THE INFLUENCE OF LOCAL OWN-SOURCE REVENUE, HUMAN DEVELOPMENT INDEX, AND LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION LEVEL ON GRDP PER CAPITA MODERATE BY THE DEPTH OF POVERTY IN CITY DISTRICTS OF PAPUA PROVINCE IN 2017-2021

Alisa Noviani Putri[1]
Universitas Trisakti, Jakarta, Indonesia
npalisa79@gmail.com

Dini Hariyanti[2]
Universitas Trisakti, Jakarta, Indonesia
dinihariyanti@trisakti.ac.id

Mona Adriana[3]
Universitas Trisakti, Jakarta, Indonesia
mona.as@trisakti.ac.id

Abstract

This research aims to analyze the factors that influence GDP per capita in Papua Province. The analytical method used in this research is panel data regression, using data on Local Own-Source Revenue, Human Development Index, Labor Force Participation Level, and Gross Domestic Product Per Capita from 2017-2021 in districts/cities in Papua province, by adding the depth of poverty variable as a moderating variable. The results of panel data processing show that the best model is the Fixed Effect Model, with the regression results showing that the one that has a negative influence on GDP per capita is the HDI variable. Meanwhile, those that do not influence GDP per capita are the variables of Local Own-Source Revenue, Human Development Index, Labor Force Participation Level, and Depth of Poverty. Many factors cause the variables used to have no influence, one of which is the minimal observation period so long-term effects were not identified, especially in this study. Another cause is the difficult geographical conditions in the form of mountains and difficult terrain to travel in these districts, hampering the mobility of people, goods, and services, as well as access to education and health services. The difficulty of this terrain also hinders efforts for equal distribution and economic development, so that access to economic development is only felt by urban areas, such as Jayapura City and its surroundings. This causes the Poverty Depth Index (P1) to be unable to moderate the variables of Local Own-Source Revenue (PAD), Human Development Index (HDI), and Labor Force Participation Level (TPAK) on GDP per capita. It is recommended for future researchers to use all provinces in Papua and add other variables.

Keywords: GRDP Per Capita, Local Own-Source Revenue, PAD, HDI, TPAK, Depth of Poverty

INTRODUCTION

Economic growth is a picture of the economic situation in a region, and sustainable economic growth is a picture of the results of the government's work, both national and regional, in bringing prosperity and increasing the prosperity of society (Nainggolan et al, 2022). Economic growth is one of the main indicators for measuring the economic level of a country or region which is closely related to national development. Development in a region is said to be advanced in terms of per capita income, the higher the per capita income, the higher the welfare of the region, so that per capita income is a measure of the community's standard of living. A high per capita income also means a high standard of living (Winarni, E et al, 2023).

High economic growth is expected to increase economic capacity (GRDP - Gross Regional Domestic Product). A high GDP will create a trickledown effect so that people's welfare will be higher. Increasing social welfare and prosperity is reflected in an increase in GDP per capita or GRDP divided by the population. The concept of development in economics is based on the welfare of the people in the form of reducing poverty and inequality (Sardini et al, 2023). Economic development is achieving a sustainable level of per capita income growth to enable a country to expand its output at a faster rate than its population growth rate (Todaro & Smith, 2012). The following data on GDP contribution by region in Indonesia in 2022 is attached in Table 1.

Table 1.

GRDP Contribution to Indonesian Territory

Region	Contribution (%)
Java	57.78
Sumatra	21.96
Sentence	8.29
Sulawesi	6.73
Bali and Nusa Tenggara	2.66
Maluku and Papua	2.58

Source: National BPS (2023)

Table 1. The largest GRDP contribution is contributed by the Java Island region and the lowest GRDP contributor by region is occupied by Maluku and Papua, namely 2.58%. Based on data on the status of the developing village index (IDM) in 2022 which is presented in Table 2, there is 1 province with independent status, and 12 provinces showing advanced IDM status. Meanwhile, 17 provinces have developing status. Meanwhile, the provinces that show lagging IDM status are the provinces of North Maluku and West Papua. IDM status for very underdeveloped information is occupied by Papua Province. Based on the results of the IDM Status in 2022, the author will use this research as a sample. The following data is presented.

Table 2.

2022 Provincial Level Development Village Index Status Ranking

Rank	Province Name	Average Value of IDM Province 2022	IDM Province Status 2022
1	Bali	0.8269	Independent
2	In Yogyakarta	0.8128	Proceed
3	West Java	0.7529	Proceed
4	East Java	0.7517	Proceed
5	West Sumatra	0.7402	Proceed
6	Western Sentence	0.7382	Proceed
7	KEP. Bangka Belitung	0.7362	Proceed
8	Eastern sentence	0.7344	Proceed
9	NTB	0.7339	Proceed
10	North Sulawesi	0.7194	Proceed
11	Central Java	0.7118	Proceed
12	Southern Kalimantan	0.7107	Proceed
13	Jambi	0.7089	Proceed
14	Gorontalo	0.7068	Develop
15	South Selawesi	0.7019	Develop
16	Lampung	0.6914	Develop
17	Riau	0.6782	Develop
18	Riau islands	0.6748	Develop
19	Central Kalimantan	0.6705	Develop

20	Bengkulu	0.668	Develop
21	Central Sulawesi	0.6705	Develop
22	South Sulawesi	0.668	Develop
23	Banten	0.6626	Develop
24	Maluku	0.6526	Develop
25	North Kalimantan	0.6521	Develop
26	Aceh	0.6483	Develop
27	Southeast Sulawesi	0.6464	Develop
28	West Sulawesi	0.6309	Develop
29	North Sumatra	0.6155	Develop
30	NTT	0.6104	Develop
31	North Maluku	0.5924	Left behind
32	West Papua	0.5184	Left behind
33	**Papua**	**0.4676**	**Very Left Behind**

Source: Developing Village Index (2022), data processed

Based on this data, the gap in Table 2 data in underdeveloped areas is caused by various variables such as poor economic development progress index, lack of human resources, and increasing poverty rates. Districts designated as underdeveloped areas not only receive treatment as underdeveloped areas but also as border, transmigration, and/or rural areas. Efforts to develop underdeveloped areas must be connected as a synergistic development system so that the gap between underdeveloped and non-underdeveloped areas can be further reduced. However, it seems that several regions that are classified as underdeveloped regions are willing to accept this appointment to ensure a sustainable flow of funds from the central government (Ombudsman, 2020).

Based on Table 2, it can be seen that Papua Province is a very underdeveloped province. This is what makes the author interested in researching further. With this data, this research uses city districts in Papua Province as samples. Papua Province itself is a province that has an area of around 808,105 km and has 29 districts/cities. Papua Province is a province where there are still many people who are less prosperous or whose economic growth is still weak, where Papua Province itself is not yet able to compete with other provinces, so the Central Government provides Special Autonomy Funds to Papua Province to be able to

compete with other provinces, but the reality is different. that Papua Province itself is still not able to process these funds properly because there is still misuse in the budget, apart from that the Papuan people are not utilizing their natural resources or there is a lack of adequate technology and infrastructure in Papua Province. However, Papua Province is the richest Province in Indonesia with an area three times the size of Java Island, coupled with a small population and still many plantation forests or regional potential that have not been explored by research (Ade et al, 2018).

This research is different from that conducted by Sasea, G., Wurarah, RN, & Tafalas, MG (2020). In this research, we only used PAD and DAU variables in West Papua Province, but in this research, we added other variants and the year of research was also different. This is also different from the research of Utami, F. P (2020), where his research did not include the variable labor force participation rate (TPAK), but in this study adding this variable, the areas studied were different. Macroeconomically, many factors influence GDP per capita in a country, one of which is this research examining Local Own-Source Revenue, human development index, labor force participation rate, and depth of poverty, especially in Papua Province. The novelty of this research is adding a Moderation variable, namely the depth of poverty as measured by the depth of poverty index (P1). It is also different from the research of Ade et al (2018), who conducted PBRD research in districts and cities in Papua Province, but the period used and the independent variables used were different. Based on previous background and research, this research will analyze the influence of local original income, human development index, and labor force participation level on GDP per capita moderated by the depth of poverty in city districts in Papua Province in 2017-2021.

RESEARCH METHOD

The research approach used in this research is quantitative. The qualitative approach by John W. Creswell, is as follows "quantitative research approach is a scientific approach that involves collecting numerical data or data that can be measured to explain phenomena, test hypotheses, and answer research questions." According to Sugiyono (2019), quantitative research is also called traditional research because it has been used for a long time. Creswell (Kusumastuti et al. 2020) stated that quantitative research methods are a method for testing

certain theories by examining the relationships between variables. This method focuses on collecting and analyzing quantitative data to identify patterns, relationships, or statistical effects in a phenomenon.

According to Rahardjo, (2017), research methods are a way to obtain and search for tentative truth, not absolute truth. The result is scientific truth. Scientific truth is a truth that is open to continuous testing, criticism, and even revision. Therefore, there is no best method for searching for the truth, but there is a method that is appropriate for a particular purpose according to the existing phenomenon. The choice of research method must be adjusted to the research being conducted so that the results are optimal (Budiharto, 2019). Yusuf (2014) divides the types of research classification into the following:

1. Quantitative and qualitative research.
2. Survey and non-survey research.
3. Basic and applied research.
4. Policy research, evaluative research, and research and development (R&D).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Testing Election Model

For election model which appropriate moreover formerly need done Test Chow for cho ose is model which appropriate is Common Effect Model (CEM) or Fixed Effect Model (FE). Results processing showed on table 4.1, show that results from mark prob from chi-square is as big as as big as 0.0000 < 0.05. Ha accepted And Ho rejected And obtained conclusion from model which appropriate is FEM.

Table 2.

Results Testing Chow Test

Testing	Prob. Chi-Square	Information
Chow Test	0.0000*	Fixed Effect Model (FEM)

* Significant α 5%

Source: Data processed (E-views 12.0)

Results processing Chow Test show FEM is model which chosen so that next, testing is

carried out Hausman test for choose is model which appropriate is FEM or Random Effect Model (BRAKE). From results processing obtained mark probability from the chi-square prob of 0.0025 < 0.05 so that Ha is accepted by Ho rejected and can concluded that model which chosen is FEM like showed with table 3. Ther eby can concluded that FEM is model which appropriate.

Table 3.

Results Testing HausmanTest

Testing	Prob. Chi-Square	Information
Hausman Test	0.0025*	Fixed Effect Model (FEM)

* Significant α 5%

Source: Data processed (E-views 12.0)

Test Hypothesis

Results processing For GRDP model showed on table 4, with explanation as following:

a. Coefficient of Determination

Based on results testing on Table 4. obtained mark Adjusted R-Squared of 0.905214 or 90.52% which it means ability variable independent namely PAD, HDI, TPAK and P1 Poverty Depth capable explain behavior variable dependent namely GRDP of 29.39% And the rest of 9.48% explained by variable other but No entered into the model.

Table 4.
Results Estimate with Fixed Effect Model

Dependent Variable: GRDP PER CAPITA				
Independent Variable	**Coefficient**	**Tstat**	**Prob**	**Conclusion**
C	210.4914	2.247158	0.0266	
LOGPAD	-1.221750	-0.399526	0.6903	(-) No Sig
HDI	-3.251114	-2.037383	0.0440	(-) Sig
TPAK	0.132946	0.703820	0.4830	(+) No Sig
IKKP1	0.133176	0.173277	0.8627	(+) No Sig
R-squared	0.926277			
Adjusted R-squared	0.905214			
F-stat	43.97514			
Prob F-stat	0.000000			

*Significant α 5%

Source: Processed data (E-views 12.0)

b. Simultaneous Test (F-Test)

Results processing For testing whole model showed with mark F statistics amounting to 43.97514. Mark probability from F as big as 0.000000 < 0.05 so Ho rejected And Ha accepted so that can concluded that there is minimum One variable itsindependence influential significant to variable dependent nam ely GDP per capita.

c. Test Partial (T-Test)

H1 = Regional Original Income influential significant positive to GRDP Per Capita

Based on results testing statistics show big mark probability as big as (0.6903) > 0.05 (alpha 5 percent), so concluded hypothesis H1 rejected. This means that there is no Regional Original Income influential to GRDP Per Capita

H_2= The Human Development Index has a significant positive effect on GRDP Per Capita

Based on results testing statistics show big mark probability as big as (0.0440) < 0.05 (alpha 5 percent), so concluded hypothesis H2 accepted. It means The Human Development Index has a negative effect to GDP per capita

H_3= Labor Force Participation Level has a significant positive effect on GRDP Per Capita

Based on results testing statistics show the magnitude of the probability value as big as (0.4830) < 0.05 (alpha 5 percent), so concluded hypothesis H3 rejected This means that the Labor Force Participation Level does not affect GDP per capita

H_4 = P1 Poverty Depth Index has a significant negative effect on GRDP Per Capita

Based on results testing statistics show the probability value is (0.8627) > 0.05 (alpha 7 percent), so concluded hypothesis H4 rejected. This means that the P1 Poverty Depth Index does not affect GRDP Per Capita

d. Analysis Regression Fixed Effect Model

GDPBit = 210.4914 - 1.221750PAD - 3.251114IPM + 0.132946TPAK + 0.133176IKKP1

Results testing Fixed regression Effect Model on table 4. with level error as big as 5% on each variable obtained results as following:

1) Constant (α) = 210.4914 shows if PAD, HDI, TPAK and IKK are P1 as big as 0 (zero) then GDP Per Capita will go up amounting to 210.4914.
2) β1 = -1.221750 shows if PAD go on as big as 1 unit so GRDP Per

Capita will down amounting to 1.221750.

3) β2 = -3.251114 shows if HDI go on as big as 1 unit so GRDP Per Capita will down amounting to 3.251114.
4) β3 = 0.132946 show if TPAK rises as big as 1 unit so GRDP Per Capita will go up of 0.132946.
5) β4 = 0.133176 show if IKK is P1 go on as big as 1 unit so GRDP Per Capita will go up amounting to 0.133176.

Moderated Regression Analysis (MRA)

Moderating variables can be interpreted as variables that can strengthen or weaken the relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable. The following are the test results from the moderation regression analysis.

Table 5.
Moderation Regression Analysis Test

	Variable	Prob Output 1	Prob Output 2	Conclusion
IKKP1 moderates PAD	IKKP1	0.6734		No Sig
	LOGPADIKKP1		0.3507	No Sig
IKKP1 moderates the IPM	IKKP1	0.7501		No Sig
	IPMIKKP1		0.6888	No Sig
IKKP1 moderates TPAK	IKKP1	0.7142		No Sig
	TPAKIKKP1		0.2118	No Sig

*Significant α = 5%

Source: Processed data (E-views 12.0)

The Influence of Local Own-Source Revenue (PAD) on GRDP Per Capita With the Poverty Depth Index (P1) as Moderation

Based on Table 5, the test results show that the probability value of the interaction between IKKP1 moderating PAD on GRDP per capita in the first output of the IKKP1 variable is 0.6734 and in the second output the LOGPADIKKP1 variable is 0.3507. These results indicate that the Poverty Depth Index (P1) cannot strengthen the influence of Local Own-Source Revenue on GDP Per Capita. So, the hypothesis proposed is H5: The Poverty Depth Index (P1) can moderate Regional Original Income on GDP Per Capita, in the test results where the value is not significant, which means it is rejected.

This is because the Poverty Depth Index (P1) for Papua Province is one of the provinces with the highest Poverty Depth Index (P1) in Indonesia. So, the Poverty Depth

Index (P1) is considered to weaken the relationship between Local Own-Source Revenue and GDP Per Capita, due to the inequality of PAD between Regencies/Cities which needs to be developed first to increase the regional economic turnover.

The Influence of The Human Development Index on GDP Per Capita with the Poverty Depth Index (P1) as Moderation

Based on Table 5, the test results show that the probability value of the interaction between IKKP1 moderating HDI on GRDP per capita in the first output of the IKKP1 variable is 0.7501 and in the second output the IPMIKKP1 variable is 0.6888. These results indicate that the Poverty Depth Index (P1) cannot strengthen the influence of the Human Development Index on GDP per capita. So, the hypothesis proposed, namely H6: The Poverty Depth Index (P1) can moderate the Human Development Index on GDP Per Capita, is rejected.

This is because the HDI for Papua Province has the lowest value in Indonesia, which has an impact on the high Poverty Depth Index (P1) value. However, this does not have an impact on Pecapita's GRDP due to the existence of different income disparities for each individual.

Influence of Labor Force Participation Level on GRDP Per Capita with Poverty Depth Index (P1) as Moderation

Based on Table 5, the test results show that the probability value of the interaction between IKKP1 moderating TPAK on GDP Per Capita in the first output of the IKKP1 variable is 0.7142 and in the second output the TPAKIKKP1 variable is 0.2118. These results indicate that the Poverty Depth Index (P1) cannot strengthen the influence of the Labor Force Participation Level on GDP Per Capita. So the hypothesis proposed, namely H7: The Poverty Depth Index (P1) can moderate the level of labor force participation in GRDP per capita, is rejected.

This is because the Poverty Depth Index (P1) for Papua Province is one of the provinces with the highest Poverty Depth Index (P1) in Indonesia due to inequality between districts/cities. So the Poverty Depth Index (P1) is considered to weaken the relationship between the Labor Force Participation Level and GDP Per Capita because the percentage of the working-age population in Papua Province is considered not to play an active role in the

labor market. So the Poverty Depth Index (P1) is unable to moderate TPAK on GRDP per capita because job opportunities are not available according to needs and the level of community welfare has not increased.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of research that has been carried out and discussed in the previous chapter, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. Local Own-Source Revenue has no effect on GDP per capita in Papua Province
2. The Human Development Index hurts GDP per capita in Papua Province
3. The level of labor force participation does not affect GDP per capita in Papua Province
4. The depth of poverty has no effect on GDP per capita in Papua Province
5. The depth of poverty is unable to moderate local original income on GDP per capita in Papua Province
6. The depth of poverty is unable to moderate the human development index on GRDP per capita in Papua Province.
7. The depth of poverty is unable to moderate the level of labor force participation in GDP per capita in Papua Province.

REFERENCES

Affandi, A., Si, Mirdha.F., & Risma, Okta.R. (2019). Analisis Tingkat Pendidikan dan TPAK Terhadap PDRB Perkapita Di Indonesia. *Ekombis*, vol. 5, no. 2, 26 Nov. 2019. doi:10.35308/ekombis.v5i2.1363.

Asya, Aghniya., Ayu, Ningrum., Chumaedi, Afriansyah., Faiqotul, Ikrimah., Ibnu, Ubaidillah.Amin., Ines, wulantika., Misrohim. (2023). Pengaruh Pendapatan Asli Daerah (PAD) Terhadap Pdrb Harga Berlaku Melalui Belanja Modal Sebagai Variabel Intervening Di Kabupaten Cirebon Tahun 2011-2016. *OSF Preprints 864j2*, *Center for Open Science*. IAIN Syekh Nurjati Cirebon.

Azizah, Nur., & Aisyah, Siti. (2023). Penerapan Kaidah Rantai Dalam Diferensial: Pengaruh Produk Domestik Regional Bruto Terhadap Kemiskinan 34 Provinsi Di Indonesia Tahun 2017-2021. *Jurnal Bisnis dan Manajemen* Vol. 3, No. 2 February (2023)

Arifin, S. R., & Fadllan. (2021). Pengaruh Indeks Pembangunan Manusia (IPM) dan Tingkat Pengangguran Terhadap Pertumbuhan Ekonomi di Provinsi Jawa Timur Tahun 2016-

2018. Jurnal Ekonomi & Perbankan Syariah 8(1), 38-59 https://doi.org/10.19105/iqtishadia.v8i1.4555

Alkhoiriyah, & Sa'roni. (2021). Pengaruh Indeks Pembangunan Manusia (IPM) dan Pengangguran terhadap Pertumbuhan Ekonomi di Kota Banjarmasin. Jurnal Ilmu Ekonomi Dan Pembangunan, 4(2), 299–309.

Anwar, A. R. D., Abdullah, M. F., & Hadi, S. (2018). Analisis Pengaruh Pendapatan Asli Daerah, Dana Otonomi Khusus dan Belanja Modal Terhadap PDRB di Kab/Kota Provinsi Papua. Jurnal Ilmu Ekonomi, 2(1), 1–13.

Ade et al (2018). Analisa Pengaruh Pendapatan Asli daerah, Dana Otonomi Khusus dan Belanja Modal Terhadap PDRB di Kabupaten/Kota Provinsi Papua. Jurnal Ilmu Ekonomi. Vol, 2 . Jilid1 . 1 - 13. https://ejournal.umm.ac.id/index.php/jie/article/view/6961/5895

Aghniya, A., Ningrum, A., Afriansyah, C., Ikrimah, F., Amin, I. U., Wulantika, I., & Misrohim.. (2023). Pengaruh Pendapatan Asli Daerah (PAD) Terhadap Pdrb Harga Berlaku Melalui Belanja Modal Sebagai Variabel Intervening Di Kabupaten Cirebon Tahun 2011-2016. *OSF Preprints 864j2, Center for Open Science*. IAIN Syekh Nurjati Cirebon.

Badan Pemeriksa Keuangan. (2021). Pendapat BPK dalam Pengelolaan Dana Otonomi Khusus pada Provinsi Papua dan Papua Barat 2021.

Badan Pusat Statistik Papuua https://papua.bps.go.id/indicator/23/274/1/indeks-keparahan-kemiskinan-p2-menurut-wilayah-semesteran-.html

Bekti, Rokhana.Dwi., David., Gita, N., Priscillia., dan Serlyana. (2014). Model Persamaan Simultan Pada Analisis Hubungan Kemiskian dan PDRB. *ComTech* Vol. 5 No. 2 Desember 2014: 810-817.

Data Keuangan APBD https: //djpk.kemenkeu.go.id// portal /data/ apbd? tahun= 2018 &provi

Dewi Dkk (2019). Pengaruh Pendapatan Asli Daearh (PAD), Dana Perimbangan Terhadap Pertumbuhan Ekonomi dan Dampaknya Terhadap Kemiskinan Kota Bitun. Jurnal Ekonomi Pembangunan dan Keuangan Daerah. Vol 18. No.4,1907-3593. https://ejournal.unsrat.ac.id/v3/index.php/jpekd/article/view/15774/15285

Dinarjoto, A., & Dharmazi, A (2020). Pengaruh Desentralisasi Fiskal, Investasi, dan Indeks Pembangunan Manusia Terhadap Pertumbuhan Ekonomi Regional di Provinsi Kalimantan Timur. Jurnal Pajak Dan Keuangan Negara (PKN), 2(1), 57–72. https://doi.org/10.31092/jpkn.v1i2.789

Fahmy, Ismail., Harlen., dan Ekwarso, Hendro. (2022). Analisis Pengaruh Penduduk Usia Produktif dan Indeks Pembangunan Manusia (IPM) Terhadap PDRB Per Kapita Provinsi Riau. *Jurnal Pekbis*, Vol. 14, No. 1, 2022: 10 – 17.

Fikri, R. O., & Suparyati, A. (2017). Pengaruh Pendidikan, Kesehatan Dan Gender Terhadap Tingkat Kemiskinan Di Provinsi Nusa Tenggara Timur. Media Ekonomi, 25(1), 43. https://doi.org/10.25105/me.v25i1.5203. (diakses tgl 21 April 2020)

Fitriani, Oktavia. (2022). Pengaruh Indeks Pembangunan Manusia, Indeks Pembangunan Gender, Pengangguran Dan Tingkat Kemiskinan Terhadap Produk Domestik Regional Bruto (PDRB) Per Kapita Riil Di Provinsi Indonesia Tahun 2010-2019. *Tesis*. Universitas Atma Jaya Yogyakarta.

Gemmel, N. (1992). *Ilmu Ekonomi Pembangunan.* Lembaga Penerbit Universitas Indonesia, Jakarta.

Humaiyah. (2022). Pengaruh Tingkat Partisipasi Angkatan Kerja dan Inflasi Terhadap Produk Domestik Regional Bruto Di Provinsi Banten 2011-2019. *Tesis*, UIN Sultan Maulana Hasanuddin Banten.

Kusuma, L., & Wiksuana, I. G, B (2018). Pengaruh pedapatan Daerah terhadap Pertumbuhan Ekonomi di Wilayah Sarbatiga Provinsi Bali. E-Jurnal Manajemen Universitas Udayana 7 (5), 2592. https://doi.org/10.24843/ejmunud.2018.v07.i05.p12

Mulyasari, A. (2018). Pengaruh Indeks Pembangunan Manusia dan Angkatan Kerja terhadap Produk Domestik Regional Bruto. Economics Development Analysis Journal, 5(4), 368-376. https://doi.org/10.15294/edaj.v5i4.22174.

Nainggolan, L., Lie, D., Nainggolan, N., & Siregar, R. (2022). How Determinants of the Human Development Index Impact Indonesia. *Indonesian Interdisciplinary Journal of Sharia Economics (IIJSE)*, *5*(2), 687-700. https://doi.org/10.31538/iijse.v5i2.2477

NIC Zebua. (2023). Analisis Pengaruh Bonus Demografi Terhadap Pertumbuhan Ekonomi Di Sumatera Utara. Jurnal: Manajemen Akuntansi. Vol,3 No.3 1299-1310. Analysis of the Effect of Demographic Bonus on Economic Growth in North Sumatra | Clawdya Zebua | Journal of Accounting Management (JUMSI) (ulb.ac.id)

Ningsih, E.K dan Novianty, D, E (2019). Pengaruh Pendapatan Asli Daerah dan Dana Perimbangan terhadap Pertumbuhan Ekonomi Provinsi Sumatera Selatan 2014-2018. Ekonomis: Journal of Economics and Business, 3(2), September2019, pp.91-95. http://ekonomis.unbari.ac.id/index.php/ojsekonomis/article/view/67/70

Novriansyah, Mohamad Arif. "Pengaruh Pengangguran Dan Kemiskinan Terhadap Pertumbuhan Ekonomi Di Provinsi Gorontalo." Gorontalo Development Review1, no. 1 (1 April 2018): 59–73. https://doi.org/10.32662/golder.v1i1.115

Oktafia, A. M., Soelistyo, A., & Arifin, Z. (2018). Pengaruh Pendapatan Asli Daerah (PAD), Dana Alokasi Umum (DAU), Dana Alokasi Khusus (DAK) terhadap Produk Domestik Regional Bruto (PDRB) Kabupaten/Kota di Provinsi Jawa Timur. *Jurnal Ilmu Ekonomi*, 2(1), 53-62.

Oktaviani, Reni. (2023). Pengaruh Laju Pertumbuhan Penduduk, Dependency Ratio, Investasi, dan Tpak Terhadap Pendapatan Perkapita Di Provinsi Jawa Barat Tahun 2010-2022. *Diploma thesis*, Universitas Siliwangi.

Paat, D. C., Koleangan, R. A. M., & Rumate, V. A. (2019). Pengaruh Pendapatan Asli Daerah (PAD), Dana Perimbangan ter-hadap Pertumbuhan Ekonomi Serta Dampaknya terhadap Kemiskinan di Kota Bitung. Jurnal Pembangunan Ekonomi Dan Keuangan Daerah, 18(4)

Pasaribu, Erlyger.R.N., & Ariani, M.B.Nani. (2023). Pengaruh Tingkat Partisipasi Angkatan Kerja, Belanjamodal, Dan Pengguna Internet Terhadap Tingkat Pertumbuhan Pdrb Di Kabupaten/Kota Provinsi Nusa Tenggara Timur. *Jurnal Of Development Economic and Digitalization* Vol. 2, No. 2, 2023, pp. 105-123.

Rahmawati, Yulida. (2018). Pengaruh Belanja Daerah, Investasi dan Tingkat Partisipasi Angkatan Kerja Terhadap PDRB di Kabupaten Jember. Diss. Fakultas Ekonomi Dan Bisnis.

Rhamedia, H., Hady, H., & Lusiana, L. (2022). Pertumbuhan Ekonomi Sumatra Barat Ditinjau dari Pendapatan Asli Daerah dan Dana Alokasi Umum dengan belanja Daerah sebagai Pemediasi. JBE, Vol.7 No.3, Hal 229-239. 2502-6275.

Sabilla, Tara.May., & Sumarsono, Hadi. (2022). Pengaruh belanja pemerintah, pendapatan asli daerah, penanaman modal dalam negeri, indeks pembangunan manusia terhadap PDRB. Jurnal Ekonomi Manajemen dan Akuntansi. Vol 24 No. 1.

Sardini, S., Nasution, M., & Harahap, R. (2023). Determinants of Human Development Index Using Asy Syatibi's Maqashid Sharia Approach in North Sumatra Province. *Indonesian Interdisciplinary Journal of Sharia Economics (IIJSE)*, *6*(3), 1791-1810. https://doi.org/10.31538/iijse.v6i3.3904

Sasea, G., Wurarah, R. N., & Tafalas, M. G. (2020). Analisis Pengaruh Pendapatan Asli Daerah (PAD) dan Dana Alokasi Umum (DAU) Terhadap Produk Domestik Regional Bruto (PDRB) di Provinsi Papua Barat2014-2018(Studi Kasus 10 Kabupaten dan 1 Kota) . Lensa Ekonomi. Volume 11 No. 01 November 2020: p. 44-59.

Sari, Y., Nasrun, A., & Putri, A. K. (2020). Analisis Pengaruh Indeks Pembangunan Manusia Dan Kemiskinan Terhadap Pertumbuhan Ekonomi Kabupaten/Kota Di Provinsi Kepulauan Bangka Belitung Tahun 2010-2017. Jurnal Ekonomi, 8(1), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.33019/equity.v8i1.9

Sen, A. K. (1981). *Poverty and Famines. An Essay on Entlitements and Deprivation*. Basil Blacwell, Oxford.

Siswiyanti P (2015). Pengaruh Pad, Dau, Dak Terhadap Pertumbuhan Ekonomi Dengan BelanjaModal Sebagai Variabel Intervening. AKRUAL : Jurnal Akuntansi. 7(1) (2015): 1-17e-ISSN: 2502-6380, https://journal.unesa.ac.id/index.php/aj/article/view/1329/921

Sutriani, & Damanik. (2022). Analisis pengaruh derajat desentralisasi fiskal terhadap pertumbuhan ekonomi di kota pematangsiantar. Jurnal Kajian Ekonomi Dan Kebijakan Publik, 7(1), 38–50.

Sukmawati, R. M. (2020). SIMBA; Seminar Inovasi Manjemen, Bisnisdan Akuntansi.Vol,2.2686-1771. http://prosiding.unipma.ac.id/index.php/SIMBA/article/view/1823/1561

Talangamin, O. B., Kindangen, P., & Koleangan, R. A. M. (2018). Pengaruh Pendapatan Asli Daerah (PAD), Dana Alokasi Umum dan Dana Alokasi Khusus terhadap

Pertumbuhan Ekonomi di Kota Tomohon. *Jurnal Pembanagunan Ekonomi dan Keuanagn Daearh*, Volume 19, No 7.

Todaro, P. Micheal. (2000). Pembangunan Ekonomi di dunia Ketiga, Edisi Keenam jilid 1. Jakarta: Erlangga

Utami, F. P (2020). Pengaruh Indeks Pembangunan Manusia (IPM), Kemiskinan dan Pengangguran terhadap Pertumbuhan Ekonomi di Provinsi Aceh. Jurnal Samudra Ekonomika, 4 (2), 101–113. Retrieved from https://ejurnalunsam.id/index.php/jse/article/view/2303

UU Nomor 22 tahun 1999 tentang Pemerintahan Daerah UU Nomor 23 Tahun 2004 tentang Pemerintahan Daerah

UU Nomor 25 Tahun 1999 tentang Perimbangan Keuangan antara Pemerintah Pusatdan Daerah

UU Nomor 33 Tahun 2004 tentang PerimbanganKeuangan antara Pemerintah Pusat dan Pemerintah Daerah

UNDP *(United NationsDevelopment Programme)* Peringkat Status Indeks Desa Membangun Tingkat Provinsi Tahun 2022

Wardani, Diah.Sukma., & Huda, Syamsul. (2023). Analisis Pengaruh PAD, IPM dan Tingkat Partisipasi Angkatan Kerja Terhadap Produk Domestik Regional Bruto di Provinsi Bali. *EKOMA: Jurnal Ekonomi, Manajemen & Akuntansi*. Vol 2 No, 2 Januari-Juni 2023.

Wididarma, K., & Jember, M. (2021). Pengaruh Indeks Pembangunan Manusia dan Pendapatan Asli Daerah Terhadap Pertumbuhan Ekonomi dan Kemiskinan Kabupaten/Kota di Provinsi Bali. Jurnal EP Unud, 10(7), 2982–3010.

https://ojs.unud.ac.id/index.php/eep/article/view/58290

Winarni, Etik., Sari, Yolanda., dan Amali, Muhammad. (2023). Analisis Pengaruh Upah Minimum, Pendapatan Asli Daerah, Tenaga Kerja dan Pertumbuhan Ekonomi terhadap PDRB Perkapita Provinsi Jambi. *Ekonomis: Journal of Economics and Business*, Volume 7, No 2 (2023), September, 1182-1188.

Yuniarti, Wianti, W., & Nurgaheni, N. E. (2020). Analisis Faktor-Faktor yang Mempengaruhi Tingkat Pertumbuhan Ekonomi di Indonesia. *SERAMBI: Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Bisnis Islam*, 2(3), 169–176. https://doi.org/10.36407/serambi.v2i3.207