

Compose

Mail

- Inbox
- Starred
- Snoozed

Chat +

Spaces +



No spaces yet
Create or find a space

Meet

- New meeting
- My meetings



54 of 59

Editorial system registration External Inbox x



Iranian Economic Review <ier@ut.ac.ir>
to me, waspodotjipto

Tue, Jun 30, 2020, 10:18 PM

Dear Waspodo Tjipto Subroto,

Welcome to **Iranian Economic Review** website.

Thank you for your registration in the Editorial System Online Submission and peer review tracking system. Below please find your username and confidential password, which you need to access the system at:

<https://ier.ut.ac.ir/>

Your username is: **Waspodo**

Your password is: **jr52d632dt**

Please save this information in a safe place.

Once you login , you can change your password on your profile.

Editorial Office

Iranian Economic Review

<https://ier.ut.ac.ir/>

Activate Windows
Go to Settings to activate Windows.

Compose

Mail

- Inbox
- Starred
- Snoozed

Chat +

Spaces +



No spaces yet
[Create or find a space](#)

Meet

- New meeting
- My meetings

53 of 59

Acknowledgement of Submission (#IER-202007-1006907)

External Inbox

Iranian Economic Review <ier@ut.ac.ir>
to me, waspodotjipto, ier

Tue, Jun 30, 2020, 10:51 PM

Manuscript ID: IER-202007-1006907

Manuscript Title: **Does Funding Decentralization Can Influence The Local Economic Growth?**

Authors: Waspodo Tjipto Subroto, Imam Baidlowi Baidlowi

Dear **Dr. Waspodo Tjipto Subroto**

I wish to acknowledge receiving above mentioned manuscript.

It should be noted that the manuscript will be reviewed for possible publication in the Scientific Journals Management System.

Please be sure that the submitted manuscript (or its translation) has not been published previously and will not be submitted elsewhere prior to our decision.

Activate Windows
Go to Settings to activate Windows.

Compose

Mail

- Inbox
- Starred
- Snoozed

Chat +

Spaces +



No spaces yet
[Create or find a space](#)

Meet

- New meeting
- My meetings

48 of many

Iranian Economic Review <ier@ut.ac.ir>
to me, waspodotjipto

Mon, Jul 27, 2020, 1:22 AM

Manuscript ID: **IER-202007-1006907**

Manuscript Title: **Does Funding Decentralization Can Influence The Local Economic Growth?**

Authors: Waspodo Tjipto Subroto, Imam Baidlowi Baidlowi

Dear **Dr. Waspodo Tjipto Subroto**

Your manuscript has been reviewed and obtained revisions. Please revise your paper, highlight the revised parts and resubmit it within 15 days. Then we send it to the final reviewer.

If it needs, please upload a "response to reviewers" file to answer the reviewers' questions. We will send your revisions to the final reviewer.

**** It is important to choose the type "response to reviewer" on the webpage. If not, the reviewer will not be able to see your file.**

[Go to Settings to activate Windows.](#)

Compose

Mail

- Inbox
- Starred
- Snoozed

Chat +

Spaces +



No spaces yet
[Create or find a space](#)

Meet

- New meeting
- My meetings



48 of many

The overview of the first reviewer (major revision):

"1- Time period of the study should be included in the abstract.

2- Works done by Jafari Samimi et al. on decentralization and economic growth should be considered by the Authors

3- The model needs to be completed by adding more independent variables affecting decentralization as seen in other studies."

The overview of the second reviewer (major revision):

"Journal of Poverty, Investment and Development www.iiste.org ISSN 2422-846X An International Peer-reviewed Journal Vol.51, 2019

Decentralization and Financial Local Governments Performance: How Does Fiscal Autonomy Affect Spending, Economic Growth, and Poverty in East Java Indonesia?

Activate Windows
Go to Settings to activate Windows.

Compose

- Mail
- Inbox
- Starred
- Snoozed

- Chat +
- Spaces +



No spaces yet
[Create or find a space](#)

- Meet
- New meeting
- My meetings

43 of many

IER Journal <ier@ut.ac.ir> Aug 4, 2020, 1:01 AM

Manuscript ID: IER-202007-1006907 (R1)

Manuscript Title: **Does Funding Decentralization Can Influence The Local Economic Growth?**

Authors: Waspodo Tjipto Subroto, Imam Baidlowi Baidlowi

Dear Dr. Waspodo Tjipto Subroto

Your revised paper is not uploaded in our webpage, and it is necessary to upload your revised paper in the website of IER Journal, because the reviewers would see the first version of your paper and his/her last overview in the website page. In addition, we need to archive all these information in our website. So:

How to submit your revised paper or change other information you registered before

Please enter into your page (with user and password you had before),

Then open this link:

Activate Windows
Go to Settings to activate Windows.

Compose

Mail

- Inbox
- Starred
- Snoozed

Chat +

Spaces +



No spaces yet
Create or find a space

Meet

- New meeting
- My meetings

← [Icons] 43 of many < > [Icon]

Click on the Manuscript ID,

Click on the link "Attach files" (on the left of the page),

Then you should choose the type of your file; so in front of "file type", please choose "manuscript main file" (for your revised paper)

and choose "response to reviewer" type for explanation to the reviewer(s),

and then upload the final article with "browse" button.

** Please delete all other files you see; we have them in the archive of our website.

Then go through all stages (with "next" button) until you finish the process of resubmitting or revising.

For the final step, click on "submit revision" button (a blue button).

- You can revise other information in the other stages as well.
- If you are not the Corresponding Author, you cannot change any information or upload the final version.**
- The format of the final version should be Microsoft Word (not Pdf , ...).

If you had any question, please do not hesitate to email the executive manager (ier@ut.ac.ir).

Regards,

Executive Manager

Iranian Economic Review (IER) Journal

Hamideh Mirhoseinzadeh

Activate Windows
Go to Settings to activate Windows.

Compose

Mail

- Inbox
- Starred
- Snoozed

Chat +

Spaces +



No spaces yet
[Create or find a space](#)

Meet

- New meeting
- My meetings

← [Icons] 42 of many < >

Authors: Waspodo Tjipto Subroto, Imam Baidlowi Baidlowi

Date: 2020-07-01

Dear **Dr. Waspodo Tjipto Subroto**

Thank you for submitting the revised file of your manuscript to the **Iranian Economic Review**

The Editorial Office will proceed on your manuscript and inform you in the earliest time.

If there is any question, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Truly yours,

Executive Manager of **Iranian Economic Review**

Iranian Economic Review

Activate Windows
Go to Settings to activate Windows.

Compose

Mail

- Inbox
- Starred
- Snoozed

Chat +

Spaces +



No spaces yet
[Create or find a space](#)

Meet

- New meeting
- My meetings

41 of many

Acceptance With Minor Revision (#IER-202007-1006907 (R3)) Inbox x



Iranian Economic Review <ier@ut.ac.ir>
to me, waspodotjipto

Sat, Sep 12, 2020, 12:11 AM

Manuscript ID: IER-202007-1006907 (R2)

Manuscript Title: **Does Funding Decentralization Can Influence The Local Economic Growth?**

Authors: Waspodo Tjipto Subroto, Imam Baidlowi Baidlowi

Dear Dr. Waspodo Tjipto Subroto

I am pleased to inform you that your paper has been accepted to be published in the next volume(s) of the Iranian Economic Review (IER) journal. The exact date of publishing is not clear yet.

The comments of the final reviewer:

Activate Windows
Go to Settings to activate Windows.

Compose

Mail

- Inbox
- Starred
- Snoozed

Chat +

Spaces +



No spaces yet
[Create or find a space](#)

Meet

- New meeting
- My meetings



41 of many

The comments of the final reviewer:

**"now the necessary corrections have been completed by author .
The author last name in the first article in bibliography of the paper is Jafari Samimi & his first name is Ahmad."**

(It will publish around one year later. If you need an acceptance letter, please inform us.)

* The abstract of the article with the names of authors will be on our website ("Articles in press" link) before publishing and a DOI code is assigned to it.

To do so, please upload the **latest version of the full paper with names of authors and their information** at the site of this journal addressed:

https://ier.ut.ac.ir/contacts?_action=login

Activate Windows
Go to Settings to activate Windows.

Compose

Mail

- Inbox
- Starred
- Snoozed

Chat +

Spaces +



No spaces yet
Create or find a space

Meet

- New meeting
- My meetings



41 of many

Please follow these instructions carefully:

- Specify the full name of the author(s), his/their position(s) and email(s) in the paper, and specify the name of the **Corresponding Author**. Please mention authorized emails of authors like university emails, etc. (not Gmail, Hotmail or Yahoo). Please see the attachment (example).
- Edit the references of the article, based on AP standard **very carefully** with details (punctuation is important); please read the examples of attachment (IER Journal - format). If you need more examples, use this link: <http://www.usq.edu.au/library/referencing/apa-referencing-guide>
- **About the references:** do not use numbers next to each reference. (Alphabetic sort of author's surname is enough.)

If your information about articles, book ... is not enough, please write the link of access after "Retrieved from". Please see the examples of attachment (IER Journal - format). Regards,

Activate Windows
Go to Settings to activate Windows.



IER

Away



Compose

- Mail
- Inbox
- Starred
- Snoozed

- Chat +
- Spaces +



No spaces yet
Create or find a space

- Meet
- New meeting
- My meetings

41 of many

Please follow these instructions carefully:

- Specify the full name of the author(s), his/their position(s) and email(s) in the paper, and specify the name of the **Corresponding Author**. Please mention authorized emails of authors like university emails, etc. (not Gmail, Hotmail or Yahoo). Please see the attachment (example).
- Edit the references of the article, based on AP standard **very carefully** with details (punctuation is important); please read the examples of attachment (IER Journal - format). If you need more examples, use this link: <http://www.usq.edu.au/library/referencing/apa-referencing-guide>
- About the references:** do not use numbers next to each reference. (Alphabetic sort of author's surname is enough.)

If your information about articles, book ... is not enough, please write the link of access after "Retrieved from". Please see the examples of attachment (IER Journal - format). Regards,

Activate Windows



IER

Away



Compose

- Mail
- Inbox
- Starred
- Snoozed

- Chat
- Spaces



No spaces yet
Create or find a space

- Meet
- New meeting
- My meetings

40 of many

IER Journal <ier@ut.ac.ir> Sat, Sep 12, 2020, 12:11 AM

Manuscript ID: IER-202007-1006907 (R2)

Manuscript Title: **Does Funding Decentralization Can Influence The Local Economic Growth?**

Authors: Waspodo Tjipto Subroto, Imam Baidlowi Baidlowi

Dear Dr. Waspodo Tjipto Subroto

I am pleased to inform you that your paper has been accepted to be published in the next volume(s) of the Iranian Economic Review (IER) journal. The exact date of publishing is not clear yet.

The comments of the final reviewer:
**"now the necessary corrections have been completed by author .
 The author last name in the first article in bibliography of the paper is Jafari Samimi & his first name is Ahmad."**

(It will publish around one year later. If you need an acceptance letter, please inform us.)

* The abstract of the article with the names of authors will be on our website ("Articles in press" link) before publishing and a DOI code is assigned to it.

To do so, please upload the **latest version of the full paper with names of authors and their information** at the site



IER

Away



Compose

- Mail
- Inbox
- Starred
- Snoozed

- Chat +
- Spaces +

No spaces yet
Create or find a space

- Meet
- New meeting
- My meetings

40 of many

of this journal address:

https://ier.ut.ac.ir/contacts?_action=login

Please follow these instructions carefully:

- Specify the full name of the author(s), his/their position(s) and email(s) in the paper, and specify the name of the **Corresponding Author**. Please mention authorized emails of authors like university emails, etc. (not Gmail, Hotmail or Yahoo). Please see the attachment (example).
- Edit the references of the article, based on AP standard **very carefully** with details (punctuation is important); please read the examples of attachment (IER Journal - format). If you need more examples, use this link: <http://www.usq.edu.au/library/referencing/apa-referencing-guide>
- **About the references:** do not use numbers next to each reference. (Alphabetic sort of author's surname is enough.)

If your information about articles, book ... is not enough, please write the link of access after "Retrieved from". Please see the examples of attachment (IER Journal - format).Regards,

Executive Manager

Iranian Economic Review (IER) journal

Activate Windows
Go to Settings to activate Windows.



IER

Away



Compose

- Mail
 - Inbox
 - Starred
 - Snoozed
- Chat
- Spaces
- Meet
 - New meeting
 - My meetings

39 of many

On Sat, Sep 12, 2020 at 2:11 PM IER Journal <ier@ut.ac.ir> wrote:

Manuscript ID: IER-202007-1006907 (R2)

Manuscript Title: **Does Funding Decentralization Can Influence The Local Economic Growth?**

Authors: Waspodo Tjipto Subroto, Imam Baidlowi Baidlowi

Dear Dr. Waspodo Tjipto Subroto

I am pleased to inform you that your paper has been accepted to be published in the next volume(s) of the Iranian Economic Review (IER) journal. The exact date of publishing is not clear yet.

The comments of the final reviewer:

"now the necessary corrections have been completed by author .

The author last name in the first article in bibliography of the paper is Jafari Samimi & his first name is Ahmad."

(It will publish around one year later. If you need an acceptance letter, please inform us.)

* The abstract of the article with the names of authors will be on our website ("Articles in press" link) before publishing and a DOI code is assigned to it.

To do so, please upload the **latest version of the full paper with names of authors and their information** at the site of this journal addressed:

Activate Windows



IER

Away



Compose

- Mail
 - Inbox
 - Starred
 - Snoozed
- Chat
- Spaces
- Meet
 - New meeting
 - My meetings

35 of many

Manuscript ID: IER-202007-1006907 (R3)

Manuscript Title: Does Funding Decentralization Can Influence The Local Economic Growth?

Authors: Waspodo Tjipto Subroto, Imam Baidlowi Baidlowi

Dear Dr. Waspodo Tjipto Subroto

Thanks for revising your paper;

It will be published around one year later, but because we check the last revisions near the time of publishing, we will put it in "Acceptance with minor revision" folder until its time.

Regards,

Executive Manager

Iranian Economic Review (IER) journal

Activate Windows
Go to Settings to activate Windows.



IRANIAN ECONOMIC REVIEW

[Home](#)[Browse](#)[Journal Info](#)[Guide for Authors](#)[Submit Manuscript](#)[Reviewers](#)[Contact Us](#)[Waspodo Tjipto Subroto](#)[Logout](#)

Can Funding Decentralization Influence The Local Economic Growth?

Authors

Waspodo Tjipto Subroto ¹; Imam Baidlowi Baidlowi ²

¹ Faculty of Economics, Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Indonesia.

² Faculty of Economics, Universitas Islam Mojopahit, Mojokerto, Indonesia.

10.22059/IER.2020.77978

Abstract

Experiences often by many countries slowing economic growth as a result of central government-centered funding policies. The concern about slowing economic growth is motivating the need for a decentralized policy in development funding to foster economic growth. The research aims to describe the policy influence of the decentralization of funding sources between central and local governments to foster economic growth in East Java. This research method uses an explanation design with a quantitative approach. Data panels are collected from 38 cities/counties among 2009 to 2018 years, in East Java, with analysis using regression technique with SPSS version 23. The results of this study showed that decentralization of funding sources can increase significantly on local economic activities and affect the increase of local economic growth. Increasing local economic activity can significantly increase economic growth. While local growing of economics can significantly



Articles in Press,
Accepted
Manuscript
Available Online
from 29
September 2020

Files

XML

Share

How to cite

Activate Windows
Go to Settings to activate Windows.
Go to Settings to activate Windows.




Faculty of Economics
University of Tehran

2021, January 18


Dear Dr. Waspodo Tjipto Subroto (Corresponding Author)

The editorial board of the Iranian Economic Review (IER) journal is pleased to inform you that your manuscript (IER-202007-1006907) with **Dr. Imam Baidlowi**, entitled "**Does Funding Decentralization Can Influence the Local Economic Growth?**" will be published in next issues of IER journal, according to the publishing priorities.

Regards,


Hossein Abbasinejad

Iranian Economic Review (IER) Journal





IER

Away



Compose

- Mail
 - Inbox
 - Starred
 - Snoozed
- Chat +
- Spaces +
No spaces yet
[Create or find a space](#)
- Meet
 - New meeting
 - My meetings

30 of many

Manuscript Title: **Does Funding Decentralization Can Influence The Local Economic Growth?**

Authors: Waspodo Tjipto Subroto, Imam Baidlowi Baidlowi

Dear **Dr. Waspodo Tjipto Subroto**

Thanks for revising your paper;

It will be published around one year later, but because we check the last revisions near the time of publishing, we will put it in "Acceptance with minor revision" folder until its time.

Activate Windows
Go to Settings to activate Windows.



IER

Away



Compose

- Mail
 - Inbox
 - Starred
 - Snoozed
- Chat +
- Spaces +
 - No spaces yet
 - Create or find a space
- Meet
 - New meeting
 - My meetings

Navigation icons: back, forward, archive, trash, mail, clock, refresh, print, share, etc.

30 of many

Dr. Waspodo Tjipto Subroto
 Associate Professor of Economics
 Faculty of Economics
 Universitas Negeri Surabaya
 Indonesia
 email: waspodosubroto@unesa.ac.id
waspodotjipto@yahoo.co.id
tjiptosubroto@gmail.com

On Mon, Dec 21, 2020 at 4:33 PM IER Journal <ier@ut.ac.ir> wrote:

Dear Dr. Waspodo Tjipto Subroto

Your paper will be published in 2022-2 (Summer, 2022) possibly and near the time of publishing we check your revisions and if it needs more revision we will email you.

If you need an accept letter, please inform us.

Regards,
Executive Manager
Iranian Economic Review (IER) Journal
Hamideh Mirhosseinzadeh

Activate Windows
Go to Settings to activate Windows.



IER

Away



Compose

- Mail
- Inbox
- Starred
- Snoozed

- Chat
- Spaces

No spaces yet
Create or find a space

- Meet
- New meeting
- My meetings

30 of many

Acceptance letter (#IER-202007-1006907) Inbox

IER Journal <ier@ut.ac.ir> Jan 18, 2021, 1:43 AM ★

to me, imambaidlowi

Manuscript ID: IER-202007-1006907

Manuscript Title: **Does Funding Decentralization Can Influence The Local Economic Growth?**

Authors: Waspodo Tjipto Subroto, Imam Baidlowi Baidlowi

Dear Dr. Waspodo Tjipto Subroto

The acceptance letter is in the attachment.

Regards,
Executive Manager
Iranian Economic Review (IER) Journal
Hamideh Mirhosseinzadeh

On 2021-01-12 09:19, Waspodo Tjipto Subroto wrote:

Dear Editor IER

Activate Windows
Go to Settings to activate Windows.



IER

Away



Compose



29 of many

Letter of Acceptance



Dr. Waspodo Tjipto <waspodotjipto@yahoo.co.id> to waspodotjipto, me, imambaidlowi, imambaidlowiku

Mon, Jan 18, 2021, 2:58 PM

Sent from my iPhone



Reply Reply all Forward

Activate Windows Go to Settings to activate Windows.



IER

Away



Compose

26 of many

Iranian Economic Review <ier@ut.ac.ir>
to me, waspodotjipto

Sun, May 2, 2021, 4:30 PM

Manuscript ID: IER-202007-1006907 (R5)

Manuscript Title: **Does Funding Decentralization Can Influence The Local Economic Growth?**

Authors: Waspodo Tjipto Subroto, Imam Baidlowi Baidlowi

Dear **Dr. Waspodo Tjipto Subroto**

The reminders of IER website has been sent automatically, and if you revised your paper based on IER format, there is no need to answer it.

Regards,
Executive Manager
Iranian Economic Review (IER) Journal
Hamideh Mirhosseinzadeh

Activate Windows
Go to Settings to activate Windows.



IER

Away



Compose

- Mail
 - Inbox
 - Starred
 - Snoozed
- Chat
- Spaces
- Meet
 - New meeting
 - My meetings

16 of many

Emergency - IER-202007-1006907 for pub in 2022-2 External Inbox

IER Journal <ier@ut.ac.ir> to me, imambaidlowi Tue, Apr 26, 10:21 PM

Manuscript ID: IER-202007-1006907 (R5)
Manuscript Title: Does Funding Decentralization Can Influence The Local Economic Growth?

Authors: Waspodo Tjipto Subroto, Imam Baidlowi Baidlowi

Dear Dr. Waspodo Tjipto Subroto

Your paper will be published in 2022-2; Therefore, please check if the last uploaded paper in your page is the final version of your manuscript with the names of authors and their complete information based on the attachment ("example" file).

Moreover, check the reference section of your paper and revise it very carefully based on the attachment ("IER journal-format" file).

Please check it until 1 May 2022.

Activate Windows
Go to Settings to activate Windows.



IER

Away



Compose

- Mail
- Inbox
- Starred
- Snoozed

- Chat +
- Spaces +

No spaces yet
Create or find a space

- Meet
- New meeting
- My meetings

14 of many

**IER-202007-1006907 for pub in 2022-2 External Inbox x

IER Journal <ier@ut.ac.ir>
to me

Sun, May 8, 3:31 AM

Dear Dr. Waspodo Tjipto Subroto

The final version should be in **Microsoft word**; to page designer can change it to the format of our journal.
So please send a Microsoft word file.

Thanks and Regards,
Executive Manager
Iranian Economic Review (IER) Journal
Hamideh Mirhosseinzadeh

On 2022-04-28 10:39, Waspodo Tjipto Subroto wrote:

Dear Editor of IER

I sent final revision of my manuscript for publish in your journal.
Thank you very much.

Best regards

Activate Windows
Go to Settings to activate Windows.



IER

Away



Compose

10 of many

Iranian Economic Review
to me, waspodotjipto

Tue, Jul 5, 3:45 AM

- Mail
- Inbox
- Starred
- Snoozed

- Chat
- Spaces



No spaces yet
Create or find a space

- Meet
- New meeting
- My meetings

Manuscript ID: IER-202007-1006907 (R5)

Manuscript Title: **Does Funding Decentralization Can Influence The Local Economic Growth?**

Authors: Waspodo Tjipto Subroto, Imam Baidlowi Baidlowi

Dear **Dr. Waspodo Tjipto Subroto**

Your paper will be published in 2022-2, and your paper still needs revision. Therefore, please answer your paper's comments in the attachment by **Saturday, 9 July 2022.**

Thanks and Regards,

Executive Manager
Iranian Economic Review (IER) Journal
Hamideh Mirhosseinzadeh

Activate Windows
Go to Settings to activate Windows.

Print PDF

Article Acceptance Certificate

This certificate confirms that the following paper has been accepted for publication in
Iranian Economic Review

Title: Does Funding Decentralization Can Influence The Local Economic Growth?

ID: IER-202007-1006907 (R5)

Authors: Waspodo Tjipto Subroto, Imam Baidlowi Baidlowi

Submit Date: 01 July 2020

Accept Date: 30 June 2022

Abbasinejad, Hossein

Editor-in-Chief of Iranian Economic Review

Activate Windows
Go to Settings to activate Windows

Got it!

This website uses cookies to ensure you get the best experience on our website.



IER

Away



Compose

10 of many

Iranian Economic Review
to me, waspodotjipto

Tue, Jul 5, 3:45 AM

- Mail
- Inbox
- Starred
- Snoozed

- Chat
- Spaces



No spaces yet
Create or find a space

- Meet
- New meeting
- My meetings

Manuscript ID: IER-202007-1006907 (R5)

Manuscript Title: **Does Funding Decentralization Can Influence The Local Economic Growth?**

Authors: Waspodo Tjipto Subroto, Imam Baidlowi Baidlowi

Dear **Dr. Waspodo Tjipto Subroto**

Your paper will be published in 2022-2, and your paper still needs revision. Therefore, please answer your paper's comments in the attachment by **Saturday, 9 July 2022.**

Thanks and Regards,

Executive Manager
Iranian Economic Review (IER) Journal
Hamideh Mirhosseinzadeh

Activate Windows
Go to Settings to activate Windows.



My Home / Author / Submissions with a Decision

#	Manuscript ID	Manuscript Type	Manuscript Title	Submit Date	Current Status	Modify Date	Email	Manuscript Main File	Acceptance Certificate
1	IER-202007-1006907 (R5)	Research Paper	Does Funding Decentralization Can Influence The Local Economic Growth?	2020-07-01	Accepted to Online Publish	2022-07-16			
2	IER-202007-1006912	Research Paper	REGIONAL AUTONOMY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT TO FOSTER GROWTH FOR WELFARE SOCIETY: Empirical Studies in East Java, Indonesia	2020-07-30	Manuscript Rejected	2020-08-04			
3	IER-202007-1006923	Research Paper	EMPOWERING SMALL MEDIUM ENTERPRISES TO IMPROVE ECONOMIC GROWTH	2020-07-30	Manuscript Rejected	2020-11-03			

Activate Windows
Go to Settings to activate Windows

This website uses cookies to ensure you get the best experience on our website.

Got it!

Does Funding Decentralization Can Influence The Local Economic Growth?

Waspodo Tjipto Subroto
Senior Lecturer in Universitas Negeri Surabaya
Corresponding: waspodosubroto@unesa.ac.id

Imam Baidlowi
Lecturer in Universitas Islam Mojopahit Mojokerto
Email: imambaidlowi@unim.ac.id

ABSTRACT

Experiences often by many countries slowing economic growth as a result of central government-centered funding policies. The concern about slowing economic growth is motivating the need for a decentralized policy in development funding to foster economic growth. The research aims to describe the policy influence of the decentralization of funding sources between central and local governments to foster economic growth in East Java. This research method uses an explanation design with a quantitative approach. Data panels are collected from 38 cities/counties among 2009 to 2018 years, in East Java, with analysis using regression technique with SPSS version 23. The results of this study showed that decentralization of funding sources can increase significantly on local economic activities and affect the increase of local economic growth. Increasing local economic activity can significantly increase economic growth. While local growing of economics can significantly increased on welfare for society in East Java. These findings remind the importance of the policy that decentralized funding will contribute positively to the growth of local economies. More importantly, if the local government in total regulates the sources of fiscal income and effective expenditure, decentralized funding will be able to encourage the growth of the local economy, which will eventually improve the welfare of the people in East Java.

Keyword: Funding Decentralization; Regional Autonomiy; Local Economic Growth; Welfare Society.

JEL Classifications: E6, O1

I. INTRODUCTION

Structured and functioning of local government has a greater role in facilitating the prosperity and stability of nations. The power of local government structure in itself depends upon the institutional design that distributes the power and functions among the different stages of governance. Ganaie (2018) says, at the important functionally that depicts the depth of a regional is the mechanism by which the funding responsibilities are shared by these levels of government. Furthermore, a greates to deal at political and economics decentralisation have taked place in the development of the world.

Funding decentralization may be indeed has a direct effect in economics development but the theoretical underpinnings for this relationship remain largely undeveloped. Robert (2003) says, implement fund decentralization programs on the basic of improving the rate of economic growth. In the fact, funding decentralization simply means empowering local source to collect their own taxes, on expenditure and investment activities among others independent of the central government, with the degree of autonomy varying from countries. The better knowing about

mechanization through while funding decentralization can be leading for growth in economy efficiencies for the calling funding decentralized theories. In the fact, right to information foster advanced and a more insighted in the preferred from citizenship, regional governance and more capabilities and national governance for the province of social good or social serviced to the needed for local society. According to Rodriguez (2011), if about to possible economy enhancement link to the funding decentralized to increase the better and the more about heterogeneous of country. Furthermore, in homogenous country for to information about profit and benefited for conducted policy and provided public expenditure or social service governance in the counties and cities. Enhancement of funding decentralized increasing for internalization of heterogeneities made the individuality preference better to diversified for increased local economic activities.

The province East of Java very interested to implementation of funding decentralization for increased local economic growth with goal to foster welfare society. According to BAPPENAS (2004), East Java province is keen to implement decentralized funding for the increase of local economic growth with the aim to encourage welfare society. According to BAPPENAS (2004), East Java is a province that has the largest autonomous region in Indonesia. For that province it is interesting to research the impact of decentralized funding on the economic growth. Although it has the largest region in autonomy, it also has differences in region characteristics and faces various problems. According to the Central Bureau of Statistics (2015), an indicator of economic development in East Java was strengthened by some research that results showed that fiscal decentralization brings better economic growth. This is different from some other provinces that indicate it has not been able to bring towards better economic growth. In fact, there is a view that the decentralization of funding in Indonesia is only related to the relationship between central and local governments without a positive influence in the economic growth.

Funding decentralization is very supporting toward local economic growth in East of Java, Indonesia. According to Morozov (2016), theories and practical experiences known that local economic activities is correlation with funding decentralization policy and to increase local economic development. Regularly of this local economic activities, in the Number 32, year 1999 explained about law of regional autonomy, were revised in Article 33 to 34 of Act No. 33 of 2004 include local economic activities in regional government. Felix (2015) says, the use of local economic activities, can be foster is local economic growth. Therefore, funding decentralization should get priority for manage budget and expenditure government for flexibilities to local economic activities. In addition, East of Java is needed to improved and to increased about local economic activities for local economic growth.

According to Baskaran (2016), literature theories of funding decentralization has indicator several channels through which governance decentralisation can be effects in the economics development. Policy of funding decentralization in East of Java, can be support toward local economic activities, so will be foster local economic growth. Noor (2014) says, management funds in regional autonomy implementation is effective to increase local economic growth in regional government. According to Rodriguez (2011), if argumentation of backed that potentialy is positived correlation between funding decentralized and economy performed is base in the chapter of simplified premised. Funding decentralization policy can be simplified to manage funds and economic activities, with hope can be increased local economic activities and than can be improving for local economic growth. So, research about funding decentralization in East of Java is very importance to foster local economic growth through increase local economic activities for welfare society. However, Ministry of Finance (2017) says, the interaction of funding

decentralization and the dynamicality of local economics developing is still not clear, so decentralisation leads for the faster dividends for developmental reform in better areas, with national allowances.

Urgency of this research, can be provide useful explanation about information of funding decentralization policy in the specifies assessment which to preferenced of currently and funding tol public expenditure between regional and crossing countries in the East of Java for mattered of local economics development, focused in the precised about impacted of decentralization of economics development, and welfare society. How much importance of funding decentralization for increase local economic growth, will be explanation in this research. Policy of regional autonomy can be simplified to manage funding in the counties and cities with hope to increase local economic activitaly and can be local economics developemnt in the East of Java.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Funding Decentralization

Theories of the funding decentralized have intended for better in the support of positived the impact in granted the greating finance autonomus and transfered resourched to sub-national stage of governance between allocating and producing efficiencies and economics development. Acoording to Rodriguez (2011), the argumentation in the back of the potency positived correlation both funding decentralized and economy performanced is base in a stage of simplified premised. In the fact, about premised in this funding decentralized implication for mobilized of resourcing. Regional governance, for the simply factual and to be greating autonomus of funding, is complement for mobilized the resourcing in they territories, fathermore waiting for solution and for the provisioning of social assets and social serviced to become for a central governance, and better remoted, and authorities. The leading to the greater emphasised in economy efficiencies crossing regional and local territories any given countries or the tapped in otherwised maybe has untapped potency.

The possible economy enhancement linked to the funding decentralized theories for increaing of the large with the more about heterogenities in countries. However about smallled of homogenous country for information profit and the benefit for conducted policy and provided social assets and social services in the regional area maybe are limited, the enhancement of funding decentralized to increased are internally heterogen made individually about preference and more diversified. Perspective of this potential, can be significanted profit and benefited for funding decentralized have be able full expectation and a certained countries.

Decentralization can be brings in potential profit and benefits where situation economics of scale existences. It the case the about that is often the costing from produced was certained publics expenditure and tendeds to rised significant which sized. According Andreas (2019), funding decentralisation is definetion as local about spending on educations, healthy or society protect as a shared of generally governance spending in each policies respective. In this particular that is true if the deliveries of public expenditure and social service is done by larged, the remoted and often not efficiencies for central bureaucracy. They bureaucracy are frequently less good to suite to delivery specifics public expenditure better efficiencies and than the better supple regional governsnce, are consequences of they closed to the peoples and they morer knowing of they needs. Local deliveries also shorted supplies chains and alleviation costs, potential for generating greaters economics efficiencies and event alleviation to the risks correlated with the losses of distributive powered of the centrals governance (Ezcurra and Pascual, 2008). However, the interaction about decentralisation toward local economic developing dinamica remain uncleared. According to Hill

(2016), funding decentralization leading to a reformation in divide of better fash to mor development in local government, with attendance national profitabilities and benefits. The impact from spatial equality is very determinant to increased local economic growth.

Literature theories about funding decentralisation have indicator similar the channel where governance decentralisation can effectly local development economics. According to Baskaran (2016), most of the theories about funding decentralisation take to focused in the efficiencies aspect of the provisioning of public service decentralisation, and than funding decentralisation can be foster economics development by enhanced the abilities of the political systemic to innovative and implement reformations. In cases, some experts gave the argumentation for funding decentralisation to foster government ineffective and inefficiencies, and hereby can alleviation growing. The some research has sought to identifies the decentralized effect on development economics in the empiric for over the post two decades. However, the between decentralisation and the dynamica of local economics growth have relationship remained unclear. Decentralization leads to a faster dividend development reform in the better of the Regionals government, with a national allowances officer.

Hypothesis 1. Funding decentralization will cause more to local economic activities.

B. Local Economic Growth

Economic growth may cause living standards to improve. Growth is the fundamental objective of a society because it lifts people out of poverty and enhances the quality of their lives. In particular, Subroto (2015) says, ensuring steady economic growth is very important to build long term poverty reduction. Briefly stated, positive improvement in macroeconomic indicators are influenced by positive rates of economic growth. However, economic growth may also erode traditional values and lead to exploitation, environmental destruction, and corruption (Case, Fair and Oster, 2011). Therefore, examination of the economic growth across countries has become one of the important study subject over the last decades (Deliktas, 2016). Economic growth is mainly depends on having more resources or policy of macroeconomics, using available resources or policy of macroeconomics, more efficiently, technological change (or advance), and good governance. Therefore, the main aim to analyze the relationship between regional autonomy efficiency and economic growth, the input efficiency and its effect on economic growth have recently received a great deal of attention from academia. Input efficiency analyses are generally studied by academic or expert and are aimed to optimize the regional policy and economic growth, is mutually effect for welfare society.

The relationship between regional autonomy and economic growth has been theoretically sinergys supported. While conventional wisdom predicts a growth-enhancing effect of autonomy, recent developments suggest that policies autonomy is not always beneficial to economic growth. Zahonogo (2016) says, to foster economic growth by policies the diffusion of resources and economic potencial in the regional. Traditional policy theory predicts growth gains from regionaization at the country level through decentralization, specialization, investment in innovation, productivity improvement, or enhanced resource allocation. The role of autonomy policy in economic growth has been a key matter of debate in the growing theories. The neoclassical growth models consider regional autonomy change as endogenous and support that, consequently, autonomy policies can be impact in economic growth. However, new economic growth theories assume that policy change is an endogenous variable and that regional policies can be combined with those on welfare society.

It remains open to question whether policy of decentralization or autonomy regional drives

economic growth or economic growth drives policy about decentralization policy. Of course, there is also the possibility that the two variables are mutually causal. According Messaoud (2014), numerous potential growth determinants have been identified over the years. The interaction of decentralisation regulations toward economic development is very mutually benefited and profited. A number of studies does not deal with the effect of decentralization regulation on economic growth directly but instead focuses on the effect of decentralization regulation on one of the economy development drivers. In the current economic policy, growth remains a key government priority. The literature on economic growth has turned to the effects of country's political, legal, economic and social institutions on wealth and long-term growth.

Hypothesis 2. Local economic activities will lead to increased local economic growth.

C. Welfare Society

Welfare society is a complex functional system of relationships which incorporates certain values, objectives, intentions, the general program of tool and local government, and the implementation of one or another attitude to definite conditions of behavior and activity. Dimension of welfare form the system of objective and subjective relations to ontological spaces all people are involved in. According Anikina (2015), the suggested model of welfare studying and estimating, the source of activity and development economic to cross-systems interactions. The specificity of subdominant can be found out through the content of emotional and estimating grounds that additional a multidirectional society to the subject behavior. The interconnection and combination of these components define the degree of implementation of man's demands, stability of the social status, life satisfaction, confidence in future, emotional attitude to being. Welfare society is model being designed considering the existing international approaches and national or regional characteristic features. This will provide a wide use of this model at national and regional, or local levels and also the qualitative analysis of the major welfare parameters for all peoples in the world.

Increasing economic activity could imply future costs, costs that must be paid sooner or later. The payment of these costs are more likely to become accumulated over generations like debt. So, a share of production output must be used to offset the costs of economy activity and defensive costs. According Marques (2016), share of production output must be used to offset the costs of economy activity, the so-called defensive costs. Private consumption measures society's wellbeing through the available income of families, because the acquisition of more money by wealthy families creates less well-being than it does for poor families.


The modern international models of welfare and those of all people are represented by integral indices based on socioeconomic. Mankiw (2009) says, objective indicators, and, partially, on data of sociological inquires that reflect the subjective estimation conducted in many countries of the world. International indicators and rankings of all people welfare estimation, their comparison, enhancement and disenchantment are described in many scientific papers. (Sebnem, 2010). Integral indices denote the ratio between the set of phenomena comprising heterogeneous, disparate elements and are used to form suitable and efficient methods and tools for measuring phenomena of any nature including socioeconomic. Integral indices allow the unequivocal interpretation of the phenomenon under study and are valuable both from research and management points of view. In the theory of the development of man and other related fields of economy such local economic, quality of living, poverty, and health.

Hypothesis 3. Local economic growth will be foster economic development for welfare society.

D. Conceptual Framework.

Schematic of thinking in this research is the result of correlation policy about funding decentralization toward local economic activities and local economic growth for supported welfare society. Than, it's can be used to describe about role of funding decentralization policy to accelerate development economics in local or regional area in East of Java. Schematic of this research will be clarify about conceptually thinking in figure 1 as follows.

Figure 1: Conceptual of Thinking in the Research.



III. METHODS OF RESEARCH.

This research used explanatory correlation of variables of funds decentralization, local economy activities and local economic growth of 38 county/cities in East of Java. The counties and cities on East of Java is: 1.Pacitan, 2.Ponorogo, 3.Trenggalek, 4.Tulungagung, 5.Blitar, 6.Kediri, 7.Malang, 8.Lumajang, 9.Jember, 10.Banyuwangi, 11.Bondowoso, 12.Situbondo, 13.Probolinggo, 14.Pasuruan, 15.Sidoarjo, 16.Mojokerto, 17.Jombang, 18.Nganjuk, 19.Madiun, 20.Magetan, 21.Ngawi, 22.Bojonegoro, 23.Tuban, 24.Lamongan, 25. Gresik, 26. Bangkalan, 27.Sampang, 28.Pamekasan, 29.Sumenep. And the Cities is: 30.Kediri, 31.Blitar, 32.Malang, 33.Probolinggo, 34.Pasuruan, 35.Mojokerto, 37.Madiun, 37.Surabaya, and 38.Batu. Counties and cities in East of Java, as well as increasing local economics growth to improve welfare society. In this studies have design as a crossed-sectional studies, because the design crossed-sectional is usually used in with descriptived and explanatories. This studies used secondary data's with

collective from the Centered of Bureau Statistic (BPS) from counties and cities in East of Java and other institutions related to the study. Research variable is independent and dependent variables. Independent variables is: (1.) Variable of funding decentralization in correlation to local economic activities (2) Variable of funding decentralization to local economic growth. (3) funding decentralization to increase welfare society. (4) funds decentralization with correlation to increased welfare society. According Sugiyono. (2013), the data's analyses use regression analyses and use the help of SPSS 23 version.

IV. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The empirical results are shown in Table 1 shows the results of the benchmark model. Funding decentralization is shown to be positively correlated with local economic activities. Funding decentralization have supporting to incresed local economic activities, such as: Output Economic, Transaction of Buying, and Business Dynamic. Performed used statistic tool with SPSS 23 version, and to showed in table 1 as follows:

Table 1. Results Regression test

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.374 ^a	.385	.136	5.750	.362	6.743	2	38	.002

a. Predictors: (Constant), Funding Decentralization, Local Economics Activities

d. Dependent Variable: Welfare Society

The result of table 1 can be seen in column R and there is a correlation coefficient (r_{xy}) = 0.374 so that it can compare with table R has a significance rate of 5% with $n = 38$ is 0.220, so knowed a arithmetics $0.374 > R$ table 0.243. With a probability of 0002, F 6.743 tests of $> F$ table 3, 85 and significant are with small and than the significant in the level ($\alpha = 0.05$), however this result will be conclusion that the decentralized funding variable are simultaneously a significant positive effect on the variables of the local economic activity. So, from the R-Square column The result 0385 means that 38.5% of the local economic activity can be a positive correlation to local economic growth and, carried out used SPSS 23 version, and there can to showe at the table 2 as follows:

Table 2. Results Regression test in Model from Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.492 ^a	.351	.129	5.750	.351	6.856	2	38	.002

a.Predictors: (Constant), Funding Decentralization and Local Economics Growth

d.Dependent Variable: Welfare Society

From table 2 above description at column R have significant correlation coefficient (R) = 0.492 so can be comparing with R table have the significant level of 5% with $n = 38$ is 0.220 so knowing with arithmetic $0492 > R$ table 0.220. In this case, with a probability of 0002, F 6.856 tests of $> F$ table 3.51 and (2-tailed) are small and than with significance level ($\alpha = 0.05$), with the result that be conclusion if decentralisation funding variables are simultaneously significant positive effects in the local economics growth variables. And from, the R-Square column of the result 0351 means

that 35.1% of local economic activities can be a positive correlation to the growth of local economies and the remainder 64.9% are influencing from variable other and not include from this studies.

Table 3. Results Regression Coefficients

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Beta	Standardized	Sig.
	B	Standard Error		Coefficients	
1 (Constant)	32.927	7.991		4.121	.000
Funding	.262	.073	.382	3.527	.001
Decentralization					
Welfare Society	.230	.095	.236	3.335	.004

a. Dependent Variable: Funding Decentralization, Local Economic Activities, Local Economic Growth..

b. Dependent Variable: Welfare Society

In the table 3 above, from the constant and simplified regression coefficient are obtaining at column B, seen there have linear regression equation is as follows $Y = 32.927 + 0.262 X_1 + 0.230 X_2 + \epsilon_0$. The meaning of this result, if a decentralisation variable is funding upgrade of unity, this result will in an foster local economic growth of 0.262 units, if the local economic growth variable is one unit, then it will result in an increase of the welfare community by 0.230 units, by discussed if this variables no influenced on the variable independent X_1 (decentralization funding) and X_2 (local economic activity), community welfare.

Data about result in the table 3 can be clarify for decentralized funding $t = 3.527$ with a probabilities values of 0.001 and comparing with in R-table at a significant rate of 5% with $n = 38$ T Test $3,709 > T$ table 1,991 and significantly small and than the significance level ($\alpha = 0.05$), until the implication coefficient X_1 (decentralized funding) with variable Y (community welfare) has a significant correlation. As for local economic growth $T = 3.335$ with a probabilities values of 0.004 and comparing with the R-table at a significant rate of 5% with $n = 38$ T Test $3,335 > T$ $T_1, 991$ and signegficant smaller than the significant level ($\alpha = 0.05$), and than the correlation coefficient of X_3 (local economimic growth) with variable Y (community welfare) is significant.

V. DISCUSSION

Regarding the impact of decentralized funding at local economics activities, local economics growth, and the foster in the welfare society's results showed that regardless of whether the provincial and city samples in East Java were utilized, decentralized funding was initially improved but ultimately withheld local economic activity and local economic growth. Analysis with the accountability and political economy towards public financing for public welfare, the intensity of this policy for public finances seems to be stronger when the policy of regional autonomy when it becomes a regulation for local economic activities. (Aviral, 2014; Baskaran, 2016). A logical conclusion, is that higher accountabilities and increased public finances have been proven to occur with decentralized funding, and some are not necessarily leading to the activities of economic freedom. Generally of this studies about correlation the funding decentralization, and simplified managing public financial, can be foster local economic activities, so there are all of variables given a positive correlation effect to increased the local economic growth of regional autonomy policy in counties and cities. That are showed, if the funding decentralization policy can

be able to increased welfare society.

1. Correlation Funding Decentralization Toward Local Economic Activities.

Preferred to public expenditure to the determinant of public expenditure is expectation for has a higher impacted at sequential development. However, preferred for public expenditure may be determinant in economics development. Its showed at figure above, about resulted in that analyses allowed to partially qualified our previously finds. According to Andreas (2019), with respected to the degree of decentralized of currently expenditure, our estimated reveal the presenced of an inverted shaped linking between there variables and economic development. The causality under studies is positived if the level of decentralized of publics expenditure to increased for related lower level, but beyond a certaining thresholds it turned negative. Martinez (2007) says, that raised the possibilities of used the decentralized of public expenditure at a meaning to increased economic development at the relatively centrals country, but also highlight the economics risk correlation with increasing at public expenditure on highly decentralized country. According to Park (2019), Strengthening local taxation power, a decentralised income can better serve the purpose of local economic development than simply loosening the restriction of inter-governmental transfer, because of the public expenditure that determines decentralized funding. Nicola (2016) said, at the city and district level, however, no Pro-growth effect exists; We instead find partial evidence in favor of inverse causality – economic growth for democratic in decentralization. To contrast about it, resulted in the existing decentralization rate of budget expenditure doesn't not given any proof non-linear related to development. (Irfan, 2008; Irina, 2015; Ivankina, 2013) on the coefficients of this variable it is all negative cases and statistical significance, as is the case with a decentralized funding measurement employ.

According to Samimi (2910), they are finding that fiscal decentralization has a positive effect on Iran's economic growth. An important feature of public expenditure is that the function and the relative expenditure of the stocks of the subnational government vary greatly from country to country and they reflect tradition and inertia as many or more of the best principles. On the other hand, another dominant characteristic of developing countries is the concentration of education and health expenditure on the subnational level divided by many other countries, especially in terms of education. The division of public expenditure between currently and budget expenditures affected the coefficiented of politically and administrative decentralized. According to Schneider's (2003) indexing, the degrees of politically decentralized now showed to exertice a positive influencing at economic development, whole the degree of administrative decentralized is not statistical significant in more case. At this correlation of politically decentralized in the economic development is sensitives for the choiced of indexing used. According to Hooghe (2008) indexed, the impacted of politically decentralized is marginal negative or significantly, which controllied for the funding decentralized of currented expenditure, is positive and significant, when controlled for public expenditure (Table 1). At in the cases of the resulted reported in Tables 2 and 3, the effected of this variables from economics growth is contingencies at there measurement of decentralized use regulating. (Ahmad, 2013; Dobrovic, 2016; Daniela, 2016).

2. Correlation Local Economic Activities To Foster Local Economic growth

Preferences for funding decentralization among regional governments affected the linked both politic and funding decentralized and local economics development and that this relationship in once again, contingented in the choiced of indicators. Schneider (2003) says, politically decentralized on positive and significant associating with local economic growth in the counties adn cities of territorial and a preferences for funding decentralization on local economics growth.

According to Hooghe (2008) index, on political decentralized is negative correlation in economic performance in the preferred for social expenditure, health, social service, education and social asset, in the cases of preferred not for local economic development.

Threaded on the fine level or considered about impact of the sub-national sharing in local government can support local economic growth, and welfare society to complete the development economic and welfare society in the regional or county and cities. These correlation about funding decentralization indicators are included as explanatory variables expenditure, local economic activities and local economic growth. According Khuzaini (2006), the estimated carries out of reveal that the coefficient of these variables are positive and have correlation of variables. Todaro (2014) confirms, the existence of a positive correlation between the decentralized of there type of expenditure and the local economic activities. There are, the level of decentralized of expended on local economic activities correlation with local economic growth. And then, the empirically evidences supply in Tables 3 and 4 suggested the present of a the linear linked between there measurement of funding decentralized and local economic growth performing at the East of Java.

The basic argument of economics for decentralized funding is that it can provide greater economic efficiency in the allocation of resources in the public sector. Under the assumption that public officials respond to their constituent desires, local governments are more able to match these preferences, especially when these preferences differ across jurisdictions. According to Baskaran (2013), there is an advantage in efficiency on the increase if the taxpayer is mobile because they can migrate or sort live among the most suitable jurisdictions for those who prefer tax expenditure. Preference for differences in public spending across regions or individuals, the level of wellbeing achieved through the provision of public goods that are uniform by the central government is lower than can be achieved with decentralized provisions that allow for differences across jurisdictions. According to Odero (2004), decentralized funding is a concern that is diverted from the expenditure function and the source of tax revenue between different levels of government. Regional governance can play an important role in an efficient, there is a broad consensus that the purpose of redistribution of income and macroeconomic stability is better pursued by the central or regional government. Government activities in the market economy are primarily justified by the failure of private markets in suppressing public expenditure and externalities, and the provision of public expenditure, with the public sector, can generally increase with decentralized funding.

3. Correlation Local Economics Growth To Increased Welfare Society

Local Economic activities is the purpose to foster in local economic growth. The funding decentralization policies in regional governance is for simplified budget management and governance public financial to matching with priorities local economic activities. Overall local economic activities in the regional autonomy policy conducted has positive influence can be local economic growth. However, this local economic growth policies will adequate and follow funding decentralization management for better more to effective and efficient to increased local economic growth, and welfare society. (Anikina, 2015; Heiko, 2013; Craig, 2000).

The results reveal that estimated of funding decentralization is positive and statistically significant at level of significance, thereby implying that further funding decentralization will improve local economic growth rate which is in consistency with Bird (2010) and Corinne (2017). It means the positive effect of funding decentralization is so much strong that it outweighs the negative influence due to revenue decentralization. National governments appear to be efficient in

collecting money while subnational governments appear to be more efficient in spending it. Besides that, the increased in economics growth due to revenue decentralization may happen because of regressive revenue-raising measures that will obstruct the private investment, redtatism, favouritism and corruption. According Dunnell (2019), it will lead to diversion of resources from the productive to the unproductive sectors of economy.

Though rich states may witness high growth over the period of time, but that may be well below their potential in relation to resource use. According Ivankina (2015), the funding decentralization will enhance the infrastructure of states that will incentivize the private sector to increase their economics activities, and hence the rate of economics growth will increase. It will lead to increase in resource utilization especially in the case of regional autonomy policy. Ramez (2001) says, funding decentralization and its relationship with local economic growth has been a major focus of discussion in both developed and developing regional autonomy within the context of public financial. In the assumed that funding decentralization would improve efficiency in the local government and local production of public goods and hence local economic growth to foster welfare society.(Soejoto, 2015; David, 2006; Durana, 2015; Robert, 2013). So, funding decentralization can be increased local economic activities and local economic growth to foster welafare society.

V. CONCLUSSION

The results of this study show that funding decentralization have significant effect on local economic activities and can affect the increase of local economic growth. However, local economic activities and local economic growth can improve people's welfare. The positive correlation between funding decentralization and local economic growth has been able to significantly and consistently to increased the welfare of the people in East Java. These findings emphasize that the funding decentralization policy usually positively affects the growth of the local economy.

The findings also have some implications for other provinces in Indonesia, in the framework of local wisdom the decentralization policy of this funding is more effective in increasing the local economic growth in its region. The benefits of decentralized funding should be seen relative to spending or shopping for economic development in the region. The central government may be better off when making public investments with externalities in the early stages of economic development. More importantly, if the local government can manage the total fiscal income following the maximum economic development expenditure, with further decentralization of funding to encourage local economic growth, thereby improving the welfare of the people in East Java.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors are grateful to the Dean of Faculty of Economics, Universitas Negeri Surabaya to funding of this research. Also to thank for Indra Patmoko for analyses data, and my student's anonymous to collected data of this studies.

REFERENCES

Ahmad Jafari Samimi, Gholamreza Keshavarz HaddadGholamreza, and M. Alizadeh (2010). Fiscal Decentralization and Economic Growth in Iran. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*. 4(11). Pp. 5490-5495.

Ahmad Danu Prasetyo and Ubaidillah Zuhdi. (2013). The Government Expenditure Efficiency towards the Human Development. *Procedia Economics and Finance*. 5 Pp. 615 – 622.

Andreas PK and Oriol RS. 2019. Local Decentralization and the Quality of Public Services in Europe. *Social Indicators Research*. 145 pp. 755–776.

Anikina, E., Ivankina, L., Gumennikov, I., Kashchuk, I., Monastyrny, E. (2015). A Study of Welfare of Older People at National Research Tomsk Polytechnic University. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* Volume 214. Pp. 906 – 910.

Aviral Kumar Tiwari and Muhammad Shahbaz. (2014). Does financial development increase rural-urban income inequality?. *International Journal of Social Economics*. Vol. 40 Issue: 2, pp.151-168, <https://doi.org/10.1108/03068291311283616>

Baskaran, T, Feld, L.P., & Schnellenbach, J (2016). Fiscal Federalism, Decentralization, and Economic Growth: A Meta-Analysis. *Economic Inquiry*, 54(3), 1445-1463

Baskaran, T, & Feld, L.P.(2013). Fiscal Decentralization, and Economic Growth in OCED Countries: Is There a Relationship?: *Public Finance Review*, 41(14), 421-445.

Bird N, Richard & Vaillance,. (2010). *Funding Decentralization from Developing Country*. Jakarta: Rosdakarya.

BAPENAS dan UNDP. (2004). *Human Development Index Report, Economics Democratic cost of Human Development Index Indonesia*. Jakarta. BAPPENAS

Central Bureau of Statistics. (2015). *Analyses of Macro Indicator from East of Java*. Surabaya: BPS East Java Indonesia

Corinne Blanquart1 & Martin Koning. (2017). The local economic impacts of high-speed railways: theories and facts. *Euro Transportation. Res. Rev.* (2017) 9: 12. DOI 10.1007/s12544-017-0233-0

Case, K.E., Fair, E., Oster, S.C. (2011). *Principles of Microeconomics*. Prentice Hall. 10th Edition.

Craig Young & Sylwia Kaczmarek. (2000). Local government, local economic development and quality of life in Poland. *GeoJournal*. 50: 225–234

David M and Keith Willet. (2006). Local Economic Performance and Election Outcomes. *Atlantic Economic Journal*. 34: 219-232

Deliktas, E and Gunal, GG. (2016). Economic Growth and Input Use Efficiency in Low, Upper – Middle and High Incomed Countries (1991-2011): A Data Envelopment Analysis. *Procedia Economics and Finance*. Volume 38. Pp. 308 – 317

Dobrovič Jána. (2015). Regional Development of small and medium-Sized Enterprises (SMEs) in the Prešov region with Focus on Tourism. *Procedia Economics and Finance*. 34. 594 – 599

Daniela Mihaela Neamtu. (2016). Education, the economic development pillar. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 180 (2015) 413 – 420

Dunnell K (2009) 'National Statistician's article: measuring regional economic performance'. *Economic & Labour Market Review* 3(1), pp 18–30.

Durana, DC and Gogana, ALM. (2015). The objectives of sustainable development - ways to achieve Welfare. *Procedia Economics and Finance*. Volume 26. Pp. 812 – 817

Ezcurra, R., Pascual, P. (2008) The link between fiscal decentralization and regional disparities: Evidence from several European Union countries. *Environment and Planning*. 40: 1185–1201.

Felix Moses Edoho, (2015) "Entrepreneurship and socioeconomic development: Catalyzing African transformation in the 21st century", *African Journal of Economic and Management Studies*, Vol. 6. Issue: 2, pp.127-147, <https://doi.org/10.1108/AJEMS-03-2013-0030>

Ganaie, AA, Baht SA, Kamaiah, B. 2018. Fiscal Decentralization and Economic Growth: Evidence from Indian. *Macroeconomics South Asian Journal*. Vol 7 (1) 83–108. SAGE Pblcation.

Hooghe, L., Marks, G., Schakel, A.H. (2008) Regional authority in 42 democracies, 1950–2006: a measure and five hypotheses. *Regional and Federal Studies*, 18: 111–302.

Hill, H. & Vidyattama, Y. (2016). Regional Development Dynamic in Indonesia Before and After The Big Bang Decentralization: *The Singapore Economic review*. 61(02), 1640027

Heiko T. Burreta and Lars P. Feld. (2013). Fiscal Institutions in Germany. *Swiss Society of Economics and Statistics*. Vol. 149 (2) 249–290

Irfan Ahmed. Claudio Socci, Francesca Severini, Rosita Pretaroli. (2008). Fiscal policy for households and public budget constraint in Italy. *Econ Politica*. 36:19–35

Irina Arhipovaa and Liga Paura. (2015). Regional development and private consumption structure in Latvia. *Procedia Economics and Finance* 26. 86 – 91

Ivankina, L.L. & Lotova, E.V. (2013). Civil society and social network: on the issue of relationship. *Bulletin of the Tomsk Polytechnic University*. Volume 6. Pp. 236.

Ivankina, L.L and Latygovskaya, T. (2015). Modern social welfare in the light of the sustainability model. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. Volume 166. Pp. 111 – 115.

Khuzaini, Muhammad. (2006), *Decentralizations Financing Study: Influence to Publics Economics, Grow and welfared societies. Study in East of Java*. Disertation University of Brawijaya.

Marques, AC and Fuinhas, JA, Gaspar, JS. (2016) On the nexus of energy use economic

development: a panel approach. *Energy Procedia*. Volume 106. Pp. 225 – 234.

Martinez-Vasquez., and R. McNab. (2007). *Fiscal Decentralization, Economic Growth, and Democratic*. Washington: Longmann Inc.

Morozov B (2016). Decentralization: operationalization and measurement model. *International Journal Organization Theory Behaviour*. 19(3) : 275–307

Morozov ,B. (2017). Decentralization and economic growth: specification, measurement, and direction of causal relationship. *International Journal Public Administration*. 41(9):684–699.

Ministry of Finance of the Republic of Indonesia, (2017). *Transfer Policy to Local and Village Funds*. Jakarta: Director General of Fiscal Balance.

Nicola Boccellaa and Irene Salerno. (2016). Creative Economy, Cultural Industries and Local Development. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 223. Pp.291 – 296.

Noor Suzilawati Rabe*, Mariana Mohamed Osman, Syahirah Bachok. (2014). Economics of Local People: Iskandar, Malaysia. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 153. Pp. 463 – 478.

Odero, K.K. (2004). *Decentralized Contexts: Comparative Lessons on Local Planning and Fiscal Dimensions*, Washington, DC: World Bank Publications.

Park, S Park, M-G, & Nam, K-M (2019). Growth Effect of Fiscal Decentralization with Weak Economic Motivation: The case of South Korea. *The Annal of regional Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00168-019-00936-9>

Ramez Abubakar Badeeb, Hooi Lean. (2017) . Financial development, oil dependence and economic growth: Evidence from the Republic of Yemen", *Studies in Economics and Finance*, Vol. 34. Issue: 2, pp.281-298, <https://doi.org/10.1108/SEF-07-2014-0137>.

Rodriguez-Pose, A. & Ezcurra, R (2010). Is Fiscal Decentralization harmful for Economic growth?. Evidence from the OECD countries. *Journal of Economic Geography*. 11(4). 619-643.

Robert M. McNab. (2003). Fiscal Decentralization and Economic Growth. *World Development*. Vol. 31, No. 9, pp. 1597–1616.

Todaro, Michael P. dan Stephen C. Smith. (2014). Economic Development (*The Pearson Series in Economics*). Philadelphia:Longman Inc.

Mankiw, N. Gregory. (2009). *Macroeconomics, 4Th Edition*. New York: Worth Publisher.

Sebnem Oguz and Jonathan Knight. (2010). Regional economic indicators A focus on regional gross value added using shiftshare analysis. *Economic & Labour Market Review*. Vol 4 (8). Pp. 1-17

Subroto, W.T. (2015). Revitalization of Pancasila Economic System in the Globalization Era. *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*. Volume 5 (4), Pp.1-8.

Sugiyono. (2013). *Methods of Administration Reseach*. Bandung: Alfabeta. Bandung.

Soejoto A, Subroto, W.T, Suyanto. (2015). Fiscal Decentralization Policy in Promoting Indonesia Human Development. *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*. Vol 5 (3), 763-771.

Zahonogo, Pam. (2016). Trade and economic growth in developing countries: Evidence from sub-Saharan Africa. *Journal of African Trade*. Volume 3. Pp. 41–56.

Does Funding Decentralization Can Influence The Local Economic Growth?

Waspodo Tjipto Subroto*¹,
Imam Baidlowi²

ABSTRACT

Experiences often by many countries slowing economic growth as a result of central government-centered funding policies. The concern about slowing economic growth is motivating the need for a decentralized policy in development funding to foster economic growth. The research aims to describe the policy influence of the decentralization of funding sources between central and local governments to foster economic growth in East Java. This research method uses an explanation design with a quantitative approach. Data panels are collected from 38 cities/counties among 2009 to 2018 years, in East Java, with analysis using regression technique with SPSS version 23. The results of this study showed that decentralization of funding sources can increase significantly on local economic activities and affect the increase of local economic growth. Increasing local economic activity can significantly increase economic growth. While local growing of economics can significantly increased on welfare for society in East Java. These findings remind the importance of the policy that decentralized funding will contribute positively to the growth of local economies. More importantly, if the local government in total regulates the sources of fiscal income and effective expenditure, decentralized funding will be able to encourage the growth of the local economy, which will eventually improve the welfare of the people in East Java.

Keyword: Funding Decentralization; Regional Autonomiy; Local Economic Growth; Welfare Society.

JEL Classifications: E6, O1

I. INTRODUCTION

Structured and functioning of local government has a greater role in facilitating the prosperity and stability of nations. The power of local government structure in itself depends upon the institutional design that distributes the power and functions among the different stages of governance. Ganaie (2018) says, at the important functionality that depicts the depth of a regional is the mechanism by which the funding responsibilities are shared by these levels of government. Furthermore, a greates to deal at political and economics decentralisation have taken place in the development of the world.

Funding decentralization may be indeed has a direct effect in economics development but the theoretical underpinnings for this relationship remain largely undeveloped. Robert (2003) says, implement fund decentralization programs on the basic of improving the rate of economic

1. Faculty of Economic, Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Indonesia. (Corresponding Author: waspodosubroto@unesa.ac.id)

2. Faculty of Economic, Universitas Islam Mojopahit, Mojokerto, Indonesia. (imambaidlowi@unim.ac.id)

growth. In the fact, funding decentralization simply means empowering local source to collect their own taxes, on expenditure and investment activities among others independent of the central government, with the degree of autonomy varying from countries. The better knowing about mechanization through while funding decentralization can be leading for growth in economy efficiencies for the calling funding decentralized theories. In the fact, right to information foster advanced and a more insightful in the preferred from citizenship, regional governance and more capabilities and national governance for the province of social good or social services to the needed for local society. According to Rodriguez (2011), if about to possible economy enhancement link to the funding decentralized to increase the better and the more about heterogeneity of country. Furthermore, in homogeneous country for to information about profit and benefited for conducted policy and provided public expenditure or social service governance in the counties and cities. Enhancement of funding decentralized increasing for internalization of heterogeneities made the individuality preference better to diversified for increased local economic activities.

The province East of Java very interested to implementation of funding decentralization for increased local economic growth with goal to foster welfare society. According to BAPPENAS (2004), East Java province is keen to implement decentralized funding for the increase of local economic growth with the aim to encourage welfare society. According to BAPPENAS (2004), East Java is a province that has the largest autonomous region in Indonesia. For that province it is interesting to research the impact of decentralized funding on the economic growth. Although it has the largest region in autonomy, it also has differences in region characteristics and faces various problems. According to the Central Bureau of Statistics (2015), an indicator of economic development in East Java was strengthened by some research that results showed that fiscal decentralization brings better economic growth. This is different from some other provinces that indicate it has not been able to bring towards better economic growth. In fact, there is a view that the decentralization of funding in Indonesia is only related to the relationship between central and local governments without a positive influence in the economic growth.

Funding decentralization is very supporting toward local economic growth in East of Java, Indonesia. According to Morozov (2016), theories and practical experiences known that local economic activities is correlation with funding decentralization policy and to increase local economic development. Regularly of this local economic activities, in the Number 32, year 1999 explained about law of regional autonomy, were revised in Article 33 to 34 of Act No. 33 of 2004 include local economic activities in regional government. Felix (2015) says, the use of local economic activities, can be foster is local economic growth. Therefore, funding decentralization should get priority for manage budget and expenditure government for flexibilities to local economic activities. In addition, East of Java is needed to improved and to increased about local economic activities for local economic growth.

According to Baskaran (2016), literature theories of funding decentralization has indicator several channels through which governance decentralisation can be effects in the economic development. Policy of funding decentralization in East of Java, can be support toward local economic activities, so will be foster local economic growth. Noor (2014) says, management funds in regional autonomy implementation is effective to increase local economic growth in regional government. According to Rodriguez (2011), if argumentation of backed that potentially is positive correlation between funding decentralized and economy performance is base in the chapter of simplified premise. Funding decentralization policy can be simplified to manage

funds and economic activities, with hope can be increased local economic activities and than can be improving for local economic growth. So, research about funding decentralization in East of Java is very importance to foster local economic growth through increase local economic activities for welfare society. However, Ministry of Finance (2017) says, the interaction of funding decentralization and the dynamically of local economics developing is still not clear, so decentralisation leads for the faster dividends for developmental reform in better areas, with national allowances.

Urgency of this research, can be provide useful explanation about information of funding decentralization policy in the specifies assessment which to preferenced of currently and funding tol public expenditure between regional and crossing countries in the East of Java for mattered of local economics development, focused in the precised about impacted of decentralization of economics development, and welfare society. How much importance of funding decentralization for increase local economic growth, will be explanation in this research. Policy of regional autonomy can be simplified to manage funding in the counties and cities with hope to increase local economic activitically and can be local economics developemnt in the East of Java.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Funding Decentralization

Theories of the funding decentralized have intended for better in the support of positived the impact in granted the greating finance autonomous and transfered resourched to sub-national stage of governance between allocating and producing efficiencies and economics development. Acoording to Rodriguez (2011), the argumentation in the back of the potency positived correlation both funding decentralized and economy performanced is base in a stage of simplified premised. In the fact, about premised in this funding decentralized implication for mobilized of resourcing. Regional governance, for the simply factual and to be greating autonomous of funding, is complement for mobilized the resourcing in they territories, fathermore waiting for solution and for the provisioning of social assets and social serviced to become for a central governance, and better remoted, and authorities. The leading to the greater emphasised in economy efficiencies crossing regional and local teritories any given countries or the tapped in otherwised maybe has untapped potency.

The possible economy enhancement linked to the funding decentralized theories for increaing of the large with the more about heterogenities in countries. However about smalled of homogenous country for information profit and the benefit for conducted policy and provided social assets and social services in the regional area maybe are limited, the enhancement of funding decentralized to increased are internally heterogen made individually about preference and more diversed. Perspective of this potential, can be significantated profit and benefited for funding decentralized have be able full expectation and a certained countries.

Decentralization can be brings in potential profit and benefits where situation economics of scale existences. It the case the about that is often the costing from produced was certained publics expenditure and tendeds to rised significant which sized. According Andreas (2019), funding decentralisation is definetion as local about spending on educations, healthy or society protect as a shared of generally governance spending in each policies respective. In this particular that is true if the deliveries of public expenditure and social service is done by larged, the remoted and often not efficiencies for central bureaucracy. They bureaucracy are frequently less good to suite to delivery specifics public expenditure better efficiencies and than the better

supple regional governance, are consequences of they closed to the peoples and they morer knowing of they needs. Local deliveries also shorted supplies chains and alleviation costs, potential for generating greater economics efficiencies and event alleviation to the risks correlated with the losses of distributive powered of the centrals governance (Ezcurra and Pascual, 2008). However, the interaction about decentralisation toward local economic developing dynamica remain uncleared. According to Hill (2016), funding decentralization leading to a reformation in divide of better fash to mor development in local government, with attendance national profitabilities and benefits. The impact from spatial equality is very determinant to increased local economic growth.

Literature theoreies about funding decentralisation have indicator similar the channel where governance decentralisation can effectly local development economics. According to Baskaran (2016), most of the theories about funding decentralisation take to focused in the efficiencies aspect of the provisioning of public service decentralisation, and than funding decentralisation can be foster economics development by enhanced the abilities of the political systemic to innovative and implement reformations. In cases, some experts gived the argumentation for funding decentralisation to foster government ineffective and inefficiencies, and hereby can alleviation growing. The some research has sought to identifies the decentralized effect on development economics in the empiric for over the post two decades. However, the between decentralisation and the dynamica of local economics growth have relationship remained unclear. Decentralization leads to a faster dividend development reform in the better of the Regionals government, with a national allowances officer.

Hypothesis 1. Funding decentralization will cause more to local economic activities.

B. Local Economic Growth

Economic growth may cause living standards to improve. Growth is the fundamental objective of a society because it lifts people out of poverty and enhances the quality of their lives. In particular, Subroto (2015) says, ensuring steady economic growth is very important to build long term poverty reduction. Briefly stated, positive improvement in macroeconomic indicators are influenced by positive rates of economic growth. However, economic growth may also erode traditional values and lead to exploitation, environmental destruction, and corruption (Case, Fair and Oster, 2011). Therefore, examination of the economic growth across countries has become one of the important study subject over the last decades (Deliktas, 2016). Economic growth is mainly depends on having more resources or policy of macroeconomics, using available resources or policy of macroeconomics, more efficiently, technological change (or advance), and good governance. Therefore, the main aim to analyze the relationship between regional autonomy efficiency and economic growth, the input efficiency and its effect on economic growth have recently received a great deal of attention from academia. Input efficiency analyses are generally studied by academic or expert and are aimed to optimize the regional policy and economic growth, is mutually effect for welfare society.

The relationship between regional autonomy and economic growth has been theoretically sinergys supported. While conventional wisdom predicts a growth-enhancing effect of autonomy, recent developments suggest that policies autonomy is not always beneficial to economic growth. Zahonogo (2016) says, to foster economic growth by policies the diffusion of resources and economic potencial in the regional. Traditional policy theory predicts growth gains from regionaization at the country level through decentralization, specialization, investment in innovation, productivity improvement, or enhanced resource allocation. The role of autonomy

policy in economic growth has been a key matter of debate in the growing theories. The neoclassical growth models consider regional autonomy change as endogenous and support that, consequently, autonomy policies can be impact in economic growth. However, new economic growth theories assume that policy change is an endogenous variable and that regional policies can be combined with those on welfare society.

It remains open to question whether policy of decentralization or autonomy regional drives economic growth or economic growth drives policy about decentralization policy. Of course, there is also the possibility that the two variables are mutually causal. According Messaoud (2014), numerous potential growth determinants have been identified over the years. The interaction of decentralisation regulations toward economic development is very mutually benefited and profited. A number of studies does not deal with the effect of decentralization regulation on economic growth directly but instead focuses on the effect of decentralization regulation on one of the economy development drivers. In the current economic policy, growth remains a key government priority. The literature on economic growth has turned to the effects of country's political, legal, economic and social institutions on wealth and long-term growth.

Hypothesis 2. Local economic activities will lead to increased local economic growth.

C. Welfare Society

Welfare society is a complex functional system of relationships which incorporates certain values, objectives, intentions, the general program of tool and local government, and the implementation of one or another attitude to definite conditions of behavior and activity. Dimension of welfare form the system of objective and subjective relations to ontological spaces all people are involved in. According Anikina (2015), the suggested model of welfare studying and estimating, the source of activity and development economic to cross-systems interactions. The specificity of subdominant can be found out through the content of emotional and estimating grounds that additional a multidirectional society to the subject behavior. The interconnection and combination of these components define the degree of implementation of man's demands, stability of the social status, life satisfaction, confidence in future, emotional attitude to being. Welfare society is model being designed considering the existing international approaches and national or regional characteristic features. This will provide a wide use of this model at national and regional, or local levels and also the qualitative analysis of the major welfare parameters for all peoples in the world.

Increasing economic activity could imply future costs, costs that must be paid sooner or later. The payment of these costs are more likely to become accumulated over generations like debt. So, a share of production output must be used to offset the costs of economy activity and defensive costs. According Marques (2016), share of production output must be used to offset the costs of economy activity, the so-called defensive costs. Private consumption measures society's wellbeing through the available income of families, because the acquisition of more money by wealthy families creates less well-being than it does for poor families.

The modern international models of welfare and those of all people are represented by integral indices based on socioeconomic. Mankiw (2009) says, objective indicators, and, partially, on data of sociological inquires that reflect the subjective estimation conducted in many countries of the world. International indicators and rankings of all people welfare estimation, their comparison, enhancement and disenchantment are described in many scientific papers. (Sebnem, 2010). Integral indices denote the ratio between the set of phenomena comprising heterogeneous, disparate elements and are used to form suitable and efficient methods and tools


for measuring phenomena of any nature including socioeconomic. Integral indices allow the unequivocal interpretation of the phenomenon under study and are valuable both from research and management points of view. In the theory of the development of man and other related fields of economy such local economic, quality of living, poverty, and health.

Hypothesis 3. Local economic growth will be foster economic development for welfare society.

D. Conceptual Framework.

Schematic of thinking in this research is the result of correlation policy about funding decentralization toward local economic activities and local economic growth for supported welfare society. Than, it's can be used to describe about role of funding decentralization policy to accelerate development economics in local or regional area in East of Java. Schematic of this research will be clarify about conceptually thinking in figure 1 as follows.

Figure 1: Conceptual of Thinking in the Research.



III. METHODS OF RESEARCH.

This research used explanatory correlation of variables of funds decentralization, local economy activities and local economic growth of 38 county/cities in East of Java. The counties and cities on East of Java is: 1.Pacitan, 2.Ponorogo, 3.Trenggalek, 4.Tulungagung, 5.Blitar, 6.Kediri, 7.Malang, 8.Lumajang, 9.Jember, 10.Banyuwangi, 11.Bondowoso, 12.Situbondo, 13.Probolinggo, 14.Pasuruan, 15.Sidoarjo, 16.Mojokerto, 17.Jombang, 18.Nganjuk, 19.Madiun,

20.Magetan, 21.Ngawi, 22.Bojonegoro, 23.Tuban, 24.Lamongan, 25. Gresik, 26. Bangkalan, 27.Sampang, 28.Pamekasan, 29.Sumenep. And the Cities is: 30.Kediri, 31.Blitar, 32.Malang, 33.Probolinggo, 34.Pasuruan, 35.Mojokerto, 37.Madiun, 37.Surabaya, and 38.Batu. Counties and cities in East of Java, as well as increasing local economics growth to improve welfare society. In this studies have design as a crossed-sectional studies, because the design crossed-sectional is usually used in with descriptived and explanatories. This studies used secondary data's with collective from the Centered of Bureau Statistic (BPS) from counties and cities in East of Java and other institutions related to the study. Research variable is independent and dependent variables. Independent variables is: (1.) Variable of funding decentralization in correlation to local economic activities (2) Variable of funding decentralization to local economic growth. (3) funding decentralization to increase welfare society. (4) funds decentralization with correlation to increased welfare society. According Sugiyono. (2013), the data's analyses use regression analyses and use the help of SPSS 23 version.

IV. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The empirical results are shown in Table 1 shows the results of the benchmark model. Funding decentralization is shown to be positively correlated with local economic activities. Funding decentralization have supporting to incresed local economic activities, such as: Output Economic, Transaction of Buying, and Business Dynamic. Performed used statistic tool with SPSS 23 version, and to showed in table 1 as follows:

Table 1. Results Regression test

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.374 ^a	.385	.136	5.750	.362	6.743	2	38	.002

a. Predictors: (Constant), Funding Decentralization, Local Economics Activities

d. Dependent Variable: Welfare Society

The result of table 1 can be seen in column R and there is a correlation coefficient (r_{xy}) = 0.374 so that it can compare with table R has a significance rate of 5% with $n = 38$ is 0.220, so knowed a arithmetics $0.374 > R$ table 0.243. With a probability of 0002, F 6.743 tests of $> F$ table 3, 85 and significant are with small and than the significant in the level ($\alpha = 0.05$), however this result will be conclusion that the decentralized funding variable are simultaneously a significant positive effect on the variables of the local economic activity. So, from the R-Square column The result 0385 means that 38.5% of the local economic activity can be a positive correlation to local economic growth and, carried out used SPSS 23 version, and there can to showe at the table 2 as follows:

Table 2. Results Regression test in Model from Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.492 ^a	.351	.129	5.750	.351	6.856	2	38	.002

a.Predictors: (Constant), Funding Decentralization and Local Economics Growth

d.Dependent Variable: Welfare Society

From table 2 above description at column R have significant correlation coefficient (R) = 0.492 so can be comparing with R table have the significant level of 5% with n = 38 is 0.220 so knowing with arithmetic $0.492 > R_{table} 0.220$. In this case, with a probability of 0.002, F 6.856 tests of $> F_{table} 3.51$ and (2-tailed) are small and than with significance level ($\alpha = 0.05$), with the result that be conclusion if decentralisation funding variables are simultaneously significant positive effects in the local economics growth variables. And from, the R-Square column of the result 0.351 means that 35.1% of local economic activities can be a positive correlation to the growth of local economies and the remainder 64.9% are influencing from variable other and not include from this studies.

Table 3. Results Regression Coefficients

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		Sig.
	B	Standard Error	Beta	t	
1 (Constant)	32.927	7.991		4.121	.000
Funding	.262	.073	.382	3.527	.001
Decentralization					
Welfare Society	.230	.095	.236	3.335	.004

a. Dependent Variable: Funding Decentralization, Local Economic Activities, Local Economic Growth..

b. Dependent Variable: Welfare Society

In the table 3 above, from the constant and simplified regression coefficient are obtaining at column B, seen there have linear regression equation is as follows $Y = 32.927 + 0.262 X_1 + 0.230 X_2 + \epsilon_0$. The meaning of this result, if a decentralisation variable is funding upgrade of unity, this result will in an foster local economic growth of 0.262 units, if the local economic growth variable is one unit, then it will result in an increase of the welfare community by 0.230 units, by discussed if this variables no influenced on the variable independent X_1 (decentralization funding) and X_2 (local economic activity), community welfare.

Data about result in the table 3 can be clarify for decentralized funding $t = 3.527$ with a probabilities values of 0.001 and comparing with in R-table at a significant rate of 5% with $n = 38$ T Test $3,709 > T_{table} 1,991$ and significantly small and than the significance level ($\alpha = 0.05$), until the implication coefficient X_1 (decentralized funding) with variable Y (community welfare) has a significant correlation. As for local economic growth $T = 3.335$ with a probabilities values of 0.004 and comparing with the R-table at a significant rate of 5% with $n = 38$ T Test $3,335 > T_{T1, 991}$ and signegficant smaller than the significant level ($\alpha = 0.05$), and than the correlation coefficient of X_3 (local economic growth) with variable Y (community welfare) is significant.

V. DISCUSSION

Regarding the impact of decentralized funding at local economics activities, local economics growth, and the foster in the welfare society's results showed that regardless of whether the provincial and city samples in East Java were utilized, decentralized funding was initially improved but ultimately withheld local economic activity and local economic growth. Analysis with the accountability and political economy towards public financing for public welfare, the intensity of this policy for public finances seems to be stronger when the policy of regional autonomy when it becomes a regulation for local economic activities. (Aviral, 2014;

Baskaran, 2016). A logical conclusion, is that higher accountabilities and increased public finances have been proven to occur with decentralized funding, and some are not necessarily leading to the activities of economic freedom. Generally of this studies about correlation the funding decentralization, and simplified managing public financial, can be foster local economic activities, so there are all of variables given a positive correlation effect to increased the local economic growth of regional autonomy policy in counties and cities. That are showed, if the funding decentralization policy can be able to increased welfare society.

1. Correlation Funding Decentralization Toward Local Economic Activities.

Preferred to public expenditure to the determinant of public expenditure is expectation for has a higher impacted at sequential development. However, preferred for public expenditure may be determinant in economics development. Its showed at figure above, about resulted in that analyses allowed to partially qualified our previously finds. According to Andreas (2019), with respected to the degree of decentralized of currently expenditure, our estimated reveal the presenced of an inverted shaped linking between there variables and economic development. The causality under studies is positived if the level of decentralized of publics expenditure to increased for related lower level, but beyond a certaining thresholds it turned negative. Martinez (2007) says, that raised the possibilities of used the decentralized of public expenditure at a meaning to increased economic development at the relatively centrals country, but also highlight the economics risk correlation with increasing at public expenditure on highly decentralized country. According to Park (2019), Strengthening local taxation power, a decentralised income can better serve the purpose of local economic development than simply loosening the restriction of inter-governmental transfer, because of the public expenditure that determines decentralized funding. Nicola (2016) said, at the city and district level, however, no Pro-growth effect exists; We instead find partial evidence in favor of inverse causality – economic growth for democratic in decentralization. To contrast about it, resulted in the existing decentralization rate of budget expenditure doesn't not given any proof non-linear related to development. (Irfan, 2008; Irina, 2015; Ivankina, 2013) on the coefficients of this variable it is all negative cases and statistical significance, as is the case with a decentralized funding measurement employ.

According to Samimi (2910), they are finding that fiscal decentralization has a positive effect on Iran's economic growth. An important feature of public expenditure is that the function and the relative expenditure of the stocks of the subnational government vary greatly from country to country and they reflect tradition and inertia as many or more of the best principles. On the other hand, another dominant characteristic of developing countries is the concentration of education and health expenditure on the subnational level divided by many other countries, especially in terms of education. The division of public expenditure between currently and budget expenditures affected the coefficiented of politically and administrative decentralized. According to Schneider's (2003) indexing, the degrees of politically decentralized now showed to exertice a positive influencing at economic development, whole the degree of administrative decentralized is not statistical significant in more case. At this correlation of politically decentralized in the economic development is sensitives for the choiced of indexing used. According to Hooghe (2008) indexed, the impacted of politically decentralized is marginal negative or significantly, which controllied for the funding decentralized of currented expenditure, is positive and significant, when controlled for public expenditure (Table 1). At in the cases of the resulted reported in Tables 2 and 3, the effected of this variables from economics growth is contingencies at there measurement of decentralized use regulating. (Ahmad, 2013;

Dobrovic, 2016; Daniela, 2016).

2. Correlation Local Economic Activities To Foster Local Economic growth

Preferences for funding decentralization among regional governments affected the linked both politic and funding decentralized and local economics development and that this relationship in once again, contingent in the choiced of indicators. Schneider (2003) says, politically decentralized on positive and significant associating with local economic growth in the counties adn cities of territorial and a preferences for funding decentralization on local economics growth. According to Hooghe (2008) indexd, on political decentralized is negative correlaton in economicc performanced in the preferenced for social expenditure, healthy, social service, education and social asset, in the the cases of preferenced not for local economiy development.

Threaded on the fine level or considered about impact of the sub-national sharing in local government can support local economic growth, and welfare society to complete the development economic and welfare society in the regional or conty and cities These correlation about funding decentralization indicators are included as explanatory variables expenditure, local economic activities and local economic grwoth. According Khuzaini (2006), the estimated carries out of reveal that the coefficient of these variables are positive and have correlation of variables. Todaro (2014) confirms, the existence of a positive correlation between the decentralized of there type of expenditure and the local economic activities. There are, the level of decentralized of expensidured on local economics activities correlation with local economic growth. And than, the empirically evidences supply in Tables 3 and 4 suggested the present of a the linear linked between there measurement of funding decentralized and local economics growth performancing at the East of Java.

The basic argument of economics for decentralized funding is that it can provide greater economic efficiency in the allocation of resources in the public sector. Under the assumption that public officials respond to their constituent desires, local governments are more able to match these preferences, especially when these preferences differ across jurisdictions. According to Baskaran (2013), there is an advantage in efficiency on the increase if the taxpayer is Mobile because they can migrate or sort live Selve among the most suitable jurisdictions for those who prefer tax expenditure. Preference for differences in public spending across regions or individuals, the level of wellbeing achieved through the provision of public goods that are uniform by the central government is lower than can be achieved with decentralized provisions that allow for differences across jurisdictions. According to Odero (2004), decentralized funding is a concern that is diverted from the expenditure function and the source of tax revenue between different levels of government. Regional governance can play an important Roling in an efficient, there is a broad consensus that the purpose of redistribution of income and macroeconomic stability is better pursued by the central or regional government. Government activities in the market economy are primarily justified by the failure of private markets in suppressing public expenditure and externalities, and the provision of public expenditure, with the public sector, can generally increase with decentralized funding.

3. Correlation Local Economics Growth To Increased Welfare Society

Local Economic activities is the purpose to foster in local economic growth. The funding decentralization policies in regional governance is for simplizied budget management and gonernance public financial to matching with priorities local economic activities. Overall local

economics activities in the regional autonomy policy conducted has positive influence can be local economic growth. However, this local economic growth policies will adequate and follow funding decentralization management for better more to effectived and effcient to increased local economic growth, and welfare society.(Anikina, 2015; Heiko, 2013; Craig, 2000).

The results reveal that estimated of funding decentralization is positive and statistically significant at level of significance, thereby implying that further funding decentralization will improve local economic growth rate which is in consistency with Bird (2010) and Corinne (2017). It means the positive effect of funding decentralization is so much strong that it out weighs the negative influence due to revenue decentralization. National governments appear to be efficient in collecting money while subnational governments appear to be more efficient in spending it. Besides that, the increased in economics growth due to revenue decentralization may happen because of regressive revenue-raising measures that will obstruct the private investment, redtapism, favouritism and corruption. According Dunnell (2019), it will lead to diversion of resources from the productive to the unproductive sectors of economy.

Though rich states may witness high growth over the period of time, but that may be well below their potential in relation to resource use. According Ivankina (2015), the funding decentralization will enhance the infrastructure of states that will incentivize the private sector to increase their economics activities, and hence the rate of economics growth will increase. It will lead to increase in resource utilization especially in the case of regional autonomy policy. Ramez (2001) says, funding decentralization and its relationship with local economic growth has been a major focus of discussion in both developed and developing regional autonomy within the context of public financial. In the assumed that funding decentralization would improve efficiency in the local government and local production of public goods and hence local economic growth to foster welfare society.(Soejoto, 2015; David, 2006; Durana, 2015; Robert, 2013). So, funding decentralization can be increased local economic activities and local economic growth to foster welafare society.

V. CONCLUSSION

The results of this study show that funding decentralization have significant effect on local economic activities and can affect the increase of local economic growth. However, local economic activities and local economic growth can improve people's welfare. The positive correlation between funding decentralization and local economic growth has been able to significantly and consistently to increased the welfare of the people in East Java. These findings emphasize that the funding decentralization policy usually positively affects the growth of the local economy.

The findings also have some implications for other provinces in Indonesia, in the framework of local wisdom the decentralization policy of this funding is more effective in increasing the local economic growth in its region. The benefits of decentralized funding should be seen relative to spending or shopping for economic development in the region. The central government may be better off when making public investments with externalities in the early stages of economic development. More importantly, if the local government can manage the total fiscal income following the maximum economic development expenditure, with further decentralization of funding to encourage local economic growth, thereby improving the welfare of the people in East Java.

REFERENCES

Ahmad Danu Prasetyo & Ubaidillah Zuhdi. (2013). The Government Expenditure Efficiency towards the Human Development. *Procedia Economics and Finance*. 5 Pp. 615 – 622.

Andreas PK & Oriol RS. 2019. Local Decentralization and the Quality of Public Services in Europe. *Social Indicators Research*. 145 pp. 755–776.

Anikina, E., Ivankina, L., Gumennikov, I., Kashchuk, I., & Monastyrny, E. (2015). A Study of Welfare of Older People at National Research Tomsk Polytechnic University. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* Volume 214. Pp. 906 – 910.

Aviral Kumar Tiwari & Muhammad Shahbaz. (2014). Does financial development increase rural-urban income inequality?. *International Journal of Social Economics*. Vol. 40 Issue: 2, pp.151-168, <https://doi.org/10.1108/03068291311283616>

Baskaran, T, Feld, L.P., & Schnellenbach, J (2016). Fiscal Federalism, Decentralization, and Economic Growth: A Meta-Analysis. *Economic Inquiry*, 54(3), 1445-1463

Baskaran, T, & Feld, L.P.(2013). Fiscal Decentralization, and Economic Growth in OCED Countries: Is There a Relationship?: *Public Finance Review*, 41(14), 421-445.

Bird N, Richard & Vaillance,. (2010). *Funding Decentralization from Developing Country*. Jakarta: Rosdakarya.

BAPENAS & UNDP. (2004). *Human Development Index Report, Economics Democratic cost of Human Development Index Indonesia*. Jakarta. BAPPENAS

Central Bureau of Statistics. (2015). *Analyses of Macro Indicator from East of Java*. Surabaya: BPS East Java Indonesia

Corinne Blanquart1 & Martin Koning. (2017). The local economic impacts of high-speed railways: theories and facts. *Euro Transportation. Res. Rev.* (2017) 9: 12. DOI 10.1007/s12544-017-0233-0

Case, K.E., Fair, E., & Oster, S.C. (2011). *Principles of Microeconomics*. Prentice Hall. 10th Edition.

Craig Young & Sylwia Kaczmarek. (2000). Local government, local economic development and quality of life in Poland. *GeoJournal*. 50: 225–234

David M & Keith Willet. (2006). Local Economic Performance and Election Outcomes. *Atlantic Economic Journal*. 34: 219-232

Deliktas, E & Gunal, GG. (2016). Economic Growth and Input Use Efficiency in Low, Upper – Middle and High Incomed Countries (1991-2011): A Data Envelopment Analysis. *Procedia Economics and Finance*. Volume 38. Pp. 308 – 317

Dobrovič Jána. (2015). Regional Development of small and medium-Sized Enterprises (SMEs) in the Prešov region with Focus on Tourism. *Procedia Economics and Finance*. 34. 594 – 599

Daniela Mihaela Neamtu. (2016). Education, the economic development pillar. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 180 (2015) 413 – 420

Dunnell K (2009) 'National Statistician's article: measuring regional economic performance'. *Economic & Labour Market Review* 3(1), pp 18–30.

Durana, DC & Gogana, ALM. (2015). The objectives of sustainable development - ways to achieve Welfare. *Procedia Economics and Finance*. Volume 26. Pp. 812 – 817

Ezcurra, R. & Pascual, P.(2008) The link between fiscal decentralization and regional disparities: Evidence from several European Union countries. *Environment and Planning*. 40: 1185–1201.

Felix Moses Edoho, (2015) "Entrepreneurship and socioeconomic development: Catalyzing African transformation in the 21st century", *African Journal of Economic and Management Studies*, Vol. 6. Issue: 2, pp.127-147, <https://doi.org/10.1108/AJEMS-03-2013-0030>

Ganaie, AA, Baht SA, & Kamaiah, B. 2018. Fiscal Decentralization and Economic Growth: Evidence from Indian. *Macroeconomics South Asian Journal*. Vol 7 (1) 83–108. SAGE Pblcation.

Hooghe, L., Marks, G, & Schakel, AH.(2008) Regional authority in 42 democracies, 1950–2006: a measure and five hypotheses. *Regional and Federal Studies*, 18: 111–302.

Hill, H. & Vidyattama, Y. (2016). Regional Development Dynamic in Indonesia Before and After The Big Bang Decentralization: *The Singapore Economic review*. 61(02), 1640027

Heiko T. Burreta & Lars P. Feld. (2013). Fiscal Institutions in Germany. *Swiss Society of Economics and Statistics*. Vol. 149 (2) 249–290

Irfan Ahmed. Claudio Socci, Francesca Severini, & Rosita Pretaroli. (2008). Fiscal policy for households and public budget constraint in Italy. *Econ Politica*. 36:19–35

Irina Arhipovaa & Liga Paura. (2015). Regional Development and Private Consumption structure in Latvia. *Procedia Economics and Finance* 26. 86 – 91

Ivankina, L.L. & Lotova, E.V. (2013). Civil Society and Social Network: on the issue of relationship. *Bulletin of the Tomsk Polytechnic University*. Volume 6. Pp. 236.

Ivankina, L.L & Latygovskaya, T. (2015). Modern Social Welfare in the Light of the Sustainability Model. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. Volume 166. Pp. 111 – 115.

Jafari Samimi, A, Gholamreza Keshavarz Haddad Gholamreza, & M. Alizadeh (2010). Fiscal Decentralization and Economic Growth in Iran. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied*

Sciences. 4(11). Pp. 5490-5495.

Khuzaini, Muhammad. (2006), *Decentralizations Financing Study: Influence to Publics Economics, Grow and welfared societies. Study in East of Java*. Disertation University of Brawijaya.

Marques, AC, Fuinhas, JA, & Gaspar, JS. (2016) On the nexus of energy use economic development: a panel approach. *Energy Procedia*. Volume 106. Pp. 225 – 234.

Martinez-Vasquez., & R. McNab. (2007). *Fiscal Decentralization, Economic Growth, and Democratic*. Washington: Longmann Inc.

Morozov B (2016). Decentralization: Operationalization and Measurement Model. *International Journal Organization Theory Behaviour*. 19(3) : 275–307

Morozov, B. (2017). Decentralization and economic growth: specification, measurement, and direction of causal relationship. *International Journal Public Administration*. 41(9):684–699.

Ministry of Finance of the Republic of Indonesia, (2017). *Transfer Policy to Local and Village Funds*. Jakarta: Director General of Fiscal Balance.

Nicola Boccellaa & Irene Salerno. (2016). Creative Economy, Cultural Industries and Local Development. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 223. Pp.291 – 296.

Noor Suzilawati Rabe*, Mariana Mohamed Osman, & Syahirah Bachok. (2014). Economics of Local People: Iskandar, Malaysia. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 153. Pp. 463 – 478.

Odero, K.K. (2004). *Decentralized Contexts: Comparative Lessons on Local Planning and Fiscal Dimensions*, Washington, DC: World Bank Publications.

Park, S Park, M-G, & Nam, K-M (2019). Growth Effect of Fiscal Decentralization with Week Economic Motivation: The case of South Korea. *The Annal of regional Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00168-019-00936-9>

Ramez Abubakar Badeeb & Hooi Lean. (2017) . Financial development, oil dependence and economic growth: Evidence from the Republic of Yemen", *Studies in Economics and Finance*, Vol. 34. Issue: 2, pp.281-298, <https://doi.org/10.1108/SEF-07-2014-0137>.

Rodriguez-Pose, A. & Ezcurra, R (2010). Is Fiscal Decentralization hamful for Economic growth?. Evidence from the OECD countries. *Journal of Economic Geography*. 11(4). 619-643.

Robert M. & McNab. (2003). Fiscal Decentralization and Economic Growth. *World Development*. Vol. 31, No. 9, pp. 1597–1616.

Todaro, Michael P. & Stephen C. Smith. (2014). Economic Development (*The Pearson Series in*

Economics). Philadelphia:Longman Inc.

Mankiw, N. Gregory. (2009). *Macroeconomics, 4Th Edition*. New York: Worth Publisher.

Sebnem Oguz & Jonathan Knight. (2010). Regional economic indicators A focus on regional gross value added using shiftshare analysis. *Economic & Labour Market Review*. Vol 4 (8). Pp. 1-17

Subroto, W.T. (2015). Revitalization of Pancasila Economic System in the Globalization Era. *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*. Volume 5 (4), Pp.1-8.

Sugiyono. (2013). *Methods of Administration Reseach*. Bandung: Alfabeta. Bandung.

Soejoto A, Subroto, W.T, & Suyanto. (2015). Fiscal Decentralization Policy in Promoting Indonesia Human Development. *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*. Vol 5 (3), 763-771.

Zahonogo, Pam. (2016). Trade and economic growth in developing countries: Evidence from sub-Saharan Africa. *Journal of African Trade*. Volume 3. Pp. 41–56.

Does Funding Decentralization Can Influence The Local Economic Growth?

Waspodo Tjipto Subroto
Senior Lecturer in Universitas Negeri Surabaya
Corresponding: waspodosubroto@unesa.ac.id

Imam Baidlowi
Lecturer in Universitas Islam Mojopahit Mojokerto
Email: imambaidlowi@unim.ac.id

ABSTRACT

Experiences often by many countries slowing economic growth as a result of central government-centered funding policies. The concern about slowing economic growth is motivating the need for a decentralized policy in development funding to foster economic growth. The research aims to describe the policy influence of the decentralization of funding sources between central and local governments to foster economic growth in East Java. This research method uses an explanation design with a quantitative approach. Data panels are collected from 38 cities/counties among 2009 to 2018 years, in East Java, with analysis using regression technique with SPSS version 23. The results of this study showed that decentralization of funding sources can increase significantly on local economic activities and affect the increase of local economic growth. Increasing local economic activity can significantly increase economic growth. While local growing of economics can significantly increased on welfare for society in East Java. These findings remind the importance of the policy that decentralized funding will contribute positively to the growth of local economies. More importantly, if the local government in total regulates the sources of fiscal income and effective expenditure, decentralized funding will be able to encourage the growth of the local economy, which will eventually improve the welfare of the people in East Java.

Keyword: Funding Decentralization; Regional Autonomiy; Local Economic Growth; Welfare Society.

JEL Classifications: E6, O1

I. INTRODUCTION

Structured and functioning of local government has a greater role in facilitating the prosperity and stability of nations. The power of local government structure in itself depends upon the institutional design that distributes the power and functions among the different stages of governance. Ganaie (2018) says, at the important functionally that depicts the depth of a regional is the mechanism by which the funding responsibilities are shared by these levels of government. Furthermore, a greates to deal at political and economics decentralisation have taked place in the development of the world.

Funding decentralization may be indeed has a direct effect in economics development but the theoretical underpinnings for this relationship remain largely undeveloped. Robert (2003) says, implement fund decentralization programs on the basic of improving the rate of economic growth. In the fact, funding decentralization simply means empowering local source to collect their own taxes, on expenditure and investment activities among others independent of the central government, with the degree of autonomy varying from countries. The better knowing about

mechanization through while funding decentralization can be leading for growth in economy efficiencies for the calling funding decentralized theories. In the fact, right to information foster advanced and a more insighted in the preferred from citizenship, regional governance and more capabilities and national governance for the province of social good or social serviced to the needed for local society. According to Rodriguez (2011), if about to possible economy enhancement link to the funding decentralized to increase the better and the more about heterogeneous of country. Furthermore, in homogenous country for to information about profit and benefited for conducted policy and provided public expenditure or social service governance in the counties and cities. Enhancement of funding decentralized increasing for internalization of heterogeneities made the individuality preference better to diversified for increased local economic activities.

The province East of Java very interested to implementation of funding decentralization for increased local economic growth with goal to foster welfare society. According to BAPPENAS (2004), East Java province is keen to implement decentralized funding for the increase of local economic growth with the aim to encourage welfare society. According to BAPPENAS (2004), East Java is a province that has the largest autonomous region in Indonesia. For that province it is interesting to research the impact of decentralized funding on the economic growth. Although it has the largest region in autonomy, it also has differences in region characteristics and faces various problems. According to the Central Bureau of Statistics (2015), an indicator of economic development in East Java was strengthened by some research that results showed that fiscal decentralization brings better economic growth. This is different from some other provinces that indicate it has not been able to bring towards better economic growth. In fact, there is a view that the decentralization of funding in Indonesia is only related to the relationship between central and local governments without a positive influence in the economic growth.

Funding decentralization is very supporting toward local economic growth in East of Java, Indonesia. According to Morozov (2016), theories and practical experiences known that local economic activities is correlation with funding decentralization policy and to increase local economic development. Regularly of this local economic activities, in the Number 32, year 1999 explained about law of regional autonomy, were revised in Article 33 to 34 of Act No. 33 of 2004 include local economic activities in regional government. Felix (2015) says, the use of local economic activities, can be foster is local economic growth. Therefore, funding decentralization should get priority for manage budget and expenditure government for flexibilities to local economic activities. In addition, East of Java is needed to improved and to increased about local economic activities for local economic growth.

According to Baskaran (2016), literature theories of funding decentralization has indicator several channels through which governance decentralisation can be effects in the economics development. Policy of funding decentralization in East of Java, can be support toward local economic activities, so will be foster local economic growth. Noor (2014) says, management funds in regional autonomy implementation is effective to increase local economic growth in regional government. According to Rodriguez (2011), if argumentation of backed that potentialy is positived correlation between funding decentralized and economy performed is base in the chapter of simplified premised. Funding decentralization policy can be simplified to manage funds and economic activities, with hope can be increased local economic activities and than can be improving for local economic growth. So, research about funding decentralization in East of Java is very importance to foster local economic growth through increase local economic activities for welfare society. However, Ministry of Finance (2017) says, the interaction of funding

decentralization and the dynamical of local economics developing is still not clear, so decentralisation leads for the faster dividends for developmental reform in better areas, with national allowances.

Urgency of this research, can be provide useful explanation about information of funding decentralization policy in the specifies assessment which to preferenced of currently and funding tol public expenditure between regional and crossing countries in the East of Java for mattered of local economics development, focused in the precised about impacted of decentralization of economics development, and welfare society. How much importance of funding decentralization for increase local economic growth, will be explanation in this research. Policy of regional autonomy can be simplified to manage funding in the counties and cities with hope to increase local economic activitaly and can be local economics developemnt in the East of Java.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Funding Decentralization

Theories of the funding decentralized have intended for better in the support of positived the impact in granted the greating finance autonomous and transfered resourched to sub-national stage of governance between allocating and producing efficiencies and economics development. Acoording to Rodriguez (2011), the argumentation in the back of the potency positived correlation both funding decentralized and economy performanced is base in a stage of simplified premised. In the fact, about premised in this funding decentralized implication for mobilized of resourcing. Regional governance, for the simply factual and to be greating autonomous of funding, is complement for mobilized the resourcing in they territories, fathermore waiting for solution and for the provisioning of social assets and social serviced to become for a central governance, and better remoted, and authorities. The leading to the greater emphasised in economy efficiencies crossing regional and local territories any given countries or the tapped in otherwised maybe has untapped potency.

The possible economy enhancement linked to the funding decentralized theories for increaing of the large with the more about heterogenities in countries. However about smallled of homogenous country for information profit and the benefit for conducted policy and provided social assets and social services in the regional area maybe are limited, the enhancement of funding decentralized to increased are internally heterogen made individually about preference and more diversified. Perspective of this potential, can be significanted profit and benefited for funding decentralized have be able full expectation and a certained countries.

Decentralization can be brings in potential profit and benefits where situation economics of scale existences. It the case the about that is often the costing from produced was certained publics expenditure and tendeds to rised significant which sized. According Andreas (2019), funding decentralisation is definetion as local about spending on educations, healthy or society protect as a shared of generally governance spending in each policies respective. In this particular that is true if the deliveries of public expenditure and social service is done by larged, the remoted and often not efficiencies for central bureaucracy. They bureaucracy are frequently less good to suite to delivery specifics public expenditure better efficiencies and than the better supple regional governsnce, are consequences of they closed to the peoples and they morer knowing of they needs. Local deliveries also shorted supplies chains and alleviation costs, potential for generating greaters economics efficiencies and event alleviation to the risks correlated with the losses of distributive powered of the centrals governance (Ezcurra and Pascual, 2008). However, the interaction about decentralisation toward local economic developing dinamica remain uncleared. According to Hill

(2016), funding decentralization leading to a reformation in divide of better fash to mor development in local government, with attendance national profitabilities and benefits. The impact from spatial equality is very determinant to increased local economic growth.

Literature theories about funding decentralisation have indicator similar the channel where governance decentralisation can effectly local development economics. According to Baskaran (2016), most of the theories about funding decentralisation take to focused in the efficiencies aspect of the provisioning of public service decentralisation, and than funding decentralisation can be foster economics development by enhanced the abilities of the political systemic to innovative and implement reformations. In cases, some experts gave the argumentation for funding decentralisation to foster government ineffective and inefficiencies, and hereby can alleviation growing. The some research has sought to identifies the decentralized effect on development economics in the empiric for over the post two decades. However, the between decentralisation and the dynamica of local economics growth have relationship remained unclear. Decentralization leads to a faster dividend development reform in the better of the Regionals government, with a national allowances officer.

Hypothesis 1. Funding decentralization will cause more to local economic activities.

B. Local Economic Growth

Economic growth may cause living standards to improve. Growth is the fundamental objective of a society because it lifts people out of poverty and enhances the quality of their lives. In particular, Subroto (2015) says, ensuring steady economic growth is very important to build long term poverty reduction. Briefly stated, positive improvement in macroeconomic indicators are influenced by positive rates of economic growth. However, economic growth may also erode traditional values and lead to exploitation, environmental destruction, and corruption (Case, Fair and Oster, 2011). Therefore, examination of the economic growth across countries has become one of the important study subject over the last decades (Deliktas, 2016). Economic growth is mainly depends on having more resources or policy of macroeconomics, using available resources or policy of macroeconomics, more efficiently, technological change (or advance), and good governance. Therefore, the main aim to analyze the relationship between regional autonomy efficiency and economic growth, the input efficiency and its effect on economic growth have recently received a great deal of attention from academia. Input efficiency analyses are generally studied by academic or expert and are aimed to optimize the regional policy and economic growth, is mutually effect for welfare society.

The relationship between regional autonomy and economic growth has been theoretically sinergys supported. While conventional wisdom predicts a growth-enhancing effect of autonomy, recent developments suggest that policies autonomy is not always beneficial to economic growth. Zahonogo (2016) says, to foster economic growth by policies the diffusion of resources and economic potencial in the regional. Traditional policy theory predicts growth gains from regionaization at the country level through decentralization, specialization, investment in innovation, productivity improvement, or enhanced resource allocation. The role of autonomy policy in economic growth has been a key matter of debate in the growing theories. The neoclassical growth models consider regional autonomy change as endogenous and support that, consequently, autonomy policies can be impact in economic growth. However, new economic growth theories assume that policy change is an endogenous variable and that regional policies can be combined with those on welfare society.

It remains open to question whether policy of decentralization or autonomy regional drives

economic growth or economic growth drives policy about decentralization policy. Of course, there is also the possibility that the two variables are mutually causal. According Messaoud (2014), numerous potential growth determinants have been identified over the years. The interaction of decentralisation regulations toward economic development is very mutually benefited and profited. A number of studies does not deal with the effect of decentralization regulation on economic growth directly but instead focuses on the effect of decentralization regulation on one of the economy development drivers. In the current economic policy, growth remains a key government priority. The literature on economic growth has turned to the effects of country's political, legal, economic and social institutions on wealth and long-term growth.

Hypothesis 2. Local economic activities will lead to increased local economic growth.

C. Welfare Society

Welfare society is a complex functional system of relationships which incorporates certain values, objectives, intentions, the general program of tool and local government, and the implementation of one or another attitude to definite conditions of behavior and activity. Dimension of welfare form the system of objective and subjective relations to ontological spaces all people are involved in. According Anikina (2015), the suggested model of welfare studying and estimating, the source of activity and development economic to cross-systems interactions. The specificity of subdominant can be found out through the content of emotional and estimating grounds that additional a multidirectional society to the subject behavior. The interconnection and combination of these components define the degree of implementation of man's demands, stability of the social status, life satisfaction, confidence in future, emotional attitude to being. Welfare society is model being designed considering the existing international approaches and national or regional characteristic features. This will provide a wide use of this model at national and regional, or local levels and also the qualitative analysis of the major welfare parameters for all peoples in the world.

Increasing economic activity could imply future costs, costs that must be paid sooner or later. The payment of these costs are more likely to become accumulated over generations like debt. So, a share of production output must be used to offset the costs of economy activity and defensive costs. According Marques (2016), share of production output must be used to offset the costs of economy activity, the so-called defensive costs. Private consumption measures society's wellbeing through the available income of families, because the acquisition of more money by wealthy families creates less well-being than it does for poor families.


The modern international models of welfare and those of all people are represented by integral indices based on socioeconomic. Mankiw (2009) says, objective indicators, and, partially, on data of sociological inquires that reflect the subjective estimation conducted in many countries of the world. International indicators and rankings of all people welfare estimation, their comparison, enhancement and disenchantment are described in many scientific papers. (Sebnem, 2010). Integral indices denote the ratio between the set of phenomena comprising heterogeneous, disparate elements and are used to form suitable and efficient methods and tools for measuring phenomena of any nature including socioeconomic. Integral indices allow the unequivocal interpretation of the phenomenon under study and are valuable both from research and management points of view. In the theory of the development of man and other related fields of economy such local economic, quality of living, poverty, and health.

Hypothesis 3. Local economic growth will be foster economic development for welfare society.

D. Conceptual Framework.

Schematic of thinking in this research is the result of correlation policy about funding decentralization toward local economic activities and local economic growth for supported welfare society. Than, it's can be used to describe about role of funding decentralization policy to accelerate development economics in local or regional area in East of Java. Schematic of this research will be clarify about conceptually thinking in figure 1 as follows.

Figure 1: Conceptual of Thinking in the Research.



III. METHODS OF RESEARCH.

This research used explanatory correlation of variables of funds decentralization, local economy activities and local economic growth of 38 county/cities in East of Java. The counties and cities on East of Java is: 1.Pacitan, 2.Ponorogo, 3.Trenggalek, 4.Tulungagung, 5.Blitar, 6.Kediri, 7.Malang, 8.Lumajang, 9.Jember, 10.Banyuwangi, 11.Bondowoso, 12.Situbondo, 13.Probolinggo, 14.Pasuruan, 15.Sidoarjo, 16.Mojokerto, 17.Jombang, 18.Nganjuk, 19.Madiun, 20.Magetan, 21.Ngawi, 22.Bojonegoro, 23.Tuban, 24.Lamongan, 25. Gresik, 26. Bangkalan, 27.Sampang, 28.Pamekasan, 29.Sumenep. And the Cities is: 30.Kediri, 31.Blitar, 32.Malang, 33.Probolinggo, 34.Pasuruan, 35.Mojokerto, 37.Madiun, 37.Surabaya, and 38.Batu. Counties and cities in East of Java, as well as increasing local economics growth to improve welfare society. In this studies have design as a crossed-sectional studies, because the design crossed-sectional is usually used in with descriptived and explanatories. This studies used secondary data's with

collective from the Centered of Bureau Statistic (BPS) from counties and cities in East of Java and other institutions related to the study. Research variable is independent and dependent variables. Independent variables is: (1.) Variable of funding decentralization in correlation to local economic activities (2) Variable of funding decentralization to local economic growth. (3) funding decentralization to increase welfare society. (4) funds decentralization with correlation to increased welfare society. According Sugiyono. (2013), the data's analyses use regression analyses and use the help of SPSS 23 version.

IV. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The empirical results are shown in Table 1 shows the results of the benchmark model. Funding decentralization is shown to be positively correlated with local economic activities. Funding decentralization have supporting to incresed local economic activities, such as: Output Economic, Transaction of Buying, and Business Dynamic. Performed used statistic tool with SPSS 23 version, and to showed in table 1 as follows:

Table 1. Results Regression test

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.374 ^a	.385	.136	5.750	.362	6.743	2	38	.002

a. Predictors: (Constant), Funding Decentralization, Local Economics Activities

d. Dependent Variable: Welfare Society

The result of table 1 can be seen in column R and there is a correlation coefficient (r_{xy}) = 0.374 so that it can compare with table R has a significance rate of 5% with $n = 38$ is 0.220, so knowed a arithmetics $0.374 > R$ table 0.243. With a probability of 0002, F 6.743 tests of $> F$ table 3, 85 and significant are with small and than the significant in the level ($\alpha = 0.05$), however this result will be conclusion that the decentralized funding variable are simultaneously a significant positive effect on the variables of the local economic activity. So, from the R-Square column The result 0385 means that 38.5% of the local economic activity can be a positive correlation to local economic growth and, carried out used SPSS 23 version, and there can to showe at the table 2 as follows:

Table 2. Results Regression test in Model from Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.492 ^a	.351	.129	5.750	.351	6.856	2	38	.002

a.Predictors: (Constant), Funding Decentralization and Local Economics Growth

d.Dependent Variable: Welfare Society

From table 2 above description at column R have significant correlation coefficient (R) = 0.492 so can be comparing with R table have the significant level of 5% with $n = 38$ is 0.220 so knowing with arithmetic $0492 > R$ table 0.220. In this case, with a probability of 0002, F 6.856 tests of $> F$ table 3.51 and (2-tailed) are small and than with significance level ($\alpha = 0.05$), with the result that be conclusion if decentralisation funding variables are simultaneously significant positive effects in the local economics growth variables. And from, the R-Square column of the result 0351 means

that 35.1% of local economic activities can be a positive correlation to the growth of local economies and the remainder 64.9% are influencing from variable other and not include from this studies.

Table 3. Results Regression Coefficients

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		Sig.
	B	Standard Error	Beta	t	
1 (Constant)	32.927	7.991		4.121	.000
Funding Decentralization	.262	.073	.382	3.527	.001
Welfare Society	.230	.095	.236	3.335	.004

a. Dependent Variable: Funding Decentralization, Local Economic Activities, Local Economic Growth..

b. Dependent Variable: Welfare Society

In the table 3 above, from the constant and simplified regression coefficient are obtaining at column B, seen there have linear regression equation is as follows $Y = 32.927 + 0.262 X_1 + 0.230 X_2 + \epsilon_0$. The meaning of this result, if a decentralisation variable is funding upgrade of unity, this result will in an foster local economic growth of 0.262 units, if the local economic growth variable is one unit, then it will result in an increase of the welfare community by 0.230 units, by discussed if this variables no influenced on the variable independent X_1 (decentralization funding) and X_2 (local economic activity), community welfare.

Data about result in the table 3 can be clarify for decentralized funding $t = 3.527$ with a probabilities values of 0.001 and comparing with in R-table at a significant rate of 5% with $n = 38$ T Test $3,709 > T$ table $1,991$ and significantly small and than the significance level ($\alpha = 0.05$), until the implication coefficient X_1 (decentralized funding) with variable Y (community welfare) has a significant correlation. As for local economic growth $T = 3.335$ with a probabilities values of 0.004 and comparing with the R-table at a significant rate of 5% with $n = 38$ T Test $3,335 > T$ $T_1, 991$ and signegficant smaller than the significant level ($\alpha = 0.05$), and than the correlation coefficient of X_3 (local economimic growth) with variable Y (community welfare) is significant.

V. DISCUSSION

Regarding the impact of decentralized funding at local economics activities, local economics growth, and the foster in the welfare society's results showed that regardless of whether the provincial and city samples in East Java were utilized, decentralized funding was initially improved but ultimately withheld local economic activity and local economic growth. Analysis with the accountability and political economy towards public financing for public welfare, the intensity of this policy for public finances seems to be stronger when the policy of regional autonomy when it becomes a regulation for local economic activities. (Aviral, 2014; Baskaran, 2016). A logical conclusion, is that higher accountabilities and increased public finances have been proven to occur with decentralized funding, and some are not necessarily leading to the activities of economic freedom. Generally of this studies about correlation the funding decentralization, and simplified managing public financial, can be foster local economic activities, so there are all of variables given a positive correlation effect to increased the local economic growth of regional autonomy policy in counties and cities. That are showed, if the funding decentralization policy can

be able to increased welfare society.

1. Correlation Funding Decentralization Toward Local Economic Activities.

Preferred to public expenditure to the determinant of public expenditure is expectation for has a higher impacted at sequential development. However, preferred for public expenditure may be determinant in economics development. Its showed at figure above, about resulted in that analyses allowed to partially qualified our previously finds. According to Andreas (2019), with respected to the degree of decentralized of currently expenditure, our estimated reveal the presenced of an inverted shaped linking between there variables and economic development. The causality under studies is positived if the level of decentralized of publics expenditure to increased for related lower level, but beyond a certaining thresholds it turned negative. Martinez (2007) says, that raised the possibilities of used the decentralized of public expenditure at a meaning to increased economic development at the relatively centrals country, but also highlight the economics risk correlation with increasing at public expenditure on highly decentralized country. According to Park (2019), Strengthening local taxation power, a decentralised income can better serve the purpose of local economic development than simply loosening the restriction of inter-governmental transfer, because of the public expenditure that determines decentralized funding. Nicola (2016) said, at the city and district level, however, no Pro-growth effect exists; We instead find partial evidence in favor of inverse causality – economic growth for democratic in decentralization. To contrast about it, resulted in the existing decentralization rate of budget expenditure doesn't not given any proof non-linear related to development. (Irfan, 2008; Irina, 2015; Ivankina, 2013) on the coefficients of this variable it is all negative cases and statistical significance, as is the case with a decentralized funding measurement employ.

According to Samimi (2910), they are finding that fiscal decentralization has a positive effect on Iran's economic growth. An important feature of public expenditure is that the function and the relative expenditure of the stocks of the subnational government vary greatly from country to country and they reflect tradition and inertia as many or more of the best principles. On the other hand, another dominant characteristic of developing countries is the concentration of education and health expenditure on the subnational level divided by many other countries, especially in terms of education. The division of public expenditure between currently and budget expenditures affected the coefficiented of politically and administrative decentralized. According to Schneider's (2003) indexing, the degrees of politically decentralized now showed to exertice a positive influencing at economic development, whole the degree of administrative decentralized is not statistical significant in more case. At this correlation of politically decentralized in the economic development is sensitives for the choiced of indexing used. According to Hooghe (2008) indexed, the impacted of politically decentralized is marginal negative or significantly, which controllied for the funding decentralized of currented expenditure, is positive and significant, when controlled for public expenditure (Table 1). At in the cases of the resulted reported in Tables 2 and 3, the effected of this variables from economics growth is contingencies at there measurement of decentralized use regulating. (Ahmad, 2013; Dobrovic, 2016; Daniela, 2016).

2. Correlation Local Economic Activities To Foster Local Economic growth

Preferences for funding decentralization among regional governments affected the linked both politic and funding decentralized and local economics development and that this relationship in once again, contingent in the choiced of indicators. Schneider (2003) says, politically decentralized on positive and significant associating with local economic growth in the counties adn cities of territorial and a preferences for funding decentralization on local economics growth.

According to Hooghe (2008) index, on political decentralized is negative correlation in economic performance in the preferred for social expenditure, health, social service, education and social asset, in the cases of preferred not for local economic development.

Threaded on the fine level or considered about impact of the sub-national sharing in local government can support local economic growth, and welfare society to complete the development economic and welfare society in the regional or county and cities. These correlation about funding decentralization indicators are included as explanatory variables expenditure, local economic activities and local economic growth. According Khuzaini (2006), the estimated carries out of reveal that the coefficient of these variables are positive and have correlation of variables. Todaro (2014) confirms, the existence of a positive correlation between the decentralized of there type of expenditure and the local economic activities. There are, the level of decentralized of expended on local economic activities correlation with local economic growth. And then, the empirically evidences supply in Tables 3 and 4 suggested the present of a the linear linked between there measurement of funding decentralized and local economic growth performing at the East of Java.

The basic argument of economics for decentralized funding is that it can provide greater economic efficiency in the allocation of resources in the public sector. Under the assumption that public officials respond to their constituent desires, local governments are more able to match these preferences, especially when these preferences differ across jurisdictions. According to Baskaran (2013), there is an advantage in efficiency on the increase if the taxpayer is mobile because they can migrate or sort live among the most suitable jurisdictions for those who prefer tax expenditure. Preference for differences in public spending across regions or individuals, the level of wellbeing achieved through the provision of public goods that are uniform by the central government is lower than can be achieved with decentralized provisions that allow for differences across jurisdictions. According to Odero (2004), decentralized funding is a concern that is diverted from the expenditure function and the source of tax revenue between different levels of government. Regional governance can play an important role in an efficient, there is a broad consensus that the purpose of redistribution of income and macroeconomic stability is better pursued by the central or regional government. Government activities in the market economy are primarily justified by the failure of private markets in suppressing public expenditure and externalities, and the provision of public expenditure, with the public sector, can generally increase with decentralized funding.

3. Correlation Local Economics Growth To Increased Welfare Society

Local Economic activities is the purpose to foster in local economic growth. The funding decentralization policies in regional governance is for simplified budget management and governance public financial to matching with priorities local economic activities. Overall local economic activities in the regional autonomy policy conducted has positive influence can be local economic growth. However, this local economic growth policies will adequate and follow funding decentralization management for better more to effective and efficient to increased local economic growth, and welfare society. (Anikina, 2015; Heiko, 2013; Craig, 2000).

The results reveal that estimated of funding decentralization is positive and statistically significant at level of significance, thereby implying that further funding decentralization will improve local economic growth rate which is in consistency with Bird (2010) and Corinne (2017). It means the positive effect of funding decentralization is so much strong that it outweighs the negative influence due to revenue decentralization. National governments appear to be efficient in

collecting money while subnational governments appear to be more efficient in spending it. Besides that, the increased in economics growth due to revenue decentralization may happen because of regressive revenue-raising measures that will obstruct the private investment, redtatism, favouritism and corruption. According Dunnell (2019), it will lead to diversion of resources from the productive to the unproductive sectors of economy.

Though rich states may witness high growth over the period of time, but that may be well below their potential in relation to resource use. According Ivankina (2015), the funding decentralization will enhance the infrastructure of states that will incentivize the private sector to increase their economics activities, and hence the rate of economics growth will increase. It will lead to increase in resource utilization especially in the case of regional autonomy policy. Ramez (2001) says, funding decentralization and its relationship with local economic growth has been a major focus of discussion in both developed and developing regional autonomy within the context of public financial. In the assumed that funding decentralization would improve efficiency in the local government and local production of public goods and hence local economic growth to foster welfare society.(Soejoto, 2015; David, 2006; Durana, 2015; Robert, 2013). So, funding decentralization can be increased local economic activities and local economic growth to foster welafare society.

V. CONCLUSSION

The results of this study show that funding decentralization have significant effect on local economic activities and can affect the increase of local economic growth. However, local economic activities and local economic growth can improve people's welfare. The positive correlation between funding decentralization and local economic growth has been able to significantly and consistently to increased the welfare of the people in East Java. These findings emphasize that the funding decentralization policy usually positively affects the growth of the local economy.

The findings also have some implications for other provinces in Indonesia, in the framework of local wisdom the decentralization policy of this funding is more effective in increasing the local economic growth in its region. The benefits of decentralized funding should be seen relative to spending or shopping for economic development in the region. The central government may be better off when making public investments with externalities in the early stages of economic development. More importantly, if the local government can manage the total fiscal income following the maximum economic development expenditure, with further decentralization of funding to encourage local economic growth, thereby improving the welfare of the people in East Java.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors are grateful to the Dean of Faculty of Economics, Universitas Negeri Surabaya to funding of this research. Also to thank for Indra Patmoko for analyses data, and my student's anonymous to collected data of this studies.

REFERENCES

Ahmad Jafari Samimi, Gholamreza Keshavarz HaddadGholamreza, and M. Alizadeh (2010). Fiscal Decentralization and Economic Growth in Iran. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*. 4(11). Pp. 5490-5495.

Ahmad Danu Prasetyo and Ubaidillah Zuhdi. (2013). The Government Expenditure Efficiency towards the Human Development. *Procedia Economics and Finance*. 5 Pp. 615 – 622.

Andreas PK and Oriol RS. 2019. Local Decentralization and the Quality of Public Services in Europe. *Social Indicators Research*. 145 pp. 755–776.

Anikina, E., Ivankina, L., Gumennikov, I., Kashchuk, I., Monastyrny, E. (2015). A Study of Welfare of Older People at National Research Tomsk Polytechnic University. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* Volume 214. Pp. 906 – 910.

Aviral Kumar Tiwari and Muhammad Shahbaz. (2014). Does financial development increase rural-urban income inequality?. *International Journal of Social Economics*. Vol. 40 Issue: 2, pp.151-168, <https://doi.org/10.1108/03068291311283616>

Baskaran, T, Feld, L.P., & Schnellenbach, J (2016). Fiscal Federalism, Decentralization, and Economic Growth: A Meta-Analysis. *Economic Inquiry*, 54(3), 1445-1463

Baskaran, T, & Feld, L.P.(2013). Fiscal Decentralization, and Economic Growth in OCED Countries: Is There a Relationship?: *Public Finance Review*, 41(14), 421-445.

Bird N, Richard & Vaillance,. (2010). *Funding Decentralization from Developing Country*. Jakarta: Rosdakarya.

BAPENAS dan UNDP. (2004). *Human Development Index Report, Economics Democratic cost of Human Development Index Indonesia*. Jakarta. BAPPENAS

Central Bureau of Statistics. (2015). *Analyses of Macro Indicator from East of Java*. Surabaya: BPS East Java Indonesia

Corinne Blanquart¹ & Martin Koning. (2017). The local economic impacts of high-speed railways: theories and facts. *Euro Transportation. Res. Rev.* (2017) 9: 12. DOI 10.1007/s12544-017-0233-0

Case, K.E., Fair, E., Oster, S.C. (2011). *Principles of Microeconomics*. Prentice Hall. 10th Edition.

Craig Young & Sylwia Kaczmarek. (2000). Local government, local economic development and quality of life in Poland. *GeoJournal*. 50: 225–234

David M and Keith Willet. (2006). Local Economic Performance and Election Outcomes. *Atlantic Economic Journal*. 34: 219-232

Deliktas, E and Gunal, GG. (2016). Economic Growth and Input Use Efficiency in Low, Upper – Middle and High Incomed Countries (1991-2011): A Data Envelopment Analysis. *Procedia Economics and Finance*. Volume 38. Pp. 308 – 317

Dobrovič Jána. (2015). Regional Development of small and medium-Sized Enterprises (SMEs) in the Prešov region with Focus on Tourism. *Procedia Economics and Finance*. 34. 594 – 599

Daniela Mihaela Neamtu. (2016). Education, the economic development pillar. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 180 (2015) 413 – 420

Dunnell K (2009) 'National Statistician's article: measuring regional economic performance'. *Economic & Labour Market Review* 3(1), pp 18–30.

Durana, DC and Gogana, ALM. (2015). The objectives of sustainable development - ways to achieve Welfare. *Procedia Economics and Finance*. Volume 26. Pp. 812 – 817

Ezcurra, R., Pascual, P. (2008) The link between fiscal decentralization and regional disparities: Evidence from several European Union countries. *Environment and Planning*. 40: 1185–1201.

Felix Moses Edoho, (2015) "Entrepreneurship and socioeconomic development: Catalyzing African transformation in the 21st century", *African Journal of Economic and Management Studies*, Vol. 6. Issue: 2, pp.127-147, <https://doi.org/10.1108/AJEMS-03-2013-0030>

Ganaie, AA, Baht SA, Kamaiah, B. 2018. Fiscal Decentralization and Economic Growth: Evidence from Indian. *Macroeconomics South Asian Journal*. Vol 7 (1) 83–108. SAGE Pblcation.

Hooghe, L., Marks, G., Schakel, A.H. (2008) Regional authority in 42 democracies, 1950–2006: a measure and five hypotheses. *Regional and Federal Studies*, 18: 111–302.

Hill, H. & Vidyattama, Y. (2016). Regional Development Dynamic in Indonesia Before and After The Big Bang Decentralization: *The Singapore Economic review*. 61(02), 1640027

Heiko T. Burreta and Lars P. Feld. (2013). Fiscal Institutions in Germany. *Swiss Society of Economics and Statistics*. Vol. 149 (2) 249–290

Irfan Ahmed. Claudio Socci, Francesca Severini, Rosita Pretaroli. (2008). Fiscal policy for households and public budget constraint in Italy. *Econ Politica*. 36:19–35

Irina Arhipovaa and Liga Paura. (2015). Regional development and private consumption structure in Latvia. *Procedia Economics and Finance* 26. 86 – 91

Ivankina, L.L. & Lotova, E.V. (2013). Civil society and social network: on the issue of relationship. *Bulletin of the Tomsk Polytechnic University*. Volume 6. Pp. 236.

Ivankina, L.L and Latygovskaya, T. (2015). Modern social welfare in the light of the sustainability model. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. Volume 166. Pp. 111 – 115.

Khuzaini, Muhammad. (2006), *Decentralizations Financing Study: Influence to Publics Economics, Grow and welfared societies. Study in East of Java*. Disertation University of Brawijaya.

Marques, AC and Fuinhas, JA, Gaspar, JS. (2016) On the nexus of energy use economic

development: a panel approach. *Energy Procedia*. Volume 106. Pp. 225 – 234.

Martinez-Vasquez., and R. McNab. (2007). *Fiscal Decentralization, Economic Growth, and Democratic*. Washington: Longmann Inc.

Morozov B (2016). Decentralization: operationalization and measurement model. *International Journal Organization Theory Behaviour*. 19(3) : 275–307

Morozov ,B. (2017). Decentralization and economic growth: specification, measurement, and direction of causal relationship. *International Journal Public Administration*. 41(9):684–699.

Ministry of Finance of the Republic of Indonesia, (2017). *Transfer Policy to Local and Village Funds*. Jakarta: Director General of Fiscal Balance.

Nicola Boccellaa and Irene Salerno. (2016). Creative Economy, Cultural Industries and Local Development. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 223. Pp.291 – 296.

Noor Suzilawati Rabe*, Mariana Mohamed Osman, Syahirah Bachok. (2014). Economics of Local People: Iskandar, Malaysia. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 153. Pp. 463 – 478.

Odero, K.K. (2004). *Decentralized Contexts: Comparative Lessons on Local Planning and Fiscal Dimensions*, Washington, DC: World Bank Publications.

Park, S Park, M-G, & Nam, K-M (2019). Growth Effect of Fiscal Decentralization with Weak Economic Motivation: The case of South Korea. *The Annal of regional Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00168-019-00936-9>

Ramez Abubakar Badeeb, Hooi Lean. (2017) . Financial development, oil dependence and economic growth: Evidence from the Republic of Yemen", *Studies in Economics and Finance*, Vol. 34. Issue: 2, pp.281-298, <https://doi.org/10.1108/SEF-07-2014-0137>.

Rodriguez-Pose, A. & Ezcurra, R (2010). Is Fiscal Decentralization harmful for Economic growth?. Evidence from the OECD countries. *Journal of Economic Geography*. 11(4). 619-643.

Robert M. McNab. (2003). Fiscal Decentralization and Economic Growth. *World Development*. Vol. 31, No. 9, pp. 1597–1616.

Todaro, Michael P. dan Stephen C. Smith. (2014). Economic Development (*The Pearson Series in Economics*). Philadelphia:Longman Inc.

Mankiw, N. Gregory. (2009). *Macroeconomics, 4Th Edition*. New York: Worth Publisher.

Sebnem Oguz and Jonathan Knight. (2010). Regional economic indicators A focus on regional gross value added using shiftshare analysis. *Economic & Labour Market Review*. Vol 4 (8). Pp. 1-17

Subroto, W.T. (2015). Revitalization of Pancasila Economic System in the Globalization Era. *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*. Volume 5 (4), Pp.1-8.

Sugiyono. (2013). *Methods of Administration Reseach*. Bandung: Alfabeta. Bandung.

Soejoto A, Subroto, W.T, Suyanto. (2015). Fiscal Decentralization Policy in Promoting Indonesia Human Development. *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*. Vol 5 (3), 763-771.

Zahonogo, Pam. (2016). Trade and economic growth in developing countries: Evidence from sub-Saharan Africa. *Journal of African Trade*. Volume 3. Pp. 41–56.

Does Funding Decentralization Can Influence The Local Economic Growth?

Waspodo Tjipto Subroto^{a*}, Imam Baidlowi^b

- a. Faculty of Economica and Business, State University of Surabaya, Indonesia
(Corresponding author email: waspodosubroto@unesa.ac.id)
- b. Faculty of Economics, University of Islamic Mojokerto, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

Experiences often by many countries slowing economic growth as a result of central government-centered funding policies. The concern about slowing economic growth is motivating the need for a decentralized policy in development funding to foster economic growth. The research aims to describe the policy influence of the decentralization of funding sources between central and local governments to foster economic growth in East Java. This research method uses an explanation design with a quantitative approach. Data panels are collected from 38 cities/counties among 2009 to 2018 years, in East Java, with analysis using regression technique with SPSS version 23. The results of this study showed that decentralization of funding sources can increase significantly on local economic activities and affect the increase of local economic growth. Increasing local economic activity can significantly increase economic growth. While local growing of economics can significantly increased on welfare for society in East Java. These findings remind the importance of the policy that decentralized funding will contribute positively to the growth of local economies. More importantly, if the local government in total regulates the sources of fiscal income and effective expenditure, decentralized funding will be able to encourage the growth of the local economy, which will eventually improve the welfare of the people in East Java.

Keyword: Funding Decentralization; Regional Autonomiy; Local Economic Growth; Welfare Society.

JEL Classifications: E6, O1

I. INTRODUCTION

Structured and functioning of local government has a greater role in facilitating the prosperity and stability of nations. The power of local government structure in itself depends upon the institutional design that distributes the power and functions among the different stages of governance. Ganaie (2018) says, at the important functionality that depicts the depth of a regional is the mechanism by which the funding responsibilities are shared by these levels of government. Furthermore, a greates to deal at political and economics decentralisation have taked place in the development of the world.

Funding decentralization may be indeed has a direct effect in economics development but the theoretical underpinnings for this relationship remain largely undeveloped. Robert (2003) says, implement fund decentralization programs on the basic of improving the rate of economic growth. In the fact, funding decentralization simply means empowering local source to collect

their own taxes, on expenditure and investment activities among others independent of the central government, with the degree of autonomy varying from countries. The better knowing about mechanization through while funding decentralization can be leading for growth in economy efficiencies for the calling funding decentralized theories. In the fact, right to information foster advanced and a more insightful in the preferred from citizenship, regional governance and more capabilities and national governance for the province of social good or social services to the needed for local society. According to Rodriguez (2011), if about to possible economy enhancement link to the funding decentralized to increase the better and the more about heterogeneous of country. Furthermore, in homogeneous country for to information about profit and benefited for conducted policy and provided public expenditure or social service governance in the counties and cities. Enhancement of funding decentralized increasing for internalization of heterogeneities made the individuality preference better to diversified for increased local economic activities.

The province East of Java very interested to implementation of funding decentralization for increased local economic growth with goal to foster welfare society. According to BAPPENAS (2004), East Java province is keen to implement decentralized funding for the increase of local economic growth with the aim to encourage welfare society. According to BAPPENAS (2004), East Java is a province that has the largest autonomous region in Indonesia. For that province it is interesting to research the impact of decentralized funding on the economic growth. Although it has the largest region in autonomy, it also has differences in region characteristics and faces various problems. According to the Central Bureau of Statistics (2015), an indicator of economic development in East Java was strengthened by some research that results showed that fiscal decentralization brings better economic growth. This is different from some other provinces that indicate it has not been able to bring towards better economic growth. In fact, there is a view that the decentralization of funding in Indonesia is only related to the relationship between central and local governments without a positive influence in the economic growth.

Funding decentralization is very supporting toward local economic growth in East of Java, Indonesia. According to Morozov (2016), theories and practical experiences known that local economic activities is correlation with funding decentralization policy and to increase local economic development. Regularity of this local economic activities, in the Number 32, year 1999 explained about law of regional autonomy, were revised in Article 33 to 34 of Act No. 33 of 2004 include local economic activities in regional government. Felix (2015) says, the use of local economic activities, can be foster is local economic growth. Therefore, funding decentralization should get priority for manage budget and expenditure government for flexibilities to local economic activities. In additional, East of Java is needed to improved and to increased about local economic activities for local economic growth.

According to Baskaran (2016), literature theories of funding decentralization has indicator several channels through which governance decentralisation can be effects in the economics development. Policy of funding decentralization in East of Java, can be support toward local economic activities, so will be foster local economic growth. Noor (2014) says, management funds in regional autonomy implementation is effective to increase local economic growth in regional government. According to Rodriguez (2011), if argumentation of backed that potentiality is positived correlation between funding decentralized and economy performed is base in the chapter of simplified premised. Funding decentralization policy can be simplified to manage funds and economic activities, with hope can be increased local economic activities and than can be improving for local economic growth. So, research about funding decentralization in East of Java

is very importance to foster local economic growth through increase local economic activities for welfare society. However, Ministry of Finance (2017) says, the interaction of funding decentralization and the dynamically of local economics developing is still not clear, so decentralisation leads for the faster dividends for developmental reform in better areas, with national allowances.

Urgency of this research, can be provide useful explanation about information of funding decentralization policy in the specifies assessment which to preferenced of currently and funding tol publicd expenditure between regional and crossing countries in the East of Java for mattered of local economics development, focused in the precised about impacted of decentralization of economics development, and welfare society. How much importance of funding decentralization for increase local economic growth, will be explanation in this research. Policy of regional autonomy can be simplified to manage funding in the counties and cities with hope to increase local economic activitically and can be local economics developemnt in the East of Java.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Funding Decentralization

Theories of the funding decentralized have intended for better in the support of positived the impact in granted the greating finance autonomous and transfered resourced to sub-national stage of governance between allocating and producing efficiencies and economics development. Acoording to Rodriguez (2011), the argumentation in the back of the potency positived correlation both funding decentralized and economy performanced is base in a stage of simplified premised. In the fact, about premised in this funding decentralized implication for mobilized of resourcing. Regional governance, for the simply factual and to be greating autonomous of funding, is complement for mobilized the resourcing in they territories, fathermore waiting for solution and for the provisioning of social assets and social serviced to become for a central governance, and better remoted, and authorities. The leading to the greater emphasised in economy efficiencies crossing regional and local teritories any given countries or the tapped in otherwised maybe has untapped potency.

The possible economy enhancement linked to the funding decentralized theories for increaing of the large with the more about heterogenities in countries. However about smalled of homogenous country for information profit and the benefit for conducted policy and provided social assets and social services in the regional area maybe are limited, the enhancement of funding decentralized to increased are internally heterogen made individually about preference and more diversified. Perspective of this potential, can be significanted profit and benefited for funding decentralized have be able full expectation and a certained countries.

Decentralization can be brings in potential profit and benefits where situation economics of scale existences. It the case the about that is often the costing from produced was certained publics expenditure and tendeds to rised significant which sized. According Andreas (2019), funding decentralisation is definetion as local about spending on educations, healthy or society protect as a shared of generally governance spending in each policies respective. In this particular that is true if the deliveries of public expenditure and social service is done by larged, the remoted and often not efficiencies for central bureaucracy. They bureaucracy are frequently less good to suite to delivery specifics public expenditure better efficiencies and than the better supple regional governsnce, are consequences of they closed to the peoples and they morer knowing of they needs. Local deliveries also shorted supplies chains and alleviation costs, potential for generating greaters economics efficiencies and event alleviation to the risks correlated with the losses of distributive

powered of the central governance (Ezcurra and Pascual, 2008). However, the interaction about decentralisation toward local economic developing dynamics remain unclear. According to Hill (2016), funding decentralization leading to a reformation in a better way for development in local government, with attendance national profitabilities and benefits. The impact from spatial equality is very determinant to increased local economic growth.

Literature theories about funding decentralisation have indicated similar the channel where governance decentralisation can effectively local development economics. According to Baskaran (2016), most of the theories about funding decentralisation take to focus in the efficiencies aspect of the provisioning of public service decentralisation, and then funding decentralisation can be foster economics development by enhanced the abilities of the political system to innovative and implement reformations. In cases, some experts gave the argumentation for funding decentralisation to foster government ineffective and inefficiencies, and hereby can alleviate growing. The some research has sought to identify the decentralized effect on development economics in the empiric for over the past two decades. However, the relationship between decentralisation and the dynamics of local economics growth have relationship remained unclear. Decentralization leads to a faster dividend development reform in the better of the Regional government, with a national allowances officer.

Hypothesis 1. Funding decentralization will cause more to local economic activities.

B. Local Economic Growth

Economic growth may cause living standards to improve. Growth is the fundamental objective of a society because it lifts people out of poverty and enhances the quality of their lives. In particular, Subroto (2015) says, ensuring steady economic growth is very important to build long term poverty reduction. Briefly stated, positive improvement in macroeconomic indicators are influenced by positive rates of economic growth. However, economic growth may also erode traditional values and lead to exploitation, environmental destruction, and corruption (Case, Fair and Oster, 2011). Therefore, examination of the economic growth across countries has become one of the important study subject over the last decades (Deliktas, 2016). Economic growth is mainly depends on having more resources or policy of macroeconomics, using available resources or policy of macroeconomics, more efficiently, technological change (or advance), and good governance. Therefore, the main aim to analyze the relationship between regional autonomy efficiency and economic growth, the input efficiency and its effect on economic growth have recently received a great deal of attention from academia. Input efficiency analyses are generally studied by academic or expert and are aimed to optimize the regional policy and economic growth, is mutually effect for welfare society.

The relationship between regional autonomy and economic growth has been theoretically synergys supported. While conventional wisdom predicts a growth-enhancing effect of autonomy, recent developments suggest that policies autonomy is not always beneficial to economic growth. Zahanogo (2016) says, to foster economic growth by policies the diffusion of resources and economic potencial in the regional. Traditional policy theory predicts growth gains from regionalization at the country level through decentralization, specialization, investment in innovation, productivity improvement, or enhanced resource allocation. The role of autonomy policy in economic growth has been a key matter of debate in the growing theories. The neoclassical growth models consider regional autonomy change as endogenous and support that, consequently, autonomy policies can be impact in economic growth. However, new economic growth theories assume that policy change is an endogenous variable and that regional policies

can be combined with those on welfare society.

It remains open to question whether policy of decentralization or autonomy regional drives economic growth or economic growth drives policy about decentralization policy. Of course, there is also the possibility that the two variables are mutually causal. According Messaoud (2014), numerous potential growth determinants have been identified over the years. The interaction of decentralisation regulations toward economic development is very mutually benefited and provided. A number of studies does not deal with the effect of decentralization regulation on economic growth directly but instead focuses on the effect of decentralization regulation on one of the economy development drivers. In the current economic policy, growth remains a key government priority. The literature on economic growth has turned to the effects of country's political, legal, economic and social institutions on wealth and long-term growth.

Hypothesis 2. Local economic activities will lead to increased local economic growth.

C. Welfare Society

Welfare society is a complex functional system of relationships which incorporates certain values, objectives, intentions, the general program of tool and local government, and the implementation of one or another attitude to definite conditions of behavior and activity. Dimension of welfare form the system of objective and subjective relations to ontological spaces all people are involved in. According Anikina (2015), the suggested model of welfare studying and estimating, the source of activity and development economic to cross-systems interactions. The specificity of subdominant can be found out through the content of emotional and estimating grounds that additional a multidirectional society to the subject behavior. The interconnection and combination of these components define the degree of implementation of man's demands, stability of the social status, life satisfaction, confidence in future, emotional attitude to being. Welfare society is model being designed considering the existing international approaches and national or regional characteristic features. This will provide a wide use of this model at national and regional, or local levels and also the qualitative analysis of the major welfare parameters for all peoples in the world.

Increasing economic activity could imply future costs, costs that must be paid sooner or later. The payment of these costs are more likely to become accumulated over generations like debt. So, a share of production output must be used to offset the costs of economy activity and defensive costs. According Marques (2016), share of production output must be used to offset the costs of economy activity, the so-called defensive costs. Private consumption measures society's wellbeing through the available income of families, because the acquisition of more money by wealthy families creates less well-being than it does for poor families.


The modern international models of welfare and those of all people are represented by integral indices based on socioeconomic. Mankiw (2009) says, objective indicators, and, partially, on data of sociological inquires that reflect the subjective estimation conducted in many countries of the world. International indicators and rankings of all people welfare estimation, their comparison, enhancement and disenchantment are described in many scientific papers. (Sebnem, 2010). Integral indices denote the ratio between the set of phenomena comprising heterogeneous, disparate elements and are used to form suitable and efficient methods and tools for measuring phenomena of any nature including socioeconomic. Integral indices allow the unequivocal interpretation of the phenomenon under study and are valuable both from research and management points of view. In the theory of the development of man and other related fields of economy such local economic, quality of living, poverty, and health.

Hypothesis 3. Local economic growth will be foster economic development for welfare society.

D. Conceptual Framework.

Schematic of thinking in this research is the result of correlation policy about funding decentralization toward local economic activities and local economic growth for supported welfare society. Than, it's can be used to describe about role of funding decentralization policy to accelerate development economics in local or regional area in East of Java. Schematic of this research will be clarify about conceptually thinking in figure 1 as follows.

Figure 1: Conceptual of Thinking in the Research.



III. METHODS OF RESEARCH.

This research used explanatory correlation of variables of funds decentralization, local economy activities and local economic growth of 38 county/cities in East of Java. The counties and cities on East of Java is: 1.Pacitan, 2.Ponorogo, 3.Trenggalek, 4.Tulungagung, 5.Blitar, 6.Kediri, 7.Malang, 8.Lumajang, 9.Jember, 10.Banyuwangi, 11.Bondowoso, 12.Situbondo, 13.Probolinggo, 14.Pasuruan, 15.Sidoarjo, 16.Mojokerto, 17.Jombang, 18.Nganjuk, 19.Madiun, 20.Magetan, 21.Ngawi, 22.Bojonegoro, 23.Tuban, 24.Lamongan, 25. Gresik, 26. Bangkalan, 27.Sampang, 28.Pamekasan, 29.Sumenep. And the Cities is: 30.Kediri, 31.Blitar, 32.Malang, 33.Probolinggo, 34.Pasuruan, 35.Mojokerto, 37.Madiun, 37.Surabaya, and 38.Batu. Counties and cities in East of Java, as well as increasing local economics growth to improve welfare society. In

this studies have design as a crossed-sectional studies, because the design crossed-sectional is usually used in with descriptived and explanatories. This studies used secondary data's with collective from the Centered of Bureau Statistic (BPS) from counties and cities in East of Java and other institutions related to the study. Research variable is independent and dependent variables. Independent variables is: (1.) Variable of funding decentralization in correlation to local economic activities (2) Variable of funding decentralization to local economic growth. (3) funding decentralization to increase welfare society. (4) funds decentralization with correlation to increased welfare society. According Sugiyono. (2013), the data's analyses use regression analyses and use the help of SPSS 23 version.

IV. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The empirical results are shown in Table 1 shows the results of the benchmark model. Funding decentralization is shown to be positively correlated with local economic activities. Funding decentralization have supporting to increased local economic activities, such as: Output Economic, Transaction of Buying, and Business Dynamic. Performed used statistic tool with SPSS 23 version, and to showed in table 1 as follows:

Table 1. Results Regression test

Model	R	Standard Error			Change Statistics				
		R Square	Square Estimate	Adjusted R of the	R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.374 ^a	.385	.136	5.750	.362	6.743	2	38	.002

a. Predictors: (Constant), Funding Decentralization, Local Economics Activities

d. Dependent Variable: Welfare Society

The result of table 1 can be seen in column R and there is a correlation coefficient (r_{xy}) = 0.374 so that it can compare with table R has a significance rate of 5% with $n = 38$ is 0.220, so knowed a arithmetics $0.374 > R$ table 0.243. With a probability of 0002, F 6.743 tests of $> F$ table 3, 85 and significant are with small and than the significant in the level ($\alpha = 0.05$), however this result will be conclusion that the decentralized funding variable are simultaneously a significant positive effect on the variables of the local economic activity. So, from the R-Square column The result 0385 means that 38.5% of the local economic activity can be a positive correlation to local economic growth and, carried out used SPSS 23 version, and there can to showe at the table 2 as follows:

Table 2. Results Regression test in Model from Summary

Model	R	Std. Error			Change Statistics				
		R Square	Square Estimate	Adjusted R of the	R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.492 ^a	.351	.129	5.750	.351	6.856	2	38	.002

a.Predictors: (Constant), Funding Decentralization and Local Economics Growth

d.Dependent Variable: Welfare Society

From table 2 above description at column R have significant correlation coefficient (R) = 0.492 so can be comparing with R table have the significant level of 5% with $n = 38$ is 0.220 so knowing with arithmetic $0492 > R$ table 0.220. In this case, with a probability of 0002, F 6.856 tests of $> F$ table 3.51 and (2-tailed) are small and than with significance level ($\alpha = 0.05$), with the result that

be conclusion if decentralisation funding variables are simultaneously significant positive effects in the local economics growth variables. And from, the R-Square column of the result 0351 means that 35.1% of local economic activities can be a positive correlation to the growth of local economies and the remainder 64.9% are influencing from variable other and not include from this studies.

Table 3. Results Regression Coefficients

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		Sig.
	B	Standard Error	Beta	t	
1 (Constant)	32.927	7.991		4.121	.000
Funding	.262	.073	.382	3.527	.001
Decentralization					
Welfare Society	.230	.095	.236	3.335	.004

a. Dependent Variable: Funding Decentralization, Local Economic Activities, Local Economic Growth..

b. Dependent Variable: Welfare Society

In the table 3 above, from the constant and simple regression coefficient are obtaining at column B, seen there have linear regression equation is as follows $Y = 32.927 + 0.262 X_1 + 0.230 X_2 + \epsilon_0$. The meaning of this result, if a decentralisation variable is funding upgrade of unity, this result will in an foster local economic growth of 0.262 units, if the local economic growth variable is one unit, then it will result in an increase of the welfare community by 0.230 units, by discussed if this variables no influenced on the variable independent X_1 (decentralization funding) and X_2 (local economic activity), community welfare.

Data about result in the table 3 can be clarify for decentralized funding $t = 3.527$ with a probabilities values of 0.001 and comparing with in R-table at a significant rate of 5% with $n = 38$ T Test $3.709 > T$ table 1,991 and significantly small and than the significance level ($\alpha = 0.05$), until the implication coefficient X_1 (decentralized funding) with variable Y (community welfare) has a significant correlation. As for local economic growth $T = 3.335$ with a probabilities values of 0.004 and comparing with the R-table at a significant rate of 5% with $n = 38$ T Test $3.335 > T$ T_1 , 991 and signegficant smaller than the significant level ($\alpha = 0.05$), and than the correlation coefficient of X_3 (local economic growth) with variable Y (community welfare) is significant.

V. DISCUSSION

Regarding the impact of decentralized funding at local economics activities, local economics growth, and the foster in the welfare society's results showed that regardless of whether the provincial and city samples in East Java were utilized, decentralized funding was initially improved but ultimately withheld local economic activity and local economic growth. Analysis with the accountability and political economy towards public financing for public welfare, the intensity of this policy for public finances seems to be stronger when the policy of regional autonomy when it becomes a regulation for local economic activities. (Aviral, 2014; Baskaran, 2016). A logical conclusion, is that higher accountabilities and increased public finances have been proven to occur with decentralized funding, and some are not necessarily leading to the activities of economic freedom. Generally of this studies about correlation the funding decentralization, and simplified managing public financial, can be foster local economic activities, so there are all of

variables given a positive correlation effect to increased the local economic growth of regional autonomy policy in counties and cities. That are showed, if the funding decentralization policy can be able to increased welfare society.

1. Correlation Funding Decentralization Toward Local Economic Activities.

Preferred to public expenditure to the determinant of public expenditure is expectation for has a higher impacted at sequential development. However, preferred for public expenditure may be determinant in economics development. Its showed at figure above, about resulted in that analyses allowed to partially qualified our previously finds. According to Andreas (2019), with respected to the degree of decentralized of currently expenditure, our estimated reveal the presenced of an inverted shaped linking between there variables and economic development. The causality under studies is positived if the level of decentralized of publics expenditure to increased for related lower level, but beyond a certaining thresholds it turned negative. Martinez (2007) says, that raised the possibilities of used the decentralized of public expenditure at a meaning to increased economic development at the relatively centrals country, but also highlight the economics risk correlation with increasing at public expenditure on highly decentralized country. According to Park (2019), Strengthening local taxation power, a decentralised income can better serve the purpose of local economic development than simply loosening the restriction of inter-governmental transfer, because of the public expenditure that determines decentralized funding. Nicola (2016) said, at the city and district level, however, no Pro-growth effect exists; We instead find partial evidence in favor of inverse causality – economic growth for democratic in decentralization. To contrast about it, resulted in the existing decentralization rate of budget expenditure doesn't not given any proof non-linear related to development. (Irfan, 2008; Irina, 2015; Ivankina, 2013) on the coefficients of this variable it is all negative cases and statistical significance, as is the case with a decentralized funding measurement employ.

According to Samimi (2910), they are finding that fiscal decentralization has a positive effect on Iran's economic growth. An important feature of public expenditure is that the function and the relative expenditure of the stocks of the subnational government vary greatly from country to country and they reflect tradition and inertia as many or more of the best principles. On the other hand, another dominant characteristic of developing countries is the concentration of education and health expenditure on the subnational level divided by many other countries, especially in terms of education. The division of public expenditure between currently and budget expenditures affected the coefficiented of politically and administrative decentralized. According to Schneider's (2003) indexing, the degrees of politically decentralized now showed to exertice a positive influencing at economic development, whole the degree of administrative decentralized is not statistical significant in more case. At this correlation of politically decentralized in the economic development is sensitives for the choiced of indexing used. According to Hooghe (2008) indexed, the impacted of politically decentralized is marginal negative or significantly, which controllied for the funding decentralized of currented expenditure, is positive and significant, when controlled for public expenditure (Table 1). At in the cases of the resulted reported in Tables 2 and 3, the effected of this variables from economics growth is contingencies at there measurement of decentralized use regulating. (Ahmad, 2013; Dobrovic, 2016; Daniela, 2016).

2. Correlation Local Economic Activities To Foster Local Economic growth

Preferences for funding decentralization among regional governments affected the linked both politic and funding decentralized and local economics development and that this relationship in once again, contingented in the choiced of indicators. Schneider (2003) says, politically

decentralized on positive and significant associating with local economic growth in the counties and cities of territorial and a preferences for funding decentralization on local economics growth. According to Hooghe (2008) indexd, on political decentralized is negative correlaton in economic performed in the preferred for social expenditure, healthy, social service, education and social asset, in the the cases of preferred not for local economy development.

Threaded on the fine level or considered about impact of the sub-national sharing in local government can support local economic growth, and welfare society to complete the development economic and welfare society in the regional or county and cities. These correlation about funding decentralization indicators are included as explanatory variables expenditure, local economic activities and local economic growth. According Khuzaini (2006), the estimated carries out of reveal that the coefficient of these variables are positive and have correlation of variables. Todaro (2014) confirms, the existence of a positive correlation between the decentralized of there type of expenditure and the local economic activities. There are, the level of decentralized of expended on local economics activities correlation with local economic growth. And then, the empirically evidences supply in Tables 3 and 4 suggested the present of a the linear linked between there measurement of funding decentralized and local economics growth performing at the East of Java.

The basic argument of economics for decentralized funding is that it can provide greater economic efficiency in the allocation of resources in the public sector. Under the assumption that public officials respond to their constituent desires, local governments are more able to match these preferences, especially when these preferences differ across jurisdictions. According to Baskaran (2013), there is an advantage in efficiency on the increase if the taxpayer is Mobile because they can migrate or sort live Selve among the most suitable jurisdictions for those who prefer tax expenditure. Preference for differences in public spending across regions or individuals, the level of wellbeing achieved through the provision of public goods that are uniform by the central government is lower than can be achieved with decentralized provisions that allow for differences across jurisdictions. According to Odero (2004), decentralized funding is a concern that is diverted from the expenditure function and the source of tax revenue between different levels of government. Regional governance can play an important Roling in an efficient, there is a broad consensus that the purpose of redistribution of income and macroeconomic stability is better pursued by the central or regional government. Government activities in the market economy are primarily justified by the failure of private markets in suppressing public expenditure and externalities, and the provision of public expenditure, with the public sector, can generally increase with decentralized funding.

3. Correlation Local Economics Growth To Increased Welfare Society

Local Economic activities is the purpose to foster in local economic growth. The funding decentralization policies in regional governance is for simplified budget management and governance public financial to matching with priorities local economic activities. Overall local economics activities in the regional autonomy policy conducted has positive influence can be local economic growth. However, this local economic growth policies will adequate and follow funding decentralization management for better more to effectived and efficient to increased local economic growth, and welfare society.(Anikina, 2015; Heiko, 2013; Craig, 2000).

The results reveal that estimated of funding decentralization is positive and statistically significant at level of significance, thereby implying that further funding decentralization will improve local economic growth rate which is in consistency with Bird (2010) and Corinne (2017).

It means the positive effect of funding decentralization is so much strong that it out weighs the negative influence due to revenue decentralization. National governments appear to be efficient in collecting money while subnational governments appear to be more efficient in spending it. Besides that, the increased in economics growth due to revenue decentralization may happen because of regressive revenue-raising measures that will obstruct the private investment, redtapism, favouritism and corruption. According Dunnell (2019), it will lead to diversion of resources from the productive to the unproductive sectors of economy.

Though rich states may witness high growth over the period of time, but that may be well below their potential in relation to resource use. According Ivankina (2015), the funding decentralization will enhance the infrastructure of states that will incentivize the private sector to increase their economics activities, and hence the rate of economics growth will increase. It will lead to increase in resource utilization especially in the case of regional autonomy policy. Ramez (2001) says, funding decentralization and its relationship with local economic growth has been a major focus of discussion in both developed and developing regional autonomy within the context of public financial. In the assumed that funding decentralization would improve efficiency in the local government and local production of public goods and hence local economic growth to foster welfare society.(Soejoto, 2015; David, 2006; Durana, 2015; Robert, 2013). So, funding decentralization can be increased local economic activities and local economic growth to foster welfare society.

V. CONCLUSION

The results of this study show that funding decentralization have significant effect on local economic activities and can affect the increase of local economic growth. However, local economic activities and local economic growth can improve people's welfare. The positive correlation between funding decentralization and local economic growth has been able to significantly and consistently to increased the welfare of the people in East Java. These findings emphasize that the funding decentralization policy usually positively affects the growth of the local economy.

The findings also have some implications for other provinces in Indonesia, in the framework of local wisdom the decentralization policy of this funding is more effective in increasing the local economic growth in its region. The benefits of decentralized funding should be seen relative to spending or shopping for economic development in the region. The central government may be better off when making public investments with externalities in the early stages of economic development. More importantly, if the local government can manage the total fiscal income following the maximum economic development expenditure, with further decentralization of funding to encourage local economic growth, thereby improving the welfare of the people in East Java.

REFERENCES

Ahmad Danu Prasetyo & Ubaidillah Zuhdi. (2013). The Government Expenditure Efficiency towards the Human Development. *Procedia Economics and Finance*. 5(1), 615 – 622.

Andreas PK & Oriol RS. 2019. Local Decentralization and the Quality of Public Services in Europe. *Social Indicators Research*. 145(3), 755–776.

Anikina, E., Ivankina, L., Gumennikov, I., Kashchuk, I., & Monastyrny, E. (2015). A Study of

Welfare of Older People at National Research Tomsk Polytechnic University. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 214(1), 906 – 910.

Aviral Kumar Tiwari & Muhammad Shahbaz. (2014). Does financial development increase rural-urban income inequality?. *International Journal of Social Economics*. 40(2), 151-168, <https://doi.org/10.1108/03068291311283616>

Baskaran, T, Feld, L.P., & Schnellenbach, J (2016). Fiscal Federalism, Decentralization, and Economic Growth: A Meta-Analysis. *Economic Inquiry*, 54(3), 1445-1463

Baskaran, T, & Feld, L.P.(2013). Fiscal Decentralization, and Economic Growth in OCED Countries: Is There a Relationship?: *Public Finance Review*, 41(14), 421-445.

Bird N, Richard & Vaillance,. (2010). *Funding Decentralization from Developing Country*. Jakarta: Rosdakarya.

BAPENAS & UNDP. (2004). *Human Development Index Report, Economics Democratic cost of Human Development Index Indonesia*. Jakarta. BAPPENAS

Central Bureau of Statistics. (2015). *Analyses of Macro Indicator from East of Java*. Surabaya: BPS East Java Indonesia

Corinne Blanquart1 & Martin Koning. (2017). The local economic impacts of high-speed railways: theories and facts. *Euro Transportation. Res. Rev.* 2017(9): 12. DOI 10.1007/s12544-017-0233-0

Case, K.E., Fair, E., & Oster, S.C. (2011). *Principles of Microeconomics*. Prentice Hall. 10th Edition.

Craig Young & Sylwia Kaczmarek. (2000). Local government, local economic development and quality of life in Poland. *GeoJournal*. 50, 225–234

David M & Keith Willet. (2006). Local Economic Performance and Election Outcomes. *Atlantic Economic Journal*. 34, 219-232

Deliktas, E & Gunal, GG. (2016). Economic Growth and Input Use Efficiency in Low, Upper – Middle and High Incomed Countries (1991-2011): A Data Envelopment Analysis. *Procedia Economics and Finance*. 38(1), 308 – 317

Dobrovič Jána. (2015). Regional Development of small and medium-Sized Enterprises (SMEs) in the Prešov region with Focus on Tourism. *Procedia Economics and Finance*. 34. 594 – 599

Daniela Mihaela Neamtu. (2016). Education, the economic development pillar. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 180, 413 – 420

Dunnell K (2009) ‘National Statistician’s article: measuring regional economic performance’. *Economic & Labour Market Review* 3(1), 18–30.

Durana, DC & Gogana, ALM. (2015). The objectives of sustainable development - ways to achieve Welfare. *Procedia Economics and Finance*. 26, 812 – 817

Ezcurra, R. & Pascual, P.(2008) The link between fiscal decentralization and regional disparities: Evidence from several European Union countries. *Environment and Planning*. 40, 1185–1201.

Felix Moses Edoho, (2015) "Entrepreneurship and socioeconomic development: Catalyzing African transformation in the 21st century", *African Journal of Economic and Management Studies*. 6(2), 127-147, <https://doi.org/10.1108/AJEMS-03-2013-0030>

Ganaie, AA, Baht SA, & Kamaiah, B. (2018). Fiscal Decentralization and Economic Growth: Evidence from Indian. *Macroeconomics South Asian Journal*. 7 (1), 83–108.

Hooghe, L., Marks, G, & Schakel, AH.(2008) Regional authority in 42 democracies, 1950–2006: a measure and five hypotheses. *Regional and Federal Studies*, 18: 111–302.

Hill, H. & Vidyattama, Y. (2016). Regional Development Dynamic in Indonesia Before and After The Big Bang Decentralization: *The Singapore Economic review*. 61(02), 164-182

Heiko T. Burreta & Lars P. Feld. (2013). Fiscal Institutions in Germany. *Swiss Society of Economics and Statistics*. 149(2), 249–290

Irfan Ahmed. Claudio Socci, Francesca Severini, & Rosita Pretaroli. (2008). Fiscal policy for households and public budget constraint in Italy. *Econ Politica*. 36, 19–35

Irina Arhipovaa & Liga Paura. (2015). Regional Development and Private Consumption structure in Latvia. *Procedia Economics and Finance*. 26, 86 – 91

Ivankina, L.L. & Lotova, E.V. (2013). Civil Society and Social Network: on the issue of relationship. *Bulletin of the Tomsk Polytechnic University*. 6, 236-254.

Ivankina, L.L & Latygovskaya, T. (2015). Modern Social Welfare in the Light of the Sustainability Model. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 166, 111 – 115.

Jafari Samimi, A, Gholamreza Keshavarz Haddad Gholamreza, & M. Alizadeh (2010). Fiscal Decentralization and Economic Growth in Iran. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*. 4(11)., 5490-5495.

Khuzaini, Muhammad. (2006), *Decentralizations Financing Study: Influence to Publics Economics, Grow and welfared societies. Study in East of Java*. Malang: University of Brawijaya press.

Marques, AC, Fuinhas, JA, & Gaspar, JS. (2016) On the nexus of energy use economic development: a panel approach. *Energy Procedia*. 106., 225 – 234.

Martinez-Vasquez., & R. McNab. (2007). *Fiscal Decentralization, Economic Growth, and Democratic*. Washington: Longmann Inc.

Morozov B (2016). Decentralization: Operationalization and Measurement Model. *International Journal Organization Theory Behaviour*. 19(3), 275–307

Morozov, B. (2017). Decentralization and economic growth: specification, measurement, and direction of causal relationship. *International Journal Public Administration*. 41(9), 684–699.

Ministry of Finance of the Republic of Indonesia, (2017). *Transfer Policy to Local and Village Funds*. Jakarta: Director General of Fiscal Balance.

Nicola Boccellaa & Irene Salerno. (2016). Creative Economy, Cultural Industries and Local Development. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 223., 291 – 296.

Noor Suzilawati Rabe, Mariana Mohamed Osman, & Syahirah Bachok. (2014). Economics of Local People: Iskandar, Malaysia. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 153.. 463 – 478.

Odero, K.K. (2004). *Decentralized Contexts: Comparative Lessons on Local Planning and Fiscal Dimensions*, Washington, DC: World Bank Publications.

Park, S Park, M-G, & Nam, K-M (2019). Growth Effect of Fiscal Decentralization with Week Economic Motivation: The case of South Korea. *The Annal of regional Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00168-019-00936-9>

Ramez Abubakar Badeeb & Hooi Lean. (2017) . Financial development, oil dependence and economic growth: Evidence from the Republic of Yemen", *Studies in Economics and Finance*, 34(2)., 281-298, <https://doi.org/10.1108/SEF-07-2014-0137>.

Rodriguez-Pose, A. & Ezcurra, R (2010). Is Fiscal Decentralization harmful for Economic growth?. Evidence from the OECD countries. *Journal of Economic Geography*. 11(4). 619-643.

Robert M. & McNab. (2003). Fiscal Decentralization and Economic Growth. *World Development*. 31(9), 1597–1616.

Todaro, Michael P. & Stephen C. Smith. (2014). *Economic Development (The Pearson Series in Economics)*. Philadelphia: Longman Inc.

Mankiw, N. Gregory. (2009). *Macroeconomics, 4Th Edition*. New York: Worth Publisher.

Sebnem Oguz & Jonathan Knight. (2010). Regional economic indicators A focus on regional gross value added using shiftshare analysis. *Economic & Labour Market Review*. 4(8)., 1-17

Subroto, W.T. (2015). Revitalization of Pancasila Economic System in the Globalization Era. *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*. 5 (4), 1-8.

Sugiyono. (2013). *Methods of Administration Reseach*. Bandung: Alfabeta. Bandung.

Soejoto A, Subroto, W.T, & Suyanto. (2015). Fiscal Decentralization Policy in Promoting Indonesia Human Development. *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*. 5(3), 763-771.

Zahonogo, Pam. (2016). Trade and economic growth in developing countries: Evidence from sub-Saharan Africa. *Journal of African Trade*. 3., 41–56.