

4-3-2012

Central Government's Roles in New Autonomous Region Development in Bandung Barat

Irawan Setiawan

Indonesia Muda Institute, Jakarta; Indonesia

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarhub.ui.ac.id/jbb>

Recommended Citation

Setiawan, Irawan (2012) "Central Government's Roles in New Autonomous Region Development in Bandung Barat," *BISNIS & BIROKRASI: Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi dan Organisasi*: Vol. 18 : No. 2 , Article 4. DOI: 10.20476/jbb.v18i2.992

Available at: <https://scholarhub.ui.ac.id/jbb/vol18/iss2/4>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty of Administrative Science at UI Scholars Hub. It has been accepted for inclusion in *BISNIS & BIROKRASI: Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi dan Organisasi* by an authorized editor of UI Scholars Hub.

Central Government's Roles in New Autonomous Region Development in Bandung Barat

IRAWAN

Indonesia Muda Institute, Jakarta, Indonesia

irawan.setiawan1989@gmail.com

Abstract. This research discusses the effectiveness of placing Ngamprah sub-district as the capital city of Bandung Barat District, using qualitative approach and central place theory which covers the center of administration and center of growth dimensions. The conclusion is that the center of administration and the center of growth dimensions analysis have not shown the effectiveness of Ngamprah sub-district as the Capital City of Bandung Barat District. Our recommendation is for the local government to construct railroads to tie other sub-districts to Ngamprah, i. e. the roads linking Cisarua and Ngamprah, both from Jambudipa and Cipada, to establish Ngamprah Market to potentially become the District's business center, and to build up housing area.

Keywords: *central place effectiveness, administration center, growth center*

INTRODUCTION

The Ministry of Internal Affairs Decree No. 32 of 2004 on Regional Government state that Indonesia adopts decentralization for the governmental administration system. The Regional Governments are given wider rights to administer their districts. The right covers not only the defence system, but also fiscal and monetary, legal, international affairs and religion policies. Therefore, it holds central role in the administration of government affairs.

The development of autonomy or decentralization implementation provides chances for the potential districts to expand. Since 1999, the waves of regional expansion have prolonged. From 1999 to 2009, according to Monitoring and Evaluation Subdirector, Local Governance and Special Autonomy Director, Regional Autonomy General Director, 205 regions have expanded to gain autonomous status.

The development of New Autonomous Regions (DOB) in the reform era is a logical consequence of the implementation of political decentralization regulation. Due to political decentralization, the Central Government forms autonomous districts with their own local government in the sense that they have their own region, community, leader, and Regional Legislatives chosen by the community, and they have their own public servants and rights to handle regional affairs (Percik, 2007).

Most academic study indicates that regional expansion is triggered by economic needs and the effort to improve public service condition by presenting the state in the center of the community. Expansion incentives in forms of General Allocation Fund (DAU) and Specific Allocation Fund (DAK) also attract the region to expand

(Pratikno, 2008).

Expansion is another form of regional strategy to attract the center. In the Old Order Era, the regions expressed their demand through riots. Those riots were silenced in the New Order through elitist loyalty-bribe mechanism. In the reform era, the center institutionally responds the regional demands by providing political and cultural recognition, and by allocating economic resources throughout the whole region (Pratikno, 2008).

From 2007 to 2009, there are 57 New Autonomous Regions. The expansion proposals were initiated by the government and Legislative, most of which are from the Legislative. 52 out of 57 proposals are from the Legislative (Monev Subdirector of Ministry of Internal Affairs, 2010).

The Central Government feels that the expansion policy is also important to foster economic activity and economic growth acceleration in the marginal area, to enhance national identity by providing service to the public in such a close distance to ensure that the state is present and felt by the people, and to actively secure the Nation by forming security and defence in the borderline (Pratikno, 2008).

However, expansion does not bring similar effect for each region. Each has its own distinction not to be easily generalized. For the sake of national policy, it is necessary for us to determine the impact of expansion in general. Such impact does not only relate to governmental administration, public service, and development at national level, but also on the social, political, and economic impact at the regional level.

Regional expansion consequently means that the region should have a district as its capital city, the status

of district organizations can not be separated from principle of decentralization (Khairi, 2010). The autonomous regional capital is the center of development control fostering balance growth between city and villages and among the synergical villages (Alaci, 2010). The autonomous regional capital city is the center of regional balance, in the sense that the sustenance of regional potency depends on demographic balance providing similar venture towards socioeconomic and environmental demography in order to establish the whole potency to maintain quality ensurance and public service justice (Hamid, 2008; Wellington and Innocent, 2009). Regional expansion focusing on governmental service aspect refers to central place theory which utilizes the following indicators: affordability, recoverability, and replicability (Haggett, 2001). Meanwhile, the measurement of its impact operates economic performance indicators, namely: (a) the increase of regional income per capita (Seymoar et al, 2010) and (b) the increase of work opportunity (Kiliçaslan et al., 2009; Huang et al., 2009). Christaller (1966) explains that the governmental center is the heart of service activities and the center of regional development, while area surrounding that center and its hinterland is the area to serve.

The Ministry of Internal Affairs Regulation No. 12 year 2007 on the Formation of Bandung Barat District in West Java Province becomes the new stage for Bandung Barat District Governance, because it legally separates Bandung Barat and Bandung District. The proposal of expansion surfaces from the opinion that it is geographically spacious (2.324.84 km²) surrounding Bandung and Cimahi, with massive population (4,3 million according to 2002 census). Based on that condition, on August, 9, 1999, Bandung Barat notables gather to form Bandung Barat District Expansion Acceleration Support Forum. The evaluation from Monev Subdirector, Local Governance and Special Autonomy Director, District Autonomy General Director, Ministry of Internal Affairs, indicates, as local government has run for two years, that the district evaluation score places the district at the medium category. The score of Bandung Barat District was 63,4 out of 100.

Bandung Barat Districts covers 15 districts, namely: Padalarang, Cikalongwetan, Cililin, Parongpong, Cipatat, Cisarua, Batujajar, Ngamprah, Gununghalu, Cipongkor, Cipeundeuy, Lembang, Sindangkerta, Cihampelas and Rongga. It borders with Cianjur District in the West. The Northern borderline is Purwakarta and Subang Districts. In the East, it borders with Bandung and Cimahi City. The southern borderline is the southern part of Bandung District and Cianjur District (www.bandungbaratkab.go.id). Article 7 of Regulation No 12 year 2007 explains that the capital city of the District lies at Ngamprah sub-

district. Placing Ngamprah as the Capital City of Bandung Barat District in 2007 granted the district the role of center of service and center of economic growth for the whole district. The massive population of the district, 1.408.550, 705.679 male and 702.871 female, (District Central Agencies on Statistics, 2010) challenged the local government in providing the best service. The strategy to select Ngamprah as the Capital City was a step to provide the best service for the community. As the capital city, Ngamprah should also become the center of administration, as well as social and economic center. The spirit to select Ngamprah should prolong, not only as a formal legal criteria for the formation of Bandung Barat District.

Another concern is the working status of the community. Most of the population works as labors. The highest number is in Padalarang District (33,097 people). In 2006, the population of work force in the district was 447,314, with 398,915 of them employed and 48,399 others unemployed. The total percentage of job seekers compared to the work force was 10.82%. The highest percentage was at Cipongkor District (19,86%), while the lowest percentage was at Cipeundeuy District, that is 4,28% (District Central Agencies on Statistics, 2007).

According to the Head of Local Government Planning Board of Bandung Barat District, Bambang Subagio, several research institutions suggested three alternatives as capital city. The places under consideration were Cikamuning, Padalarang and Ngamprah sub-districts. There are also options for the capital city in seven points stretching from the east to the west part of the district (Pikiran Rakyat Daily, 2009). The location should consider geographical positioning reachable by the fifteen districts. Visibility, accessibility, and lesser productive area should also be under consideration.

Although the capital city of Bandung Barat District has been established in Ngamprah, refusal spins. It is believed to be of political interest, as it does not consider geographical location and accessibility. Seven districts in the southern part relatively far from Ngamprah will certainly face problems due to the distance.

This has been expressed by Bandung Barat Community Communication Forum represented by Ahmad Taufik Saepuloh in Batujajar District Office (Pikiran Rakyat Daily, 2009). Ahmad stated that the decision to place Ngamprah as the capital city would create distance with the community and its service. Meanwhile, the mission of regional expansion is to increase service. However, the government continued with the decision to select Ngamprah as the capital. Ahmad even questioned the basic reason of the choice since Ngamprah is a part of Northern Bandung Area prohibiting massive construction. Based on those challenges and the expressed doubt

concerning Ngamprah as the capital city of Bandung Barat District, this research aims to describe the effectiveness of placing the capital city of Bandung Barat District di Ngamprah.

RESEARCH METHODS

The approach is qualitative approach (Denzin and Lincoln, 2009) through in-depth interview, document study, and observation. Qualitative data analysis technique used is data analysis model put forward by Miles and Huberman. There are three stages in this model, namely data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing/verification (Sugiyono, 2009). Data analysis technique used to analyze the effectiveness is Scalogram as supporting instrument. This quantitative data analysis technique helps researcher to analyze the center of governance in the aspect of service adequacy.

In scalogram method, all public facilities owned by each subdistrict are accounted and arranged in one table. This method can be used by calculating the number of facilities owned, or the lack of those facilities. From this, we can identify the infrastructure types, number and characteristics needed to support economic development in a subdistrict. The stages in arranging the scalogram are as follows: (1) Arranging facilities based on the spread and quantity in subdistrict units. The data of facilities equally spread in all subdistricts are placed at the left column, and the least spread facility is placed at the right column. The number written down is the number of facilities owned by each subdistrict unit; (2) Arranging the subdistrict in such a way so that the one with the most complete facilities is put at the highest rank, while the least complete one will be placed at the bottom; (3) Calculating the whole social facilities horizontally, both for the types and quantities of facility units in each subdistrict.; (4) Calculating facility units vertically to gain total facility units spread in all subdistricts.; (4) From the calculation, the rank is in order, with the highest position for the subdistrict having the most complete facilities to the lowest with the least complete one; (5) If from the calculation and arrangement we find two subdistricts with the exact same amount of facilities and units, then the third factor under consideration is the population. The subdistrict with the higher population is placed above.

The researcher conducted document study for the District Vision dan Mission, Regional Medium Term Development Strategy for Bandung Barat District, The District Strategic Plan of Community Resource Board and Village Governance, 2010 Profile of Social, Labor and Transmigration Office, and 2010 Bandung Barat District in Number published by District Central Agency

on Statistics, 2009 Community Social Economy Data of Bandung Barat District and 2009 Regional Survey of Socio-Economy's Result Publication, as well as Transportation Office Data of Bandung Barat District. Meanwhile, observation was systematically performed through audio-visual recording and in field transcription. In-depth interviews were conducted with the Head of Local Economy and Sociocultural Reinforcement Division and Local Governance, the Head of Planology and Environment Sub Division of Development Planning Board of Bandung Barat District and the Head of Transportation Section of Bandung Barat District.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The effectiveness based on service center dimension is analyzed using several indicators, namely service accessibility, adequacy and appropriateness. *First*, one indicator in determining an area, in this case a subdistrict, to be a capital city is the community accessibility. Accessibility here means that the community can access the center easily and fast whenever they require those services. Therefore, the specific sub-indicators are the distance, time, and community closeness.

From distance accessibility aspect, the access to Ngamprah by public transportation is not fully facilitated. In order to reach Ngamprah, the only public transportation available stops at Padalarang. To reach Ngamprah, we have to use another public service, namely ojek (a motorcycle used as public transportation vehicle).

Table 1 portrays the lack of facility for the lines reaching Ngamprah. According to District Central Agency on Statistics, the distance between Padalarang and Ngamprah is 5 km. It means that individuals requiring services, particularly those related with governmental leaders and apparatus, have to travel for another five kilometer after reaching Padalarang.

The distance accessibility principle also indicates that the total distance to the service center should be minimized. One of the visions of expansion is for the service access cloneseness. For other subdistricts at the border, the total distance is 22 km for Lembang, 53 for Rongga, 32 for Cipendeuy, and 22 km for Cikalong Wetan. The distance is reasonably far and the lack of public transportation to Ngamprah raises another problem. We can compare the furthest distance if we choose Padalarang. The distance to Padalarang Subdistrict is 22 km from Lembang, 48 km from Rongga, 27 km from Cipeundeuy and 17 km from Cikalong Wetan (Transportation Office, 2010). The distance travelled by the community is minimal compared to the distance to Ngamprah.

From time accessibility aspect, additional time is required to reach Ngamprah Subdistrict after the transit

Table 1. Public Transportation Destination in Bandung Barat District

No.	Code	Destination	Distance (km)
1.	64	Lembang-Maribaya-Cibodas	3
2.	65	Lembang-Cikawari	20
3.	66	Lembang-Cikole	12
4.	67	Lembang-Cijengkol	15
5.	69	Lembang-Cisarua	12
6.	70	Cikole-Tangkuban Perahu	7
7.	86	Padalarang-Cikalong Wetan-Cipeundeuy	20
8.	87	Padalarang-Gunung Bentang	9
9.	88	Padalarang-Pangheotan	7
10.	89	Padalarang-Parongpong	48
11.	90	Padalarang-Rajamandala	24
12.	94	Cisarua-Pangheotan	12
13.	95	Cililin-Sindangkerta-Gung Halu	18
14.	96	Cililin-Cijenuk-Baranangsiang	21
15.	104	Cibitung-Rajamandala	25
16.	108	P. Tehnik-Ciwaruga-Cigugur-Parongpong	16

Source: Transportation Office, Bandung Barat District, 2010

in Padalarang. Time accessibility is in line with distance. The distance from Padalarang to Ngamprah is approximately 10 km. By calculating the distance and time proportion, as one km equals to 1.93 minutes, the community in Lembang, Rongga, Cipeundeuy, Cikalong Wetan Subdistricts needs approximately 5 to 10 extra minutes after the transit. For example, the travel from Lembang to Ngamprah requires 62.5 minutes journey to Padalarang and additional 5 to 10 minutes journey from Padalarang to Ngamprah. In other word, the time consumed is more than an hour. Similar case is felt for Rongga, Cipeundeuy, and Cikalong Wetan subdistricts.

Community closeness aspect is one of the subindicators of service accessibility. It explains population distribution surrounding the central government. The community around the center will assemble to the center. This aspect also explains the community movement in order to acquire services.

Ngamprah as the capital city of Bandung Barat District is close to several other subdistricts, namely Padalarang, Cisarua, and Cikalong Wetan. The total population of Padalarang is 155,457, Cisarua is 66,315, and Cikalong Wetan is 108,477. This means that 330,249 people are around Ngamprah, along with the population of Ngamprah, which is 154,166 (Subdistrict Labor and Transmigration Office, 2010).

The data from District Agency on Statistic concerning public health visit in Ngamprah in 2009 shows that with similar composition of public health unit as maintained in Padalarang, the total visit to public health in Padalarang is significantly higher than the visit to those in Ngamprah.

Both Ngamprah and Padalarang have three local government public healths. Those in Ngamprah received 14.612 visits while the total visit to public healths in Padalarang was more than twice as much, 35.200 visits. Such a condition indicates that people in Padalarang did not go to Ngamprah in order to get public health service. It was actually the population in Ngamprah who went to get public health service in Padalarang.

Similarly, two other subdistricts near Ngamprah, namely Cikalong Wetan and Cisarua did not access the service in Ngamprah. The absence of hospital in Ngamprah is an indication for the community in Cikalong Wetan and Cisarua not to go to Ngamprah in order to get public health service. Based on observation, the population in Cikalong Wetan prefers to goto Padalarang or even Cimahi City, while those in Cisarua go to Cimahi City. Based on this explanation, the status of Ngamprah as the capital city has not magnetized the community to assemble themselves to this subdistrict to get public health service.

Economically, there has been no magnetic attraction to move people around Ngamprah into this subdistrict. One economic magnet for a region is market. There is no market in Ngamprah to support transaction and goods distribution. It is actually Padalarang that provides attractive markets visited by the community of Bandung Barat Districts. The people in Cisarua usually sell their harvest in Padalarang market and buy their daily life needs also in Padalarang. Similarly, people from Cikalong Wetan, Cipatat, and Batujajar Subdistricts also go to Padalarang market to shop.

Therefore, based on service accessibility indicator as depicted by distance accessibility, time accessibility and community closeness Ngamprah Subdistrict has not shown its effectiveness as the capital. This is shown by the inefficient distance and time consumed to reach the subdistrict. Community closeness also indicates that the community around Ngamprah, especially those in Padalarang, Cisarua, and Cikalong Wetan did not move to Ngamprah to get public health service or to run their economy.

Second, service adequacy. The status of capital city makes Ngamprah as an *urban area*. With such a status, Ngamprah Subdistrict has the potency to provide services categorized as city service. Some important city services are education, health, water supply and hotels.

First, education service measures numbers of elementary and high schools. There are 41 elementary schools and 11 junior high schools in Ngamprah. Based on the rank, the rank of education facilities in Ngamprah Subdistrict is 7th. The highest rank is for Lembang with the proportion of 62 elementary and 14 Junior High Schools while the lowest rank is for Cisarua with the proportion of 28 elementary and 4 Junior High Schools (Scalogram Analysis Result, 2011).

From this fact, school children are widely distributed in Bandung Barat District. One important thing in relation with Ngamprah is that students usually prefer to study at the center. The central subdistrict is supposedly treated as the urban city where students prefer to move. However, although Ngamprah is legally the capital city, it functionally lacks the educational service forcing many students to study in Padalarang. In this case, Padalarang attracts the students in continuing their study, possibly due to the many favourite schools in and the urban characteristic of Padalarang community.

The data from District Central Agency on Statistics state that the total number of schools in Ngamprah is 52. Subdistrict Community Socioeconomic Data indicate that the overall school-age population in Ngamprah is 317,596. This means that the ratio between unit numbers of elementary and junior high schools and total number of elementary and junior high school population is 1: 6.108.

Ngamprah Subdistrict only has one senior high school, SMAN 1 Ngamprah. The community socioeconomic data indicate that the senior high school age population is 15.664. SMAN 1 Ngamprah could not possibly deal with the total number of students so that many continue their study in Senior High Schools in Padalarang or Cimahi City.

The second is public health facility in Bandung Barat District. There are three governmental public health centers with 15 medical staffs. The number is lower than the neighbour subdistrict, Padalarang. In Padalarang,

the three governmental public health centers operate with 20 medical staffs. The highest number of governmental public health center is found in Gununghalu (6) while the highest number of medical staffs available is in Cikalongwetan with 40 staffs (District Central Agency on Statistics, 2010).

Public health facility availability affects the community movement in getting their service. As the capital city, adequate facility is important. If the minimum condition of facilities persists, it will not cover the health service demand.

Compared with the ratio of population, the number of public health centers in Ngamprah Subdistrict is not adequate. The total population of Ngamprah is 51.521. It means that each health center in Ngamprah serves 17.174 people in average.

The total number of medical staffs in Ngamprah is 15, while the total population of Ngamprah is 51.521. This means that each medical staff serves 3435 people in average. Conceptually, the ratio for total population and medical staffs is 3.000: 1. This means that each medical staff in Ngamprah District serves total number of people above the standard capacity. Therefore, additional staff is required.

Third, in terms of water supply, the number of water facility in Ngamprah is 2.665. In rank, the rank of Ngamprah's water supply is 7th. There is a significant difference if we compare the facility of the highest rank, Padalarang, which provides 11.976 unit of water supply facilities (Scalogram Analysis Result, 2011).

Water supply is significantly important for the sustainability of urban society. Urban society activities require that the water facility and infrastructure are adequate. As the capital city, Ngamprah potentially attracts urbanization so that the water facility and infrastructure are inadequate since Ngamprah should not only facilitate its own community, the society living in Ngamprah Subdistrict but also the newcomers.

Fourth, the last aspect under consideration for service adequacy is the dwelling as the characteristic of urban society. The possible formation of housing as the characteristic of urban community is superblock and there is an indication of hotels for travellers.

Ngamprah with its status as the capital city is functionally a city. The community characteristic is supposed to be the characteristic of a city. This urban characteristic is in line with the formation of elite houses and hotels.

Observation indicates that elite houses are found mostly in Padalarang and Batujajar. In Padalarang we have Kota Baru Parahyangan, an elite housing area suitably classified as *superblock*. There are also Perumahan Citra Padalarang Indah, Pondok Padalarang Indah, and Bentang

Padalarang District. In Batujajar, there are Puspa District Batujajar and Batujajar District.

Hotels become important facility for an urban area. This is because the urban area has its own attraction for the gathering of people, especially outsiders, as city tour. Urban area is also the concentration of governmental activity, particularly for official visits both from the central government and among local governments. The officials need hotels in conducting their formal assignments.

In Bandung Barat District alone, hotels are rare. Data from District Central Agency on Statistics, for the Year of 2009, indicates that the total number of star and non star hotels is 74, eight star hotels and 66 non-star hotels. The distribution is not widely spread as hotels are available only in Lembang and Padalarang. The total number of hotels in both subdistricts also significantly varies. Only one hotel is found in Padalarang while 73 hotels are located in Lembang. Ironically, Ngamprah as the capital city provides no hotel facility.

From the service adequacy indicator to measure the effectiveness of Ngamprah as capital city, based on education facility adequacy, Ngamprah's rank is at 7th and it means that the facility is still lacking. From the health facility condition Ngamprah has only three health centers and 15 medical staffs, the least number of staffs available among the subdistricts. Based on water supply condition, Ngamprah is also ranked 7th. Lastly, from the housing and hotel facility, Ngamprah does not provide elite house or hotel. Therefore, based on the service adequacy, Ngamprah is not effective in running its function as the capital city.

Third, service appropriateness. In forming Bandung Barat District as a new autonomous region, Ngamprah is planned as the center of administration and *central of business*. Center of administration means that all governmental offices are established in this area. The plan as central of business is interpreted as the establishment of shopping center attracting people to enter Ngamprah. The Head of Planning and Environmental Subdivision of Bandung Barat District, Ir. H. Firmansyah, states that the center of administration means the establishment of District House and all governmental offices in an approximately 100 ha area. Since Ngamprah is a part of Northern Bandung Region, the coefficient for infrastructure should be less than 20%.

As the center of governance, the establishment of all the buildings is normal. The establishment will make service access easier. This is appropriate when the subdistrict provides District-scope services such as business legal permit. Furthermore, Ir. H. Firmansyah claims that Ngamprah will become civic center and Central Business Subdistrict (CBD).

The community response towards *Central Business Subdistrict* creates polemics. The status of Ngamprah as Bandung Utara Region as it functions as the lung of Bandung is one of the trigger. The people feel that when structures are established, new vicinity is open and it will reduce oxygen production.

In the discussion of center of growth dimension, there are two indicators to determine the effectiveness of civic center as center of growth. The two indicators are the agglomeration advantage and spread effect to its environment.

First, agglomeration advantage explains that there is a tendency for individuals and entities to choose location in relatively growing area or the center of the regions. This is due to several advantages created by the centralization which attract people and economic activities to choose the location (Nasoetion, 1985).

The advantage of agglomeration is the formation of better facilities such as electric supply, water supply, housing or workshop. In such a location, we often find experts. The facility reduces production cost/ capital required since all facilities are not separately established. In order to decide the location, businessmen calculate those factors and choose the location with the minimum cost. Agglomeration advantage indicator also explains that a region should have economic business scale, economic location, and economic urbanization factors. In the context of civic center, the three factors can consequently increase regional development and services. Ngamprah as the capital city also has indirect responsibility to provide agglomeration advantage especially for private sectors and transmigrants.

For private sectors, we determine the distribution of companies in Bandung Barat District. The operating companies are classified as huge, medium and small scale industries. The classification is based on the total number of labors for each industry. The total number of labors for large scale industry is higher than 100 persons, 50-100 labors for medium scale industry and 10-50 labors for small scale industry. In Bandung Barat District, there are 93 large scale industries, 54 medium scale industries and 165 small scale industries. The society also creates business in forms of Small to Medium Micro Business, Small-Medium Business, kiosk and restaurants. The industries are not equally distributed. (Dinsoskertrans KBB, 2010).

Most of the industries are found in Batujajar Subdistrict with the total number of 121 companies. Padalarang is on the second place with 89 companies. In Ngamprah, there are 23 companies, 5 huge, 2 medium and 16 small scale industries. The data indicate that, in proportion, smaller scale industries dominate in Ngamprah. It also indicates that businessmen prefer Batujajar and Padalarang as its busi-

ness location. The possible reason is the distance and more convenient access to the two subdistricts as compared to Ngamprah. Entrepreneurs consider minimum cost of production, including transportation cost in running their business.

Businessmen can reduce transportation cost for the five-kilometer distance since to reach Ngamprah, they have to spend additional five kilometer from Padalarang. As previously discussed for distance availability indicator, there are some subdistricts at the border of other regions, namely Lembang, Rongga, Cipeundeuy, and Cikalong Wetan. In order to reach Ngamprah, the distance from Lembang Subdistrict is approximately 22 km, 53 km from Rongga, 32 km from Cipeundeuy, and 22 km from Cikalong Wetan. The condition is different if the location is in Padalarang subdistrict with sufficient transportation access which reduces transportation cost.

Another factor under consideration in selecting location is labor availability around the area. In Bandung Barat District, with lowland and mountainous condition, most of the people work in agriculture, plantation, forestry, fishery, mining, industry, electrical, water, trading, transportation, financial and service sectors.

From all those sectors, agriculture, plantation, forestry, fishery sectors absorbs most labors. Industry is on the second place, absorbing 11.2604 labors. It means that industry becomes the alternative sectors chosen by Bandung Barat society and becomes the most attractive sector to gain appropriate income. However, businessmen do not directly accept all applications. Selection process is held. This indicates that when selection process takes place, they will evaluate applicant's skill, expertise and educational background.

Entrepreneurs prefer educated labors living near their business location. Applicants who live nearby provides advantage for the company, especially in ensuring that the labors can work optimally, e.g. they come on time. As for educational background, they prefer labors with knowledge, skill and expertise. Such a qualification is advantageous since the labors are easily directed, and adaptive to the working environment. The company can also reduce the cost which might otherwise be required for the labors training.

Padalarang Subdistrict is the largest supplier of labors in Bandung Barat District based on level of education, namely bachelor and undergraduate. It produces 6.533 male labors and 4.081 female labors. Ngamprah Subdistrict is on the second place as it provides 5.934 male and 3.447 female labors (Dinsoskertrans KBB, 2010). The number shows that at least Ngamprah is one of the subdistricts contributing large number of ready-to-use labors. In other word, we can conclude that Ngamprah is quite

effective in this category. However, this supply does not make businessmen readily invest in this subdistrict.

Another aspect under discussion regarding agglomeration aspect is economic urbanization aspect. Ngamprah as capital city of Bandung Barat District should provide job opportunity stimulating urbanization to Ngamprah. In order to attract outsiders, infrastructure and economic facilities are crucial. To indicate that Ngamprah is a destination for urbanization, we can also calculate the number of job seekers in Ngamprah, especially university graduates. The indication is that when there are still university graduate from Ngamprah who still search for job opportunities, we can conclude that Ngamprah is not capable to absorb more job seekers. In other word, the internal job seekers have not been optimally absorbed by business sector in Ngamprah, let alone other job seekers outside the subdistrict.

The data from Social, Labor and Transmigration Office of Bandung Barat District shows the number of job seekers, distributed and calculated for each subdistrict. The data shows that university level job seekers are indeed from Ngamprah. Bachelor and undergraduate job seekers from Ngamprah is 173 male and 156 female job seekers. This suggests that they are not fully absorbed due to the fact that only small number of companies is located in Ngamprah. Therefore university graduates seek job opportunities outside Ngamprah. They go, for example, to Batujajar or Padalarang. This actually means that there is no urbanization at all, let alone economical urbanization.

Another aspect determining economic urbanization is the housing established for outsiders in Ngamprah Subdistrict. Field observation shows that the housing is mostly located in Batujajar and Padalarang Subdistricts. In Padalarang we have Kota Baru Parahyangan, an elite housing area suitably classified as *superblock*. There are also Perumahan Citra Padalarang Indah, Pondok Padalarang Indah, and Bentang Padalarang District. In Batujajar Subdistrict, there are Puspa District Batujajar and Batujajar District. The houses function as living abode for outsiders. However, there is no housing established for outsiders. Such a development is ecologically risky particularly for Bandung Barat and Bandung Raya in general. This is due to the fact that Ngamprah is a part of Norther Bandung Region which functions to support oxygen supply for Bandung Raya. The concern is justified as governmental office buildings have already acquired approximately 100 ha area.

Urbanisation aspect in Ngamprah creates another problem, that is, ecological disturbance of Ngamprah and Bandung Raya. Therefore, economic urbanization aspect does not take place in Ngamprah.

The second center of growth indicator is *spread effect*. For *spread effect* indicator, the effectiveness of the subdistrict for center of growth dimension is analyzed from the subindicators of regional income increase, income per capita increase, the increase of job opportunity, the decrease of poverty level, the decrease of unemployment and the increase of investment climate.

The first subindicator of spread effect is regional income increase. Gross Regional Domestic Product of Bandung Barat District in 2006 was Rp.6.095.540.000,- with income per capita of Rp.3.861.950,-. Lembang had the highest income per capita (Rp.7.899.120,-) and Rongga had the lowest Gross Regional Domestic Product (Rp.116.950.230.000,-) with income per capita of Rp.2.122.590,-. The largest contribution for Gross Regional Domestic Product was from industry sector (Rp.2.590.358.470.000,-) and the lowest contribution was from mining sector (Rp.33.797.270.000,-) (www.bandungbaratkab.go.id).

In its development as new autonomous region, one aspect to observe is whether Bandung Barat can be categorized as good, medium or minimum new autonomous region, based on GRDP. From GRDP, we can also see the contribution of all sectors, from the highest to the lowest contribution. This relates with effectiveness of Ngamprah Subdistrict as the capital city of Bandung Barat as it measures the contribution of Ngamprah for the GRDP as analyzed from the business sectors located in Ngamprah Subdistrict.

As we analyze the Data of District Central Agency on Statistics data on GRDP in 2007-2009, there was consistent increase in all posts of business sectors. The highest contribution for GRDP was from industry sector. In 2007, industry sector GRDP reached the amount of Rp.5.761.640.360.000,-. The amount indicates 12.74 % industry sector GRDP increase as compared to the previous year. In 2008 the GRDP increased (Rp.6.624.524.150.000,-) with GRDP growth of 14.98%, and the GRDP in 2009 reached Rp.6.921.771.980.000, with 4.49% GRDP growth.

The lowest contribution for Bandung Barat GRDP is from mining sector. Although there is annual growth, but the contribution is not significant. In 2007, it reached Rp.55.816.820.000. In 2008, it the amount was Rp.58.121.250.000. In 2009 it increased to reach Rp.62.608.580.000. The second biggest GRDP contribution is from trade, hotel and restaurant sector. In 2007, this sector contributed Rp.2.267.290.040.000. The contribution in 2008 was Rp.2.634.504.960.000. In 2009, the amount was Rp.3.081.115.570.000. Important identification from the contribution is the amount of contribution from Ngamprah Subdistrict for the overall Bandung Barat District, especially for the sector related with its status as the capital city. Two of the most significant sectors for the

analysis are industry sector, and trade, hotel and restaurant sector.

For industry sector, most of the companies are located in Padalarang and Batujajar Subdistricts. In Padalarang there are 89 companies and in Batujajar lies 121 companies. The total percentage of companies in the two subdistricts reaches 67% of the whole companies found in Bandung Barat District. Meanwhile, there are 23 companies found in Ngamprah District and they are dominantly small industries (16 out of 23). The contribution of the 5 large scale industries located in Ngamprah is not significant for the growth of Bandung Barat GRDP. The contribution of GRDP is mostly provided by the companies in two other subdistricts, Padalarang and Batujajar.

For trade, hotel and restaurant sector, the analysis shows similar pattern as the contribution from Ngamprah turns out to be not significant for the District GRDP. The data from the District Central Agency on Statistics portrays that the dominant market supporting the community economic activity lies in Padalarang Subdistrict. The people in Ngamprah actually perform their economic activity in Padalarang market. And when we analyze hotel industry, it turns out that Ngamprah does not provide hotel. Both star and non-star hotels are found in Padalarang and Lembang. Therefore, there is no contribution provided from Ngamprah Subdistrict for Bandung Barat District GRDP from hotel industry. Similarly, as restaurant is usually attached to hotel industry and Ngamprah does not make hotel available, no contribution is provided from restaurant sector.

The second subindicator of the spread effect is the increase of income per capita. This indicator correlates with regional income. Bandung Barat District GRDP in 2007 to 2009 continuously increases. This also insinuates the increase of the income per capita. In 2007, the income per capita was Rp.8.207.108.306. The amount in 2008 became Rp.9.440.793.329. In 2009, the amount reached Rp.10.282.304.620. The average monthly income per capita denotes that the income is still below the average minimum wage. In 2007, the monthly income per capita was only Rp.683.925,6922. Although an increase occurred in 2008, but it was not significant as it reached Rp.786.732,774. In 2009, the amount was Rp.856.858,718.

It is important to note that the calculation of income per capita can also mean that the lowest income per capita is covered by those with higher income. However, income per capita calculation is the standard of calculation in the running system. Bandung Barat GRDP is highly contributed by industry sector and trade, hotel and restaurant sector and the contribution of Ngamprah in increasing the GRDP is, again, not significant and undersized, as only five large scale industries are located in Ngamprah

and there is lack of economic activity and hotel. The non contributing subdistrict correlates with the the slight increase of income per capita of the community.

The third subindicator of spread effect is the increase of job opportunity. This subindicator explains the total amount of economic entities established in Ngamprah. This indicates the businessmen's interest to invest in Ngamprah. Investors that can absorb labors are those who establish large, medium and small scale industries. The higher number of industries established in Ngamprah indicates the higher chance of labor employment, as well as job opportunity. This will mean more chance for job seekers, both internally and externally, to find their job in Ngamprah.

The data from Social, Labor, and transmigration Office of 2010 Bandung Barat District shows that total labors working in industry sector were 112.604 people, 46.330 male and 66.274 female. It means that only 7.5% of the population worked in this industry. In Ngamprah, only 23.135 people worked in this industry. It indicates that the total amount of labor working in industry sector from Ngamprah was the second largest after Padalarang. The total number of labors from Padalarang who worked in this industry was 41.968.

The total number of labors for industry sector in Ngamprah indicates that only 1.5% of the total District community works in this sector. It shows minimum job opportunity available in Ngamprah to absorb job seekers for the whole Bandung Barat District. This is supported by the data from Social, Labor and Transmigrasion Office which portray the small number of business entities located in Ngamprah Subdistrict.

Ngamprah has 23 business enterprises, 5 large scale industries, 2 medium scale industry and 16 small industries. Large scale industry potentially absorbs higher number of labors. However the five industries located in Ngamprah do not significantly affect the total number of workers absorbed in industry sector.

Large scale industries turn out to locate in two neighbouring subdistricts, namely Padalarang and Batujajar. In Padalarang Subdistrict, there are 23 large scale industries, while, in Batujajar Subdistrict, the large scale industries reach 46 in number. Therefore, Padalarang and Batujajar Subdistricts are actually the two subdistricts generating large scale industries, so that the people in Batujajar and Padalarang who work in this sector is significantly higher than those in Ngamprah.

This fact signifies the tendency of investors to choose Padalarang and Batujajar as the location of the business. It also reflects the higher increase of job opportunity in the two subdistricts compared to Ngamprah. If we relate this to the community empowering program held by

Local Governance and Community Empowering Office, it seems to suggest that there is no significant program held to increase community empowerment in Ngamprah although this subdistrict receives large amount of Village Fund Allocation.

The fourth subindicator of spread effect is the decrease of poverty. One instrument to measure poverty in Bandung Barat District is the data of receiver of Direct Cash Aid. In 2008, the total number of receivers was 197.000 households. It is estimated that the total number of poverty increases up to 450.000 family units. The borderline of poverty in 2010 for Bandung Barat District was the minimum salary of Rp 220.000,00 per capita per month. In other word, if someone's income was below this number, he fell into the category of poor people. This standard is different compared to the standard held in 2008, which was Rp.150.000,00 per capita per month. Based on the increase of the standard, the more are categorized as poor. However, this can be a justification for public since the increase of poverty is potentially due to the increase of standard.

If we refer to the data from Social, Labor and Transmigration Office of Bandung Barat District in 2010 regarding income received from workers in industry sector alone, it turns out that 52% received income below the minimum wage. From the total of 142.780 labors, 74.309 of them received the wages below the minimum standard. The total number of workers receiving minimum standard was 41.291 or approximately 29% of the labors. This means that the total number of labors receiving minimum wages or even lower salary covered 81% of the population. It reflects the living standard of Bandung Barat society in general. Most of the people lived poorly and struggled to cope with their daily needs.

However, it is important to note that the total number of labors working in industry sector is not significant in Ngamprah. This is reflected by the small number of industry held in this subdistrict. Therefore, there is actually insignificant contribution for Ngamprah in increasing the income of labors in industry sector.

The fifth subindicator of spread effect is the decrease of unemployment. The investors not only increase the total regional income but also help to absorb local labors. In 2010, total number of labors absorbed through Foreign Investment was 7.823, consisting of 7.768 local workers and 55 foreigners. Meanwhile, Domestic Investment absorbed 11.831 labors, 11.809 local workers and 22 foreigners.

The data from Social, Labor, and transmigration Office of 2010 Bandung Barat District shows that total number of unemployed bachelor and undergraduate job seekers was 2.534 for male and 2.126 for female. Generally, unem-

ployed bachelor and undergraduate job seekers looked for job other than farming sector. They applied for work in 312 companies spreading in Bandung Barat District, 93 large scale industries, 54 medium scale industries and 165 small industries. Apparently, the total sum of industries available cannot absorb the unemployed bachelor and undergraduate job seekers.

Specifically, the 23 business entities in Ngamprah Subdistrict cannot significantly create sufficient job opportunities. This is due to the fact that only five large scale industries are available. Other industries available are categorized as medium scale industries (5 entities) and 16 small industries. With such a small number of large scale industries, absorption does not occur. If the average large scale industries absorb 150 workers, only 750 of them work in huge companies in Ngamprah. It is relatively small considering that the total unemployment which has reached the total number of 4.660 and that the total number of fresh graduate continuesly increases each year. To add to the problem, there are still a lot of senior high graduates who directly apply for jobs. This strongly indicates than Ngamprah, with the existing companies available, cannot significantly absorb the available supply and it does not effectively reduce the total number of unemployment in Bandung Barat District.

The last subindicator of the spread effect is the increase of investment climate. Total investment in Bandung Barat District has shown significant increase for the last two years. Some potential investment from several sectors attracts investors. Data from Capital Investment Office of Bandung Barat District in 2010 shows that total domestic capital investment reached Rp 4.04 billions, 237 % increase compared to the Rp 1,67 billion investment in 2008. Meanwhile, foreign investment in 2010 was Rp 5,6 billion, a 420% increase as compared to the Rp 1,4 billions investment for the previous two years. The investment was from 51 foreign companies and 51 domestic companies. Those business entities invested in various sectors, namely textile, housing, food and manufacture sectors.

Several companies invested in various regions in Bandung Barat District. The subdistricts that attract the investment are Padalarang, Batujajar, Lembang, and Ngamprah. Many companies establish various industry in Batujajar Subdistrict, while, in Lembang, most investors are attracted in real estate sector.

From the total amount of investment in various subdistricts in Bandung Barat, the investment in Ngamprah is still insignificant. Only 23 companies invest in Ngamprah, 5 of which is large scale industries, while 2 and 16 others are classified as medium scale and small scale industries. This means that only 7.4% of companies invest in

Ngamprah, from the total of 312 business entities investing in Bandung Barat District.

CONCLUSION

The analysis for center of service dimension shows that to place Ngamprah as the capital city of Bandung Barat District is not effective. For the analysis for center of growth dimension, the result turns out to be similar. Therefore, the conclusion of the research is that placing Ngamprah as the capital city of Bandung Barat District in summary is ineffective. Therefore, Our recommendation is for the local government to construct railroads to tie other subdistricts to Ngamprah, i. e. the roads linking Cisarua and Ngamprah, both from Jambudipa and Cipada, to establish Ngamprah Market to potentially become the District's business center, and to build up housing area. This recommendation considers ecological aspect of Ngamprah Subdistrict as a part of Northern Bandung Region, so that the housing establishment do not require larger space which might risk the oxygen supply for Bandung Raya.

The research has limitation for sources required. The researcher focuses on data analysis based on local government offices. Other data derived from the community and private companies are not deeply investigated. Therefore, the research contribution demands community and private companies response for a more elaborate study.

REFERENCES

- Alaci, Davidson, 2010. Regulating Urbanisation in Sub-Saharan Africa Through Cluster Settlements: Lessons for Urban Managers in Ethiopia. *Theoretical and Empirical Researches in Urban Management*, Volume 14, page 20-34.
- Badan Pusat Statistik Kabupaten Bandung Barat, 2007. *Kabupaten Bandung Barat dalam Angka*. Bandung Barat: BPS KBB.
- _____, 2010. *Kabupaten Bandung Barat dalam Angka*. Bandung Barat: BPS KBB.
- Christaller, Walter. 1966. *Die zentralen Orte in Sudddeutschland*. Jena: Gustav Fischer, 1933. (Translated (in part), by Charlisle W. Baskin, as *Central Places in Southern Germany*. Prentice Hall.
- Denzin, Norman K. and Lincoln, Yvonna S., 2009. *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. London: Sage Publication.
- Haggett, P., 2001. *Geography. A Global Synthesis*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Hamid, Hasani. 2008. *Dimana Ibukota Kabupaten Kerinci*. (unpublished).

- Harian Pikiran Rakyat, 2009. Ibu Kota Bandung Barat Tetap di Ngamprah. *www.pikiran-rakyat.com*. 6 Maret.
- Huang, Jin; Guo, Baorong; Bricout, John C., 2009. From Concentration to Dispersion: The Shift in Policy Approach to Disability Employment in China. *Journal of Disability Policy Studies*, Volume 20, Number 1, page.
- Kabupaten Bandung Barat, 2006. Geografi Kabupaten Bandung Barat, 2006. *www.bandungbaratkab.go.id*. 5 Maret.
- Khairi, Akmal, 2010. Analisis Pemberdayaan Peran dan Fungsi Camat. *Journal of Administrative Sciences and Organization, Bisnis and Birokrasi*, Volume 17, Number 2.
- Kiliçaslan, Yilmas; Pond, Richard; Tasiran, Ali Cevat; Jefferys, Steve, 2009. Commodification of Public Services, Productivity and Employment. *International Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Volume 3, Number 1.
- Pratikno, 2008. *Nasionalisme dan Kebangsaan di Era Desentralisasi*. Fisipol-UGM, 14-15.
- Percik, 2007. Proses dan Implikasi Sosial-Politik Pemekaran: Studi Kasus di Sambas dan Buton. *DSF Publications*.
- Seymoar, Nola-Kate; Ballantyne, Elizabeth; Pearson, Craig J., 2010. Empowering Residents and Improving Governance in Low Income Communities Through Urban Greening. *International Journal of Agricultural Sustainability*, Volume 1, Number 2.
- Subdirektorat Monitoring dan Evaluasi Kementerian Dalam Negeri RI, 2010. *Ringkasan Hasil Evaluasi Perkembangan Dini 57 Daerah Otonom Baru Usia Di Bawah 3 Tahun*. Jakarta: Subdit Monev Kemendagri.
- Sugiyono, 2009. *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R and D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Wellington, Jonga; Innocent, Chirisa, 2009. Urban Local Governance in The Crucible: Empirical Overtones of Central Government Meddling in Local Urban Councils Affairs in Zimbabwe. *Theoretical and Empirical Researches in Urban Management*, Volume 12.