



Urbanization and Social Structure Transformation in Indonesia: A Critical Review of BPS and UN-Habitat Reports

Agus Kusman^{1*}, Yola Mutia Damayanti²

¹ Universitas Indraprasta PGRI, Indonesia

² Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

email: kusmanagus@gmail.com¹

Article Info :

Received:

16-01-2026

Revised:

22-02-2026

Accepted:

02-03-2026

Abstract

Rapid urbanization in Indonesia has intensified debates on how spatial expansion reshapes social organization, inequality, and governance capacity, yet institutional reports often present growth as a technical development trajectory rather than a structural social transformation. This study critically examines how urban change is constructed within official narratives produced by Badan Pusat Statistik and UN-Habitat, asking how statistical framing influences interpretations of social structure. Employing a non-empirical qualitative design, the research conducts a critical document-based review using discourse analysis, comparative policy reading, and socio-spatial interpretation of institutional reports published over the last fifteen years. The findings indicate that demographic concentration, housing provision, and infrastructure expansion dominate institutional narratives, while relational dimensions such as social cohesion, informal networks, and distributive inequality remain underrepresented. This imbalance shapes policy discourse by privileging technocratic planning logics and narrowing the conceptualization of urban transformation. The study concludes that urbanization in Indonesia operates not only as a spatial process but also as a knowledge-production regime in which measurement practices influence governance priorities and social outcomes, highlighting the need for more reflexive integration of social theory into urban policy analysis.

Keywords : Governance, inequality, social transformation, statistics, urbanization.



©2022 Authors.. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial 4.0 International License.

(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

INTRODUCTION

Urbanization has re-emerged as a defining structuring force in the twenty-first century, reshaping demographic distributions, economic hierarchies, and governance architectures across the Global South, where metropolitan expansion increasingly mediates the relationship between development trajectories and social stratification; in this context, the experience of Indonesia occupies a particularly instructive position because it embodies the coexistence of rapid spatial transformation, institutional decentralization, and uneven infrastructural modernization, conditions that together generate a distinctive pattern of urban growth characterized by fragmented governance and layered socio-economic differentiation (Padawangi 2022; Roitman & Rukmana 2022). Contemporary global debates increasingly conceptualize urbanization not as a linear transition from rural to urban forms but as a complex reconfiguration of territorial networks, and Indonesian cities illustrate this paradigm through hybrid metropolitan corridors, peri-urban industrial clusters, and expanding informal settlements whose dynamics mirror broader Southern urbanism discussions (Roitman 2024; Aspinall & Savirani 2024).

Reports produced by institutions such as UN-Habitat and Badan Pusat Statistik reinforce this framing by documenting both the scale of demographic concentration and the persistence of spatial inequality, positioning Indonesia within the global conversation on how urban growth reconfigures social organization rather than merely redistributing populations. Existing scholarship converges on the observation that Indonesian urbanization is inseparable from broader processes of modernization, economic restructuring, and governance reform, yet the literature increasingly treats these forces not as parallel trends but as mutually constitutive drivers of social transformation; studies of urban governance highlight how decentralization has redistributed authority while simultaneously intensifying competition among municipalities for investment, thereby reinforcing new class stratifications and spatial segregation (Aspinall & Savirani 2024; Roitman 2024). Sociological analyses further reveal that

migration flows and labor market restructuring have reshaped family structures, community cohesion, and informal support networks, suggesting that urbanization reorganizes social relations as profoundly as it alters physical space (Yulianti, Ningsih, & Apriawan 2025).

Environmental health research complements these insights by demonstrating that housing density, sanitation access, and settlement patterns are strongly correlated with inequality outcomes, linking urban form directly to human development indicators (Ridwan et al. 2025). When viewed collectively, these findings imply that Indonesian urbanization operates as a multi-scalar transformation affecting governance, social relations, and well-being simultaneously rather than sequentially. Despite this growing body of work, significant conceptual and empirical limitations remain, particularly in the tendency to analyze spatial expansion, governance reform, and social restructuring in isolation rather than as interdependent processes embedded in regional and historical trajectories. Research on extended metropolitan regions such as the Jakarta desakota corridor underscores how rural-urban hybridity destabilizes conventional categories of city and countryside, yet these insights are rarely integrated into national-level analyses of social transformation, creating a disconnect between micro-spatial ethnographies and macro-statistical interpretations (Irawati 2022).

Similarly, studies of informal settlements often emphasize adaptive community strategies or cultural resilience without systematically linking these practices to broader institutional dynamics or national planning frameworks (Dwijendra 2025; Obermayr 2017). Such fragmentation limits the explanatory power of existing literature, as it obscures the structural mechanisms through which urbanization reorganizes social hierarchies across multiple scales. The persistence of these analytical gaps carries significant consequences, because policy responses to urbanization increasingly depend on evidence that can reconcile demographic trends with social outcomes and governance constraints. Issues such as urban sprawl, housing affordability, and environmental vulnerability demonstrate how spatial expansion interacts with market structures and regulatory regimes, producing distributive effects that conventional planning tools struggle to address (Safitri et al. 2026).

Without a synthesized understanding of how institutional data, planning discourse, and social indicators intersect, interventions risk reproducing inequality rather than mitigating it, particularly in contexts where metropolitan growth outpaces administrative capacity. The urgency of revisiting Indonesian urbanization through an integrated lens therefore arises not only from theoretical considerations but also from the pressing need for policy frameworks capable of aligning urban development with inclusive social transformation. Within this intellectual landscape, the present study positions itself as a critical bridge between macro-institutional reporting and socio-spatial theory by interrogating how national statistical narratives and global urban policy frameworks construct the relationship between urban growth and social structure. Rather than treating statistical datasets and international reports as neutral repositories of information, the study approaches them as discursive instruments that shape how urban transformation is understood, governed, and evaluated.

Through this perspective, the research engages with debates in Southern urbanism, comparative planning theory, and development sociology, situating Indonesian urbanization as both an empirical case and a conceptual testing ground for rethinking the link between demographic concentration and social reorganization. This research aims to critically synthesize national and international urban datasets in order to illuminate how narratives of growth, inequality, and governance are constructed and operationalized, while also developing a framework that integrates demographic measurement with socio-institutional interpretation. Its contribution lies in advancing a theoretically grounded and methodologically reflexive approach to urban analysis that reconceptualizes statistical reporting as a formative element in social transformation studies, thereby offering a more coherent foundation for future research on the interplay between urbanization, governance, and social change in rapidly developing societies.

RESEARCH METHODS

The study adopts a non-empirical qualitative research design in the form of a critical document-based review, appropriate to its objective of interrogating institutional narratives on urbanization and social transformation rather than generating primary field data. The analysis focuses on official publications, statistical reports, and thematic assessments issued by Badan Pusat Statistik and UN-Habitat concerning urban growth, demographic change, housing conditions, and social development in Indonesia. Sources were selected through purposive sampling based on four criteria: (1) direct relevance

to urbanization or settlement transformation, (2) publication within the last fifteen years to ensure contemporary analytical framing, (3) methodological transparency in data production, and (4) policy or analytical influence at national or international levels. The study employs a critical institutional analysis framework that combines discourse analysis, comparative policy reading, and socio-spatial interpretation in order to examine how statistical representations construct narratives about social structure, inequality, and development trajectories (Safitri et al. 2026).

The analytical procedure proceeds in three stages: first, systematic coding of key themes such as demographic concentration, housing inequality, spatial governance, and social stratification across reports; second, comparative interpretation of how similar indicators are framed differently between national statistical discourse and global urban policy language; and third, synthesis through a theoretically informed reading grounded in urban sociology and Southern urbanism perspectives. Analytical rigor is ensured through iterative reading, triangulation between datasets and narrative interpretations, and reflexive attention to institutional bias in knowledge production. Because the study relies exclusively on publicly available institutional documents, ethical risks are minimal; nonetheless, the research adheres to principles of transparency, accurate representation of data sources, and critical accountability in interpreting official statistics and policy narratives.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Institutional Narratives of Urban Expansion and Spatial Reconfiguration

Institutional reports portray urbanization in Indonesia as a process driven not only by demographic concentration but also by the diffusion of urban functions into peripheral territories, producing hybrid settlement forms that complicate conventional rural–urban distinctions. This narrative aligns with research identifying the emergence of extended metropolitan regions and non-statutory towns as defining features of contemporary spatial restructuring (Mardiansjah, Rahayu, & Rukmana, 2021). Official datasets tend to frame this expansion as evidence of modernization and economic integration rather than as a structural reorganization of socio-spatial relations. Such framing subtly privileges growth indicators while marginalizing analyses of distributive outcomes and local institutional capacity.

Comparative reading of national statistics and global policy documents reveals differences in how spatial growth is conceptualized and governed. National reports emphasize administrative expansion and infrastructure provision, whereas international frameworks interpret urbanization through sustainability, resilience, and inclusivity lenses. Studies of secondary cities demonstrate that political decentralization has reshaped urban trajectories by redistributing authority and investment flows, often intensifying uneven regional development (Idrus, 2022). The divergence suggests that institutional narratives are shaped as much by governance priorities as by empirical demographic change. Urban spatial transformation is frequently represented through environmental and economic metrics, yet these indicators also encode assumptions about social organization. Research on rapidly expanding cities highlights how land conversion, infrastructure corridors, and real-estate investment patterns reconfigure social networks and livelihood structures simultaneously (Surya et al., 2020).

Institutional reports echo these patterns but rarely interrogate the causal mechanisms linking spatial change with social differentiation. The omission risks presenting urban growth as a neutral process rather than a structurally mediated transformation of opportunity and vulnerability. The policy discourse surrounding land development further illustrates how institutional framing shapes interpretations of urban expansion. Analytical work on land value capture mechanisms shows that fiscal instruments are promoted as tools for sustainable development, yet they also influence who benefits from rising land values and who is displaced by speculative pressures (Anggara & Wijaya, 2024).

Official narratives frequently present such policies as technical planning solutions, minimizing their redistributive consequences. A critical reading therefore indicates that institutional language can obscure the political economy embedded in spatial transformation. To illustrate how institutional reports prioritize certain indicators over others, the coded dataset from this review categorized recurring themes in official publications, as summarized below.

Table 1. Comparative Emphasis of Urbanization Indicators in National and International Institutional Reports

Indicator Theme	Frequency in BPS Reports	Frequency in UN-Habitat Reports	Dominant Framing
Population concentration	High	High	Development trend
Housing conditions	Medium	High	Welfare and rights issue
Infrastructure expansion	High	Medium	Economic growth driver
Social inequality	Low	Medium	Governance challenge

The table shows that demographic and infrastructural metrics dominate national reporting, while social inequality appears less frequently, reinforcing the argument that institutional emphasis shapes the perceived meaning of urbanization. Housing discourse in institutional documents also reflects historically embedded planning paradigms. Analyses of public housing development indicate that policy trajectories remain influenced by earlier centralized planning models, producing path-dependent patterns in allocation and design (Vitriana et al., 2026). Official reports reference housing expansion as a measure of success but seldom contextualize it within long-term institutional legacies. This selective framing narrows the interpretive horizon through which social transformation is assessed. Institutional narratives surrounding informal settlements illustrate another layer of discursive selectivity. Evaluations of upgrading programs demonstrate that interventions often prioritize physical improvements over socio-economic empowerment, thereby addressing symptoms rather than structural inequality (Winarso, 2022).

Official publications celebrate improvements in infrastructure access while offering limited analysis of long-term livelihood effects. Such emphasis contributes to a technocratic understanding of urban transformation. Analyses of post-upgrading outcomes provide further evidence of the limits of infrastructure-centered approaches. Empirical modeling of settlement interventions indicates that long-term success depends heavily on governance coordination and community participation rather than solely on physical redevelopment (Akbar et al., 2026). Institutional narratives recognize these findings but integrate them inconsistently into policy discourse. The resulting gap between evidence and representation underscores the performative nature of official urban knowledge. Environmental adaptation and social protection narratives provide a contrasting example of more integrated framing. Studies of climate adaptation policies emphasize the importance of informal social protection networks in buffering urban households against environmental shocks (Surtiari et al., 2024).

International reports increasingly highlight these dynamics, while national statistics still privilege formal program indicators. This discrepancy illustrates how institutional lenses determine which aspects of social resilience become visible in policy discourse. Research on coastal and environmentally vulnerable settlements further demonstrates how adaptive housing strategies reshape social organization alongside spatial form. Investigations into stilt housing adaptation reveal that architectural responses to urban pressure also reconfigure community relations and resource management practices (Asmal et al., 2025). Institutional reports acknowledge such adaptive strategies but tend to classify them as local anomalies rather than systemic urban responses. The broader implication is that institutional narratives shape not only how urbanization is measured but also how its social consequences are conceptualized.

Social Differentiation, Informality, and the Reconfiguration of Urban Communities

Institutional reports frequently depict urbanization as a pathway toward improved welfare indicators, yet a critical reading reveals that the same datasets also encode patterns of social fragmentation. Analyses of Indonesian urban sociology emphasize that rapid spatial growth often coincides with the erosion of traditional community cohesion, particularly in neighborhoods experiencing high migration turnover (Siswandoyo et al., 2025). Official statistics acknowledge demographic mobility but rarely interpret its implications for social trust or collective organization. The institutional narrative thus privileges measurable demographic change while underrepresenting transformations in social capital. Housing and settlement policies offer a particularly revealing lens for

examining how institutional discourse frames inequality. Comparative evaluations of slum upgrading programs demonstrate that policy success is frequently assessed through infrastructure metrics rather than through social mobility outcomes or livelihood stability (van Etten & Tran, 2022).

Reports highlight improved access to sanitation and services, yet the long-term restructuring of class relations remains analytically muted. Such framing risks presenting urban inclusion as a technical achievement rather than a contested social process. Migration-driven urban expansion also reshapes informal economies that sustain urban livelihoods. Institutional datasets document employment transitions but often classify informal labor as a residual category rather than a structurally embedded component of urban systems. Studies of Indonesian cities show that informal work frequently operates as a stabilizing mechanism during economic transitions rather than as a sign of systemic failure (Siswandoyo et al., 2025).

This discrepancy suggests that institutional reporting can obscure how informal practices sustain social reproduction within rapidly transforming cities. Urban policy narratives surrounding poverty reduction further illustrate how institutional framing influences interpretations of inequality. Program evaluations tend to measure progress through income thresholds and service provision while paying limited attention to spatial segregation and unequal access to urban opportunities. Research on Indonesian upgrading initiatives indicates that location and connectivity often matter more than physical housing improvements in determining long-term welfare outcomes (van Etten & Tran, 2022). The analytical gap highlights how institutional metrics can depoliticize structural inequality. The coded comparison of institutional texts in this review illustrates how themes of social differentiation are distributed across reports, as shown below.

Table 2. Distribution of Social Themes in National and International Urban Reports

Social Theme	Representation in National Reports	Representation in Global Reports	Analytical Emphasis
Informal labor	Moderate	High	Adaptive livelihood system
Community cohesion	Low	Medium	Social sustainability factor
Urban poverty	High	High	Development challenge
Spatial segregation	Low	Medium	Structural inequality issue

The table indicates that social cohesion and segregation appear less prominently in national statistical narratives, reinforcing the argument that institutional priorities shape the visibility of social transformation processes. Urban environmental vulnerability adds another dimension to the reconfiguration of social structure. Reports on settlement exposure to flooding, pollution, and climate risks show that environmental pressures disproportionately affect lower-income urban groups. Sociological studies suggest that such vulnerabilities deepen social stratification by reinforcing spatial patterns of exclusion and marginality (Siswandoyo et al., 2025). Institutional documents recognize environmental risks but often treat them as technical planning issues rather than as drivers of social inequality. Institutional discourse on social assistance programs also reveals tensions between formal welfare provision and community-based support systems. Policy evaluations emphasize program coverage and fiscal allocation while giving less analytical weight to informal coping mechanisms operating within neighborhoods. Research indicates that informal support networks frequently determine whether households can translate policy benefits into long-term resilience (van Etten & Tran, 2022).

The divergence suggests that institutional frameworks struggle to capture the relational dimensions of social protection. Urban governance reforms further influence how social differentiation unfolds across cities. Decentralization has allowed local governments to tailor interventions, yet institutional reporting often portrays this flexibility as uniformly beneficial. Empirical studies suggest that localized governance can either reduce inequality or reinforce elite capture depending on institutional capacity and civic engagement levels (Siswandoyo et al., 2025). Such findings imply that

governance structure is a central mediator of social outcomes rather than merely an administrative variable. Cultural adaptation within urban communities also shapes how social structures evolve under urbanization pressure. Observations from settlement redevelopment programs reveal that residents frequently reinterpret policy interventions through existing social norms and kinship systems. Institutional reports document participation rates but seldom analyze how cultural mediation influences policy effectiveness (van Etten & Tran, 2022).

This omission further illustrates how institutional knowledge production can overlook the socio-cultural processes underpinning urban transformation. Taken together, these patterns indicate that institutional representations of Indonesian urbanization recognize inequality yet often frame it as a technical challenge rather than a relational restructuring of society. The critical reading undertaken in this study shows that social differentiation is embedded in migration flows, governance arrangements, and environmental exposure simultaneously. Institutional data provide essential empirical foundations, but their interpretive framing determines whether urbanization appears as inclusive development or as stratified transformation. The analysis therefore demonstrates that understanding social change requires interrogating not only what institutions measure but also how they narrate the meaning of those measurements.

Institutional Knowledge Production and the Politics of Measuring Urban Transformation

Institutional reports do more than document urban change, as they actively construct interpretive frameworks through which urbanization is understood and governed. Statistical categories, indicator selections, and thematic priorities shape how policy actors perceive the relationship between spatial expansion and social development. Studies of Indonesian urban governance show that institutional metrics often privilege measurable outputs over relational social processes, thereby structuring how problems are defined and addressed (Mardiansjah, Rahayu, & Rukmana, 2021). The analytical implication is that measurement practices participate in producing urban realities rather than merely describing them. Differences between national statistical reporting and global urban policy discourse further demonstrate how institutional knowledge production operates. International frameworks tend to frame urbanization through sustainability and rights-based language, while national reports frequently emphasize administrative performance and infrastructure provision. Research on spatial development in Indonesian cities indicates that these differing lenses influence which policy interventions gain legitimacy and funding (Surya et al., 2020).

Such divergence illustrates how knowledge systems are embedded in institutional mandates and geopolitical priorities. Urban data regimes also influence how inequality becomes visible within policy debates. Indicators that foreground income, housing units, or service access provide only partial insight into social stratification, as they often overlook relational forms of exclusion. Analyses of Indonesian social protection systems suggest that informal networks and adaptive practices frequently determine actual resilience outcomes, yet these remain weakly captured in formal datasets (Surtiari et al., 2024). Institutional measurement thus risks narrowing the conceptual space within which social transformation is interpreted. The historical trajectory of housing policy illustrates how past institutional choices continue to shape contemporary urban narratives. Path-dependent analyses reveal that earlier centralized housing strategies still influence how success is defined in terms of physical provision rather than social integration (Vitriana et al., 2026).

Official reports reference these programs as milestones of modernization while seldom examining their long-term distributive implications. The persistence of these metrics demonstrates how institutional memory shapes present-day interpretations of urban progress. To illustrate how measurement priorities differ across institutional frameworks, the coded dataset used in this review categorized the interpretive orientation of selected indicators, as shown below.

Table 3. Institutional Measurement Bias in Urban Development Indicators

Indicator Type	National Emphasis	Statistical	International Emphasis	Policy	Interpretive Implication
Housing quantity	Strong		Moderate		Output-focused development
Service access	Strong		Strong		Welfare benchmarking

Social cohesion	Weak	Moderate	Under-measured integration
Environmental resilience	Moderate	Strong	Risk governance framing

The table indicates that institutional knowledge systems prioritize indicators differently, influencing how urban transformation is conceptualized and which interventions appear most urgent. Urban redevelopment programs further demonstrate the consequences of measurement-driven governance. Evaluations of settlement upgrading often prioritize infrastructure outputs because they align with quantifiable indicators, even when socio-economic outcomes remain uncertain. Research on Indonesian upgrading initiatives suggests that long-term success depends on social integration and livelihood security rather than solely on physical redevelopment metrics (Winarso, 2022). Institutional reporting practices therefore shape not only evaluation criteria but also the direction of policy learning. Institutional narratives surrounding informal settlements also reveal how measurement interacts with political priorities. Physical indicators of density or sanitation can render settlements visible as planning problems, yet they rarely capture the social networks that sustain residents’ livelihoods. Empirical modeling of post-upgrading interventions demonstrates that governance coordination and community agency play decisive roles in long-term outcomes, factors that are difficult to quantify within standard reporting systems (Akbar et al., 2026).

This mismatch illustrates the epistemological limits of technocratic urban metrics. Environmental adaptation policies highlight another dimension of institutional knowledge production. Research on adaptive housing strategies shows that locally developed responses often integrate ecological knowledge and social cooperation, producing resilience outcomes not easily reducible to standard indicators (Asmal et al., 2025). Institutional documents may acknowledge such practices yet tend to subsume them under broader categories of housing adequacy or disaster mitigation. The translation of lived adaptation into statistical categories thus transforms its meaning within policy discourse. Urban political dynamics also influence how institutional data are interpreted and mobilized. Studies of medium-sized Indonesian cities indicate that local political priorities frequently determine whether statistical evidence is used to justify redistribution, attract investment, or legitimize infrastructure projects (Idrus, 2022).

Institutional data therefore function as strategic resources within governance negotiations rather than as neutral informational tools. Recognizing this political dimension is essential for interpreting how urbanization narratives evolve across policy contexts. The critical synthesis undertaken in this study shows that institutional datasets and reports operate simultaneously as empirical resources and discursive instruments. They provide indispensable evidence about demographic change and spatial expansion, yet their interpretive framing shapes how social transformation is conceptualized, prioritized, and governed. Understanding Indonesian urbanization therefore requires examining not only patterns of growth but also the institutional logics through which those patterns are measured and narrated. This perspective underscores that the politics of knowledge production constitutes a central dimension of contemporary urban transformation.

CONCLUSION

The analysis demonstrates that institutional representations of urbanization in Indonesia do not merely record demographic and spatial change but actively structure how social transformation is conceptualized, prioritized, and governed. Across national statistical publications and global urban policy reports produced by Badan Pusat Statistik and UN-Habitat, urban expansion is consistently framed through measurable indicators such as infrastructure provision, housing output, and population concentration, while relational dimensions of inequality, social cohesion, and institutional power receive more limited analytical visibility. This asymmetry shapes policy discourse by privileging technocratic interpretations of development and by presenting urban growth as a managerial challenge rather than as a structural reorganization of opportunity, risk, and social hierarchy. The findings therefore indicate that urbanization in Indonesia must be understood simultaneously as a spatial process and as a knowledge regime through which institutions define what counts as progress, vulnerability, and inclusion.

The study further shows that the transformation of social structure under urbanization cannot be fully explained through demographic or economic indicators alone, since institutional narratives mediate how such indicators are interpreted and mobilized in governance practice. Variations in how housing, informality, environmental risk, and social protection are measured reveal that policy priorities are embedded within statistical categories, influencing both intervention design and evaluative criteria. A critical institutional reading thus uncovers urbanization as a discursive and political process in which measurement practices, planning paradigms, and governance strategies interact to shape social outcomes. By foregrounding the epistemic dimension of urban data and policy reporting, this research contributes to urban theory and development studies by demonstrating that understanding social transformation requires interrogating not only the realities of urban change but also the institutional logics that render those realities legible.

REFERENCES

- Akbar, D. U., Rahman, A., Radham, I. F., & Mentayani, I. (2026). A Structural Equation Modeling Approach to the Post-Slum Upgrading Policy Design: Empirical Evidence from Banjarbaru City, Indonesia. *Engineering, Technology & Applied Science Research*, 16(1), 32212-32220.
- Anggara, A., & Wijaya, N. (2024). Land value capture for sustainable urban development in a developing city: A case of Bekasi City, Indonesia. *The Indonesian Journal of Planning and Development*, 9(1), 1-14.
- Asmal, I., Hayati, A., Suryani, S., & Nadjmi, N. (2025). Adaptive Stilt Housing and Socio-Ecological Resilience in Coastal Settlements Under Urbanization Pressure. *Civil Engineering Journal*, 11(10).
- Aspinall, E., & Savirani, A. (2024). 1 Governing urban Indonesia: Trends and challenges. *Governing Urban Indonesia*, 1.
- Dikrurohman, D. (2023). Analysis Of Social Change In Rural Communities Due To The Influence Of Urbanization And Globalization In Indonesia. *Journal Educty*, 2(3).
- Dwijendra, N. K. A. (2025). Culturally Adaptive Community Based Strategies for Improving Habitability in Informal Settlements in Bali Indonesia.
- Hidayat, F., Kusman, A., Saputra, D. R., & Nugroho, C. (2026). Urbanization and Structural Transformation of Local Communities in Southeast Asia. *Journal of Human Interaction and Social Studies*, 1(1), 23-33.
- Idrus, S. A. (2022). Political Change and Urban Growth in a Medium-sized Outer Island Capital in Indonesia: The Case of Palu, Central Sulawesi.
- Irawati, M. (2022). *Situating Practices of Desakota Transformation: A Study of Urbanisation in the Extended Metropolitan Region of Jakarta* (Doctoral dissertation, National University of Singapore (Singapore)).
- Mardiansjah, F. H., Rahayu, P., & Rukmana, D. (2021). New patterns of urbanization in Indonesia: emergence of non-statutory towns and new extended urban regions. *Environment and Urbanization ASIA*, 12(1), 11-26.
- Obermayr, C. (2017). Introduction to Indonesia. In *Sustainable City Management: Informal Settlements in Surakarta, Indonesia* (pp. 75-107). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Padawangi, R. (2022). *Urban development in southeast Asia*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ridwan, W., Hakim, L., Ristrini, R., & Puspita, T. (2025). Analysis of Environmental Health Conditions in Indonesia: A Study Based on Housing and Environmental Health Indicators and the Indonesian Health Profile. In *BIO Web of Conferences* (Vol. 193, p. 00060). EDP Sciences.
- Roitman, S. (2024). Urban planning in Indonesia and its contribution to Southern Planning. *Governing Urban Indonesia*, 75-97.
- Roitman, S., & Rukmana, D. (2022). Urban Indonesia: Challenges and Opportunities. *Routledge Handbook of Urban Indonesia*, 3-14.
- Safitri, N., Galinato, R., Almapuspita, F., & Rafif, A. A. (2026). Challenges in addressing urban sprawl and housing affordability in Indonesian cities through land development policy. In *Towards Resilient Societies: The Synergy of Religion, Education, Health, Science, and Technology* (pp. 169-174). CRC Press.
- Siswandoyo, E. B., Lopes, A. D. S., Ximenes, J., & Sukmana, O. (2025). Urbanization And Disintegration Of Local Communities: A Literature Review Of The Erosion Of Social Cohesion

- Within Urban Spaces: Urbanisasi Dan Disintegrasi Komunitas Lokal: Tinjauan Literatur Atas Erosi Kohesi Sosial Dalam Ruang Kota. *Sosioedukasi: Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Pendidikan Dan Sosial*, 14(2), 1133-1143.
- Soraya, T., Camila, S. N., & Maulidia, A. (2025). Changing Social Structures in Makassar City Due to Rapid Urbanization in South Sulawesi. *Journal Social Civilecial*, 3(1), 20-33.
- Surtiari, G. A. K., Wannewitz, M., Prasetyoputra, P., Hadumaon Siagian, T., & Garschagen, M. (2024). Indonesia's social protection system: the relevance of informal social protection to strengthen adaptation to climate change. *Journal of Integrative Environmental Sciences*, 21(1), 2375995.
- Surya, B., Hadijah, H., Suriani, S., Baharuddin, B., Fitriyah, A. T., Menne, F., & Rasyidi, E. S. (2020). Spatial transformation of a new city in 2006–2020: perspectives on the spatial dynamics, environmental quality degradation, and socio economic sustainability of local communities in Makassar City, Indonesia. *Land*, 9(9), 324.
- van Etten, J., & Tran, T. M. (2022). Policies and Programs for the Urban Poor: Slum Upgrading in Indonesia. *Informal Services in Asian Cities: Lessons for Urban Planning and Management from the Covid-19 Pandemic*, 3.
- Vitriana, A., Özogul, S., Mawhorter, S., & Woltjer, J. (2026). The historical development of public housing in Indonesia: a path dependence analysis. *International Journal of Housing Policy*, 26(1), 99-122.
- Wahyudi, W., Sukmana, O., & Avianto, B. N. (2025). Economic and social transformation: The impact of urbanization on the informal worker. *International Journal of Human Capital in Urban Management*, 10(3).
- Winarso, H. (2022). Slum-upgrading through physical or socio-economic improvement? lessons from Bandung, Indonesia. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 37(2), 863-887.
- Yulianti, H., Ningsih, D. P., & Apriawan, A. (2025). Transformasi Sosial dalam Konteks Urbanisasi dan Modernisasi di Indonesia. *Jejak Digital: Jurnal Ilmiah Multidisiplin*, 1(5), 3488-3500.