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ABSTRACT

This study aims to analyze the effect of education funds, health funds, and labor funds on regional income partially and simultaneously. The analysis uses panel data with multiple regression models or multiple regression. The data used in this study are secondary data obtained in ready-made form from www.djpk.depkeu.go.id and www.bps.go.id. The data obtained are data in annual form for each variable. The research period is data from 2013 to 2018. The results of this study indicate that the health fund variable has a partial effect on gross domestic product. While the variable education funding and employment absorption does not have a partial effect on gross domestic product. The results of simultaneous panel data regression, the results of the F test show that the three independent variables namely education funds, health funds and absorption of labor funds simultaneously influence the gross regional domestic product (GRDP).
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1. **Introduction**

To increase the gross regional domestic product (GRDP) of an area needs to know what factors can influence it. One factor is education, in economic development education is seen as an investment in human capital. With this investment, it is expected to obtain benefits, including income derived from participation in the labor market. Abdullah (2016: 12) states that only education can find ways and methods of economic development and only with the results of education, people will be able to care for their economy. On the other hand, people also argue that economic growth can be the cause of educational growth because economic growth requires educated people.

Other factors that can influence gross regional domestic product (GRDP) are the level of public health, high economic growth or increased income can have no meaning if there is no access to basic needs, if those basic needs are health services, educational services, government administration services , high economic growth or increased income can have no meaning if people do not have access to health services.

Allocation of government budgets for education and health is the most important part of budget policy, this policy is related to the government's role as a provider of public goods. The impact of externalities from budget allocation policies for these two fields is certainly expected to have an effect on increasing the ability of human capital to drive economic growth. Education expenditure budget consists of expenses for implementing lessons, for school administration, maintenance of school facilities and infrastructure, school staff welfare, administration, educational technical guidance and data collection (Sudjana, 2017: 289).

Another factor that is capable of influencing gross regional domestic product is labor. In Law 13 of 2003, every person who is able to do work that produces goods or services, both to meet their own needs and for the community is called labor (Agusmidah, 2012: 6). According to Payaman Simanjuntak, manpower is a resident who is or is currently working, is looking for work, and who is carrying out other activities, such as going to school and managing the household. The definition of labor and not labor according to him is determined by age or age.

Based on the background above, researchers are interested in examining issues related to economic growth. And of course a problem arises which causes low economic growth. Therefore the researcher proposes the title **"Analysis of the Effect of Education Funds, Health Funds and Labor Funds on Regional Revenues in the City of South Tangerang for the Period of 2013 - 2018".**

1. **Literature Review**

**Government Fund Theory**

Development Model About Development of Government Expenditures. This model was developed by Rostow and Musgrave which links the development of government spending with the stages of economic development which are distinguished between the initial, intermediate, and advanced stages. In the initial stages of economic development, the percentage of government investment to total large investment, because at this stage the government must provide infrastructure, such as education, health, transportation infrastructure, and so on. In the intermediate stage of economic development, government investment is still needed to increase economic growth so that it can take off, but at this stage the role of private investment has been increasingly enlarged. At a further economic level, Rostow said in Mangkoesoebroto (2012: 170), that economic development of government activities shifted from providing infrastructure to expenditures for social activities such as old age welfare programs, public health service programs, and so on.

Wagner's theory of the development of government spending is called the Wagner law of increased government activity. This theory suggests the development of government spending which is increasing in percentage against the GNP, where this theory is based on observations in European countries, US, and Japan in the 19th century (Mangkoesoebroto, 2012: 167). Wagner expressed his opinion in the form of a Wagner law, as follows: In an economy, if per capita income rises, government spending will increase in relative terms.

Seeing the development of government activities from year to year, the role of government tends to increase. The increase in government activity is due to several factors because:

1. An increase in the level of community income, then the needs of the community also increase. This has resulted in increased government activities in an effort to meet the needs of the community, such as the need for public transportation, education and health infrastructure.
2. Population development. This requires an increase in government activities to keep pace with the development of the population in meeting the needs of the population.
3. Economic development, also requires a large role for the government to fill economic activities.

**Government Funds for Education**

Development spending on the development sector can be allocated to provide educational infrastructure and provide educational services to the entire population equally. The education budget of 20% (percent) is a form of government realization to improve education. Investment in terms of education is absolutely necessary, the government must be able to build a means and a good education system. The budget allocation for government expenditure on education is a tangible manifestation of investment to increase community productivity.

According to Setiawan (2016: 12) the implication of development in education is that human life will be more quality. In relation to the economy in general (national) the higher the quality of life of a nation, the higher the level of growth and welfare of the nation. The higher the quality of life / investment of high quality human resources will also have implications for the level of national economic growth.

**Government Funds for Health**

The level of public health can be seen based on the quality and services provided by the government for public health. Patients / community see quality health services as a health service that can meet the needs that are felt and organized in a manner that is polite and polite, timely, responsive and able to cure complaints and prevent the development or spread of disease (Pohan, 2016: 13). To realize the level of public health, it is necessary to have a budget that becomes expenditure for a city through tax collection for the community. The choice of tax type becomes very important in efforts to improve tax compliance. Fluctuations in tax compliance will affect the acquisition of tax revenue and subsequently will have an impact on local government spending which will ultimately have an impact on economic growth (Siamanjuntak, 2012: 198).

**Employment**

Based on Law No. 13 of 2003 Chapter 1 article 1 Paragraph 2 which states that someone who is able to do a job to produce goods or services to meet their own needs or for the surrounding community. As a whole the population in a government or state has two groups which are laborers and not laborers. Age determined by the Indonesian government aged 15-64 years. So everyone who is able or able to work is called labor.

n Law 13 of 2003, every person who is able to do work that produces goods or services, both to meet their own needs and for the community is called labor (Agusmidah, 2012: 6). According to Payaman Simanjuntak, manpower is a resident who is or is currently working, is looking for work, and who is carrying out other activities, such as going to school and managing the household. The definition of labor and not labor according to him is determined by age or age.

**Gross Regional Domestic Product**

An important indicator to be able to know the economic conditions of a region in a certain period of time is to use Gross Regional Domestic Product (GRDP) data, can use at current prices or at constant prices. According to Sukirno (2016: 24), economic growth is an increase in output per capita in the long run, the emphasis is on three aspects namely process, output per capita, and long term. Economic growth is a process, not just a brief economic picture. Regional development and sectoral development must be carried out in line so that sectoral development in the regions can run according to regional potentials and priorities. Gross Regional Domestic Product (GRDP) is the amount of added value generated for all business areas and services in an area applying the amount the entire value of final goods and services produced by all economic units. GRDP itself can be interpreted as the amount of added value generated by all business units or is the total value of goods and services by all economic units in a region (BPS, 2019).

GRDP is calculated based on current prices and at constant prices. GRDP at current prices (nominal) or At current nominal prices which shows the ability of economic resources in a region to produce output in a period that is valued at current prices. GRDP at current prices is used to see the structure of the economy or the role of each sector and the picture of the economy in the current year. GRDP based on constant prices or constant prices are used to see the economic growth of a region both overall and sectoral.

**The development of GRDP is based on several factors**

Price Changes are Increase / decrease in the economy caused by changes in prices that occur in the market. In general these prices tend to increase so that regional income based on current prices from year to year always shows an increase.

Real Change Is an increase / decrease in the economy calculated based on real changes, meaning that prices are not included anymore. The common understanding used by economists is that income has been eliminated from the influence of inflation.

Regional income based on current prices that have been reduced by inflation is known as regional income at constant prices. This latter regional income is generally widely used by bureaucrats, researchers and economists.

**Hypothesis**

The hypothesis is a temporary answer to the formulation of the research problem, where the research problem formulation has been stated in the form of sentence questions (Sugiyono, 2012: 25). The hypotheses in this study are:

1. It is suspected that local government spending on education funds has a partial effect on gross regional domestic product.
2. It is suspected that local government spending on health funds partially influences gross regional domestic product.
3. It is suspected that labor absorption partially influences gross regional domestic product.
4. **Research Methods**

The research conducted is an empirical study in which the researcher is directly involved in the research. This study was conducted to analyze how much influence the government education funds (X1), government health funds (X2) and employment (X3) on gross regional domestic product (Y).

In this study, samples are not needed. Because the entire research object can be reached by researchers. The population studied is government expenditure on education, health and employment absorption and gross regional domestic product in South Tangerang City in 2013 - 2018.

The method used in this study uses panel data regression analysis to determine the effect of education funds, health funds and labor absorption on gross regional domestic product (GRDP).

To explain the strength and direction of the influence of several independent variables or explanatory variables (independent / explanatory variable) on one dependent variable, the data analysis method in this study (education funds, health funds and labor absorption) uses multiple regression models or Multiple Regression (Ghozali, 2013: 5). This scientific approach uses positive economics and statistics.

This regression equation aims to measure the strength of the relationship between two or more variables and show the direction of the relationship between the dependent variable and the independent variable (Ghozali 2013: 96). The method used to analyze this thesis is quantitative data using multiple regression analysis models, with some testing data from BPS Kota Tangerang Selatan. Variables consisting of dependent variables (Y) and independent variables (X). The dependent variable consists of one variable, namely "return on assets" and the independent variable consisting of education funds, health funds and employment. From these variables an analysis will be examined whether the influence of variable X on the Y variable in the regression analysis. In the analysis will use analysis tools in the form of a software Eviews 9.0.

The data analysis model used in this study is a multiple linear analysis model using EViews 8.1 software. The multiple regression analysis model is used to measure the effect of more than one independent variable on the dependent variable. The test criteria performed are using the coefficient of determination test (R2), statistical test of partial regression coefficients (t test) and F statistic testing.

1. **Results and Discussion**

**Model Determination**

The research conducted this time, chose the generalized least square (GLS) estimation approach with the fixed effect model (FEM). This was determined after going through a number of model selection processes (chow & hausman tests) and some classical assumption test analyzes. Tests carried out to determine the estimation model are the chow test and the Hausman test. Where the chow test is a test that determines the model between the common effect model and the fixed effect model. While the Hausman test is a test that determines the model between the fixed effect model and also the random effect model. The result is that the model that the researcher uses is the FEM model, but the classical assumption test that the researcher does does not pass the test, such as autocorrelation and multicollinearity found in the model. Because this is the researcher using the weight or GLS approach in the FEM estimation model, because of that, the thirst test is no longer needed because the weight or weighting does not exist or is not performed in the REM model because the REM model already uses the GLS approach (Widarjono, 2007). Then, testing classic assumptions can also be ignored because the estimation model used is GLS (Sedyadi, 2014).

1. **Chow Test Results**

The following are the chow test results:

Table 1

Chow Test Results

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Redundant Fixed Effects Tests |  |  |
| Pool: Untitled |  |  |  |
| Test cross-section fixed effects |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Effects Test | Statistic   | d.f.  | Prob.  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Cross-section F | 2.519110 | (6,32) | 0.0413 |
| Cross-section Chi-square | 16.247629 | 6 | 0.0125 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Cross-section fixed effects test equation: |  |
| Dependent Variable: PDRB? |  |  |
| Method: Panel Least Squares |  |  |
| Date: 09/26/19 Time: 13:13 |  |  |
| Sample: 2013 2018 |  |  |
| Included observations: 6 |  |  |
| Cross-sections included: 7 |  |  |
| Total pool (balanced) observations: 42 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Variable | Coefficient | Std. Error | t-Statistic | Prob.   |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| C | 1.97E+12 | 5.40E+11 | 3.642713 | 0.0008 |
| DP? | -1354.688 | 1458.743 | -0.928668 | 0.3589 |
| DK? | 3102.941 | 1149.197 | 2.700094 | 0.0103 |
| PTK? | 24002278 | 17437154 | 1.376502 | 0.1767 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| R-squared | 0.227597 |     Mean dependent var | 2.89E+12 |
| Adjusted R-squared | 0.166618 |     S.D. dependent var | 1.45E+12 |
| S.E. of regression | 1.32E+12 |     Akaike info criterion | 58.74785 |
| Sum squared resid | 6.64E+25 |     Schwarz criterion | 58.91334 |
| Log likelihood | -1229.705 |     Hannan-Quinn criter. | 58.80851 |
| F-statistic | 3.732378 |     Durbin-Watson stat | 1.788756 |
| Prob(F-statistic) | 0.019097 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

 Source: data processed 2019

From the test results, the value of the cross-section F is 0.0125. Where:

H0 = *Common Effect Model*

H1 = *Fixed Effect Model*

Because the probability value of the cross-section F is 0.0125, then H0 is rejected (because more than 0.005), the significance level used is 0.005 (α = 5%). So it is certain that the FEM estimation model is the right model for this research. Due to the autocorrelation and multicollinearity in this model, the researchers used weights in the FEM estimation model, to be able to ignore the classical assumption test. Because the REM estimation model cannot use weights, the thirst test (FEM or REM selection) is not necessary.

1. **Hausman Test Results**

The following are the results of the Hausman test:

Table 2

Hausman Test Results

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Correlated Random Effects - Hausman Test |  |
| Pool: Untitled |  |  |  |
| Test cross-section random effects |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Test Summary | Chi-Sq. Statistic | Chi-Sq. d.f. | Prob.  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Cross-section random | 10.370961 | 3 | 0.0157 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Cross-section random effects test comparisons: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Variable | Fixed   | Random  | Var(Diff.)  | Prob.  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| DP? | -18 | -1210.304781 | 465212.885152 | 0.0807 |
| DK? | 3423 | 3185.301334 | 160125.199360 | 0.5524 |
| PTK? | -18231693 | 21936679 | 610153717941533.25 | 0.1039 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Cross-section random effects test equation: |  |
| Dependent Variable: PDRB? |  |  |
| Method: Panel Least Squares |  |  |
| Date: 09/26/19 Time: 13:32 |  |  |
| Sample: 2013 2018 |  |  |
| Included observations: 6 |  |  |
| Cross-sections included: 7 |  |  |
| Total pool (balanced) observations: 42 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Variable | Coefficient | Std. Error | t-Statistic | Prob.   |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| C | 2.01E+12 | 6.16E+11 | 3.260966 | 0.0026 |
| DP? | -18.80265 | 1496.453 | -0.012565 | 0.9901 |
| DK? | 3423.041 | 1113.390 | 3.074431 | 0.0043 |
| PTK? | -18231694 | 29692377 | -0.614019 | 0.5435 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Effects Specification |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Cross-section fixed (dummy variables) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| R-squared | 0.475389 |     Mean dependent var | 2.89E+12 |
| Adjusted R-squared | 0.327842 |     S.D. dependent var | 1.45E+12 |
| S.E. of regression | 1.19E+12 |     Akaike info criterion | 58.64671 |
| Sum squared resid | 4.51E+25 |     Schwarz criterion | 59.06044 |
| Log likelihood | -1221.581 |     Hannan-Quinn criter. | 58.79836 |
| F-statistic | 3.221948 |     Durbin-Watson stat | 2.305719 |
| Prob(F-statistic) | 0.006852 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

 Source: data processed 2019

From the test results, the value of the random cross-section probability is 0.0157, where:

H0 = *Random Effect Model*

H1 = *Fixed Effect Model*

Because the result of the hausman test is 0.0157, where the result is smaller than the significance level of 0.05 (5%), then H0 is rejected and H1 is accepted. Then it is certain that the model that must be used is the fixed effect model (FEM).

**Hypothesis test**

1. **Statistic test**

Following are the results of the fixed effect estimation model using the GLS approach.

Table 4.3

Results of Calculation of Panel Data Estimation for the GLS Method

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Dependent Variable: PDRB? |  |  |
| Method: Pooled Least Squares |  |  |
| Date: 09/26/19 Time: 13:45 |  |  |
| Sample: 2013 2018 |  |  |
| Included observations: 6 |  |  |
| Cross-sections included: 7 |  |  |
| Total pool (balanced) observations: 42 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Variable | Coefficient | Std. Error | t-Statistic | Prob.   |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| C | 2.01E+12 | 6.16E+11 | 3.260966 | 0.0026 |
| DP? | -18.80265 | 1496.453 | -0.012565 | 0.9901 |
| DK? | 3423.041 | 1113.390 | 3.074431 | 0.0043 |
| PTK? | -18231694 | 29692377 | -0.614019 | 0.5435 |
| Fixed Effects (Cross) |  |  |  |  |
| \_CIPUTAT--C | 1.72E+12 |  |  |  |
| \_CIPUTAT\_TIMUR--C | -1.78E+10 |  |  |  |
| \_PAMULANG--C | -1.03E+12 |  |  |  |
| \_PONDOK\_AREN--C | -5.33E+11 |  |  |  |
| \_SERPONG--C | -8.06E+11 |  |  |  |
| \_SERPONG\_UTARA--C | -5.72E+09 |  |  |  |
| \_SETU--C | 6.65E+11 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Effects Specification |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Cross-section fixed (dummy variables) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| R-squared | 0.475389 |     Mean dependent var | 2.89E+12 |
| Adjusted R-squared | 0.327842 |     S.D. dependent var | 1.45E+12 |
| S.E. of regression | 1.19E+12 |     Akaike info criterion | 58.64671 |
| Sum squared resid | 4.51E+25 |     Schwarz criterion | 59.06044 |
| Log likelihood | -1221.581 |     Hannan-Quinn criter. | 58.79836 |
| F-statistic | 3.221948 |     Durbin-Watson stat | 2.305719 |
| Prob(F-statistic) | 0.006852 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Source: Data processed, 2019

1. R-squared coefficient results (Determination coefficient)

In accordance with the estimation model table above, the R-squared (R2) value obtained from the FEM estimation model of the GLS approach is 47%, which means, the variable education funds, health funds and employment are able to explain the variable gross regional domestic product (GRDP) of 47 %. It can be said that the 47% gross regional domestic product (PDRB) is influenced by education funds, health funds and employment, the remaining 53% can be explained / influenced by other variables beyond the three variables.

1. F-statistic test (Simultaneous Significance / Model)

How to test F-statistics are as follows:

H0: The influence of variable x together on the variable y

H1: There is no influence between variables x together on the y variable

In this study, the alpha value or significance was 5% (0.05), while the F-statistic probability value was 0.006852. It can be said that the F-statistic probability value is smaller than the alpha value, so it can be concluded that the model the researcher is using is good (it can simultaneously affect the variable y).

Education funds, health funds and workforce absorption together have a positive and significant effect on gross regional domestic product in 2013 - 2018 The result is that the F-statistical probability value is smaller than 0.05, so the initial hypothesis of the researcher is accepted.

1. Test t-statistics (Probability t-statistics)

In accordance with the GLS estimation model table, the variable education fund has a probability value of 0.9901, the effect produced by this variable is negative, as seen from the coefficient value of -18.80265 which can be interpreted, if the education fund increases by 1 percent will cause the value Gross regional domestic product fell also by 18.8265 percent.

While for the health fund variable, it has a t-statistic probability value of 0.0043. The relationship that occurs is positive, because the coefficient of the variable health fund is 3423,041, which can be interpreted, if the health fund rises by one percent, it will cause an increase in the value of gross regional domestic product of 3423,041 percent (assuming others are the same / ceteris paribus).

The last variable is the employment variable. The t-statistic probability value for this variable is 0.5435, the relationship is negative, because the coefficient of this variable is -18231694. Where when there is an increase in labor absorption of one percent, it will cause the value of gross regional domestic product to fall by 1823,1694 percent but not significantly.

**Model Analysis**

1. **Technical Analysis**

The following are the results of the panel data regression model analysis:

Table 4.6

Results of GLS Method Panel Data Interpretation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Dependent Variable: PDRB? |  |  |
| Method: Pooled Least Squares |  |  |
| Date: 09/26/19 Time: 13:45 |  |  |
| Sample: 2013 2018 |  |  |
| Included observations: 6 |  |  |
| Cross-sections included: 7 |  |  |
| Total pool (balanced) observations: 42 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Variable | Coefficient | Std. Error | t-Statistic | Prob.   |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| C | 2.01E+12 | 6.16E+11 | 3.260966 | 0.0026 |
| DP? | -18.80265 | 1496.453 | -0.012565 | 0.9901 |
| DK? | 3423.041 | 1113.390 | 3.074431 | 0.0043 |
| PTK? | -18231694 | 29692377 | -0.614019 | 0.5435 |
| Fixed Effects (Cross) |  |  |  |  |
| \_CIPUTAT--C | 1.72E+12 |  |  | 3.73E+12 |
| \_CIPUTAT\_TIMUR--C | -1.78E+10 |  |  | 1.99E+12 |
| \_PAMULANG--C | -1.03E+12 |  |  | 9.80E+11 |
| \_PONDOK\_AREN--C | -5.33E+11 |  |  | 1.48E+12 |
| \_SERPONG--C | -8.06E+11 |  |  | 1.20E+12 |
| \_SERPONG\_UTARA--C | -5.72E+09 |  |  | 2.00E+12 |
| \_SETU--C | 6.65E+11 |  |  | 2.68E+12 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Effects Specification |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Cross-section fixed (dummy variables) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| R-squared | 0.475389 |     Mean dependent var | 2.89E+12 |
| Adjusted R-squared | 0.327842 |     S.D. dependent var | 1.45E+12 |
| S.E. of regression | 1.19E+12 |     Akaike info criterion | 58.64671 |
| Sum squared resid | 4.51E+25 |     Schwarz criterion | 59.06044 |
| Log likelihood | -1221.581 |     Hannan-Quinn criter. | 58.79836 |
| F-statistic | 3.221948 |     Durbin-Watson stat | 2.305719 |
| Prob(F-statistic) | 0.006852 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

 Source: Data processed, 2019

General functions (South Tangerang):

PDRB = 2,01E+12 – 18,80265\*LOGPEND + 3423,041\*LOGKES –18231694\*LOGPTK

1. When education funds increase by 1%, the value of GRDP will decrease by 18.80265%.
2. When the health fund increases by 1%, the GRDP value will increase by 3423,041%.
3. When the absorption of labor rises by 1%, the value of the GRDP will increase by 18231694%.
4. When there is no increase or decrease in education funds, health funds and employment, the GRDP value will increase by 2.01E + 12 units.

**Economic Analysis**

1. **Education Fund**

According to the results of technical analysis, education funds do not have a negative and significant relationship, which means that each increase of one percent in the education sector will cause gross regional domestic product to also increase by 18,80265 percent with the exception of other conditions ceteris paribus (other conditions are fixed). When education funds go down by 1%, it will cause GRDP in Indonesia to increase by 2.01E + 12 index units ([0.01 \* - 18.80265] + 2.01E + 12).

The negative relationship occurs due to education funds in the form of school operational assistance, assistance funds for underprivileged children, teacher allowance assistance can increase insight and knowledge and can make an individual longer to attend school (9-year compulsory education), where knowledge insight and length of schooling is one of the second dimensions of decent living GRDP However, the increase occurred only by 2.01E + 12 units if the education fund rose by 1%, where the average government education sector expenditure ranged from 10-60 Trillion from 2013-2018. Seeing this condition, it would be better if government spending in the education sector was increased and more closely monitored the policies of the education sector expenditure, for example education guarantee assistance, more monitored the use process so that all individuals can fund all individuals to live properly according to the dimensions first GRDP. So that later when there is only a 1% increase in education sector spending can further increase the value of GRDP in South Tangerang.

1. **Health Funds**

In accordance with the results of technical analysis, health funds have a positive and significant relationship, which means that every one percent increase in the health sector will cause gross regional domestic product to increase by 3423,041 percent with the exception of other conditions ceteris paribus (the other conditions are fixed). When the health fund increases by 1%, it will cause the GRDP in Indonesia to increase by 2.01E + 12 index units ([0.01 \* + 3423.041] + 2.01E + 12).

This positive relationship occurs because government spending in the health sector in the form of health insurance assistance, health insurance for pregnant and lactating women can make an individual live healthier and live longer according to the first decent living dimensions of the GRDP so that the quality of human resources represented by the GRDP value will increase. However, the increase occurred only by 2.01E + 12 index units if the health fund increased by 1%, where the average government health sector spending ranged from 10 to 60 trillion from 2013 - 2018. Seeing this condition, it would be even better if health funds are improved and more closely monitored the running of policies from health funds, for example health insurance assistance, more closely monitored the use process so that all individuals can access JKN more easily and all individuals can live properly according to the first dimension of the GRDP. So that later when there is only a 1% increase in health sector spending can further increase the value of GRDP in South Tangerang

1. **Labor Absorption**

According to the results of technical analysis, employment does not have a negative and significant relationship, which means that each increase of one percent in the labor sector will cause gross regional domestic product to increase by 1823,1694 percent with the exception of other conditions ceteris paribus (other conditions are fixed). When education funds decrease by 1%, it will cause GRDP in Indonesia to increase by 2.01E + 12 index units ([0.01 \* - 18231694] + 2.01E + 12).

The negative relationship occurred due to labor absorption in the form of unemployment reduction, employment opportunities, where work is one of the second dimensions of decent living GRDP However, the increase occurred only by 2.01E + 12 units when labor absorption increased by 1%, where the average government expenditure in the labor sector ranges from 9-40 Trillion from 2013-2018. Seeing this condition, it would be better if government spending in the employment sector is increased and more closely monitored the running of policies from the labor sector expenditure, for example the provision of labor, increasing the number of employers who are able to absorb labor, more closely monitored the use process so all individuals can fund all individuals can live according to the first dimension of GRDP. So that later when there is only a 1% increase in labor sector expenditure can further increase the value of GRDP in South Tangerang.

1. **Conclusion**

Based on the results of research and discussion on the influence of education funds, health funds and employment in the regional gross domestic product, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. Based on the partial panel data regression results, the results of the t test show that the education funding variable has no effect on the gross regional domestic product (GRDP).
2. Based on the results of partial panel data regression, the results of the t test show that the health fund variable influences gross regional domestic product (GRDP).
3. Based on the results of partial panel data regression, the results of the t test show that the employment absorption variable has no effect on gross regional domestic product (GRDP).
4. Based on the results of simultaneous panel data regression, the results of the F test show that the three independent variables, namely education funds, health funds and workforce absorption simultaneously affect the gross regional domestic product (GRDP).
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