$
- 6 The tertiary sector comprises people employed in private and public services such as electricity, gas and water supply; construction; trade, restaurants and hotels; transport, storage and communication; finance, insurance, real estate and business services; community, social and personal services.
- 7 In this analysis principal factoring without iteration (called PA 1 in SPSS 1975: p. 479) is used. The correlation matrix is not presented for lack of space. The factor matrix has been rotated using the varimax principle. Weighted factor scores have been produced in the case of missing data not exceeding 10 %.
- 8 Five principal factors are distinguished, which together explain 47.6 % of the total variance. These factors are, in decreasing order of importance: the mid-higher education factor, the urban characteristics factor, the secondary school factor, the unemployment factor and the primary-tertiary sector factor. They explain 17.3 %, 10.1 %, 8 %, 6.2 % and 6 % respectively. The total variance explained by these factors is not very high, which is a result of the fact that the set of variables covers a wide range of phenomena.
- 9 The differences between the harmony and conflict approaches are treated extensively in urban sociological works and cannot be dealt with fully here. One of the main discussions focuses on so-called generative and parasitive cities (Hoselitz, 1954). In development economy Hirschmann (1958) and Myrdal (1969) deal with these problems. Mehta (1964) presents a number of arguments about the role of central cities in development.

REFERENCES

- Biro Pusat Statistik (BPS)
1976 *User's Guide Kabupaten/Kotamadya Data Bank*, Jakarta.
- Hadden, J. and E. Borgotta
1965 *American Cities*, Chicago.
- Hirschmann, A. O.
1958 *The strategy of economic development*, New Haven.
- Hoessein, B.
1978 *Penentuan batas-batas wilayah administrasi/daerah otonom: Suatu pemikiran berorientasi pada pembangunan*, Paper Seminar Pusat Studi Hukum dan Administrasi, Jakarta: Fakultas Hukum, Universitas Indonesia.
- Hoselitz, B. F.
1954 'Generative and parasitive cities', *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, pp. 278-294.
- Mabogunje, A. L.
1968 *Urbanization in Nigeria*, London.
- Madjid Ibrahim, A.
1976 'Perencanaan regional dalam pembangunan nasional', *Prisma*, 3: 65-73.
- Mehta, S. K.
1964 'Some demographic and economic correlates of primate cities', *Demography*, pp. 136-147.
- Mochtar Naim, Dr.
1977 *Pola perwilayahan, perkotaan dan pedesaan*, Kertas kerja Lokakarya Impak Regional Pembangunan Sektoral, Yogyakarta: Universitas Gajah Mada.
- Moser, C. A. and W. Scott
1961 *British towns*, Edinburgh.
- Myrdal, G.
1969 *Economic theory and underdeveloped regions*, London.
- SPSS
1975 *Statistical Package for the Social Sciences*, New York.
- Verbaken, K. and P. J. M. Nas
1976 *Venezolaanse steden*, Publication No. 18, Leiden: Instituut voor Culturele Antropologie en Sociologie der niet-Westerse Volken, Rijksuniversiteit Leiden.

APPENDIX 1:

Location of *kabupatens* in Indonesia (see also the next three pages).

APPENDIX 2:

LIST OF KABUPATENS.

(*kabupatens* not included in the analysis are indicated with an asterisk)

1101. Aceh Selatan	1601. Ogan Komering Ulu *
1102. Aceh Tenggara *	1602. Ogan Komering Ilir
1103. Aceh Timur	1603. Muara Enim/L.I.O.T.
1104. Aceh Tengah	1604. Lahat
1105. Aceh Barat	1605. Musi Rawas *
1106. Aceh Besar	1606. Musi Banyuasin *
1107. Pidie	1607. Bangka *
1108. Aceh Utara	1608. Belitung *
1201. Nias *	1701. Bengkulu Selatan
1202. Tapanuli Selatan	1702. Rejanglebong
1203. Tapanuli Tengah *	1703. Bengkulu Utara *
1204. Tapanuli Utara	1801. Lampung Selatan
1205. Labuhan Batu	1802. Lampung Tengah
1206. Asahan *	1803. Lampung Utara *
1207. Simalungun	3201. Pandeglang
1208. Dairi	3202. Lebak
1209. Karo	3203. Bogor
1210. Deli Serdang	3204. Sukabumi
1211. Langkat	3205. Cianjur
1301. Pesisir Selatan	3206. Bandung
1302. Solok	3207. Garut
1303. Sawah Lunto	3208. Tasikmalaya
1304. Tanah Datar	3209. Ciamis
1305. Padang Pariaman	3210. Kuningan
1306. Agam	3211. Cirebon
1307. Limapuluh Kota *	3212. Majalengka
1308. Pasaman	3213. Sumedang
1401. Indragiri Ulu *	3214. Indramayu
1402. Indragiri Ilir *	3215. Subang
1403. Kepulauan Riau	3216. Purwakarta
1404. Kampar *	3217. Krawang
1405. Bengkalis	3218. Bekasi
1501. Kerinci	3219. Tangerang
1502. Bangko Sarolangun *	3220. Serang
1503. Batanghari *	3301. Cilacap
1504. Tanjung Jabung	3302. Banyumas
1505. Muara Bungo Tebo *	3303. Purbolingo

3304. Banjarnegara	3511. Bondowoso
3305. Kebumen	3512. Panarukan
3306. Purworejo	3513. Probolinggo
3307. Wonosobo	3514. Pasuruan
3308. Magelang	3515. Sidoarjo
3309. Boyolali	3516. Mojokerto *
3310. Klaten	3517. Jombang
3311. Sukoharjo	3518. Nganjuk
3312. Wonogiri	3519. Madiun *
3313. Karanganyar	3520. Magetan
3314. Sragen	3521. Ngawi
3315. Grobogan	3522. Bojonegoro
3316. Blora	3523. Tuban
3317. Rembang	3524. Lamongan
3318. Pati	3525. Surabaya
3319. Kudus	3526. Bangkalan
3320. Jepara	3527. Sampang
3321. Demak	3528. Pamekasan
3322. Semarang	3529. Sumenep
3323. Temanggung	5101. Jember
3324. Kendal	5102. Tabanan
3325. Batang	5103. Badung
3326. Pekalongan	5104. Gianyar
3327. Pemalang	5105. Klungkung
3328. Tegal *	5106. Bangli
3329. Brebes	5107. Karangasem
3401. Kulon Progo	5108. Buleleng
3402. Bantul	5201. Lombok Barat
3403. Gunung Kidul	5202. Lombok Tengah
3404. Sleman *	5203. Lombok Timur
3501. Pacitan	5204. Sumbawa
3502. Ponorogo	5205. Dompu
3503. Trenggalek	5206. Bima
3504. Tulungagung	5301. Sumba Barat
3505. Blitar *	5302. Sumba Timur
3506. Kediri	5303. Kupang
3507. Malang	5304. Timor Tengah Selatan
3508. Lumajang	5305. Timor Tengah Utara
3509. Jember	5306. Belu
3510. Banyuwangi	5307. Alor

5308. Flores Timur	7204. Bual-Toli-Toli
5309. Sikka	7301. Selayar *
5310. Ende	7302. Bulukumba
5311. Ngada	7303. Bantaeng/Bonthain
5312. Manggarai	7304. Jeneponto
6101. Sambas *	7305. Takalar
6102. Pontianak	7306. Gowa/Goa
6103. Sanggau	7307. Sinjai
6104. Ketapang	7308. Bone
6105. Sintang *	7309. Maros
6106. Kapuas Hulu *	7310. Pangkajene Kepulauan
6201. Kota Waringin Barat *	7311. Barru
6202. Kota Waringin Timur *	7312. Soppeng
6203. Katingan *	7313. Wajo/Fajo
6204. Kapuas	7314. Sid. Rappang
6205. Barito Selatan *	7315. Pinrang
6206. Barito Timur *	7316. Enrekang
6207. Barito Utara *	7317. Luwu
6208. Kahayan Hulu *	7318. Tana Toraja
6209. Murung Raya *	7319. Polewali Mamasa
6301. Tanah Laut *	7320. Majene
6302. Kota Baru	7321. Mamuju *
6303. Banjar	7401. Buton
6304. Barito Kuala *	7402. Muna
6305. Tapin/Tapian *	7403. Kendari
6306. Hulu Sei Selatan	7404. Kolaka
6307. Hulu Sei Tengah	8101. Maluku Tenggara
6308. Hulu Sei Utara	8102. Maluku Tengah
6309. Tabalong *	8103. Halmahera Tengah
6401. Pasir	8104. Maluku Utara
6402. Kutai	8201. Merauke *
6403. Berau *	8202. Peg. Jayawijaya *
6404. Bulongan	8203. Jayapura *
7101. Gorontalo	8204. Paniai/Nabire *
7102. Bolang Mangondow	8205. Fak-Fak *
7103. Minahasa	8206. Sorong *
7104. Sangihe Talaud	8207. Manokwari *
7201. Luwuk/Banggai	8208. Yapen Waropen *
7202. Poso	8209. Teluk Cendrawasih *
7203. Donggala	