The Effect of Government Expenditure on Economic Growth in South Sulawesi

Salmawati[1], Junaidi[2]
Universitas Muhammadiyah Palopo[1,2]
email: junaidi@umpalopo.ac.id[1]

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine the effect of balancing funds on the economic growth of regencies/cities in South Sulawesi Province as measured by the GRDP value. This study specifically analyzes general allocation funds, special allocation funds, and profit-sharing funds, which are considered to have an impact on regional economic growth. The data analysis method used is the Vector Eros Correction Model (VECM) panel, which involves carrying out a stationary test or unit root test, a correlation test, and a Granger causality test. This analysis was carried out with reference to the South Sulawesi Province APBD data for 2019–2021. The results of this study indicate that general allocation funds and special allocation funds do not have a significant effect on economic growth, while profit-sharing funds have a significant effect on the economic growth of districts/cities in South Sulawesi Province.

Keywords: *Balance Fund, Economic Growth, Local Government*

INTRODUCTION

Economic growth is a condition where there is a change in a country's economic conditions for the better continuously, over a certain period of time. This condition occurs in every country, both developing and developed countries. The National Development Planning Agency (Bappenas RI, 2021) stated that the Covid-19 virus pandemic that occurred in 2019 had a slowing impact on global economic growth, especially in developing countries in East Asia and the Pacific and China. Economic recovery has continued to this day, so that global economic growth in the last five years has continued to improve slowly.

Indonesia is also one of the countries that has felt the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic. Economic growth in Indonesia experienced a slowdown due to various factors, such as a decline in export-import performance, household consumption which was still growing high and investment growth slowing down. However, based on data from the Central Statistics Agency (Statistik, Pusat, 2021) Indonesia's economic growth in the second quarter of 2021 increased to 7.07 percent on an annual basis (yoy). This economic improvement was mainly driven by increased performance in exports, household consumption, investment and government consumption.

Even though there has been an increase in the economy in Indonesia in 2021, the level of economic development in Indonesia is still relatively low. (Sisilia & Harsono, 2021) stated that economic growth is a long-term problem in development. In this case, the government's role is needed to intervene in policies to improve the quality of development. Various policies have been implemented, one of which is the fiscal decentralization policy contained in Law No. 32 of 2004 concerning Regional Government and Law No. 33 of 2004 concerning Financial Balance between Central and Regional Governments. According to (Christia & Ispriyarso, 2019; Kisman & Junaidi, 2022), fiscal decentralization policies provide opportunities for local governments to be able to explore, manage, and utilize their own regional economic potential to solve various problems. However, (Nurcahaya et al., 2022; Tahar et al., 2011) said that there was a fairly high disparity in economic growth between regions in the implementation of fiscal decentralization. According to (AlQomariah et al., 2022) this is because each region has an unequal financial capacity to fund its activities.

According to (Rosita & Sutrisna, 2018), in reducing fiscal inequality between regions, the Central Government provides assistance in the form of Balancing Funds which are regulated in Law no. 33 of 2004. (Antara et al., 2017) states that balancing funds are funds originating from SRB revenues allocated to regions based on percentage figures to fund regional needs. The form of provision from the central government to regional governments is in the form of balancing funds consisting of General Allocation Funds (GAF), Special Allocation Funds (SAF) and Revenue Sharing Funds (RSF).

The Balancing Fund aims to create a balance between the finances of the central government and local governments. (Rosita & Sutrisna, 2018) also stated that, the GAF allocated by the central government has the aim of financing expenditures made by the regions to fulfill regional needs in the form of providing better quality services to the community such as improving the quality of health, education and others. In addition, according to (Sisilia & Harsono, 2021), SAF has an important role in overcoming disparities in public services between regions by giving priority to regional government facilities and infrastructure. Meanwhile, according to (Sinaga, 2020), RSF is allocated to fund regional needs in the context of implementing decentralization which is carried out based on the principle of by origin (producing area) and distribution based on actual revenue.

Research that has been conducted (Sulaeman & Silvia, 2019) shows that GAF and PSF significantly affect economic growth, but SAF does not significantly affect economic growth. On the other hand, research results (Sisilia & Harsono, 2021) state that SAF has a significant effect on economic growth. Based on the description above, this study will test whether balancing funds affect economic growth in South Sulawesi Province. The results of this study are expected to contribute to the management of balance funds for local governments. So that with good management of balance funds by the regional government, this will certainly be able to increase the regional economic growth.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Government Expenditures

Based on Law number 33 of 2004 concerning Financial Balance between the Central Government and Regional Governments, Balancing Funds are funds originating from State Revenue and Expenditure Budget (SREB) revenues allocated to the Regions to fund Regional needs in the context of implementing Decentralization. (Ismail & Hakim, 2014), balancing funds are funds provided by the central government to regional governments that are used to develop what is there and become a priority in their respective regions to make it better. Apart from assisting the regions in funding their authority, another purpose of the balancing fund is to reduce the imbalance in funding sources between the central and regional governments and between regional governments (Antara et al., 2017). (Rosita & Sutrisna, 2018), said

that in the balancing fund there is a trilogy, where the balancing funds are divided into General Allocation Funds (GAF), Special Allocation Funds (SAF), Revenue Sharing Funds (RSF).

General Allocation Fund (GAF)
According to (Perkasa et al., 2021), the General Allocation Fund is a fund originating from State Revenue and Expenditure Budget (SREB) revenues allocated for equal distribution of financial capacity among regions to fund regional needs in implementing decentralization. This general allocation fund is intended to replace transfers in the form of subsidies to autonomous regions and presidential instructions (Sutoyo & Praharso, 2010). Meanwhile (Sulaeman & Silvia, 2019) revealed that GAF is a general purpose grant, namely funds provided by the central government to regional governments without any specific conditions for using these funds. (Rosita & Sutrisna, 2018) stated that the allocated funds can be used by local governments to improve services to the community such as improving the quality of health, education and others. GAF is a block grant, which means that its use is handed over to the regions in accordance with regional priorities and needs for improving public services in the context of implementing regional autonomy (Antara et al., 2017). In addition, (Perkasa et al., 2021) also stated that improving services to the public would stimulate people to be more active and enthusiastic at work because they were supported by adequate facilities. This is expected to increase regional economic growth.

Based on Presidential Regulation No. 10 of 2013, the total amount of GAF is determined to be at least 26% of the Net Domestic Revenue determined by the APBN. Meanwhile, provinces receive 10%, and districts/cities receive 90% of the stipulated GAF.

Special Allocation Fund (SAF)
Based on Law No. 33 of 2004, Special Allocation Funds are funds originating from State Revenue and Expenditure Budget (SREB) revenues that are allocated to certain regions with the aim of helping fund special activities which are regional affairs and in accordance with national priorities. According to Law no. 25 of 1999, SAF can be allocated from the SREB to certain regions to finance special needs by taking into account the availability of funds in the SREB. SAF aims to reduce the cost burden of special activities which are the responsibility of local governments (Wandira, 2013).

According to (Sisilia & Harsono, 2021), SAF is used to bridge the gap in public services between regions by prioritizing education, health, infrastructure, environment, agriculture, maritime affairs and fisheries, as well as local government infrastructure. (Perkasa et al., 2021) states that the implementation of SAF is directed at investment activities for development, procurement, upgrading, and repair of physical facilities and infrastructure for public services with a long economic life, including the provision of supporting physical facilities, except for capital participation. Where various programs or activities can affect the economic growth of a region.

Profit Sharing Fund (PSF)
Based on Law No. 33 of 2004, Revenue Sharing Funds or PSF are funds from State Revenue and Expenditure Budget (SREB) revenues allocated to regions according to percentage figures to fund regional needs related to the implementation of decentralization. According to (Puspaningsih & Aryani, 2016), revenue-sharing funds (PSF) are part of a balancing fund whose accountability is delegated to local governments in terms of implementing decentralization in accordance with regional needs whose funding is based on a certain percentage figure. PSF aims to improve the vertical balance between the center and the regions by taking into account the potential of producing regions (Junaidi et al., 2022a, 2022b; Sulaeman & Silvia, 2019).

(Ar & Zein, 2016) states, PSF itself originates from taxes, natural resources, natural revenue-sharing funds in accordance with the determination of the calculation basis and income areas and other provisions regarding PSF regulated by government regulations. According to (Mokorowu et al., 2020), PSF is carried out according to the principle of source, in the sense that the regional share of the revenue that is shared depends on the producing region and this principle applies to all PSF

components, except fisheries PSF which is shared equally across districts/cities. as well as the distribution of PSF both tax and natural resources is carried out based on actual revenues for the current fiscal year.

The research conducted (Rosita & Sutrisna, 2018) concluded that Profit Sharing Funds have a significant effect on Economic Growth, so this means that when the value of an area's income increases, it will also cause an increase in economic growth achievements. (Ar & Zein, 2016) also revealed, the higher the profit sharing realized, the higher the economic growth, and conversely, the lower the profit level realized, the lower the economic growth.

Economic growth

According to (Antara et al., 2017) economic growth can be interpreted as economic development that causes an increase in goods and services in society and an increase in people's welfare. Meanwhile, according to (Suci & Asmara, 2018), economic growth is an increase or change in national income (national production) in a given year, regardless of population growth and other aspects. Economic growth is one of the indicators used to assess the development or progress of economic development in an area over a certain period of time, the economic growth rate is calculated from the change in Gross Regional Domestic Product (GRDP) at standard prices from year to year (Tahar, Afrizal dan Zakhiya, 2011).

(Junaidi, 2022; Widianto et al., 2016) states that economic growth drives local governments to carry out economic development by managing existing resources and forming a pattern of partnerships with the community to create new jobs that can influence the development of regional activities. According to (Adyatma & Oktaviani, 2015; Junaidi, 2015a), there are factors that influence the improvement and improvement of service infrastructure for the community, including natural resources, labor, capital investment, entrepreneurship, transportation, communication, composition of the industrial sector, technology, export markets, international economic situation, local government capacity and government spending and development support. With the increase and improvement of service infrastructure for the community, it can encourage regional economic growth. However, according to (AlQomariah et al., 2022), each region has a different ability to finance its activities, so this causes inequality between regions.

According to (Junaidi, 2021; Salim, 2019), to address inequality of financial capabilities between regions, the central government provides funds to regional governments called balancing funds consisting of General Allocation Funds, Special Allocation Funds, and Profit Sharing Funds. And based on the results of research that has been done, (Junaidi, 2015b; Putri & Junaidi, 2022; Salim, 2019) found that balancing funds have a positive effect on economic growth.

RESEARCH METHOD

Types and Research Data
This type of research is quantitative research which is to determine the impact between the balancing fund variables on economic growth. The data used in this study is secondary data in the form of time series and cross-sectional data between districts/cities in South Sulawesi Province. The data sources for this research are the Central Bureau of Statistics (www.bps.go.id) and the Directorate General of Financial Balance of the Ministry of Finance of the Republic of Indonesia (www.djpk.depkeu.go.id).

Population and Research Sample
The population used in this research is all regencies/cities in South Sulawesi Province, namely 24 regencies/cities with a time span of 2019-2021. The sampling technique used to obtain a representative sample is purposive sampling, meaning that as many as 24 districts/cities in the South Sulawesi Province

with a time span of 2019-2021 meet the criteria as a sample because they meet the data completeness requirements needed in this study.

Data Analysis Method
The data analysis method used in this study is the Vector Eros Correction Model (VECM) panel. The Panel Vector Eros Correction Model (VECM) is a data analysis method used for variables that are interdependent or often called cointegrated. In this method, the researcher analyzed the data by carrying out a stationary test, a correlation test, and a Granger causality test.

1 Stationary Test
Stationary test is a concept used to test the stationary of a time series data. If a data has been declared stationary, then the data is suitable for use in the next calculation step or process. The stationary test was carried out using the Unit Root Test method, also known as the Augmented Dickey-Fuller Test (ADF).

2. Correlation Test
The correlation test aims to see the closeness or relationship between 2 or more variables.

3. Granger Causality Test
After carrying out the stationary test and correlation test, the next step is to carry out the Granger causality test. Granger causality test, is a test that aims to see whether there is a causal or reciprocal relationship between the two research variables, so that it can be seen whether the two variables statistically have a two-way or reciprocal relationship (influence each other), have a unidirectional relationship or not at all there is a relationship (not influencing each other) (Roman & Kartiko, 2020). To see Granger causality can be seen by comparing the probability value with the level of confidence (1%, 5%, or 10%). If the probability value is less than the confidence level, then it can be stated that the two variables have a causality relationship.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Stationary Test
In using PVECM the first thing to do in testing is the unit root test to find out whether each variable is stationary or not to be used in research. The following is the result of the unit root test or ADF test using eviews:

Table 1. ADF Unit Root Test

| Variables | Level | | | 1st level | | |
	ADF	Critical Value	Prob.*	ADF	Critical Value	Prob.*
DAU	-11.91314	-2.902953	0.0001*	-4.444755	-2.911730	0.0007*
DAK	-6.421655	-2.902953	0.0000*	-7.539136	-2.905519	0.0000*
DBH	-4.034442	-2.903566	0.0022*	-7.297982	-2.906923	0.0000*
PDRB	-5.835481	-2.904848	0.0000*	-7.009095	-2.910019	0.0000*

Based on the results of the data processing above, it can be seen that statistically, the ADF value for each variable is smaller than the critical value, namely 5% and the probability value is smaller than the confidence level used, namely 0,05. These results were obtained at the level level test as well as at the 1st level or commonly referred to as the first difference. So it can be concluded that each variable has met the stationarity requirements of the ADF test data. This indicates that all of the data is suitable for use in the next step or testing process.

Correlation Test

The next step after carrying out the stationary test is to test the correlation between variables. The following is the result of the correlation test data processing using Eviews:

Table 2. Correlation Coefficient

Variables	DAU	DAK	DBH	PDRB
DAU	1.000			
DAK	0.164	1.000		
DBH	0.367	0.155	1.000	
PDRB	0.387	0.370	0.682***	1.000

Based on the table above, we can see that the GAF variable and the SAF variable have a correlation coefficient of 0,164, which means that these variables have a very weak correlation level. Furthermore, the GAF variable and GRDP variable have a correlation coefficient of 0,387. This means that there is a correlation between the two variables with a weak correlation level.

Then for the SAH variable and PSF variable it has a correlation coefficient of 0,155, which means that the two variables have a very weak correlation level. Meanwhile, the SAF variable and GRDP variable have a correlation coefficient of 0,387. This means, the correlation between these variables is at a weak level.

Furthermore, for the PSF variable and GAF variable, we can see that the two variables have a correlation coefficient of 0,367. This shows that the correlation between the two variables is at a weak correlation level. Whereas the PSF variable and GRDP variable have a correlation coefficient of 0,682, this means that there is a positive correlation between the two variables with a strong correlation level.

Granger Causality Test

The next Vector Eros Correction Model (VECM) panel data analysis method is the Granger causality test. The following is the result of processing Granger causality test data using eviews:

Table 3. Granger Causality Test

Variables	F-Statistic	Prob.* (0.05)
DAU >>> DAK	2.85386	0.0649
DAK >>> DAU	0.78706	0.4595
DBH >>> DAK	2.22978	0.1157
DAK >>> DBH	0.60117	0.5512
PDRB >>> DAK	3.89125	0.0253***
DAK >>> PDRB	0.04055	0.9603
DBH >>> DAU	8.97031	0.0004
DAU >>> DBH	2.46396	0.0930
PDRB >>> DAU	2.70759	0.0742
DAU >>> PDRB	1.52787	0.2247
PDRB >>> DBH	6.01511	0.0040***
DBH >>> PDRB	5.59054	0.0057***

The test level used in the Granger causality test is the level of confidence ($\alpha = 0,05$). Based on the table above, we can see that the GAF variable does not statistically affect GRDP with a probability of 0,2247> 0,05 or in other words it does not have a Granger causality relationship. The same thing is also shown in the effect of GRDP on GAF, where statistically the GRDP variable does not significantly affect the GAF variable with a probability of 0,0742 > 0,05. So it can be concluded that the GAF variable does not affect the GRDP variable and the situation also applies vice versa.

It is known statistically that the SAF variable does not significantly affect the GRDP variable with a probability of 0,9603>0,05. However, the GRDP variable is known to have a statistically significant effect on the SAF variable with a probability of 0,0253<0,05. This means that there is a unidirectional causality relationship between the GRDP variable and the SAF variable. Where GRDP has an effect on SAF, but the situation does not apply the other way around.

The influence shown by the PSF variable on GRDP in the table above, can be seen that the PSF variable significantly affects the GRDP variable with a probability of 0,0057<0,05. The same thing is also shown in the effect of GRDP on PSF, where GRDP significantly affects PSF with a probability of 0,0040<0,05. So it can be concluded that there is a reciprocal causality relationship or mutual influence between the PSF variable and the GRDP variable.

The Effect of General Allocation Funds on Regency/City Economic Growth in South Sulawesi Province
Based on the results of the correlation test that has been carried out, it appears that general allocation funds have a weak influence on the economic growth of districts/cities in the province of South Sulawesi. The same result is also shown in the Granger causality test, where GAF does not statistically significantly affect GRDP and vice versa. Or in other words, there is no reciprocal causal relationship between GAF and GRDP. This means that whenever there is an increase or decrease in the GAF, this will not have a significant effect on the value of the gross regional domestic product. So it can be concluded that the general allocation fund has no effect on the economic growth of districts/cities in the province of South Sulawesi. Where one measure of economic growth in a region is an increase in the value of gross regional domestic product.

The results of this study are in accordance with those conducted by (Nainggolan & Hasugian, 2020) which states that GAF does not simultaneously affect economic growth. However, this study contradicts the results of a study (Talangamin et al., 2019) which shows that GAF has a significant positive effect on economic growth.

Since the enactment of regional autonomy in its policy to improve people's welfare, it needs support from the Central Government, where the Central Government has provided balancing funds, one of which is the general allocation fund. Regency/city regional governments in South Sulawesi province should further improve the management of these funds to improve public services and welfare, so that the main purpose of providing these funds is to reduce financial inequality and create economic stabilization in the region can be realized, where this can increase economic regional growth.

The Effect of Special Allocation Funds on Regency/City Economic Growth in South Sulawesi Province
From the results of processing the correlation test data between the SAF variable and the GRDP variable, a weak correlation level was obtained. The same thing was also obtained from the results of the Granger causality test, where SAF did not significantly affect GRDP. Unlike the GRDP variable, it significantly influences the SAF variable, or in other words, there is a unidirectional causal relationship between GRDP and SAF. However, this cannot affect regional economic growth. Where the amount of SAF has been determined in the SRB every year and this is not in accordance with the concept of increasing the value of gross regional domestic product which is a benchmark for economic growth in a region that should be influenced so that there is an increase, not even influencing it. So it can be concluded that the special allocation fund has no effect on the economic growth of districts/cities in the province of South Sulawesi.

The results of this study are in line with research conducted (Mokorowu et al., 2020) which states that SAF does not have a significant effect on economic growth, which is most likely due to the nature of SAF, namely as specific grants or assistance provided to the government to provide public services. , but has been determined by the central government.

The SAF has no effect on economic growth, possibly because the regions are not directly involved in planning programs or activities that will be funded with special allocation funds. This has resulted in the allocation of SAF not being directed at programs or activities that are in accordance with the needs and

development priorities of the region, where each region has different needs. SAF can affect economic growth if its allocation is optimized for various activities related to economic growth, such as the service sector, industrial and trade sectors, and other sectors.

Effect of Profit Sharing Funds on Regency/City Economic Growth in South Sulawesi Province
Based on the results of data processing using the correlation test between PSF and GRDP variables, it is known that the correlation between the two variables is at a strong correlation level. In addition, the results of the Granger causality test show that statistically the PSF variable significantly affects the GRDP variable and the opposite holds true. In other words, there is a reciprocal causal relationship or mutual influence between PSF and GRDP. The results of this study are in accordance with research (Ar & Zein, 2016; AlQomariah et al., 2022) that profit-sharing funds (PSF) have a significant effect on economic growth.

This shows that transfers of funds from the central government or balancing funds in the form of profit-sharing funds have achieved the goal of fiscal decentralization, namely maximizing regional economic growth rates. The large source of PSF revenues originating from the tax sector (IT, LBTL, BRAF) and non-taxable (forestry, marine, mining, tourism) is a strong reason underlying the influence of profit sharing funds on the economic growth of districts/cities in South Sulawesi. (Sulaeman & Silvia, 2019) said that PSF is a source of infrastructure financing in the form of economic facilities and infrastructure that will support the production of goods and services both by the local community and by investors from outside the area concerned. Where these investment activities will create job opportunities and provide a multiplier effect so that they can affect economic growth.

The allocation of PSF which is left entirely to the regional government, allows the regional government to have flexibility in utilizing PSF to finance programs or activities that are in line with regional priorities and needs, as well as things that can support economic growth such as spending on infrastructure and improving public services.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

From the results of the content analysis of the discussion regarding the effect of balancing funds on the economic growth of districts/cities in the province of South Sulawesi for 2019-2021 which is measured based on the GRDP value, it can be concluded that overall, the general allocation fund (GAF) has no significant effect on economic growth. This means that the use of GAF by local governments is not optimal enough to finance various activities or programs that can promote economic growth, such as improving infrastructure or facilities related to public services.

The results of the analysis of the special allocation fund (SAF), which is also one of the balancing funds from the central government, show that SAF does not have a significant effect on economic growth. This means that the allocation of special allocation funds has not been on target in financing programs or activities needed by the region, and SAF is not optimized to fund various sectors that can promote economic growth, such as the service sector, the industrial and trade sectors, and other sectors. Where this has an impact on the lack of increase in economic productivity and in the end cannot affect the occurrence of regional economic growth.

Meanwhile, from the results of the analysis it is known that revenue-sharing funds (PSF) have a significant effect on economic growth. This means that the PSF that has been fully handed over to the regional government has been utilized according to regional needs, as well as things that can support economic growth such as infrastructure financing in the form of economic facilities and infrastructure that will support the production of goods and services. Where these investment activities will create job opportunities and provide a multiplier effect so that they can affect economic growth.

Thus, the advice that can be given from the results of the analysis and conclusions above is, for district/city regional governments in the province of South Sulawesi, keep trying to optimize the use of balancing funds, especially general allocation funds and special allocation funds whose allocation of funds has not been able to affect regional economic growth, while General allocation funds are the largest contributors to balancing funds. Allocation of funds according to needs, priorities, goals and objectives can create community welfare which has an impact on increasing regional economic growth.

For future researchers, this research only takes 3 independent variables, namely GAF, SAF, and PSF and the timeframe is only 3 (years). So it is expected to increase the timeframe with the latest year's period and also add other variables such as capital expenditures, goods and services expenditures or other sources of regional revenue so that the results of this study can be compared with subsequent studies.

REFERENCES

Adyatma, E., & Oktaviani, R. M. (2015). Pengaruh Pendapatan Asli Daerah dan Dana Alokasi Umum Terhadap Belanja Modal Dengan Pertumbuhan Ekonomi Sebagai Pemoderasi. *Dinamika Akuntansi, Keuangan Dan Perbankan*, *4*(2), 190–205.

AlQomariah, A. N. R., Pardanawati, S. L., & Utami, W. B. (2022). Pendapatan Asli Daerah, Dana Alokasi Umum, Dana Bagi Hasil Terhadap Pertumbuhan Ekonomi Kabupaten Boyolali. *Jurnal Ilmiah Keuangan Akuntansi Bisnis*, *1*(2), 60–69. https://doi.org/10.53088/jikab.v1i2.9

Antara, H., Dan, R., & Gender, P. (2017). Pengaruh Pendapatan Asli Daerah Dan Dana Perimbangan Terhadap Pertumbuhan Ekonomi Dan Kemiskinan Di Provinsi Nusa Tenggara Timur. *Telaah Bisnis*, *18*(1), 19–32.

Ar, R., & Zein, B. (2016). Pengaruh Pendapatan Asli Daerah, Dana Alokasi Umum Dan Dana Bagi Hasil Terhadap Pertumbuhan Ekonomi Di Provinsi Aceh. *Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa Ekonomi Akuntansi*, *1*(1), 213–220.

Bappenas RI. (2021). *Indonesia Dan Dunia* (Vol. 5, Issue 2). https://perpustakaan.bappenas.go.id/e-library/file_upload/koleksi/migrasi-data-publikasi/file/Update_Ekonomi/Ekonomi_Makro/Perkembangan Ekonomi Indonesia dan Dunia Triwulan II Tahun 2021.pdf

Christia, A. M., & Ispriyarso, B. (2019). Desentralisasi Fiskal Dan Otonomi Daerah Di Indonesia. *Law Reform*, *15*(1), 149. https://doi.org/10.14710/lr.v15i1.23360

Ismail, A., & Hakim, A. (2014). Peran Dana Perimbangan Terhadap Kemiskinan Di Provinsi Bali. *Jurnal Aplikasi Bisnis*, *16*(9), 2168. https://doi.org/10.20885/jabis.vol16.iss9.art8

Junaidi, J. (2015a). Analisis pengungkapan CSR perbankan Syariah di Indonesia berdasarkan Islamic Social Reporting Index. Jurnal Akuntansi dan Investasi,16(1), 75-85.

Junaidi, J. (2015b). Persepsi masyarakat untuk memilih dan tidak memilih bank syariah (studi kota palopo). Fokus Bisnis: Media Pengkajian Manajemen Dan Akuntansi,14(2). https://doi.org/10.32639/fokusbisnis.v14i2.44

Junaidi, J. (2021). The awareness and attitude of Muslim consumer preference: the role of religiosity. Journal of Islamic Accounting and Business Research,12(6), 919-938. https://doi.org/10.1108/JIABR-08-2020-0250

Junaidi, J. (2022). Religiosity versus profit-loss sharing: how Islamic banks brand fidelity influence the Muslim consumers' commitment. Journal of Islamic Accounting and Business Research,13(6), 960-976. https://doi.org/10.1108/JIABR-07-2021-0188

Junaidi, J., Anwar, S.M., Alam, R., Lantara, N.F., & Wicaksono, R. (2022a), Determinants to adopt conventional and Islamic banking: evidence from Indonesia. Journal of Islamic Marketing,Vol. ahead-of-print No. ahead-of-print. https://doi.org/10.1108/JIMA-03-2021-0067

Junaidi, J., Wicaksono, R. and Hamka, H. (2022b), The consumers' commitment and materialism on Islamic banking: the role of religiosity. Journal of Islamic Marketing, 13(8), 1786-1806. https://doi.org/10.1108/JIMA-12-2020-0378

Kisman, Z., & Junaidi, J. (2022). The Effect of Love of Money, Machiavellianism, and Tax Rates on Tax Evasion. *Jurnal Ilmiah Akuntansi Dan Keuangan*, *11*(2), 102–110. https://doi.org/10.32639/jiak.v11i2.209

Mokorowu, L. A., Rotinsulu, D. C., & Engka, D. S. M. (2020). Pengaruh Pendapatan Asli Daerah (Pad), Dana Bagi Hasil (Dbh, Dana Alokasi Umum (Dau) Dan Dana Alokasi Khusus (Dak) Terhadap Pertumbuhan Ekonomi Kabupaten Minahasa Tenggara. *Jurnal Pembangunan Ekonomi Dan Keuangan Daerah*, *21*(04), 81–94.

Nainggolan, B. R. M., & Hasugian, V. (2020). Pengaruh Pendapatan Asli Daerah, Dana Bagi Hasil Dan Dana Alokasi Umum Terhadap Pertumbuhan Ekonomi Pada Kabupaten/Kota Di Sumatera Utara Periode 2016-2018 ---------. *Jurnal AKRAB JUARA*, *5*(1), 138=149.

Nurcahaya, N., Junaidi, J., & Anwar, S. M. (2022). Influence of Service Quality, Customer Satisfaction and Commitment to Customer Loyalty among Banking Consumer. *Fokus Bisnis Media Pengkajian Manajemen Dan Akuntansi*, *21*(2), 163–170. https://doi.org/10.32639/fokbis.v21i2.212

Perkasa, L. S. P., Kawung, G. M. V, Tumangkeng, S. Y. L., Pengaruh, A., Alokasi, D., Dan, U., Alokasi, D., Pembangunan, J. E., & Ekonomi, F. (2021). Analisis Pengaruh Dana Alokasi Umum Dan Dana Alokasi Khusus Terhadap Pertumbuhan Ekonomi Di Provinsi Sulawesi Utara. *Jurnal EMBA: Jurnal Riset Ekonomi, Manajemen, Bisnis Dan Akuntansi*, *9*(1), 503–514.

Puspaningsih, D. P. D., & Aryani, N. K. L. (2016). Kinerja Keuangan Daerah Sebagai Pemoderasi Pengaruh Dana Bagi Hasil dan Belanja Langsung terhadap Pertumbuhan Ekonomi. *E-Journal Akuntansi Universitas Udayana*, *15*(3), 2213–2239.

Putri, P., & Junaidi, J. (2022). THE INFLUENCE OF SERVICE QUALITY, COMMITMENT AND CUSTOMER SATISFACTION ON CUSTOMER LOYALTY IN CHOOSING A ISLAMIC BANKS. *JURNAL SYARIKAH : JURNAL EKONOMI ISLAM*, *8*(2), 175–184. https://doi.org/10.30997/jsei.v8i2.6983

Roman, F. F., & Kartiko. (2020). Penerapan Kausalitas Granger Dan Kointegrasi Johansen Trace Statistic Test Untuk Indeks Pembangunan Manusia Terhadap Pertumbuhan Ekonomi, Inflasi Dan Kemiskinan Di Nusa Tenggara Timur. *Jurnal Statistika Industri Dan Komputasi*, *05*(2), 73–83.

Rosita, I. A. P. M., & Sutrisna, I. K. (2018). Pengaruh. Pendapatan Asli. Daerah Dan Dana. Perimbangan Terhadap. Pertumbuhan Ekonomi Dan Kesejahteraan. Masyarakat Pada. Kabupaten/Kota Di. Provinsi Bali. *Ekonomi Pembangunan Universitas Udayana*, *7*(1), 1445–1471.

Salim, A. (2019). Pengaruh Pendapatan Asli Daerah, Dana Perimbangan, Dan Inflasi Terhadap Belanja Modal Dengan Pertumbuhan Ekonomi Sebagai Variabel Intervening Periode Tahun 2015 – 2018 (Penelitian Di Kota/Kabupaten Provinsi Banten). *Jurnal Riset Akuntansi Tirtayasa*, *4*(2), 164–179. https://doi.org/10.48181/jratirtayasa.v4i2.5875

Sinaga, J. A. E. P. P. D. P. (2020). Pengaruh Pendapatan Asli Daerah (PAD), Dana Alokasi Umum (DAU), dan Dana. *EKUILNOMI : Jurnal Ekonomi Pembangunan*, *2*(1), 2614–7181.

Sisilia, M., & Harsono, H. (2021). Analisis Pengaruh Pendapatan Asli Daerah, Dana Alokasi Khusus, dan Dana Alokasi Umum Terhadap Pertumbuhan Ekonomi di Kota Malang Tahun 2010- 2019. *Journal of Regional Economics Indonesia*, *2*(1), 57–70. https://doi.org/10.26905/jrei.v2i1.6182

Statistik, Pusat, B. (2021). Pertumbuhan Ekonomi Indonesia Triwulan II-2021. In *Statistics Indonesia* (Issue 60). https://www.bps.go.id/pressrelease/2020/02/05/1755/ekonomi-indonesia-2019-tumbuh-5-02-persen.html

Suci, S. C., & Asmara, A. (2018). Pengaruh Kemandirian Keuangan Daerah Terhadap Pertumbuhan Ekonomi Kabupaten/Kota Provinsi Banten. *Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Kebijakan Pembangunan*, *3*(1), 8–22. https://doi.org/10.29244/jekp.3.1.8-22

Sulaeman, A. S., & Silvia, V. (2019). Pendapatan Asli Daerah,Transfer Daerah, Dan Belanja Modal, Pengaruhnya Terhadap Pertumbuhan Ekonomi Regional Di Indonesia. *Jurnal Aplikasi Akuntansi*, *4*(1), 97–112. https://doi.org/10.29303/jaa.v4i1.61

Sutoyo, S., & Praharso, H. S. (2010). Pengaruh Efektivitas Pendapatan Asli Daerah, Dana Alokasi Umum, Dan Dana Bagi Hasil Pajak Terhadap Tingkat Otonomi Fiskal. *Kajian Akuntansi*, *5*(1), 1–15. http://eprints.upnyk.ac.id/22796/

Tahar, Afrizal dan Zakhiya, M. (2011). The Influence of Regional Original Income and General Allocation Funds on Regional Independence and Regional Economic Growth. *Jurnal Akutansi Dan Investasi*, *12*(1), 88–99.

Talangamin, O. B., Kindangen, P. ., & Koleangan, R. A. M. (2019). Pengaruh Pendapatan Asli Daerah (Pad), Dana Alokasi Umum Dan Dana Alokasi Khusus Terhadap Pertumbuhan Ekonomi Di Kota Tomohon. *Jurnal Pembangunan Ekonomi Dan Keuangan Daerah*, *19*(7), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.35794/jpekd.19897.19.7.2018

Wandira, A. G. (2013). Pengaruh PAD, DAU, DAK, dan DBH terhadap Pengalokasian Belanja Modal. *Accounting Analysis Journal*, *2*(33), 44–51.

Widianto, A., Sedya, U., & Langgeng Nurmansyah, A. (2016). Pengaruh Dana Alokasi Umum, Dana Alokasi Khusus, Dan Belanja Modal Terhadap Pertumbuhan Ekonomi Dan Tingkat Kemiskinan (Studi Kasus Pada Kota Tegal). *Journal Research Accounting Politeknik Tegal*, *Vol. 5*(No. 2), 170–176.

Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 32 Tahun 2004 Tentang Pemerintah Daerah Pasal 1 Ayat 7

Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 33 Tahun 2004 Tentang Perimbangan Keuangan Antara Pemerintah Pusat dan Pemerintah Daerah Pasal 1 Ayat 8, 19, 20, 21, dan 23.

Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 25 Tahun 1999 Tentang Perimbangan Keuangan Antara Pemerintah Pusat dan Pemerintah Daerah Pasal 1 Ayat 19