



## Characteristics of Sustainable Village Leadership

Aep Susanto<sup>1\*</sup>, Dedy Hermawan<sup>2</sup>, Suripto<sup>3</sup>

Universitas Lampung, Indonesia

**Corresponding Author:** Aep Susanto [aepstea38@gmail.com](mailto:aepstea38@gmail.com)

---

### ARTICLE INFO

*Keywords:* Characteristics, Leadership, Sustainable Village Development

*Received :* 15, May

*Revised :* 20, June

*Accepted:* 17, July

©2025 Susanto, Hermawan, Suripto (s): This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



### ABSTRACT

This study aims to determine the characteristics of village leadership including gender, age, education level and length of tenure in 105 Independent Village Development Index (IDM) villages in Lampung Province in 2022. The questionnaire was delivered to 105 Village Head respondents in the form of google form (GF). The analysis technique used in this study is the Excell program. The results of the study concluded that sustainable village development can be realized with the leadership of the Village Head who has a male gender with an age between 31-60 years with a minimum education level of upper secondary during the first period of leadership, namely 1-8 years of his leadership in the village government.

## **INTRODUCTION**

The role of the village government is very strategic in organizing village governance to carry out development and public services. Village government is a subsystem of the governance system so that the village has the authority to regulate and manage the interests of its community. The Village Head is responsible to the Village Consultative Body and submits a report on its implementation to the Regent (Widjaja, 2003). The village government has the right to autonomy and authority in organizing a more democratic village government (Amaliatulwalidain, 2022). The role of the village government is as a policy implementer and program implementer as well as a coach (Syaifudin and Ma'ruf, 2022). The village government is also the main driver of e-government implementation by coordinating with the community to find out the problems or benefits that arise in the implementation of e-Government in realizing the transparency of village governance (Pertiwi et al., 2021). The village government also has a role in community empowerment through the formation of policies, strategies, and communication (Hayati, I, 2021 and Dharma et al., 2022).

However, the quality of service of the Village Head still does not provide maximum service to the community, it can be seen in terms of the time discipline of the Village Head. The Village Head is still not alert in acting, the performance in service to the community is still not optimal, it can be seen from the completion time of each administrative arrangement taken care of by the community that takes a long time, the performance in service is still not optimal (Telaumbanua et al., 2022), lack of cooperation between village government institutions, there is still a work program that is not targeted, lack of performance in service is still not optimal, 2022), lack of cooperation between village government institutions, there are still work programs that are not on target, lack of responsiveness of the village government in absorbing the aspirations and desires of the village community (Rudiadi et al., 2021), lack of coordination between the government and other village officials, lack of assertiveness in carrying out their functions as village government or village head (Simbolon et al., 2021), and lack of assertiveness from the village government (Palakua et al., 2021). The village government has not been communicative and creative, both in approaching, and in solving village problems (Pandjaitan, 2020).

Sustainable village development can be seen through the Village Development Index (IDM) which uses economic, social and environmental composite indices as indicators of village categorization into five statuses, namely (1) very underdeveloped villages, (2) underdeveloped villages, (3) developing villages, (4) developed villages and (5) independent villages (<https://idm.kemendes.go.id/view/detil/1/tentang-idm>). The following shows the IDM data for villages in Lampung province in 2022 as shown in Table 1.

**Table 1. Recap of Lampung Province IDM Status in 2022**

No	Kabupaten	Kecamatan	Village	Idm				
				Very Underdeveloped	Underdeveloped	Developing	Developed	Independent
1	Lampung Selatan	17	256	0	1	165	90	0
2	Lampung Tengah	28	301	0	0	138	147	16
3	Lampung Utara	23	232	0	2	194	36	0
4	Lampung Barat	15	131	0	0	21	63	47
5	Tulang Bawang	15	147	0	3	107	33	4
6	Tanggamus	20	299	0	3	220	76	0
7	Lampung Timur	24	264	0	4	160	96	4
8	Way Kanan	15	221	0	2	155	54	10
9	Pesawaran	11	144	0	0	103	31	10
10	Pringsewu	9	126	0	0	32	82	12
11	Mesuji	7	105	0	9	51	45	0
12	Tulang Bawang Barat	9	93	0	0	64	28	1
13	Pesisir Barat	11	116	0	14	79	22	1
<b>Jumlah</b>		<b>204</b>	<b>2435</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>1489</b>	<b>803</b>	<b>105</b>

Source: Provincial Office of Village Community Empowerment and Transmigration Lampung in 2022

This research will make 105 independent villages in Lampung province as research locations because they are in accordance with the concept of sustainability with economic, social and environmental indicators according to Table 2.

**Tabel 2. Research Village Location**

No	KABUPATEN	KECAMATAN	VILLAGE	IDM
1	Lampung Tengah	Kalirejo	Kalirejo	0.837
2	Lampung Tengah	Kalirejo	Ponco Warno	0.824
3	Lampung Tengah	Bangun Rejo	Bangun Rejo	0.827
4	Lampung Tengah	Trimurjo	Pujo Kerto	0.820
5	Lampung Tengah	Punggur	Tanggul Angin	0.821
6	Lampung Tengah	Seputih Raman	Rama Indra	0.824
7	Lampung Tengah	Seputih Raman	Rukti Harjo	0.820
8	Lampung Tengah	Seputih Banyak	Tanjung Harapan	0.822
9	Lampung Tengah	Seputih Surabaya	Gaya Baru Li	0.818
10	Lampung Tengah	Terusan Nunyai	Bandar Agung	0.892
11	Lampung Tengah	Terusan Nunyai	Tanjung Anom	0.869
12	Lampung Tengah	Bumi Ratu Nuban	Wates	0.829
13	Lampung Tengah	Bandar Mataram	Jatidatar Mataram	0.827
14	Lampung Tengah	Sendang Agung	Sendang Agung	0.821
15	Lampung Tengah	Kota Gajah	Kota Gajah	0.825
16	Lampung Tengah	Bumi Nabung	Sri Kencono	0.848
17	Lampung Barat	Balik Bukit	Gunung Sugih	0.823
18	Lampung Barat	Balik Bukit	Kubu Perahu	0.836
19	Lampung Barat	Balik Bukit	Sebarus	0.840
20	Lampung Barat	Balik Bukit	Wates	0.829
21	Lampung Barat	Sumber Jaya	Way Petai	0.825
22	Lampung Barat	Belalau	Hujung	0.873
23	Lampung Barat	Belalau	Kejadian	0.863
24	Lampung Barat	Belalau	Kenali	0.820
25	Lampung Barat	Way Tenong	Karang Agung	0.842
26	Lampung Barat	Way Tenong	Puralaksana	0.877
27	Lampung Barat	Way Tenong	Sukaraja	0.817
28	Lampung Barat	Way Tenong	Tanjungraya	0.819
29	Lampung Barat	Sekincau	Giham Sukamaju	0.881
30	Lampung Barat	Sekincau	Pampangan	0.859
31	Lampung Barat	Sekincau	Waspada	0.827
32	Lampung Barat	Suoh	Banding Agung	0.849
33	Lampung Barat	Suoh	Ringin Sari	0.858
34	Lampung Barat	Suoh	Suka Marga	0.855
35	Lampung Barat	Suoh	Sumber Agung	0.859
36	Lampung Barat	Suoh	Tugu Ratu	0.881

37	Lampung Barat	Batu Brak	Pekon Balak	0.825
38	Lampung Barat	Sukau	Tanjung Raya	0.860
39	Lampung Barat	Gedung Surian	Ciptawaras	0.838
40	Lampung Barat	Gedung Surian	Gedung Surian	0.819
41	Lampung Barat	Gedung Surian	Puramekar	0.831
42	Lampung Barat	Gedung Surian	Trimulyo	0.907
43	Lampung Barat	Kebun Tebu	Muara Baru	0.834
44	Lampung Barat	Kebun Tebu	Muara Jaya I	0.841
45	Lampung Barat	Kebun Tebu	Muara Jaya Ii	0.845
46	Lampung Barat	Kebun Tebu	Pura Jaya	0.836
47	Lampung Barat	Kebun Tebu	Pura Wiwitan	0.858
48	Lampung Barat	Air Hitam	Gunungterang	0.884
49	Lampung Barat	Air Hitam	Semarang Jaya	0.865
50	Lampung Barat	Air Hitam	Sidodadi	0.867
51	Lampung Barat	Air Hitam	Sri Menanti	0.858
52	Lampung Barat	Air Hitam	Sumber Alam	0.883
53	Lampung Barat	Pagar Dewa	Sidomulyo	0.827
54	Lampung Barat	Batu Ketulis	Argomulyo	0.828
55	Lampung Barat	Batu Ketulis	Batu Kebayan	0.825
56	Lampung Barat	Lumbok Seminung	Keagungan	0.839
57	Lampung Barat	Lumbok Seminung	Lombok	0.856
58	Lampung Barat	Lumbok Seminung	Suka Banjar	0.839
59	Lampung Barat	Lumbok Seminung	Suka Maju	0.821
60	Lampung Barat	Bandar Negeri Suoh	Gunung Ratu	0.838
61	Lampung Barat	Bandar Negeri Suoh	Sri Mulyo	0.864
62	Lampung Barat	Bandar Negeri Suoh	Suoh	0.880
63	Lampung Barat	Bandar Negeri Suoh	Tri Mekar Jaya	0.856
64	Tulang Bawang	Banjar Agung	Dwi Warga Tunggal Jaya	0.821
65	Tulang Bawang	Banjar Agung	Tunggal Warga	0.871
66	Tulang Bawang	Banjar Margo	Penawar Jaya	0.847
67	Tulang Bawang	Banjar Margo	Penawar Rejo	0.854
68	Lampung Timur	Sukadana	Sukadana Ilir	0.836
69	Lampung Timur	Sekampung	Sumber Gede	0.824

70	Lampung Timur	Sekampung Udik	Banjar Agung	0.836
71	Lampung Timur	Bandar Sribhawono	Srimenanti	0.816
72	Way Kanan	Blambangan Umpu	Bumi Baru	0.825
73	Way Kanan	Baradatu	Bhakti Negara	0.847
74	Way Kanan	Baradatu	Gunung Katun	0.867
75	Way Kanan	Baradatu	Setia Negara	0.827
76	Way Kanan	Pakuan Ratu	Serupa Indah	0.843
77	Way Kanan	Negeri Agung	Tanjung Rejo	0.869
78	Way Kanan	Rebang Tangkas	Gunung Sari	0.822
79	Way Kanan	Rebang Tangkas	Lebak Peniangan	0.825
80	Way Kanan	Negara Batin	Negara Batin	0.839
81	Way Kanan	Bumi Agung	Pisang Baru	0.872
82	Pesawaran	Gedong Tataan	Sukaraja	0.863
83	Pesawaran	Negeri Katon	Rowo Rejo	0.911
84	Pesawaran	Tegineneng	Batang Hari Ogan	0.824
85	Pesawaran	Tegineneng	Trimulyo	0.817
86	Pesawaran	Padang Cermin	Padang Cermin	0.834
87	Pesawaran	Punduh Pidada	Bangun Rejo	0.818
88	Pesawaran	Teluk Pandan	Hanura	0.959
89	Pesawaran	Way Ratai	Bunut	0.820
90	Pesawaran	Way Ratai	Gunung Rejo	0.851
91	Pesawaran	Way Ratai	Wates Way Ratai	0.972
92	Pringsewu	Pringsewu	Podomoro	0.860
93	Pringsewu	Pringsewu	Sidoharjo	0.872
94	Pringsewu	Gading Rejo	Tambah Rejo Barat	0.877
95	Pringsewu	Gading Rejo	Tambahrejo	0.898
96	Pringsewu	Gading Rejo	Wates	0.853
97	Pringsewu	Gading Rejo	Wonodadi	0.914
98	Pringsewu	Ambarawa	Ambarawa	0.862
99	Pringsewu	Pagelaran	Bumi Ratu	0.897
100	Pringsewu	Pagelaran	Pagelaran	0.829
101	Pringsewu	Adiluwih	Adiluwih	0.851
102	Pringsewu	Adiluwih	Bandung Baru	0.822
103	Pringsewu	Sukoharjo	Sukoharjo Iii	0.927
104	Tulang Bawang Barat	Tulang Bawang Tengah	Pulung Kencana	0.834

105	Pesisir Barat	Lemong	Lemong	0.858
-----	---------------	--------	--------	-------

Source: Provincial Office of Village Community Empowerment and Transmigration Lampung in 2022

With good village leadership, it is expected to realize sustainable village development. Therefore, it is necessary to study the characteristics of village leadership, in this case the Village Head, who is able to bring sustainable village development. The purpose of this study is to analyze the characteristics of Village Heads in independent villages in Lampung province from the aspects of gender, age, education level and length of tenure.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### *Gender and Leadership*

In the concept of leadership, the position of gender, namely men and women, is an important factor in supporting the success of leadership. Male leadership style is more dominant and prominent than female leadership. The difference in leadership style occurs because men are more likely to think with complexity compared to women, so that in certain cases men are more reliable than women so that it has an impact on organizational performance. Comparison of male and female experience also determines the success of leadership in an organization, male experience in terms of leadership is superior to women who tend to be more feminist so that men are preferred in terms of leadership performance (Kimbu et al., 2021).

### *Age and Leadership*

Widakdo, et al (2021) conducted research on the effect of age and education level on the performance of agricultural extension workers, both simultaneously and partially with a quantitative approach. The sample of this study was Agricultural Extension in Banyuwangi Regency with a total sampling of 40 respondents. The results showed that age and education level had a positive and significant effect on the performance of agricultural extension workers, both simultaneously and partially. Age and performance are one of the things that are interconnected, namely performance decreases with age. A person's expertise, speed, energy, will shrink over time, this adds to the saturation of work, thus affecting the decline in productivity.

### *Education and Leadership Level*

Marpaung's research (2021) on the effect of education level on employee performance conducted at the Population and Civil Registry Office (DISDUKCAPIL) of Bekasi City shows that the level of education and training has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. Situmorang (2021) also shows through his research that the level of education affects the performance of the Village Head in Pantai Labu District, Deli Serdang Regency.

### *Length of Tenure and Leadership*

Padilah (2025) conducted a study aimed at analyzing the level of community trust in the leadership of the village head in the context of the extension of the village head's term of office from six to eight years, taking a case study in Kecamatan Sayan, Kabupaten Melawi. The research findings revealed

that a longer tenure provides opportunities for more sustainable development planning and stronger social ties between the village head and the community.

**METHODOLOGY**

This research was conducted with a quantitative approach with the location of 105 independent villages in the Village Development Index (IDM) in Lampung province conducted from March to May 2025. The respondents of this study were the Village Head with a questionnaire in the form of Google Form (GF). Data analysis was conducted using the Excell program.

**RESEARCH RESULT**

Research data from respondents obtained results according to Table 1 below.

**Tabel 1. Gender of Respondents**

Position	Gender				Amount
	Male		Female		
Village Head	97	92%	8	8%	105

Source: Primary data processed, 2025

Based on Table 1, there are 97 Village Heads with male gender (92%) and 8 Village Heads with female gender (8%). This data shows that the Village Head is still dominated by men compared to female.

Village Heads vary in age as shown in Table 2.

**Tabel 2. Age of Respondents**

Position	Age (Year)										Amount
	20 - 30		31 - 40		41 - 50		51 - 60		> 60		
Village Head		0%	12	11%	58	55%	27	26%	8	8%	105

Source: Primary data processed, 2025

Based on Table 2, out of 105 Village Heads, the majority are between 31-60 years old with 97 people (92%) and the remaining 8 people (8%) are in the age group above 60 years old.

**Tabel 3. Education Level of Respondents**

Position	Education Level										Amount
	(D1/D2/D3)		S1		S2		SMA/Sdrjt		SMP/Sdrjt		
Village Head	6	6%	4	38	1	1	56	53%	2	2%	105

Source: Primary data processed, 2025

Based on data from Table 3. Education Level of Respondents, out of a total of 105 Village Heads who were respondents, a significant majority had an upper-middle level of education (SMA equivalent and above) with a total of 103 people (98%). This number is higher than Village Heads who have a lower education, namely junior high school graduates, which only amounted to 2 people or around 2% of the total respondents.

**Tabel 4. Respondent's Length of Service**

Position	Length of Service (Year)								Amount	
	< 3		3-5		6-8		9-12			13-16
Village Head	30	29%	22	21%	40	38%	13	12%	0%	105

Source: Primary data processed, 2025

Based on Table 4. Respondents' Length of Service, it is known that out of 105 Village Head respondents, 92 people (88%) have a tenure between 1-8 years, while 13 people (12%) have served for 9-12 years.

## DISCUSSION

### *Village Leadership Led by Men*

The findings of this study indicate that the village community still gives trust in the leadership and responsibility of village government management to male leaders rather than women. This result is in accordance with the research of Dalia et.al., (2021) which shows that in general gender differences exist and women have less opportunity to become leaders in an organization than men. Siregar and Wardi (2023) show that gender differences and leadership styles have an important role in determining the decisions and policies of an organization. Organizational performance is strongly influenced by gender and leadership style. Gender inequality can affect a leader's leadership style in an organization's performance.

Male leadership adopts a more directive and task-oriented style, while women tend to apply a more participative, communicative, and transformational leadership style (Eagly and Johnson, 1990). Male leadership is stronger and ready to take risks and female leadership emphasizes caution and harmony.

From the aspect of sustainable village development, male leadership will prioritize directive and task-oriented styles amidst human resources with low learning culture and motivation in the village apparatus while female leadership will use more communicative and participatory leadership patterns to build a learning culture in the village government organization. Male leaders will be more dominant and fast in technology adoption while female leadership will be more cautious in technology adoption, but have a tendency to bring social-sustainability values. Male leadership is faster and bolder in taking breakthroughs while female leadership will tend to maintain harmony and care for sustainability. Thus, the leadership of both male and female Village Heads has an influence on sustainable village development.

### *Village Leadership at Productive Age*

The findings of this study indicate that age differences have significant implications for sustainable village development. Village Heads with unproductive ages above 60 years generally have long experience in managing village governance and understand the intricacies of social dynamics and institutional structures in village communities. However, Village Heads in this age group also tend to maintain conventional leadership approaches, are less responsive to technological change, and are relatively slow in responding to the demands of adaptive and sustainable governance innovations.

Non-productive Village Heads generally face challenges in integrating continuous learning practices, mainly due to limited access to and mastery of information technology and a tendency to rely on established work patterns. Unproductive Village Heads experience barriers in utilizing digital tools such as web-based public service applications, village information systems, or social media to bring services closer to the community. This is certainly an obstacle in realizing modern and transparent village governance. Although senior unproductive Village Heads have more value in terms of prudence and careful consideration in decision-making, the innovations needed in sustainable village development often require the courage to take risks and think creatively, which are more likely to emerge from productive Village Heads.

In contrast, productive-age Village Heads aged 31-60 years show characteristics that are more adaptive, progressive, and open to change. They are generally more familiar with information technology and have a high spirit of learning. Productive-age Village Heads tend to be more active in building collaboration, open to input and training, and encourage innovation in village government management systems. They are also more ready to adopt technology as part of public service transformation, such as the use of digital platforms in managing citizen data, administrative services, and effective communication with the community through digital media. Productive-age Village Heads are also more encouraged to innovate, both in the field of village economy, local resource management, and creative and sustainable community empowerment programs.

The results of this study are in accordance with the research of Widakdo, et al (2021) which shows that age and education level have a positive and significant effect on the performance of agricultural extension workers, both simultaneously and partially. Age and performance are one of the things that are interconnected, namely performance decreases with age. A person's expertise, speed, energy, will shrink over time, this adds to the saturation of work, thus affecting the decline in productivity.

Thus, the age of the Village Head is a factor that cannot be ignored in analyzing the successful implementation of learning organizations, digital leadership, and innovation in promoting sustainable village development. Younger Village Heads have great potential to become agents of change who are able to bring their villages towards a more adaptive and modern direction, while older Village Heads still have an important role in making strategic policies and stability, as long as they are supported by a willingness to learn and adapt. Therefore, it is important for capacity building programs for village officials to consider approaches that suit the age range and readiness of Village Heads in facing the challenges of the digital era and the demands of sustainable development.

***Village leadership has secondary education and above***

The dominance of Village Heads with secondary education and above reflects a shift in the demands for leadership competencies at the village level. Today, Village Head positions tend to be filled by individuals with higher

academic qualifications, who have the potential to bring a more strategic and innovative approach to village governance.

High school graduates and above generally have stronger analytical skills, a high level of adaptability to new information, and a willingness to promote learning within the organization. These competencies are important foundations for building effective learning organizations at the village level. In addition, a better level of digital literacy among high school graduates can facilitate the adoption of digital leadership, so that technology can be optimally utilized in managing village administration and decision-making processes.

The critical thinking and problem-solving skills honed during education are also important assets to encourage innovative initiatives, especially in addressing the increasingly complex challenges of village development.

However, the presence of Village Heads with a junior high school education background still has value and should not be overlooked. While they may require additional support in digital literacy and understanding complex managerial concepts, they often have strong practical experience and a deep understanding of local wisdom. These aspects can be a source of inspiration and innovation that is contextual, relevant and sustainable.

The results of this study are in accordance with Marpaung's research (2021) which states that the level of education and training on employee performance at the Population and Civil Registry Office (DISDUKCAPIL) of Bekasi City has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. Situmorang (2021) also shows through his research that the level of education affects the performance of the Village Head in Pantai Labu District, Deli Serdang Regency.

This finding reinforces that the education level of the Village Head influences the dynamics of sustainable village development. Therefore, it is important to formulate targeted capacity development strategies, in accordance with the educational background of each Village Head, to realize sustainable village development.

#### ***Village Leadership in Length of Service 1-8 Years***

These differences in length of tenure reflect variations in experience, adaptability, and approach to leadership at the village level, which are directly related to success in sustainable village development. Village Heads with 1-8 years of tenure, or the first term of a Village Head's tenure, are generally new leaders who may not fully understand the structure of village governance in depth, but they bring new enthusiasm, high motivation, and are likely to be more adaptive to change. New Village Heads tend to be more open to training, information updates, and the establishment of a culture of collaborative work and shared learning. In terms of digital leadership, Village Heads with relatively new terms of office are likely to be more familiar with developments in information technology and have a greater willingness to adopt digital systems as part of village governance, such as the use of application-based village information systems or the use of social media for transparency and community participation. In addition, new leaders are also more encouraged to innovate in

the planning and implementation of village programs as an effort to build public image and trust in their leadership.

Meanwhile, Village Heads with a tenure of 9-12 years or a second term of leadership have relatively long experience in village governance. This experience is a valuable asset as they have faced various village development challenges and have a deep understanding of local social, cultural and administrative dynamics. They can act as mentors or guides in creating a collective learning environment in the village. However, a possible challenge is resistance to change due to familiarity with existing systems and work patterns. Long-serving leaders may not have fully integrated digital technology into their day-to-day work, requiring regulatory encouragement or specialized training to keep up. Experienced Village Heads are potentially more cautious and less aggressive in implementing new ideas, unless they have proven to have a real impact. The results of this study are consistent with Padilah's research (2025), which revealed that longer tenure provides opportunities for more sustainable development planning and stronger social ties between village heads and residents.

Thus, the length of tenure of the Village Head is an important variable that influences readiness and effectiveness in sustainable village development. Village Heads with less than 3 years in office have more potential in terms of the spirit of change and technology adoption, while Village Heads with 9-12 years in office have advantages in terms of experience and policy stability. These two groups have different but complementary contributions to sustainable village development, and therefore Village Head empowerment strategies need to consider the length of service dimension in designing intervention programs and strengthening the capacity of village officials.

## **CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

From the results of this study, it can be concluded that sustainable village development can be realized with the leadership of the Village Head who has a male gender with an age between 31-60 years old with a minimum education level of upper secondary during the first period of leadership, namely 1-8 years of his leadership in the village government.

## **ADVANCED RESEARCH**

In this study, researchers have limitations, the limitations in this study are as follows, the number of samples is still limited, the research location is only in 1 province, the village data used is 3 years ago and the characteristics analyzed still need in-depth study. Researchers provide suggestions in future research to increase the number of samples of at least 200 respondents, the research location can be expanded to other provinces, IDM village data can use the latest data, for example the last 1 year or conduct their own surveys to obtain sustainable village locations, sustainable village leadership research can also be carried out with a qualitative approach using other variable approaches.

## REFERENCES

- Amaliatulwalidain, A. 2022. "Pemerintahan Desa Dan Demokratisasi Pasca Orde Baru." *Journal Of Public Administration And Local Governance*, 6(1), 95-103.
- Dalia, Limor, KMD., Laura, S. BS., et al. 2021. "Gender disparity in dermatology society leadership." *International Journal of Women's Dermatology* 7 (2021) 445-450
- Dharma, A. S., Ati, N. U., dan Abidin, A. Z. 2022. "Peran Pemerintah Desa Oro Oro Ombo Kecamatan Batu Kota Batu Dalam Memberdayakan Organisasi PKK RW 12 Melalui Usaha Produksi Eco Enzyme." *Respon Publik*, 16(9), 1-8.
- Eagly, A. H., and Johnson, B. T. 1990. "Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis." *Psychological Bulletin*, 108(2), 233-256.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.108.2.233>
- Kimbu, A. N., de Jong, A., Adam, I., Ribeiro, M. A., Afenyo-Agbe, E., Adeola, O., and Figueroa-Domecq, C. 2021. "Recontextualising gender in entrepreneurial leadership." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 88, 103176.
- Marpaung, N. N., Sekolah, M., Ilmu, T., dan Tribuana, E. 2021. "Pengaruh Tingkat Pendidikan Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai (Studi Kasus Disdukcapil Kota Bekasi)." *Jurnal Parameter*, 6(2), 81-95.
- Padilah, A. H., Patriani, I., Ritaudin, R., Nazari, N. A., dan Apriyani, E. 2025. "Tingkat Kepercayaan Masyarakat Terhadap Kepemimpinan Kepala Desa Dalam Dinamika Masa Jabatan 8 Tahun." *Journal of Administration, Governance, and Political Issues*, 2(1), 61-70.
- Palakua, J., Pasandaran, S., dan Pangalila, T. 2021. "Peran Pemerintah Desa Dalam Mengatasi Masalah Kamtibmas Di Desa Pulutan Kecamatan Pulutan Kabupaten Kepulauan Talaud." *Jurnal Ppkn: Media Kajian Pancasila Dan Kewarganegaraan*, 1(2), 97-104.
- Pandjaitan, R. H. 2020. "Masalah Komunikasi Pariwisata Desa Dalam Perspektif Masyarakat Desa Sawarna Lebak Banten." *Mediakom: Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi*, 4(1), 62-74.
- Pertiwi, A., Dema, H., Mustanir, A., dan Anugrah, E. 2021. "Penerapan E Government Dalam Mewujudkan Transparansi Tata Kelola Pemerintahan Desa (Studi Pada Pemerintahan Desa Bulu Timoreng)." *PRAJA: Jurnal Ilmiah Pemerintahan*, 9(3), 130-139.
- Hayati, I. 2021. "Peran Pemerintah Desa Dalam Pemberdayaan Perempuan (Studi Kasus Desa Lamamek, Kecamatan Simeulue Barat, Kabupaten Simeulue, Provinsi Aceh)."

- Rudiadi, R., Ilosa, A., dan Al Sukri, S. 2021. "Optimalisasi Kinerja Pemerintahan Desa Dalam Penyusunan Rencana Kerja Pembangunan Desa." *Jurnal EL-RIYASAH*, 12(1), 44-58.
- Simbolon, D. S., Sari, J., Purba, Y. Y., Siregar, N. I., Salsabila, R., dan Manulang, Y. 2021. "Peranan Pemerintah Desa Dalam Pembangunan Infrastruktur." *Jurnal Kewarganegaraan*, 5(2), 295-302.
- Siregar, E. S. M., dan Wardi, Y. 2023. "Pengaruh Gender Dan Gaya Kepemimpinan Terhadap Kinerja Organisasi." *Jurnal Education and Development*, 11(3), 2223-2229.
- Situmorang, C. P., Nasution, I., & Lubis, Y. A. 2021. "Pengaruh Tingkat Pendidikan terhadap Kinerja Kepala Desa." *Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan, Administrasi Publik, dan Ilmu Komunikasi (JIPIKOM)*, 3(1), 37-46.
- Syaifudin, M. Y., dan Ma'ruf, M. F. 2022. "Peran Pemerintah Desa Dalam Pengembangan Dan Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Melalui Desa Wisata (Studi Di Desa Jurug Kabupaten Ponorogo)." *Publika*, 365-380.
- Telaumbanua, G. R., Waruwu, S., dan Lase, D. 2022. "Analisis Kinerja Kepala Desa Dalam Pelayanan Publik." *Jurnal Akuntansi, Manajemen Dan Ekonomi*, 1(2), 303-311.
- Widakdo, D. S. W. P. J., Holik, A., dan Iska, L. N. 2021. "Efek usia dan tingkat pendidikan terhadap kinerja tenaga bantu penyuluh pertanian." *Jurnal penyuluhan*, 17(1), 52-59. <https://doi.org/10.25015/17202131614>
- Widjaja, H. A. W. 2003. *Otonomi Desa: Merupakan Otonomi Yang Asli, Bulat dan Utuh*. PT. Rajagrafindon Persada. <https://idm.kemendes.go.id/view/detil/1/tentang-idm>