



Jurnal Pendidikan Ekonomi & Bisnis, 7 (2) 2019, 165-174
**JURNAL PENDIDIKAN EKONOMI and
 BISNIS**

<http://journal.unj/unj/index.php/jpeb>

Domestic Investment, Local Government Revenue and Government Expenditure in the Education Sector

Endang Sri Wahyuni¹, Ady Soejoto², Norida Canda Sakti³

¹ Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Indonesia

² Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Indonesia

³ Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Indonesia

Article Info

Article history:

Received: 19 July 2019;

Accepted: 22 September 2019;

Published: 1 October 2019.

Keywords:

Domestic investment; Local government revenue; Government expenditure in the education sector.

Abstract

This research aimed to analyze the effect of domestic investment and local government revenue toward government expenditure in the education sector. This research uses secondary data obtained from Central Bureau of Statistics in Indonesia and Local Educational Balance-Departement of Education and Culture. The analysis technique used is panel data regression analysis with cross section 34 provinces and time series for 2014-2017. The results showed that partially, domestic investment and local government revenue had a significant affect on government expenditure in the education sector. Meanwhile simultaneously, it shows that domestic investment and local government revenue had a significant affect on government expenditure in the education sector. These findings indicate that the level of education expenditure can be influenced by both domestic investment and local government revenue.

Abstrak

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis pengaruh investasi dalam negeri dan pendapatan daerah terhadap pengeluaran pemerintah di sektor pendidikan baik secara simultan maupun parsial. Penelitian ini menggunakan data sekunder dari Badan Pusat Statistik dan Neraca Pendidikan Daerah-Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. Teknik analisis data yang digunakan adalah analisis regresi data panel dengan cross section 34 provinsi dan time series tahun 2014-2017. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa secara parsial, baik investasi dalam negeri maupun pendapatan daerah berpengaruh terhadap pengeluaran pemerintah di sektor pendidikan. Secara simultan, investasi dalam negeri dan pendapatan daerah berpengaruh terhadap pengeluaran pemerintah di sektor pendidikan. Hasil ini menunjukkan bahwa besar kecilnya pengeluaran pendidikan dapat dipengaruhi oleh investasi dalam negeri dan pendapatan daerah.

How to Cite:

Sri Wahyuni, E., Soejoto, A., & Sakti, N. C. (2019). The Domestic Investment, Local Government Revenue and Government Expenditure in the Education Sector. *Jurnal Pendidikan Ekonomi & Bisnis*, 7(2), 165-174. <https://doi.org/10.21009/JPEB.007.2.8>

* Corresponding Author.

endang.17070925413@mhs.unesa.ac.id (Endang)

ISSN

2302-2663 (online)

DOI: doi.org/10.21009/JPEB.007.2.8

INTRODUCTION

Education is one of the main factors in the life of the nation and state, because it plays an important role in producing quality human resources to build and realize the welfare of a nation. Therefore education needs to be given a larger portion of the budget than other budget posts. One of the commitments of the Indonesian government regarding the education budget is regulated in the 1945 Constitution article 31 section 4 and Law Number 20 Year 2003 concerning the National Education System article 49, that "Education funds other than teacher salaries and official education costs are allocated a minimum of 20 percent of the State Budget (APBN) in the education sector and a minimum of 20 percent of the Local Government Budget (APBD) ".

The impact of government spending on the education sector can be felt in the long term and in the short term, namely to create quality human resources and prosper the community. The central education budget for 2017 is allocated among others for the smart Indonesia program of 19.5 million students, school construction or school and classroom rehabilitation of 41,128 thousand units, School Operational Assistance (BOS) funds for 8.5 million students, Bidik Misi scholarships for 360.5 thousand students teacher professional allowance for 101.1 thousand teachers (Ministry of Finance, 2018).

However, in fact there are still problems with education in the regions, including the lack of equitable education, lack of educational facilities and infrastructure, lack of teacher welfare and teacher quality. In regions such as East Nusa Tenggara and Papua there are still a shortage of teachers, even one school has only one The phenomenon of school students climbing bridges almost broke to enter school. Then there are findings in the field and experience as school treasurers that the disbursement of School Operational Assistance (BOS) funds, disbursement is often late even though the operational needs of the school cannot be postponed and every day there are expenses. School Operational Assistance is calculated based on the number of students from the school concerned, if there are many students then the number of School Operational Assistance received will be more, if the school is in a remote area where the number of students is small then the amount of BOS funds to be received will be small so the educational equity is less. Problems with late BOS funds also occur in the disbursement of teacher professional and functional allowances.

Provincial government expenditure in the education sector has not reached 20 percent in accordance with regulations. Provinces that have been able to fulfill are Jakarta Province in 2015 which is 22.29 percent of the Local Government Budget, while other provinces are still less than 20 percent. The central government has allocated funds amounting to 20 percent of the state budget but in the regions it has not been implemented in accordance with applicable regulations. Therefore, regional commitment and effort is needed to be able to solve educational problems.

According to Sukirno (2011), there are three factors influencing government spending namely, first is the projected amount of tax as government income, second is the economic goals to be achieved in this case investment and third is political and security considerations. Meanwhile according to Government Regulation number 58 of 2005 article 16 paragraph (1) concerning Regional Financial Management, "Local Government Budget (APBD) in accordance with governance and regional income capability." This means that in each Local Government Budget (APBD), the factors that can affect the amount of government expenditure, especially in the field of education are regional needs and the amount of local government revenue. According to Yunina and Handayani (2018), local government revenue influences the allocation of education spending, to be able to implement the education budget properly is not

only a commitment from the local government but requires real effort to increase revenue. From the above theory it is known that the factors that can influence government expenditure in the education sector include investment and income from a region.

Investment is the most important thing in the success of development in the future because it is able to absorb labor, able to open new job opportunities for the community which will ultimately affect people's income Sajafii (2009). According to (Maharani and Isnawati (2014), regional private investment has a significant and positive influence on economic growth in the short and long term. The positive influence indicates that the higher the level of domestic investment will lead to an increase in economic growth and of course an increase in the income of the people of the area. Based on several studies above, the appropriate effort to increase government spending in the education sector is domestic investment, where the results of these investments can be felt by the local community itself.

The education development and economic development have interrelated relationships. The higher the level of education of the average population, the higher the level of economic growth of a country, the more advanced a country's economic growth, the more able to finance its education budget (Sudarsana, 2015). Based on Adolf Wagner's theory that in an economy if per capita income rises, government spending will also increase relatively relatively, so to be able to increase spending in the education sector then per capita income must be high therefore a proper effort is needed namely domestic investment whose impact will be felt directly by the local community itself.

According to Law No. 25 of 2007 concerning Investment, domestic investment is investment for doing business in the territory of Indonesia by domestic investors who can be Indonesian citizens, domestic business entities and or governments. Furthermore, the government determines business sectors for domestic investment based on the criteria of national interest, namely protection of natural resources, protection, development of Micro, Small, Medium and Cooperative businesses (MSMEs), supervision of production and distribution, improvement of technological capacity, participation of domestic capital, and cooperation with business entities appointed by the government. According to Tambunan (2012), MSMEs have proven to be more resilient in dealing with economic crises, because the characteristics of MSMEs are labor-intensive, spread almost evenly in the regions, use local raw materials and as a major provider of goods and services for basic needs of the community. In this case the government policy prioritizes domestic investment for the advancement of an area and for the welfare of the people of the region itself.

Table 1. Average of Domestic Investment, Regional Revenue and Government Spending in the Education Sector by Province in Indonesia in 2014-2017 (Billion Rupiahs)

No	Province	Average of domestic investment	Average of local government revenue	Average of government expenditure in education sector
1	Aceh	3.135,40	12.489,25	7.826,98
2	Sumatera Utara	6.264,78	9.716,00	6.359,25
3	Sumatera Barat	1.821,55	4.605,94	3.263,20
4	Riau	8.773,54	7.711,35	6.289,78
5	Jambi	2.834,81	3.415,62	2.251,24
6	Sumatera Selatan	8.680,30	6.849,40	3.451,40
7	Bengkulu	451,83	2.390,95	1.615,87
8	Lampung	4.411,15	5.406,59	3.366,60
9	Kep. Bangka Belitung	1.393,98	2.051,43	1.404,79
10	Kep. Riau	632,76	2.871,70	1.240,14

No	Province	Average of domestic investment	Average of local government revenue	Average of government expenditure in education sector
11	Jakarta	23.200,86	51.071,10	37.489,54
12	Jawa Barat	28.437,64	26.138,97	16.546,79
13	Jawa Tengah	18.237,18	18.771,43	12.751,11
14	Yogyakarta	577,37	3.856,87	2.732,10
15	Jawa Timur	41.249,47	23.974,01	14.100,88
16	Banten	11.589,85	8.210,99	5.206,64
17	Bali	644,49	5.254,34	3.474,29
18	Nusa Tenggara Barat	1.829,16	3.744,63	2.416,34
19	Nusa Tenggara Timur	800,84	3.675,39	2.424,68
20	Kalimantan Barat	7.965,18	4.345,69	2.732,96
21	Kalimantan Tengah	3.366,85	3.504,47	2.287,31
22	Kalimantan Selatan	3.455,44	5.115,35	3.050,69
23	Kalimantan Timur	10.083,90	9.186,69	5.178,47
24	Kalimantan Utara	1.440,90	1.817,25	1.542,10
25	Sulawesi Utara	1.727,86	2.822,58	1.893,90
26	Sulawesi Tengah	1.018,79	3.024,23	1.996,75
27	Sulawesi Selatan	4.867,23	6.918,38	4.532,05
28	Sulawesi Tenggara	2.052,05	2.753,97	1.829,21
29	Gorontalo	807,58	1.503,59	731,07
30	Sulawesi Barat	634,55	1.554,11	1.140,22
31	Maluku	15,93	2.390,17	1.493,00
32	Maluku Utara	340,98	2.049,07	1.412,31
33	Papua Barat	58,31	6.307,99	3.686,90
34	Papua	740,88	12.263,08	7.180,25

Source: Central Bureau of Statistics, Departement of Education and Culture, 2018

From table 1, it can be seen that the average domestic investment, regional income influences government spending in the education sector of a region. If a region has a high level of domestic investment, the income is also high, as well as government spending in the education sector is high, as happened in the provinces of Jakarta, West Java and East Java. Then if investment and income are classified as low as happened in Maluku Province, government spending in the education sector is classified as low.

There are several studies on factors that influence government spending in the education sector, such as research conducted by Rizky, Agustin, and Mukhlis (2016) in 33 provinces in Indonesia in 2010-2013 using panel data, the result is that domestic investment affects economic growth from the province, which means regional income increases so that the ability of financing in the education sector can be fulfilled.

A study by Chang and Shi (2016), where research conducted in 30 provinces and autonomous regions in China results in an investment relationship with education funding. To promote good human resources, investment must be increased to create a sustainable and stable economy, so that if the economy is stable, education funding will increase.

In addition Research Derzayeva and Akhmadieva (2014), which conducted research in the regional government of Russia states that investment in the previous year will lead to income in the future, which in turn will effectively be spent on the education sector and can increase. Therefore the factors that influence government spending in the education sector are investment and income from a region. However, research which states that government spending in the education sector is influenced by investment is not in line with research produced by Forgha and Mbella (2013), that public expenditure is not significantly related to investment in the country of Cameroon. According to Njuru, Ombuki, Wawire, and Okeri (2014), they concluded that government spending with investment has a negative relationship in Kenya, this

is due to developmental factors and the potential of a country or region itself.

Research conducted by Kusnandar and Siswantoro (2014), Badrudin and Khasanah (2011), Aprizay, Satrya, Darwanis, and Arfan (2014) each stated that regional income research had a positive effect on capital expenditure that was directly related to the public such as sector expenditure education. Meanwhile, according to Yunina and Handayani's research (2018) that regional income affects Education Expenditure by 75 percent, the weakness of this study is that the object of research is only in Aceh Province and the variables studied are only in its financial aspects.

The equation of the above studies is to examine the factors that influence government spending including domestic investment and regional income. However, there are differences in the independent variables studied, namely the components of regional income and differences in the object or region under study. This is what can lead to different research results. Furthermore, in the above research only in the scope of income or finance without regard to other economic factors, whereas the economy and education affect each other, where if the economy increases, government spending in the education sector will be implemented. Conversely, if the government pays attention to education, it is an investment to improve the economy of a country in the future. therefore in this study the scope is in the fields of economics, local government and also education.

Based on the discussion above, this study aims to analyze: 1) the effect of domestic investment and regional income on government spending in the education sector, 2) the effect of domestic investment on government spending in the education sector, 3) the effect of regional income on government spending in the education sector. The object of study and data in this research are regional government expenditure in the Indonesian education sector, published by the Regional Education Balance Ministry of Education and Culture and the Central Statistics Agency. Variabel local government expenditure in the education sector, investment in the country, local revenue, in this study limits the issues on the scope of the data by 34 provinces in Indonesia in 2014-2017.

METHOD

Type of research used is descriptive research with a quantitative approach with emphasis on testing the hypothesis in producing a conclusion. The type of data used is secondary data. Secondary data were obtained from reports and documents obtained from Central Bureau of Statistics and Local Educational Balance-Departement of Education and Culture.

Analysis of the data used in this study is panel data regression analysis, which is used to determine the presence or absence of the influence of independent variables on the dependent variable. The variables in this study consisted of two independent variables and one dependent variable. The independent variable is domestic investment (X_1) and local government revenue (X_2), while the dependent variable is government expenditure in the education sector (Y). In this study, researchers want to look for the influence of variables X_1 and X_2 together on the Y variable, the effect of the X_1 variable on the Y variable, and the effect of the X_2 variable on Y .

The population in this study is the State of Indonesia with 34 provincial governments. While the sample used is a saturated sample (census). According to Sugiyono (2016), saturated sample (census) is a sampling technique if all members of the population are used as samples. In the sample research, namely the realization of domestic investment, local government revenue, education sector government expenditure based from 2014-2017 in 34 provinces in Indonesia, so the total sample is 136 samples.

There are some classic assumption tests that must be met, but not all are done. That is because it depends on the data used in research. In this study the classic assumption tests used in this study are tests of normality, multicollinearity, and heteroscedasticity,

while autocorrelation is not used because the data used are not data time series. Normality test is used to determine whether the data is normally distributed, the statistical test used to test normality is a formal test by looking at the probability of Jarque-Bera (JB), if the probability value is greater than 0.05 then the data is normally distributed. Multicollinearity test is used to determine the relationship between independent variables, multicollinearity test can be seen from the correlation coefficient between two independent variables. If the correlation coefficient exceeds 0.80, multicollinearity occurs. Then, the heteroscedasticity test is used to find out whether the data is homoscedasticity. Homoscedasticity test can be performed with *glejser* test. The condition is that if the probability of each variable is more than 0.05 then heteroscedasticity does not occur.

After fulfilling the classic assumption test, further testing the hypothesis, that the t test and F test was followed saw the coefficient of determination (R^2). The t test is used to determine whether the independent variable significantly influences the dependent variable, while the F test is used to determine the effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable simultaneously. This research was conducted through observing the significance value at the α level used. If the t-statistic probability and the F-statistic probability <0.05 means that the independent variable has a significant effect on the dependent variable, both individually and simultaneously. R^2 (R square) is used to determine whether or not a regression model. The value of R^2 ranged from 0 to 1. The larger the value of R^2 , the independent variables more closely associated with the dependent variable, in other words, the model is considered good.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Through the likelihood ratio test obtained a probability value of 0.000, the fixed effect model is more appropriate than the common effect model. Furthermore Hausman test and obtained a probability value of 0.012 or smaller than a significant value of 0.05, the fixed effect is more appropriate. So that the conclusion is the fixed effect model approach is appropriate for this study.

The results of the classic assumption test in this study, namely the test for normality, multicollinearity, and heteroscedasticity can be seen in the table 2.:

Tabel 2. The Result of Normality Test

Jarque-Bera	0.914
Probability	0.633

Source: *Eviews output result of the 2019 processed data*

Table 2, illustrates the results of the classic assumption test of normality. Normality test results show that the Jarque-Bera (JB) probability value is 0.633. These results indicate that the residuals are normally distributed, as seen from the JB probability value greater than the level of confidence that is $0.633 > 0.05$.

Tabel 3. The Result of Multicollinearity Test

Variable	Coefisient corelation Y	Coefisient corelation X ₁	Coefisient corelation X ₂
Y	1.000	0.499	0.621
X ₁	0.499	1.000	0.737
X ₂	0.621	0.737	1.000

Source: *Eviews output result of the 2019 processed data*

From table 3, it can be seen that the correlation coefficient between variables is less than 0.800. It can be concluded that the panel data regression in this study is free from multicollinearity.

Tabel 4. The Result of Heteroscedasticity Test

Variable	t-statistic	Probability
X1	1.072	0.286
X2	1.965	0.052
C	0.153	0.879

Source: Eviews output result of the 2019 processed data

From table 4, it is known that each variable's probability is more than 0.05. It can be concluded that the research data regression in this study did not experience heterokedacity. From the fixed effect model the following results are obtained:

Tabel 5. The Result of Fixed Effect Model Estimation

Variable	Coefisient	Sign
Constanta	-16,904.68	0.000
Investment (X ₁)	0.089	0.000
Revenue (X ₂)	2017.92	0.000
Adjusted R Square	= 0.892	
F Significant	= 0.000	
Standart Error of Estimate	= 694.67	

Source: Eviews output result of the 2019 processed data

From the results of data processing in table 5, above, the following equation is obtained:

$$Y = -16,904.68 + 0.089 X_1 + 2017.92 X_2 + 0.671$$

From the analysis of the F test data it can be seen that the independent variable gives a significant influence on the dependent variable, which means domestic investment and regional income and together gives an effect of 89.2 percent on government expenditure in the education sector, while 10.8percent is influenced by factors others that were not examined in this study.

Based on the results of the regression analysis and t test it can be seen that the domestic investment variable has a probability value of 0.000 or smaller than the significance value of 0.005 which means that domestic investment influences government spending in the education sector.

The results of this study are in line with the study of Chang and Shi (2016), where research conducted in 30 provinces and autonomous regions in China results in an investment relationship with education funding. To advance good human resources, investment must be made to create a sustainable and stable economy. It implies that if the economy is stable, education funding will increase.

However the results of this study are not in line with the research produced by Forgha and Mbella (2013), which results that public expenditure is not significantly related to investment. According to Njuru et al. (2014), their research shows that between government spending and investment has a negative relationship. This is caused by the characteristics and development of a country.

To be able to allocate an education budget, of course, a region's income must be high. To get high income it is not enough just to rely on tax income, but each region must carry out economic business activities that require investment, especially domestic investment because later the income can be felt directly by the domestic party or the region itself. Investment has a role in obtaining government revenue other than tax revenue. High income in turn affects the ability to realize the education budget according to the rules properly. Although in this study the influence of domestic investment is still relatively low because in the investment community it is still not

an option in carrying out its economic activities. Because domestic investment itself is affected by consideration of the geographical conditions of the region, the potential of natural resources, raw materials and how to obtain them, infrastructure, facilities and infrastructure, inter-regional linkages, human resources and security conditions.

Based on the results of the regression analysis and t test it can be seen that the regional income variable has a probability value of 0.000 or smaller than the significant level of 0.05 which means that regional income has a positive and significant influence on government spending in the education sector. As in the Province of Jakarta where government spending in the education sector is highest, this is due to the influence of domestic investment and the high amount of revenue of Jakarta, the construction of schools and infrastructure of Jakarta is well available, hence government spending in the education sector is greater for employee salary. While the province that has the lowest education budget is Papua Province, this is because domestic investment and regional income in Papua Province are still low. The results of this study are in line with what was revealed in a study conducted by Kusnandar and Siswantoro (2014), Badrudin and Khasanah (2011), Aprizay et al. (2014) respectively stating that regional income research had a positive effect on capital expenditure directly related to the public such as education spending. Meanwhile, according to Yunina and Handayani's research, (2018) that regional income affects education expenditure by 75 percent.

This research is not in line with research conducted by Abdullah and Rona (2014) which states that regional income has a negative effect on capital expenditure, especially for education. Whereas Zakaria (2015) research conducted in Regencies or Cities in Papua Province resulted that regional income had no significant effect on regional expenditure. This is because each region has its own policy to prioritize its budget by looking at the development, real situation and condition of the region. As happened in the Province of Yogyakarta, it has a smaller domestic investment than the Provinces of West Java and East Java, but the average education expenditure is greater than the Provinces of West Java and East Java. This is because the Yogyakarta region is smaller and the population is relatively small so that local governments can commit and focus more on government spending in the education sector. For Maluku Province, investment has been classified as low, but government spending in the education sector is classified as higher, this is due to many education problems in Maluku Province, such as the very low quality of education and the lack of equal distribution of education, thus requiring greater handling and education expenditure. This means that government spending in the education sector in some cases is influenced by the conditions and needs of the area.

Based on the above data analysis, it can be said that domestic investment has an influence on government spending in the education sector. The higher the domestic investment, the higher the amount of government spending in the education sector and conversely the lower the domestic investment, the lower the amount of government spending in the education sector. The hypothesis that there is an influence of domestic investment on government spending in the education sector can be accepted and proven true.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTION

Based on the results of the research described above, it can be concluded: first there is a significant influence between domestic investment and regional income on government spending in the education sector. This shows that the two independent variables namely domestic investment and regional income have a role in influencing the size of government spending in the education sector. Second, there is a positive and significant influence between domestic investment on government spending in the education sector. This proves that the higher the domestic investment, the higher the amount of government spending in the education sector. However, domestic investment variables have a smaller effect than regional income. Third, there is a positive and significant influence between income and government expenditure in the education sector. This proves that the higher the income, the higher the amount of government spending in the education sector. And the income variable based on the research is a larger variable compared to domestic investment.

Based on the findings in this study which show that the amount of domestic investment and regional income is a factor that can affect government spending in the education sector. There are a number of suggestions, among others, the first is the importance of managing regional potential to increase domestic investment and regional income as an effort increase government spending in the education sector. Second, domestic investment has an influence on government spending in the education sector, although its influence is still low. Therefore, an increase in the amount of domestic investment must be sought because its function is very important to develop the regional economy and prosper the local community itself. Third, equitable distribution of education in the regions is still lacking, therefore government spending in the education sector must be well distributed and implemented. In the implementation, there needs to be synergy and written agreement or Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the central and regional governments. And Fourth, the provincial government expenditure in the education sector is still not entirely reached 20 percent of the Local Government Budget (APBD), therefore the importance of monitoring and transparency of government spending, especially in the education sector so that between data and implementation in the field in accordance with applicable regulations.

REFERENCES

- Abdullah, S., & Rona, R. (2014). Pengaruh Sisa Anggaran, Pendapatan Sendiri dan Dana Perimbangan terhadap Belanja Modal. *Iqtishadia (Jurnal of Islamic Economics and Business)*, 7(1), 179–202.
- Aprizay, Satrya, Y., Darwanis, & Arfan, M. (2014). Pengaruh Pendapatan Asli Daerah, Dana Perimbangan dan Sisa Lebih Pembiayaan Anggaran terhadap Pengalokasian Belanja Modal pada Kabupaten/Kota di Provinsi Aceh. *Jurnal Akuntansi Pascasarjana Universitas Syiah Kuala*, 3(1), 140–149. <https://doi.org/10.24815/jped.v4i1.10916>
- Badrudin, H., & Khasanah, M. (2011). Pengaruh Pendapatan dan Belanja Daerah terhadap Pembangunan Manusia di Provinsi Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta. *Jurnal Manajemen, Akuntansi Dan Ekonomi Pembangunan*, 9(1), 23–30.
- Chang, X., & Shi, Y. (2016). The Econometric Study on Effect of Chinese Economic Growth of Human Capital. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 91(2016), 1096–1105. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2016.07.160>
- Derzayeva, G., & Akhmadieva, G. (2014). Budgetary Policy Efficiency of Municipalities in The Field of Education. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 152, 1148–1153. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.09.291>
- Forgha, N. G. F., & Mbella, M. E. (2013). Public Expenditure and Private Investment in Camerron. A Vector Autoregressive Approach. *Journal of Emerging Issues Economic, Finance and Banking*, 2(4), 818–832.
- Kementrian Keuangan. (2018). *Informasi APBN 2017*. Direktur Jendral Anggaran. retrieved from <https://www.kemenkeu.go.id/media/6552/informasi-apbn-2018.pdf>

- Kusnandar, & Siswantoro, D. (2014). Pengaruh Dana Alokasi Umum dan Pendapatan Asli Daerah, Sisa Lebih Pembiayaan Anggaran dan Luas Wilayah terhadap Belanja Modal. *Jurnal Universitas Indonesia*.
- Maharani, K., & Isnowati, S. (2014). Kajian Investasi Pengeluaran Pemerintah, Tenaga Kerja dan Keterbukaan Ekonomi terhadap Pertumbuhan Ekonomi di Provinsi Jawa Tengah. *Jurnal Bisnis Dan Ekonomi*, 21(1), 62–72.
- Njuru, S. G., Ombuki, C., Wawire, N., & Okeri, S. (2014). Impact of Government Expenditure on Private Investment in Kenya. *Research Journal's Journal Economics*, 2(8), 1–19.
- Rizky, R. L., Agustin, G., & Mukhlis, I. (2016). Pengaruh Penanaman Modal Asing, Penanaman Modal Dalam Negeri dan Belanja Modal terhadap Pertumbuhan Ekonomi Provinsi di Indonesia. *JESP*, 8(1), 9–16. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17977/um002v8i12016p009>
- Sajafii. (2009). Pengaruh Investasi Fisik dan Sumber Daya Manusia terhadap Pertumbuhan Ekonomi. *Journal of Indonesian Applied Economic*, 3(1), 59–76.
- Sudarsana, I. K. (2015). Peningkatan Mutu Pendidikan Luar Sekolah Dalam Upaya Pembangunan Sumber Daya Manusia. *Jurnal Penjaminan Mutu*, 1(1), 1–14.
- Sugiyono. (2016). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R & D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Sukirno, S. (2011). *Makro Ekonomi: Teori Pengantar* (Ketiga). Jakarta: Rajawali.
- Tambunan, T. (2012). *Usaha Mikro Kecil dan Menengah di Indonesia: isu-isu penting*. Jakarta: LP3ES.
- Undang-Undang 2003 No.20, Sistem Pendidikan Nasional.
- Yunina, F., & Handayani, T. (2018). Faktor-Faktor yang Mempengaruhi Alokasi Belanja Pendidikan pada Dinas Pendidikan Provinsi Aceh. *Jurnal Akuntansi Muhammadiyah*, 8(1), 70–82.
- Zakaria, F. (2015). Pengaruh Alokasi Umum dan Pendapatan Asli Daerah Terhadap Belanja Daerah (Studi Pada Anggaran Pendapatan Belanja Daerah Kabupaten/ Kota di Provinsi Papua. *Jurnal Future*, 2(2), 134–144.
- <https://npd.kemdikbud.go.id>. accessed on 22 Januari 2019.
- <https://www.bps.go.id>. accessed on 22 Januari 2019