

## INFLUENCE OF FISCAL POLICY ON THE POVERTY IN ACEH PROVINCE

Syarifuddin\*, Raja Masbar<sup>1</sup>, Mohd. Nur Syechalad<sup>1</sup>, Agussabti<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Faculty of Economics and Business Syiah Kuala University

<sup>2</sup>Faculty of Agriculture Syiah Kuala University

\*Corresponding Author's Email: [syarifuddinhasan767@gmail.com](mailto:syarifuddinhasan767@gmail.com)

### Abstract

The purpose of this study is to analyse the factors that cause poverty and the effects of various fiscal policies on poverty in the Aceh Province. The data used in this research is secondary panel data on the cause of poverty with 23 regencies/cities in the Aceh province. While to examine the fiscal policy, we apply the data on 18 districts/cities for 5 years during 2010-2014. The research model employs is Fixed Effect Model (FEM). The results show that the cause of poverty using FEM are indicated by the average length of the previous school, unemployment and capital have a significant negative effect on the poverty. The estimation results of fiscal policy using FEM approach showed that only BKPG's Program has a significant negative effect on the number of poverty. However, the fiscal policy through government expenditure on Raskin's Program has a positive impact on it with the accuracy point of 95 percent. The final results of estimation of poverty and fiscal policy stated that the number of poor people in each area are still exist, it is impossible to eradicate, but it is only able to reduced. Poverty will derive an issues of lack of education and employment. Therefore, training, empowerment and entrepreneurship programs are needed.

**Keywords:** Fiscal Policy, Poverty, Fixed Effect Model (FEM), Education, Cross-Sectional

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Poverty is an economic development issues, it is not only in less developed countries but also in developed countries. The problem of poverty became one of the targets of development policy in each country. To overcome poverty requires the development efforts and policies that support the implementation of such development. The effort that has been done directly can be seen in the form of an increasing income per capita. However, Sen (1983) found that the increasing of income per capita is not guarantee the relative distribution of welfare.

Most of the societies in Aceh Province remains below the poverty line. This condition is more affected by the ongoing local conflict. Moreover, the earthquake and tsunami disaster on December 26, 2004 has destroyed people's economic activities. due to this problem, the number of poor people continues to grow. Until now, the process of rehabilitation and reconstruction after the tsunami had not been able to reduce the number of poverty. In 2006, around 45 percent of the total population of the province could be classified as a poor people (foyer Indonesia, 2006). The poverty rate in Aceh Province and National level are shown in the table below:

**Table 1. Poverty in Aceh Province and National Over the Period of 2008 to 2013 (%)**

Year	Poverty rate in Aceh	Poverty rate in National Level
March 2008	23,53	15,42
March 2009	21,80	14,15
March 2010	20,98	13,33
March 2011	19,57	12,36
March 2012	19,46	11,96
September 2012	18,58	11,66
March 2013	17,60	11,37
September 2013	17,72	11,47

Source: [www.bps.go.id](http://www.bps.go.id), 2008-2013 (Data Processed)

Table 1 illustrates that the poverty in 2008 reached about 23,53 percent, then on 2013 it decrease but still in the position of 17.72 percent. According to yearly trend indicates that the rate of poverty keep shrinking until the end of 2013. However, Aceh positioned as priority areas by the percentage of poverty which is greater than the national level which stand on 11.47 percent in 2013. Thus, there is a solution to solve poverty problem by using the fiscal policy. Fiscal policy is a government policy that is intended to influence the way or the economic life of the societies through the State Budget or APBN.

The fiscal policy was established to earn the funds and spend it in order to carry out the construction. It is one of economic policies which tend to drive the economic atmosphere being conducive by arranging the income and expenditure of the government. In fact, Aceh Province is also implementing the fiscal policies that could be beneficial to the welfare of society. In the framework of the implementation of Aceh Development Plan 2007-2012 has been implemented and it will be continued eight programs as strategic activities which based on societies approach. The programs are; Health Insurance Aceh (JKA), scholarships for orphans, scholarships for

students whose study in domestic and abroad, housing aid orphans and victims of conflict, development funds and operational funds for islamic institution, accomodation for religions such as mosques and financial support for villages (BKPG).

Based on the explanation above can be concluded that the societies in Aceh Province still remains below the poverty line. It is proven by the percentage of poverty level documented by BPS. However, there are an efforts has been done to reduce the poverty rate, either by local government or central government. There are several types of fiscal policies has been implemented in Aceh Province to reduce the poverty rate, among others: Direct Cash Assistance (BLT), Rice for the Poor People (Raskin), Community Empowerment Program (PNPM Mandiri), Aceh Health Insurance (JKA), Scholarship for poor students. Every year, the budget of Aceh Province keep growing but the poverty rate is not declining. Regarding to the background of the poverty condition in Aceh, this research will analyse the poverty problem which is related to fiscal policy with the title: ” **Influence of Fiscal Policy on The Poverty In Aceh Province**”.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

According to Nanga (2006) fiscal decentralisation has very strong indication to exacerbate rural poverty rate. Hence, fiscal policy has an important role, both to economic growth and poverty reduction nationally. Economic recovery quickly and unusually large compared with fiscal response during the economic downturn (Hong, 2010). Poverty reduction depends on the financial condition of an area, especially the developing countries. The better the country then, the financial share will be greater. The credit distribution is one of the solution to reduce poverty. Results showed economic growth rotates very slowly by the financial sector and the number of poverty. When the economic growth is increasing very high, it will reduce the percentage of poverty (Uddin, et al., 2014).

However, if the labor forces equally have higher education it will significantly contribute to economic growth. But the selection of the education investment will reduce the risk of poverty. Then, the selection of education effected the people health. Therefore, it is necessary to do a high sacrifice. The analysis indicated that the education and health have impact in reducing poverty (Gounder and Xing, 2012). In addition, economic potention able to decrease the poverty rate significantly. Government involvement is very important factor in order to shrinking the poverty. Hence, Akambit and Toit (2011) noted that the raising of fiscal policy around 10 percent is the best tool for encouraging the economic growth, especially the impact of political stability and government effectiveness and poverty reduction policies should be a priority. The poverty rate will increase due to structural changes. In line with the model of Sen Index explains the growth of poverty in the Scandinavian began to slowly decline. It caused by proper growth of economic tend to establish jobs based on the needs of societies (Mussard and Alperin, 2011). On the other hand, the distribution of income in China, both rural and urban is very equal, so there is no difference in some groups even against some of the high income (Hajargasht and Griffiths, 2013).

## 3. RESEARCH METHOD

The data required to analyse corresponding problems above is a panel data with cross section area as much as 23 districts/cities regarding to the causes of poverty and 18 districts/cities regarding to the effects of fiscal policy in the Province of Aceh. Hence, in this research time series data are used for 5 years over the period of 2010 to 2014. Then, for the variable factors that cause poverty, namely; consumption (CONS), the average length of deases per month (LKIT), the average length of the school (YOS), unemployment (UN) and capital (CAP). While fiscal policy variables are PNPM Mandiri, PKPG, Raskin, scholarships for pauper/orphan (BEA). The model used in this study is the Fix Effect Model (FEM). To simplify the study, researchers formulate these variables into two models as follows:

$$POV_{it} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1CONS_{it} + \alpha_2LKIT_{it} + \alpha_3YOS_{it} + \alpha_4UN_{it} + \alpha_5CAP_{it} + e_{it} \quad (1)$$

$$POV_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1PNPM_{it} + \beta_2PKPG_{it} + \beta_3Raskin_{it} + \beta_4Bea_{it} + e_{it} \quad (2)$$

For the first model, there is an expansion lag variable -1 on YOS and LKIT. According to the theory, the increasing of education is a tool to decline the poverty. However, in order to push the education it needs large amount of funds, so that the people will think hardly about continuing a study. It is similar to the average length of deases as a health factor's needed to be care. If the length of deases too long, it will decrease the productivity of labor and impact on the its salaries. Therefore, the third model is formulated as follows:

$$POV_{it} = \pi_0 + \pi_1CONS_{it} + \pi_2LKIT_{it-1} + \pi_3YOS_{it-1} + \pi_4UN_{it} + \pi_5CAP_{it} + e_{it} \quad (3)$$

#### 4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Panel regression analysis is completed to review the causes of poverty regarding to consumption, lenght of disease, length of education, unemployment, and capital to the poverty in 23 regencies/cities in Aceh Province using FEM models. The results of the FEM as follows:

**Table 2. The Factors that Influence The Poverty Using FEM**

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	T-Statistic	Prob.
C	70689.79	13778.99	5.130259	0.0000
CONS	-90.26863	78.27899	-1.153165	0.2531
LKIT(-1)	335.9866	238.6255	1.408008	0.164
YOS(-1)	-2821.441	1292.566	-2.182821	0.0327**
UN	-0.284789	0.064232	-4.433724	0.0000***
CAP	-0.000914	0.000506	-1.805093	0.0758*

Description: α = \*10%, \*\*5%, \*\*\*1%

The poor are generally the inability of a person to meet daily need due to lack of education, and skill, it impacts on lower income and employment. If the poor societies do not

change the economic structure of the two causes of the poor will certainly continue in a vicious circle. If it is seen an average coefficient value of the school and greater unemployment reduction impacts of poverty. But the completion of the study on the poverty factors it is not the same from one region to another with the same factor.

Table 2 demonstrates that the improvement of consumption for the main factors gave negative results. Adequacy of food consumption increases will pull out of the circle of the poor but the results of these estimates do not significantly influence. Moreover, between health and education give great results with the initial theory. The longer a person is going to get sick, the more difficult it out of poverty. Education and health has a strong correlation, higher education carries a high income so that the ability to have better health will be met. In Aceh Province, there is health insurance program for the poor people but the services are not as high as middle income people because they pay for health. It means that if someone gets sick and the poor people want to recover it is not possible with low income. Nevertheless, it is proven that education as a powerful solution in reducing poverty according to the previous research (Gounder and Xing, 2012).

Unemployment has a negative and significant relationship to poverty. There are so many prior researches mention that, unemployment and poverty are very close and gave positive results, both are negative social economy. It is true, but only in the long term unemployment leads to poverty. While in the short-term unemployment and poverty are very different from the skilled unemploys and residual income from a previous job. The estimation of the results above explains that the rise of the status of poor people becoming unemployed will give a significant effect on unemployment. Meanwhile, capital is significantly influence as an alternative to reduce poverty.

Based on the estimation on the several districts/cities which reducing the poverty using the factors above, they are: Banda Aceh, Aceh Tenggara, Pidie Jaya, Aceh Selatan, Nagan Raya, Bener Meriah, Lhokseumawe, Langsa, Aceh Barat Daya, Gayo Lues, Aceh Singkil, Simeulue, Aceh Jaya, Subulussalam and Sabang. Finally, there is the results of the area mapping by the poverty factors are as follows:

**Table 3. Mapping Area Based on The Poverty Factors Using  
*Fixed Effect Model (Person)***

No.	Area	POV <sub>i</sub>	β+ POV <sub>i</sub>	No.	Area	POV <sub>i</sub>	β+ POV <sub>i</sub>
1	Aceh Utara	89278	159968	13	Nagan Raya	-9963	60727
2	Pidie	51043	121733	14	Bener Meriah	-10315	60374
3	Bireuen	39531	110221	15	Lhokseumawe	-11797	58893
4	Aceh Besar	35281	105971	16	Langsa	-14029	56661
5	Aceh Timur	28229	98918	17	Aceh Barat Daya	-17228	53461
6	Aceh Tamiang	4106	74796	18	Gayo Lues	-21953	48737
7	Aceh Barat	3339	74029	19	Aceh Singkil	-22820	47870
8	Aceh Tengah	-4126	66563	20	Simeulue	-23330	47360
9	Banda Aceh	-5793	64897	21	Aceh Jaya	-25507	45183

<b>10</b>	Aceh Tenggara	-7243	63447	<b>22</b>	Subulussalam	-28622	42067
<b>11</b>	Pidie Jaya	-7630	63060	<b>23</b>	Sabang	-30626	40064
<b>12</b>	Aceh Selatan	-9826	60864				

The table 3 above states that the five regions of North Aceh, Pidie, Bireuen and Aceh Besar have the number of poor people exceeds 100,000. Meanwhile, the number of poor people in the area of East Aceh reached 98,918 people. While there are 74,796 people in Aceh Tamiang and Aceh Barat there are 74,029 people. The results of Cross-Effect explained by looking at the poverty factor, it is only 16 areas capable of a reduction when all the variables are used. But seven regions ranked from 1 to 7 illustrate the variable factor of poor do not provide a solution to reduce the amount of poverty in the region. Nevertheless, Aceh Barat and Aceh Tamiang are has been changed the amount of poverty, but it is not far from five other regions.

**Table 4. Fiscal Policy and Its Impact on Poverty Using FEM**

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Coefficient</b>	<b>Std. Error</b>	<b>T-Statistic</b>	<b>Prob.</b>
C	43806.84	2146.585	20.40769	0.000
PNPM	-8.57E-09	2.55E-08	-0.335732	0.7381
BKPG	-2.15E-07	3.51E-08	-6.134885	0.0000***
RASKIN	0.000883	0.00013	6.763906	0.0000***
BEA	1.50E-07	1.68E-07	0.894859	0.374

Description:  $\alpha$  = \*10%, \*\*5%, \*\*\*1%

The estimation results of PNPM explained by -8.57E-09, if the government increased spending on PNPM of 100 billion rupiah, the number of poor declined around 857 people but had no significant effect ( $0.7381 > 0.05$ ). For variable BKPG of -2.15E-07, it is explained if expenditures of BKPG rise to 100 billion rupiah, the number of poor people will drop further to 21,500 and it is statistically with the prob 0.000 less than 5 percent, mean that BKPG significant negative effect on the poverty. While Raskin with the coefficient value 0.000883, it states that the increase in expenditure of 1 million rupiah would decrease the number of poor as many as 883 people and statistically significant ( $0.000 < 0.05$ ). The last, for BEA variables of 1.50E-07, it indicates that the increase in expenditure for BEA as much as 1 billion it gave the effect of decreasing the number of poor as many as 150 people.

In the economy, poor is view as a problem that often occurs in various regions. The government has role to and obligation to reduce the poverty. Otherwise, the increase in the number of poor people would destabilize the economy. Hence, the government programs such as PNPM, BKPG, Raskin and Scholarship as the solution of the various policies. The results found that BKPG program able to reduce significantly and sharply against the amount of poverty. However, the program Raskin otherwise will increase the number of poor people, if it increased government spending for the sector. Therefore, it is not the proper solution because Raskin is consumptive or only effect in short run.

**Table 5. Area Mapping by Fiscal Policy Using**

*Fixed Effect Model (person)*

No.	Area	POV <sub>i</sub>	β+ POV <sub>i</sub>	No.	Area	POV <sub>i</sub>	β+ POV <sub>i</sub>
1	Aceh Utara	74801	118608	10	Nagan Raya	-11038	32769
2	Pidie	44292	88099	11	Bener Meriah	-11908	31899
3	Bireuen	30770	74577	12	Aceh Tenggara	-13753	30054
4	Aceh Besar	23299	67106	13	Aceh Selatan	-14228	29578
5	Aceh Timur	20623	64430	14	Aceh Barat Daya	-19909	23897
6	Aceh Barat	-87	43720	15	Aceh Singkil	-24077	19730
7	Aceh Tamiang	-2140	41667	16	Gayo Lues	-24856	18951
8	Aceh Tengah	-8484	35323	17	Simeulue	-25219	18588
9	Pidie Jaya	-10260	33547	18	Aceh Jaya	-27826	15981

The results of cross sectional data in Table 5 illustrates that the change in fiscal policy can reduce the amount of poverty in some areas but the rest area are not striving. However, based on the 18 regions observed, it shows only 15 regions has progress of poverty reduction, they are Aceh Barat, Aceh Tamiang, Central Aceh, Pidie Jaya, Nagan Raya, Bener Meriah, Aceh Tenggara, South Aceh, Southwest Aceh, Aceh Singkil, Gayo Lues, Simeulue and Aceh Jaya. While another 5 regions of North Aceh, Pidie, Bireuen, Aceh Besar, and East Aceh still remains in the positive poverty. From both sides of the cross-section of poverty and fiscal factors, namely the area of North Aceh, Pidie, Bireuen, Aceh Besar, and East Aceh quite better with their fiscal effect on the amount of poverty. Then Aceh Barat and Aceh Tamiang is better with fiscal approach compared to the poverty in which the coefficient of the two regions is negative. In the total it indicates better fiscal approach. But fiscal approach and poverty are still left the number of poor people in each region. Therefore, the poor people can not be eliminated but only able to be reduced.

## 5. CONCLUSION

The result of estimation on the factors that caused poverty using Fixed Effect Regression Models indicate that variable consumption negatively affect the amount of poverty but not significant. Further, the length of diseases are positively impact on the poverty but not significant. The average length of the previous school, unemployment, and capital affected negative significantly on the estimated number of poverty. The result of fiscal policy with Fixed Effect Model illustrates that PNPM and BKPG have negative effect on the number of poverty (effective policies). But it only BKPG that has a significant negative effect on the amount of the poverty (the policy is very effective). Between Raskin and Scholarships for orphans have positive effect on the number of poverty (the policy is not effective). With a 95 percent confidence level, variable Raskin has significant effect on poverty (the policy is not very effective). Then, the results of a cross-section poverty in the five regions of North Aceh, Pidie, Bireuen and Aceh Besar have the number of poor people exceeds from 100,000 people.

Furthermore, the results of a cross-section on the Fiscal in 15 regions of Aceh Barat, Aceh Tamiang, Central Aceh, Pidie Jaya, Nagan Raya, Bener Meriah, Aceh Tenggara, South Aceh, Southwest Aceh, Aceh Singkil, Gayo Lues, Simeulue and Aceh Jaya are reducing a

poverty (effective fiscal policy) while the remaining non-impaired (not effective fiscal policy). But considering to the fiscal approach and poverty, the number of poor people in each region remain the same. Therefore, the poor people are can not be eliminated but it only able to be reduced. Anywhere, as good as addressing poverty program drawn up by the central government, if it is not supported by the local government or out of sync poverty program drawn up by the local government, the poverty reduction program far from the expectations. The poverty reduction program each area are differences from one region to another. It is related on the problems/causes of poverty by the region.

The recommendation for the government is poverty has the same problem of lack of education and employment opportunities. Thus, it is necessary the training, empowering and entrepreneurship programs. Then, when there is a development of the infrastructure using r labor-intensive approach, so that the society has employment opportunities and increase incomes. Meanwhile, the government should increase the funding for programs that are not consumptive but productive. For instance BKPG because the program is able to empower the local economy and it is needed to be continued as well as PNPM-Mandiri program. Although the program are needed to be improvement in its implementation.

## REFERENCES

- Agussalim, 2007. Peran Anggaran Pemerintah Terhadap Pengurangan Angka Kemiskinan di Indonesia, *Ekonomi dan Bisnis*, Vol. 10, No. 1.
- Akanbi, Olesegun A. and Charlotte B. Du Toit. (2011). Macro-econometric modelling for Nigerian economy: A growth-poverty gap analysis. *Economic Modelling*, 28, 335-350.
- Azwardi dan Sukanto, 2014. *Efektivitas Alokasi Dana Desa (ADD) dan Kemiskinan di Provinsi Sumatera Selatan*, Jurnal Ekonomi Pembangunan, Vol 12, No.1, Fak.Ekonomi, Univ. Sriwijaya, Palembang.
- Badan Pusat Statistik (BPS). 2008. *Penduduk Fakir Miskin 2004*, BPS, Jakarta.
- Bappeda Pemerintah Aceh, 2015. *Laporan Akhir Strategi Percepatan Penanggulangan Kemiskinan Masyarakat Aceh*, Bappeda, Provinsi Aceh, Banda Aceh.
- Bappenas, 1994. *Kaji Tindak Program IDT 1994-1997*, Aditya Media Yogyakarta.
- Barro, R.J. 1991. Economic Growth in a Cross Section of Countries. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 106 (2), 407 – 443.
- Basri. Faisal, 2002. *Perekonomian Indonesia: Tantangan dan Harapan Bagi Kebangkitan Ekonomi Indonesia*, Erlangga, Jakarta.

- 
- Bayu Adi Saputro, Irwan Noor, Siswidiyanto, 2014. *Implementasi Program Beras Untuk Masyarakat Miskin (Raskin) dalam Upaya Pengentasan Kemiskinan (Studi di Desa Sidoharjo, Kecamatan Jambon, Kabupaten Ponorogo)*, Jurnal Administrasi Publik (JAP), Vol.3, NO.12, Fak. Ilmu Administasi, Universitas Brawijaya, Malang.
- Egbetunde, T., & O Fasanya, I, 2013. Public Expenditure and Economic Growth in Negeria ; Evidence from Auto-Regressive Distributed Lag Spesificaton. *Zagreb International Review of Economics and Business*, 16 (1) 79-92.
- Fan, S., Gulati, A., & Thorat, S. 2008. Investment, subsidies and pro-poor growth in rural India. *Agricultural Economics*, 39 (2), 163-170.
- Fan, S, Hazell, P., & Thorat, S. (2000), Government Spending, Grwth and Poverty in rural India. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 82 (4), 1038-1051.
- Fan, S, Huong, P.L., & Long, T.Q, 2004. Government spending and poverty reduction in Vietnam. *Draft Report Prepered for the world Bank-Funded Project “ Pro-Poor Spending in Vietnam, “* by International Food Policy Research Institute, Washington, DC and Central Institute for Economic Management, Hanoi.
- Fan. S., & Zhang, X. 2008. *Public expenditure, growth and Proverty reduction in rural Uganda*, African Development Review, 20 (3), 466-496.
- Fransesca Soselisa, 2014. *Analisis Faktor Eksternal dan Internal Penyebab Kemiskinan pada Masyarakat Desa Leksula Kabupaten Buru selatan*, Jurnal Citra ekonomika, Vol. VIII, NO.1, Fak. Ekonomi, Univ. Pattimura, Ambon.
- Gaiha R, Katsushi S. Imai, Ganesh Thapa, Woojin Kang (2012), *Fiskal Stimulus, Agriculture Growth and Poverty in Asia*. The world Economy, 713-739.
- Gounder, Rukmani and Zhongwei Xing. (2012). Impact Of Education And Health On Proverty Reduction: Monetary And Non-Monetary Evidence From Fiji. *Economic Modelling*, 29, 787-794.
- Hajargast, Gholamreza and William E. Griffiths. (2013). Pareto-lognormmal distributions: inequality, poverty, and estimation from grouped income data. *Economic Modelling*, 33, 593-604.
- Hasibuan Nurimansyah, 2004. Kemiskinan Struktural di Indonesia Menembus Ke Lapisan Bawah, *Jurnal Ekonomi Rakyat*, Volume VII, 65 – 97.
- Hernowo, Basah. 2010. *Kajian Pembangunan Ekonomi Desa untuk Mengatasi Kemiskinan*. Dalam [www. Bappenas.go.id](http://www.bappenas.go.id).
- Hong, K. 2010. *Fiskal Policy Issues in Korea After the Current Crisis*. Asian Development Bank Institut, Working Paper 225, Tokyo.

- 
- Indra Maipita, Mohd.Dan Jantan, Nor Azam Abdul Razak, 2010. *Dampak Kebijakan Fiskal Terhadap Kenerja Ekonomi dan Angka Kemiskinan di Indonesia*, Buletin Ekonomi Moneter dan Perbankan.
- Jhingan, M.L. 2000. *Ekonomi Pembangunan dan Perencanaan*, Raja Grafindo Persada, Jakarta.
- Kuncoro, Mudrajat, 2004. *Otonomi dan Pembangunan Daerah Reformasi, Perencanaan, Strategin dan Peluang*, Erlangga, Jakarta.
- Mahaeni, I et al, 2012. *Evaluasi Program-Program Pengentasan Kemiskinan di Provinsi Bali*, Peramida, Jurnal Kependudukan dan Pengembangan Sumber Daya Manusia, Vol. XN0. 1:8-18, Fak. Ekonomi dan Bisnis, Universitas Udayana.
- Maku, O.E, 2009. *Does Geverment Spending Spur Economic Growth in Negeria*, Munich Personal RePEc Archive Paper No. 17941.
- Martowardojo, Agus D.W, 2012. *Satu Dasawarsa Implementasi Otonomi Daerah: Dalam perspektif Desentralisasi Fiskal*, Yogyakarta, 2-4 Oktober 2012, Kongres ISEI Ke-XVIII.
- Masbar, Raja, 2002. Batas Garis Kemiskinan, Kasus Kota Banda Aceh, *Jurnal Ekonomi dan Bisnis*, No.1 Vol. 2, Agustus 2002, 271-284.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 2011. *Teori dan Analisis Kebijakan Mikroekonomi Kemiskinan*, Pidato Pengukuhan dalam Jabatan Guru Besar Fakultas Ekonomi Unsyiah, Darussalam, Banda Aceh.
- Mussard, Stephane and maria Noel Pi Alperin. (2011). Proverty Growth In Scandinavian Countries: A Sen Multi-Decomposition. *Economic Modelling*, 28, 2842-2853.
- Nachrowi, Hardius Usman, 2006. *Pendekatan Populer dan Praktis Ekonometrika Untuk Analisis Ekonomi dan Keuangan*, LPFE, Universitas Indonesia, Jakarta.
- Nanga, M. 2006. *Dampak Transfer Fiskal Terhadap Kemiskinan di Indonesia ; Suatu Analisis Simulasi Kebijakan*, Disertasi, Sekolah Pascasarjaja, IPB, Bogor.
- \_\_\_\_\_,2000. *Kisah-kisah IDT dan Program Penghapusan Kemiskinan di Sulawesi*, Yayasan Agroekonomi.
- Nurkse, R. 1952. Some International Aspect of The Problem of Economic Development, *The American Economic Review*, 571- 583.
- Prasetyawan, W. 2009. *Bantuan Tunai Langsung, Pro Rakyat Miskin*, Harian Tempo, Kamis, 2 April 2009.
- Prasetyanto PP, Eko. 2012. *Dampak Alokasi Dana Desa pada Era Desentralisasi Fiskal Terhadap Perekonomian Daerah di Indonesia*, Disertasi, IPB, Bogor.

- Pratama Ananda, 2010. *Penerapan Program Penanggulangan Kemiskinan Daerah Kota Mojokerto Tahun 2009*. *Jurnal Ilmu Ekonomi Pembangunan*, Vol.1, NO.2, FISIP, UPN V, Jatim.
- Radhiya Widyasworo, 2014. *Analisis Pengaruh Pendidikan, Kesehatan dan Angkatan Kerja Wanita Terhadap Kemiskinan di Kabupaten Gresik (Studi Kasus Tahun 2008 – 2012)*, *Jurnal Ilmiah*, Jurusan Ilmu Ekonomi, Fakultas Ekonomi dan Bisnis, Univ. Brawijaya, Malang.
- Rindayati, W., Sanim, B., Hutagaol, M.P., & Siregar, H. 2008, *Fiskal Decentralization and Food Security in West Java : Policy Analysis*. In *Forum Pasca Sarjana*, 31 (4), 251-267.
- Santoso, Awana, Dadid, G, Hidayat dan Puthut Indroyono, 2003. Program Penanggulangan Kemiskinan Bersasaran di Provinsi D.I, Yogyakarta, *Jurnal Ekonomi Rakyat*, No. 2, Tahun 2003, 144-160.
- Sen, Amartya K. 1998, *The Standard of Living*, Cambridge University Press.
- Serambi Indonesia, 2006. Kemiskinan di Nanggroe Aceh Darussalam, *Serambi Indonesia*, No. 6.209 THN, Ke 40, 2 November. 2006.
- Suparlan, Parsudi, 2000. *Kemiskinan Perkotaan dan Alternatif Penanganannya*. Ditujukan dalam Seminar Forum Perkotaan Departemen Pemukiman dan Prasarana Wilayah, Jakarta.
- Sukirno, Sadono. 2000. *Makro Ekonomi Moderen : Pengantar Ekonomi dan Bisnis Global*, Raja Grafindo Persada, Jakarta.
- Sukidjo, 2009. *Strategi Pemberdayaan Pengentasan Kemiskinan pada PNPM Mandiri*, *Jurnal Cakrawala Pendidikan*, Th. XXVIII, No.2. FISE, Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Yogyakarta.
- Sumanta. Jaka, 2005. *Pertumbuhan Ekonomi dan Pengentasan Kemiskinan di Indonesia*, *Jurnal Kebijakan Ekonomi*, Jakarta.
- Surjaningsih, N. Utari, G.D, and Trisnanto, B. (2012). The Impact of Fiskal Policy on the Output and Inflation. *Bulletin of Monetary Economics and Banking*, 14 (4), 376-96.
- Todaro, Michael P, Stephen C. Smith. 2000. *Pembangunan Ekonomi di Dunia Ketiga* , Erlangga, Jakarta.
- Uddin, G.S., Shabaz, M., Arouri, M., and Teulon, F., (2014). Financial development and poverty reduction nexus: a cointegration and causality analysis in Bangladesh. *Economic Modelling*, 36, 405-412.

Usman, 2006. *Dampak Desentralisasi Fiskal Terhadap Distribusi Pendapatan dan Tingkat Kemiskinan*, Thesis Magister Sains, Program Pascasarjana, IPB, Bogor.

Wan, Adnan, 2012. *Upaya Peningkatan Kesejahteraan Keluarga Memanfaatkan Program Nasional Pemberdayaan Masyarakat (PNPM) Mandiri Pedesaan, (Studi Keluarga Miskin di Desa Teluk Pakedai II, Kecamatan Teluk Pakedai, Kabupaten Kubu Raya, Provinsi Kalimantan Barat)*, Jurnal Tesis PMIS- UNTAN-PSIS, Univ. Tanjung Pura, Pontianak.

World Bank Institute, 2002. *Dasar-dasar Analisis Kemiskinan*, Institute Bank Dunia, Jakarta.