Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development
ISSN 2222-1700 (Paper) ISSN 2222-2855 (Online)
Vol.4, No.1, 2013

Analysis of Regional Economic Development in the Regency/Municipality at South Sulawesi Province In Indonesia

Sanusi Fattah[1*] Abdul Rahman[2]

1. Department of Economics, Faculty of Economics, Hasanuddin University Jalan Perintis Kemerdekaan Km.10, Makassar 90245, Indonesia Tel.62-411-586200 Ext. 2210, 2212, 2606-2608 Fax.62-411-587218
2. Department of Economics, Faculty of Economics, Macassar State University Jalan A.P. Pettarani Makassar, 90222 Telp : +62(411) 869854 / +62 82349 600888

* E-mail of the corresponding author: fattahsanusi@gmail.com

Abstract

This study aims to determine the characteristics of the regional economy in each regency/municipality in the province of South Sulawesi. Second, the research is also strived to identify economic sectors that could potentially be developed as a leading economic at each district/municipality in the province of South Sulawesi. Third, future study is aim to determine the economic regional development using Klassen Typology Analysis, Location Quotient Analysis, and Krugman Regional Index. The result of this research shows that from 23 regency/municipality in South Sulawesi Province, only Luwu Timur, Makassar, and Pare-Pare that belong to the classification of high growth and high-income regions. Luwu and Palopo belong to high income but low growth region. Pangkep and Pinrang could be classified as high growth but low-income region, whereas other regency/municipality as low growth and low-income regions. Next, the location quotient analysis shows that each regency/municipality has different superior/main economic sector. Finally, the result of regional specialization analysis shows that inter-regonal specialization has economic dependability, although the dependability in some part of the regency/municipality is still weak as shown by the increasing diversification of economic sector.

Keywords: Indonesia regional development, Klassen typology, Location quotient, Krugman regional index, Superior sector, Regional specialization

1. Introduction

Regional development should be tailored at best to the priorities and potential of each area in the region. Moreover, each local government should also strive for a more balanced development within their respective regions. The fact that each region has different natural resources, human resources, and conditions implies different development step in the said area. The difference of the economic potential between regions that can develop quickly with less developed regions could be related to the various limitations in the region. These have led to the importance in the role of central government as regulator of national development policies in order to made balanced and synchronized development within the local region (Tjiptoherijanto, 1995).

Moreover, economic growth that occurring in each region could also different or varied from each other. This have made some region could be known as a fast growing region, slow-growing region, whereas other region have a stagnant growth. Variations in growth rates between regions also influenced by many factors, including the number and capacity of the population, potential natural resource, availability of infrastructure development and construction of facilities, differences in the characteristics of the region, development ability of a region, development easiness, and others (Adisasmita, 2009) .

In regional development, both local government and communities strive to manage local resources hand-in-hand by forming a partnership between local government and the private sector to create a new jobs and stimulate the development of economic activities (economic growth) in the region (Arsyad, 2005). According to Siregar (2004), the resources within a region could be divided into three main aspects. First, the natural resources in the form of natural resources that are needed to meet human needs. Second, the human resources that contained within humans such as the potentiality of mind, art, skill and so on that can be used to meet the needs for himself or others or society in general. Third, the infrastructure in the form of man-made and can be used to support human living and to utilize the natural resources and human resources to the maximum, both for the present time and could be sustained to the future.

In relation to regional development, South Sulawesi has established two basic policies toward economic development. First, industry development in order to increase efficiency, productivity and competitiveness is

conducted in the form of skills-intensive patterns with high benefit, rather than labor-intensive patterns of production and natural resources. Second, the development of the agricultural sector aimed at improving the efficiency and productivity of the land using appropriate technology.

When one viewed the economic growth in South Sulawesi per sector, we could conclude that it have been supported by growth in agriculture, trade, hotels, transport and communication. Thus, it could be state that South Sulawesi still rely on agriculture as an economic sector that has good potential to support economic growth in South Sulawesi. Moreover, geographically, South Sulawesi has some ability and strategic conditions that made the region vulnerable to the impact of globalization and thus there is a need to cope with this impact. In connection with this, there is a need to improve and adjusted the sector policies, so that South Sulawesi's economic structure were able to compete in the global era, besides dealing with regional autonomy and decentralization.

This study therefore aims to determine the characteristics of the regional economy in each regency/municipality in the province of South Sulawesi. Second, the research is also strived to identify economic sectors that could potentially be developed as a leading economic at each district/municipality in the province of South Sulawesi. Third, future study is aim to determine the inter-regional specialization using Klassen Typology Analysis, Location Quotient Analysis, and Krugman Regional Index.

2. Theoretical Framework: Regional Economic Development Concept

Regional development could be thought of as an integral part of any national development effort. Arsyad (2005) states that regional economic development as a process to manage regional resource by local government and communities. Furthermore, Arsyad (2005) suggested the formation of a partnership between local government and the private sector to create a new jobs and stimulate the development of economic activities (economic growth) in the region as part of the process in regional economic development.

The main problem in regional development is located in its emphasis on development policies based on the uniqueness of the region concerned (endogenous development) by using the potential of human resources, institutional, and physical resources that exist locally. This orientation leads to the creation of initiatives from the region itself in the development process to create new employment opportunities and stimulate economic development.

Radianto (2003) have suggested that one aspect of regional development is economic development that aims to promote economic growth and structural change. Changes in economic structure may be a shift from agricultural to non-agricultural activities, from industry to services, changes in the scale of production units, as well as changes in labor status. Therefore, the concept of regional development is appropriate when supported by economic growth theory, economic base model and theory, the center of growth concept, and specialization theory.

A change in economic structure or structural transformation is characterized by the existence of percentage contribution adjustment of various sectors in the economic development, which is due to the intensity of human activity and technological change (Kuznets in Sukirno, 1985). In conjunction with this, the Shift Share Analysis is a very useful technique in analyzing changes in economic structure.

Meanwhile, the core of the economic base model explains that the direction and growth of a region is determined by the region's exports. According to the model, export is not restricted only to goods and services, but also come from foreigner's spending within the region in respect with immovable goods (Budiharsono, 2001). Economic base theory classifies all economic activity into two sectors namely the base sectors and non-base sectors. Base sector is the sector that serves markets in the region itself and outside the region. Whereas, non-base sector is the sector that only serves markets in the respective region.

In relation with the center of growth concept, it was acknowledged that Perroux thinking on the concentration of industrial activities in certain areas that drive economic growth, and then evolved into the concept of growth centers. According to this concept, there are four main characteristics of a growth center. First, the groups of economic activities are concentrated in a particular location. Second, these concentrations of economic activity are then capable of boosting dynamic economic growth in the economy. Third, there are strong input and output connections among economic activities in the respective growth center. Fourth, in the said economic activities group, there is a parent industry that encourages the development of economic activities in the center of this growth (Richardson in Sjafrizal, 2008).

In connection with an effort to accelerate regional development, thus the economic linkages between regions are also important, especially if this associated with the concept of specialization. The existence of commodity specialization in accordance with each respective sector/sub-sector would allow concentration of sector activity in

each region. This is supported by Samuelson and Nordhaus (1995), which states that the public can be more effective and efficient if there is a division of labor that divides the entire production process into specialized units. Economic specialization enables the formation of trade networks between individuals and among nations. This is a hallmark of any advanced economy. The existence of economic linkage (or specialization) between regions that drive the exchange process to suit the needs of each region would allow regional economy to move simultaneously towards economic growth process.

3. Results

3.1 Klassen Typology Analyses

Klassen Typology Analysis is used to determine the differences in the characteristics of the area in each regency/municipality in the province of South Sulawesi in the review of their respective growth rate and income. According to Klassen Typology, the observed region could be divided into four classifications, namely high growth and high income region, high income but low growth region, high growth but low income regions, and low growth and low income region (Radianto, 2003; Kuncoro, 2006 ; Syafrizal, 2008).

Therefore, for the purpose of our research, we have classified the regions based on these four classifications. First, the high growth and high-income regions are areas that have high levels of economic growth and income that is higher than the province of South Sulawesi. Second, high income but low growth region is an area that has a higher incomes, but lower economic growth rate than the province of South Sulawesi. Third, high growth but low-income region is an area that has a higher rate of economic growth, but lower income than the South Sulawesi Province. Fourth, low growth and low-income regions are areas that have levels of economic growth and income that is lower than the South Sulawesi Province.

Development of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) or PDRB[2] per regency/municipality in South Sulawesi Province in 2003-2007 periods could be seen in table 1 and 2. Based on data from these tables, we then could divide the regency/municipality in South Sulawesi into four classifications according to Klassen Typology as shown in table 3.

Quadrant I: High Growth and High Income Region

Luwu Timur, Makassar and Pare-Pare are an area that could be classified as the regions that have high growth and income compared to the South Sulawesi Province. In the period of 2003-2007, the average growth rate of Luwu Timur amounted to 7.14%, Makassar (7.42%), and Pare-Pare is at 6.23%, whereas the average economic growth rate of South Sulawesi in the period of 2003-2007 is amounted to 5.96%. Average income in Luwu Timur in the period of 2003-2007 is amounted to Rp.23,403,192; Makassar (Rp.12,917,889); and Pare-Pare is Rp.7,004,365, whereas South Sulawesi Province amounted to Rp.6,947,190.

Quadrant II: Low Income but High Growth Region

Luwu and Palopo is an area that have low income, but high-growth. In the period of 2003-2007, the average rate of economic growth in Luwu is at 6.17% and Palopo (7.29%), whereas South Sulawesi Province amounted to 5.96%. The average income in the period of 2003-2007 for Luwu is amounted to Rp.5,377,045, Palopo (Rp.6,647,191), whereas South Sulawesi Province amounted to be at Rp.6,947,190.

Quadrant III: High Income but Low Growth Region

Pangkep and Pinrang could be classified as a low growth but high-income region. Both districts have an average economic growth that is lower than the average overall growth of South Sulawesi Province, but has an average income that is higher than the average income of South Sulawesi Province. In the period of 2003-2007, the average rate of economic growth in Pangkep District was amounted to 5.16% and Pinrang at 5.19%, while South Sulawesi Province is at 5.96%. The average income per capita in the period of 2003-2007 at Pangkep District is for Rp.8,534,280, Pinrang (Rp.7,226,074), whereas South Sulawesi Province amounted to be at Rp.6,947,190.

Quadrant IV: Low Growth and Low Income Region

Sixteen other regions, namely Selayar, Bulukumba, Bantaeng, Jeneponto, Takalar, Gowa, Sinjai, Maros, Barru, Bone, Soppeng, Wajo, Sidrap, Enrekang, Tana Toraja, and Luwu Utara could be categorized as low growth and low-income regions because it has a lower average rate of economic growth and income than South Sulawesi Province. These areas are relatively backward due to unfavorable conditions in the region that making it less able to participate in economic development. These districts could not compete with other regions, even within one sector of the economy. Moreover, these regions do not have sufficient potential resources that could be exploited.

Local workforce does not have the skills to meet modern industry qualification to form local capital, and therefore the productivity of the area is very low.

3.2 Location Quotient Analysis

Location Quotient Analysis is an analytical tool to indicate the economic base of the region, especially from the local contribution criteria. Location quotient formulation according Bendavid-Val (1991) is as follows.

$$LQ = \frac{X_r / RV_r}{X_n / RV_n}$$

Where:

X_r = PDRB of the first sector in the regency/ municipality

RV_r = Total PDRB at regency/ municipality

X_n = PDRB of the first sector in the province

RV_r = Total PDRB of the first sector in the province

As for the location quotient measurement criteria, for example when LQ>1, this imply that the level of specialization in a particular sector of the respective district is greater when compared to the same sector in the respective province. In other words if LQ>1, this means that the sector is a leading sector in the regency/municipality and have the potential to be develop as a driver of the local economy. Moreover, when LQ <1, this means the level of specialization in a particular sector of the said district is less than the same sector in the said province. Therefore, if the LQ <1, this means that the sector is not the dominant sector and less potential to be develop as a driver of the local economy. Finally, when LQ=1, this imply that the level of specialization in a given sector at the regional level is the same as the respective sector at the provincial level. In other words, if LQ = 1, the relative roles of certain sectors in the regency/municipality is equal to the relative roles of certain sectors at the provincial level.

Thus, Table 4 implies two important things. First, in view of the regional comparative advantage, Makassar has only two inferior economic sectors, which is agriculture and mining sectors. Palopo also has an inferior sector that is mining and processing industries. While the regency/municipality that lack regional comparative advantage or do not have a superior economic sector is Pangkep and Luwu Timur as they relies only to the manufacturing sector. The same could be state about Wajo, Pinrang, Luwu and Luwu Utara that just based their economy on agricultural sector, and Luwu Timur that only rely on the mining sector.

Secondly, in view of the spread of economic sector, then agriculture could be state as a sector that becomes a leading economic sector. Nevertheless, agriculture sector do not have potential economic development in Pangkep, Luwu Timur, Makassar and Pare-Pare. Then, mining sector could be state as having unequal comparative advantage, because this sector is only have economic potential development in Luwu Timur. Next, the manufacturing sector has shown a great potential to be develop in Maros, Pangkep, and Makassar. Finally, service sector do not have economic potential development in Pangkep Wajo, Pinrang, Luwu, Luwu Utara, and Luwu Timur.

3.3 Krugman Regional Divergence Index Analyses

Krugman Regional Divergence Index Analysis is conducted to determine the level and degree of specialization differences between regencies/municipalities in the province of South Sulawesi. Kuncoro in Krugman (2002) provide an index formula as follows:

$$SI_{j,k} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left| E_{i,j} / E_j - E_{i,k} / E_k \right|$$

Where:

SI_{jk} = Specialization index of the regency/municipality j and k

E_{ij} = PDRB of the first sector in regency/municipality j

E_j = Total PDRB of the regency/municipality j

E_{ik} = PDRB of the first sector in regency/municipality k

E_k = Total PDRB of the regency/municipality k

The value from this formula could range between 2 and 0. When, the value is near zero, then the respective area j and k do not have different specialization, in other word they operating in the same economic sector. If the figure closer to two, then regions j and k display economic specialization, thus value of more than one imply that the region could be considered as having a specialized sector. Meanwhile, to know the high and low levels of specialization of each respective region against other regions for comparison, one could use the average value of the entire regional specialization indexes.

Based on our calculations, then there is a decline in the average value of specialization index of regencies/ municipalities in the Province of South Sulawesi, which is from 0.67 in 2003 to 0.65 in 2007. The decrease in the average value was due to the decrease in average specialization index of almost all regions in South Sulawesi Province. Furthermore, from 23 regions/municipalities, eight of them were not decreased by an average value of 0.01 to 0.02. However, these decrease showed a more diversified economy and economic specialization in the eight regions compared to other 23 regions.

In addition, one could imply that there are big differences in economic structure between Pangkep, Luwu Utara, and Luwu Timur compared to other regions. These could be seen from the magnitude of the average value of the index between Pangkep, Luwu Utara, and Luwu Timur compared to other regions as these three districts have an index value greater than one. Moreover, this means that these three areas have specialized in one economic sector, for example Pangkep who specialize in the manufacturing sector, Luwu Utara with their agriculture sector, and Luwu Timur that specializing in the mining sector.

However, when seen from the average specialization index among regency/municipality, we could state that only three districts that have higher specialization index than the average specialization index of all regions in the South Sulawesi Province. These results indicate that the level of specialization in the respective region is not a guarantee that an area can be defined as having an economic advantage, because if this is associated with Klassen Typology, thus it seems that out of 23 regions the well-developed areas only include Luwu Timur, Makassar and Pare-Pare.

4. Conclusion and Policy Implication

4.1 Conclusion

Klassen Typology Analysis have shown that of the 23 regions, only Luwu Timur, Makassar, and Pare-Pare that could be included in the classification of high growth and high income regions. Luwu and Palopo belong to the high income but low growth region. Pangkep and Pinrang included in the classification of high growth but low-income region. Meanwhile, 16 other districts are classified as low growth and low-income regions.

Meanwhile, the Location Quotient Analysis has implied that each region has a number of different leading economic sectors. Therefore, it is possible to hold inter-regional production specialization, in order to open opportunities for mutual exchange in accordance with the needs of each region. The implication is that the growth on each region would have an impact on other region's growth in the long term.

Finally, the results of regional specialization analysis indicate that among regions in South Sulawesi Province have economic linkages. Although, this linkage is somewhat weak for some regions, which indicated by the more diversified economic sector in some regency/municipality.

4.2 Policy Implication

Previous analysis and the following conclusion have point to a number of policy implications. First, establishment and development of regional development policy should be emphasized on a leading sector owned by the respective regions. Nevertheless, attention should also be put on other sectors in accordance with the potential and development opportunities to create linkages between regions in the South Sulawesi Province. This should be done to create an economic specialization that would cause synchronous economic movement through inter-regional exchange.

Second, in order to mobilize the economic growth in the region, particularly for the 16 regency/municipality that

are in a relatively classified as a remote area, then an intensive policy that could provide for the entry of investment in the area is necessary. This intensive policy could include the development and improvement of infrastructure that could somehow facilitate investor relations with the regions concerned.

Third, policies are needed that could provide intensive investment in Luwu and Palopo whose positions are in the fast-growing areas, to increase growth and revenue for the community. Although geographically, the location of these two regions is far from Makassar as the capital of South Sulawesi Province, but their economic potential need to be utilized towards the creation of economic interaction between the two regions in particular and other regions at general.

References

Adisasmita, R. (2008). *Pengembangan Wilayah, Konsep dan Teori.* Yogyakarta, Yogyakarta, Indonesia: Graha Ilmu.

Adisasmita, R. (2009). *Pertumbuhan Wilayah dan Wilayah Pertumbuhan.* Makassar, Indonesia: Seruni com.

Arsyad, L. (2005). *Pengantar Perencanaan dan Pembangunan Ekonomi Daerah*. (Edisi Kedua).Yogyakarta, Indonesia: BPFE.

Badan Pusat Statistik (2007). *Produk Domestik Bruto Provinsi Sulawesi Selatan 2006,* Makassar, Indonesia: BPS.

Badan Pusat Statistik (2008). *Propinsi Sulawesi Selatan Dalam Angka*, Makassar, Indonesia: BPS.

Badan Pusat Statistik (2008). *Produk Domestik Regional Bruto (PDRB) Kabupaten/Kota Se Sulawesi Selatan 2007.* Makassar, Indonesia: BPS.

Bendavid-Val, A. (1991). *Regional and Local Economic: Analysis for Practioners.* (4rd ed.). New York: Praeger.

Budiharsono. S. (2001). *Teknik Analisis Pembangunan Wilayah Pesisir dan Lautan.* Jakarta, Indonesia: P.T Pradnya Paratmita.

Djojohadikusumo, S. (1994). *Perkembangan Pemikiran Ekonomi, Dasar Teori Ekonomi Pertumbuhan dan Ekonomi Pembangunan*. Jakarta, Indonesia: Penerbit PT Pustaka LP3ES.

Kuncoro, M. (2004). *Analisis Spasial dan Regional: Studi Aglomerasi dan Kluster Industri-Industri.* Yogyakarta, Indonesia: UPP AMP YKPN.

Kuncoro, M. (2004). *Otonomi dan Pembangunan Daerah: Reformasi, Perencanaan Strategi, dan Peluang.* Jakarta, Indonesia: Penerbit Erlangga.

Kuznets, S. (1964). Economic Growth and the Contribution of Agriculture. In Eicher C. K.& Witt, L.W. (ed), *Agriculture in Economic Development*, New York: McGraw-Hill.

Pemerintah Propinsi Sulawesi Selatan. 2006. *Pendapatan Regional.* Online. (http://www.sulsel.go.id/pendapatan-regional.html). Diakses 20 Mei 2008.

Putong, I. (2007). *Economics, Pengantar Mikro dan Makro.* Jakarta, Indonesia: Mitra Wacana Media

Radianto, E. (2003). Evaluasi Pembangunan Regional Pasca Kerusuhan di Maluku. *Jurnal Ekonomi dan Keuangan Indonesia,* 51, 479-499.

Richardson, H.W. (1972). *Regional Economics: Location Theory, Urban Structure, and Regional Change.* New York: Praeger Publishers.

Richardson, H.W. (1977). *Dasar-Dasar Ilmu Ekonomi Regional*. Jakarta, Indonesia: LPFE UI.

Siregar, D. (2004). *Manajemen Aset*. Jakarta, Indonesia: PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama

Sjafrizal (2008). *Ekonomi Regional: Teori dan Aplikasi.* Padang, Indonesia: Baduose Media.

Sukirno, S. (1985). *Ekonomi Pembangunan, Proses, Masalah dan Dasar Kebijaksanaan*. Jakarta, Indonesia: LPFE UI - Bima Grafika.

Sukirno, S. (2002). *Pengantar Teori Makro Ekonomi*. (Edisi Kedua). Jakarta, Indonesia: PT Raja Grafindo Persada.

Tambunan, T. (2003). *Perekonomian Indonesia, Beberapa Masalah Penting.* Bandung: Ghalia Indonesia.

Tarigan, R. (2005). *Ekonomi Regional, Teori dan Aplikasi.* Edisis Revisi. PT Bumi Aksara, Jakarta

Tjiptoherijanto, P. (1995). Pengembangan Pembangunan Daerah. *Ekonomi dan Keuangan Indonesia*, XLIII, 2, 117-133.

Todaro, M.P. (2000). *Pembangunan Ekonomi di Dunia Ketiga.* (Edisi Ketujuh). Jakarta, Indonesia: Erlangga.

Notes

[1] First draft of this paper was completed in June 2012. Comments on this paper should be sent to the first author.

[2] Regional incomes in Indonesia is measured as part of the infrastructure component and measured in the Gross Domestic Product within the respective regency/municipality. In Indonesia, this regional income is known as Produk Domestik Regional Bruto or PDRB that have been adjusted by peoples' purchasing power.

Tables

Tabel 1. Regency/city's gross domestic product (PDRB) based on market price in the regency/city at South Sulawesi

Regency/Municipality	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	Average
Selayar	3575525.00	3994489.70	4365072.10	4829807.90	5429603.70	4438899.66
Bulukumba	3534989.00	4162612.30	4597429.40	5148225.20	5699441.00	4628539.39
Bantaeng	3556938.00	4170690.20	4637377.00	5267781.20	6020353.60	4730627.98
Jeneponto	2646018.00	2873613.00	3124342.30	3478232.70	3908754.90	3206192.17
Takalar	3127916.00	3420474.20	3912675.20	4434165.20	5070561.90	3993158.47
Gowa	3279242.00	3224436.10	3704043.70	4193457.10	4802864.10	3840808.62
Sinjai	4365199.00	4853118.70	5495183.60	6270385.50	7141519.60	5625081.29
Maros	2842215.00	3645517.90	4054644.00	4516570.00	5033996.60	4018588.70
Pangkep	6315520.00	7726013.30	8357123.00	9455459.40	10817285.00	8534280.23
Barru	4215079.00	4441288.90	5039515.40	5608037.50	6298623.80	5120508.91
Bone	4252701.00	4328924.70	4833725.90	5541502.00	6310991.70	5053569.07
Soppeng	4368617.00	6060359.60	5456583.30	6131382.30	6972590.60	5797906.53
Wajo	5283953.00	5713795.40	6733550.90	7732587.70	8690771.40	6830931.69
Sidrap	4583735.00	5275442.90	6132870.40	7006365.90	7896585.90	6179000.03
Pinrang	5446174.00	6586147.20	7323996.60	7887199.00	8886852.30	7226073.32
Enrekang	3336381.00	4040654.80	4663461.50	5228124.50	6103457.40	4674415.83
Luwu	3133271.00	4932778.60	5598535.80	6194259.70	7026378.90	5377044.79
Tana Toraja	2773317.00	2904197.10	3205669.30	3511633.10	3939261.60	3266815.61
Luwu Utara	3103827.00	4331267.10	4808667.00	5355700.20	6103675.10	4740627.27
Luwu Timur	15817052.00	21561671.00	24274301.00	26358147.00	29004788.00	23403191.80
Makassar	8577631.00	11233681.00	13096577.00	14846982.00	16834573.00	12917888.90
Pare-Pare	5289995.00	5952403.40	6895533.10	7740703.60	9143190.80	7004365.19
Palopo	4109434.00	6175366.40	6911807.90	7627809.20	8411539.70	6647191.45
South Sulawesi	4818410.00	6043999.70	6895137.60	7982346.80	8996056.00	6947190.03

Source: Badan Pusat Statistik (2008). *Produk Domestik Regional Bruto (PDRB) Kabupaten/Kota Se Sulawesi Selatan 2007.* Makassar, Indonesia: BPS.

Table 2. Economics growth in regency/city at South Sulawesi year 2003-2007 (percentage)

Regency/ Municipality	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	Average
Selayar	4.18	4.50	3.90	5.57	6.45	4.92
Bulukumba	3.64	4.69	4.49	6.38	5.36	4.91
Bantaeng	4.89	4.22	4.35	5.10	5.14	4.74
Jeneponto	3.76	2.07	1.21	3.97	4.06	3.01
Takalar	3.98	4.47	5.58	5.91	6.04	5.20
Gowa	4.02	4.87	5.74	6.17	6.19	5.40
Sinjai	4.95	5.52	5.23	6.11	5.43	5.45
Maros	3.84	2.17	3.11	4.33	4.58	3.61
Pangkep	1.98	6.19	5.61	5.92	6.12	5.16
Barru	5.96	4.22	4.94	4.90	4.94	4.99
Bone	4.56	2.11	4.31	5.95	6.01	4.71
Soppeng	4.02	5.32	2.85	6.63	5.37	4.84
Wajo	4.24	3.13	5.97	5.66	5.87	5.64
Sidrap	4.24	3.29	8.25	6.96	5.46	5.64
Pinrang	4.75	5.89	6.04	4.12	5.14	5.19
Enrekang	5.26	5.34	5.91	3.77	5.11	5.08
Luwu	6.54	6.11	7.16	5.51	5.53	6.17
Tana Toraja	2.61	4.23	4.82	4.07	5.35	4.22
Luwu Utara	1.23	5.23	8.69	7.61	6.83	5.92
Luwu Timur	10.08	8.77	5.57	6.86	5.75	7.41
Makassar	8.60	10.24	7.16	8.09	8.11	10.13
Pare-Pare	5.01	6.23	5.98	6.96	6.98	6.23
Palopo	8.53	7.37	7.72	6.32	6.53	7.29
South Sulawesi	5.42	5.26	6.05	6.72	6.34	5.96

Source: Badan Pusat Statistik (2008). *Propinsi Sulawesi Selatan Dalam Angka*, Makassar, Indonesia: BPS.

Table 3. Classification of South Sulawesi's regency according to Klassen Typology

Growth Rate (r)	PDRB per Kapita (y)	
	$y_i > y$	$y_i < y$
$r_i > r$	High growth and high income region: Luwu Timur, Makassar, and Pare-Pare	High income but low growth region: Luwu & Palopo
$r_i < r$	High growth but low income region: Pangkep and Pinrang	Low growth and low income region: Selayar, Bulukumba, Bantaeng, Jeneponto, Takalar, Gowa, Sinjai, Maros, Barru, Bone, Soppeng, Wajo, Sidrap, Enrekang, Tana Toraja, and Luwu Utara

Table 4. Location quotient average value of the economic sectors in South Sulawesi year 2003-2007

Regency/Municipality	Economic Sectors								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Selayar	1.330	0.050	0.440	0.430	1.450	1.020	1.570	0.570	1.300
Bulukumba	1.870	0.030	0.440	0.380	0.500	0.790	0.290	0.740	1.290
Bantaeng	1.930	0.060	0.250	0.560	1.110	0.710	0.330	0.960	1.030
Jeneponto	1.840	0.170	0.170	0.600	1.100	0.500	0.470	1.210	1.330
Takalar	1.550	0.070	0.660	1.080	1.160	0.720	0.620	1.040	1.280
Gowa	1.630	0.060	0.290	1.040	0.660	0.880	0.750	1.020	1.420
Sinjai	1.970	0.050	0.140	0.300	0.810	0.630	0.440	0.780	1.360
Maros	1.380	0.160	1.550	0.890	0.330	0.530	0.700	0.960	1.150
Pangkep	0.580	0.520	4.020	0.380	0.620	0.300	0.460	0.440	0.620
Barru	1.560	0.110	0.270	0.630	1.540	0.800	0.540	0.960	1.560
Bone	1.790	0.040	0.670	0.770	0.990	0.590	0.650	0.740	1.010
Soppeng	1.600	0.050	0.540	0.820	1.220	0.620	0.770	0.900	1.380
Wajo	1.410	0.480	0.580	0.710	0.600	1.380	0.660	0.710	0.910
Sidrap	1.690	0.050	0.500	0.990	1.330	0.760	0.390	0.780	1.290
Pinrang	2.110	0.080	0.320	0.670	0.750	0.670	0.510	0.610	0.690
Enrekang	1.700	0.040	0.350	0.660	0.950	0.700	0.330	0.690	1.770
Luwu	2.000	0.110	0.730	0.210	1.200	0.430	0.210	0.340	0.990
Tator	1.620	0.040	0.300	0.520	0.940	0.920	0.500	0.890	1.580
Luwu utara	2.350	0.030	0.150	0.550	0.770	0.460	0.230	0.810	0.650
Luwu timur	0.400	8.180	0.130	0.130	0.060	0.070	0.070	0.150	0.100
Makassar	0.030	0.001	1.680	2.090	1.680	1.920	2.120	1.660	1.040
Pare-Pare	0.260	0.030	0.230	1.460	1.850	1.970	3.220	2.160	1.110
Palopo	1.190	0.020	0.320	1.380	1.550	1.190	1.340	1.600	1.130