



Growth With Depth or Growth With Gaps? A Review of Indonesia's Q1 2026 Expansion, Its Sustainability, and Its Social Reach

Loso Judijanto

IPOSS Jakarta

Corresponding Author: Loso Judijanto losojudijantobumn@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords: Indonesia, Economic Growth, Qualitative Literature Review, Inclusive Growth, Fiscal Policy, Household Consumption, Investment, Geopolitics, Informality, Palm Oil

Received : 3 March

Revised : 20 April

Accepted: 20 May

©2026 Judijanto: This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



ABSTRACT

In the first quarter of 2026, Indonesia's GDP grew by 5.61 percent year-on-year, and it contracted by 0.77 percent compared to the previous quarter. This article examines the causes contributing to this varied performance and evaluates whether Indonesia's Q1 2026 economic development can be deemed healthy, sustainable, and widely experienced by the populace. The article employs a qualitative literature review approach instead of a systematic review, synthesizing official BPS materials from Q1 2026, along with sectoral, expenditure-based, and analytical literature, as well as recent scholarly studies on growth quality, fiscal policy, informality, and geopolitical risk. The analysis indicates that growth in Q1 2026 was bolstered by robust household consumption, a significant fiscal stimulus via government expenditure, sustained positive gross fixed capital formation, widespread sectoral contributions primarily from manufacturing, trade, agriculture, and construction, along with some commodity-related support despite adverse global conditions. Nonetheless, the structure of this expansion indicates many significant qualifications. The quarter's growth was somewhat affected by base effects, seasonal timing, and the allocation of public programs, whilst net exports had a detrimental impact. Furthermore, labor-market research indicates that improvements in real pay and job quality may have been less substantial than the headline GDP growth indicated. The essay concludes that Indonesia's Q1 2026 growth was authentic and comparatively robust in the short term, however only conditionally sustainable and partially inclusive

INTRODUCTION

Indonesia's first-quarter growth result for 2026 deserves close analytical attention because it unusually combines strength and ambiguity. According to BPS, Indonesia's economy grew **5.61 percent year-on-year** in Q1 2026, with GDP at current prices reaching **IDR 6,187.2 trillion** and GDP at 2010 constant prices reaching **IDR 3,447.7 trillion**. At the same time, the economy contracted **0.77 percent quarter-to-quarter**, although BPS also shows that first-quarter contractions have been part of the seasonal historical pattern in previous years. This twin reading matters because it reminds analysts that a quarter can be simultaneously strong in annual comparative terms and weaker in immediate sequential momentum, particularly when festive timing, year-end bases, and expenditure seasonality are involved [1].

The composition of that growth is what makes the Q1 2026 episode especially interesting. On the output side, the BPS report shows that the five largest sectors in the economy remained **manufacturing, trade, agriculture, construction, and mining**, while the fastest-growing sector was **accommodation and food service activities**, at **13.14 percent year-on-year**. On the expenditure side, **household consumption** remained the dominant GDP component with a distribution share of **54.36 percent**, **PMTB** accounted for **28.29 percent**, and **government consumption** – though smaller in share at **6.72 percent** – recorded the fastest growth at **21.81 percent**. Even more revealing is the contribution analysis: household consumption contributed **2.94 percentage points** to the total growth rate, **PMTB** contributed **1.79 points**, government consumption contributed **1.26 points**, while net exports subtracted from growth. In other words, the quarter's expansion was domestically driven, with a large role for household demand and a highly visible fiscal impulse [1].

The BPS materials further indicate that the quarter cannot be interpreted purely as a narrow consumption boom. On the output side, **manufacturing** remained the single largest source of growth, contributing **1.03 percentage points**, and BPS explicitly notes that manufacturing growth was supported by stronger demand for food and drink during Ramadan and Eid al-Fitr, increased rice production, and export demand for **CPO and CPKO**, while metal, electronics, and electrical equipment industries also grew strongly because of external demand. Agriculture grew because of the paddy harvest and rising livestock demand. Construction accelerated along with government capital spending and physical rollout associated with public programs. These details point to a broader growth pattern than a simple services spike, even if services and mobility clearly played an important marginal role [1].

The domestic-demand reading is strengthened by the BPS reports on Q1 2026 events. Those slides report that per capita consumption for restaurants and hotels rose **11.63 percent year-on-year**, online retail and marketplace transactions grew **6.19 percent quarter-to-quarter**, consumer-goods imports increased **6.12 percent year-on-year**, the real retail sales index grew **4.74 percent year-on-year**, and the value of electronic-money, debit-card, and credit-card transactions rose **4.20 percent year-on-year**. On the mobility side, domestic tourism trips grew **13.14 percent**, foreign tourist visits rose **8.62 percent**, and passenger volumes rose

across land, sea, air, and ferry transport. These indicators support a picture of a quarter in which household movement, spending, and service-sector activation were unmistakably important [1].

Yet the quarter also unfolded in a clearly adverse external environment. The same BPS materials incorporate the **IMF World Economic Outlook April 2026**, showing that global growth in 2026 was expected to soften relative to 2025, while inflation pressures remained significant. The BPS slides also summarize World Bank commodity data, indicating that in Q1 2026, crude oil prices rose **22.01 percent quarter-to-quarter**, gas prices **26.73 percent**, coal **11.89 percent**, nickel **16.51 percent**, and palm oil **4.85 percent** quarter-to-quarter, with several of those commodities also higher year-on-year. This means that Indonesia's Q1 2026 growth was achieved not in a benign global setting, but in one marked by war-related uncertainty, rising energy insecurity, and potentially destabilizing import-cost pressures [1].

That broader setting is important because the policy question raised by Q1 2026 is not whether Indonesia "grew." It obviously did. The more interesting question is whether the composition of that growth was **healthy** in macroeconomic terms, **sustainable** over time, and **broadly felt** across society. These are related but distinct questions. A quarter can record strong GDP growth while relying too heavily on temporary public disbursement, festive timing, or import-intensive domestic spending. It can also generate considerable output without generating proportionate gains in real wages, job quality, or territorial diffusion. The literature makes precisely this point by cautioning that strong government consumption, low-base effects, and festival timing may have played large roles in the headline number, while real wage growth and labor quality may have improved less than output suggests [2].

This article, therefore, pursues three objectives. First, it identifies the most important drivers of Indonesia's Q1 2026 growth by synthesizing official output-side and expenditure-side evidence with macro-context material and scholarly literature. Second, it evaluates whether the observed composition of growth justifies a judgment of macroeconomic health and medium-run sustainability. Third, it assesses whether the quarter's growth can plausibly be regarded as broadly meaningful to ordinary Indonesians rather than only to headline statistics, policymakers, or particular sectors. The article adopts a **qualitative literature review** approach because the goal is interpretive synthesis, not protocol-based systematic review or econometric decomposition. That design is especially appropriate for a current-quarter macroeconomic episode in which official data, contextual indicators, and conceptual literature must be read together [3].

The argument advanced here is straightforward but deliberately qualified. Indonesia's Q1 2026 growth was not hollow in the sense of being purely statistical or purely cosmetic. It reflected genuine strength in household demand, visible breadth in production, still-positive investment, and active fiscal support in a difficult world environment. However, some of the same features that made the quarter strong also make it analytically fragile: the negative contribution of net exports, the unusually large role of government consumption, the likely

influence of festive timing and low-base effects, and unresolved questions about real wages, informality, and the spread of benefits across regions and social groups. The article therefore concludes that Q1 2026 growth should be judged **short-run healthy but not unambiguously so, medium-run promising but conditional, and socially meaningful yet still uneven in transmission.**

LITERATURE REVIEW

A meaningful evaluation of Indonesia's Q1 2026 performance requires a literature framework that distinguishes between **growth level, growth quality, and growth transmission.** Economic growth in the narrow national-accounts sense is a rise in output. But the policy significance of growth depends on whether that rise is accompanied by adequate macroeconomic stability, productive deepening, rising household welfare, and broader diffusion of opportunity. In development debates, this problem often appears in different language—quality of growth, inclusive growth, resilient growth, or sustainable growth—but the underlying concern is essentially the same: not all percentage points of GDP growth are equal in their long-run effects or their social meaning [4], [5].

For this article, **healthy growth** is taken to mean growth that is macroeconomically credible, not excessively dependent on one-off supports, and spread broadly enough across sectors that it is less vulnerable to sudden reversal. **Sustainable growth** is taken to mean growth that can continue after temporary supports recede because it rests on productivity, investment quality, institutional capacity, and private-sector dynamism. **Broadly felt growth** is taken to mean growth that reaches households through real purchasing power, stable or improving employment quality, poverty and vulnerability reduction, and territorial diffusion. These definitions are especially appropriate for Indonesia because the country's medium-run challenge is not merely to maintain respectable GDP growth, but to ensure that growth is inclusive, productivity-enhancing, and regionally less concentrated [4], [5].

A second literature stream concerns the standard **determinants of growth in emerging, partially commodity-linked, open economies.** In the short run, growth is often driven by some combination of household consumption, government expenditure, capital formation, and exports. In a large domestic economy like Indonesia, household demand can be a particularly important stabilizer. Public spending can also matter greatly, especially when it operates through wages, transfers, capital spending, and the procurement of goods and services. But over longer horizons, the question becomes whether the composition of demand also strengthens supply—that is, whether today's growth also raises tomorrow's productive capacity. That depends not just on how much investment occurs, but on what kind of investment occurs and whether it feeds productivity, quality employment, and structural transformation [6].

The expenditure-side picture from the literature illustrates exactly why this distinction matters. Household consumption was the largest growth contributor in Q1 2026, government consumption was the fastest-growing component, and PMTB remained strong. These are not mutually exclusive

drivers, but they do pose different analytical questions. Household demand can reflect confidence and genuine income resilience, but it can also be lifted by timing effects such as Ramadan, Idulfitri, travel, and public disbursement. Government consumption can stabilize the economy and support households, but it may also raise questions about future repeatability if it grows much faster than revenue or relies on low-base comparisons. PMTB can be a good sign of optimism and capacity building, but its implications differ depending on whether it is concentrated in buildings, vehicles, machines, or intangible assets [1].

Another key body of literature concerns **geopolitical risk**. Caldara and Iacoviello show that geopolitical risk is economically consequential because it affects confidence, investment, and downside macroeconomic risk. That insight is highly relevant for Q1 2026. The BPS contextual slides show that the quarter occurred while global trade growth remained positive but uneven, while world growth was expected to soften, and while several important commodities – oil, gas, coal, nickel, and palm oil – were moving sharply. Under such conditions, the relationship between domestic growth and external vulnerability becomes more complicated. External shocks can raise export income for some sectors at the same time that they worsen inflation, logistics costs, and exchange-rate pressure for the wider economy [1], [7].

Indonesia's case also highlights that the geopolitical channel is not purely negative. Commodity producers may receive temporary cushioning from price increases, even where the broader global environment is more uncertain. This is where a neutral-to-positive framing of **palm oil** is analytically justified. The BPS industry narrative notes that the growth of food and beverage manufacturing in Q1 2026 was partly supported by export demand for **CPO and CPKO**. The commodity slide also shows that palm oil prices were up **4.85 percent quarter-to-quarter** in Q1 2026, although slightly lower year-on-year. More broadly, the World Bank's April 2026 commodity framework, as reflected in the BPS presentation, suggests that oils-and-meals markets remained relevant under the 2026 global commodity shock. Palm oil should therefore be understood not as an abnormal footnote but as one of the agro-industrial channels through which Indonesia can buffer external stress, support rural incomes, and sustain manufacturing demand in related supply chains [1].

A further literature stream concerns **fiscal and monetary transmission**. Public policy can support short-run stabilization while also shaping medium-run growth prospects, but the composition and credibility of policy matter. The BPS report shows that Q1 2026 featured continued **BI-rate stability at 4.75 percent**, expansion in manufacturing confidence, stronger capital spending, and policy efforts to support consumption during Ramadan and Eid al-Fitr. The same material also notes that government capital spending rose **36.69 percent year-on-year**, that PMDN and PMA grew **7.22 percent**, and that capital-goods imports grew **14.27 percent**. These are indications that macro policy was not merely a passive background condition; it influenced expenditure, production, and confidence directly [1].

The scholarly literature strengthens this interpretation. The post-pandemic fiscal-policy debate in Indonesia emphasizes that public spending can act as both stabilizer and catalyst, but also that it must remain consistent with medium-run credibility and crowd in rather than crowd out private dynamism [8]. Research on the bank-lending channel across Indonesian provinces likewise highlights that monetary policy affects the real economy through uneven credit transmission, implying that rate stability or accommodative policy does not automatically generate uniform investment outcomes across sectors and regions [9].

Finally, the literature on **informality and unequal transmission** is indispensable for the present topic. Hapsari et al. show that informality in Indonesia remains pervasive and structurally important, not merely a marginal labor-market segment. That matters because even strong macro growth can leave households underwhelmed if jobs remain informal, insecure, or weakly paid. The literature uses this logic directly. It argues that even if household consumption and public demand rose, the quality of labor-market improvement may have been modest because inflation had compressed real gains, and employment quality may have worsened through an increase in informal or casual work. Whether one accepts all of the note's numerical claims without reservation or not, its conceptual point is entirely consistent with the literature: GDP can rise faster than the quality of livelihoods [5].

Taken together, the literature establishes a clear evaluation framework for the rest of the article. A convincing judgment on Q1 2026 must look not only at how much Indonesia grew, but at whether growth came from **broad domestic demand or narrow temporary boosts, from productive investment or short-lived support, from broad production participation or a small number of sectors, and from household welfare transmission or merely from accounting expansion**. The evidence is read against that framework [10], [11].

METHODOLOGY

This article uses a qualitative literature review rather than a systematic literature review. The distinction is important. A systematic review would require exhaustive search protocols, inclusion and exclusion criteria designed to minimize retrieval bias, and generally a question framed around the cumulative state of one more stable research field. That is not the situation here. The present article asks how to interpret a specific macroeconomic episode – Indonesia's Q1 2026 growth result – using newly released official evidence, the literature, and recent scholarly literature. The purpose is synthesis, contextualization, and judgment, not protocol-driven evidence accumulation. A narrative or qualitative review is, therefore, methodologically appropriate because it allows the researcher to assemble and interpret heterogeneous evidence that is unified in relevance [3].

The evidence base was assembled in two tiers. The first and most authoritative tier consists of official BPS materials on Q1 2026 GDP, including the main GDP presentation, the output-side narrative, the expenditure-side narrative, the regional growth summary, and the domestic-event and commodity-context slides. The second tier consists of recent scholarship and policy literature from 2020 onward on geopolitical risk, Indonesian informality,

fiscal policy, monetary transmission, and local inequality. This tier is not used to “prove” Q1 2026 facts directly; rather, it provides frameworks for interpreting what those facts mean.

The unit of analysis is the Q1 2026 growth episode, but the paper uses short backward comparisons to Q1 2025, Q4 2025, and earlier quarters where necessary. This is particularly important because year-on-year and quarter-on-quarter movements may not tell the same story, and because the literature explicitly highlights low-base effects and timing effects. BPS’s own quarterly charts show that Q1 contractions are part of a recurring seasonal pattern, which means that the sequential contraction in Q1 2026 must be interpreted carefully and not read in isolation from the stronger year-on-year figure [1].

The paper uses a coding strategy that combines deductive and inductive elements. Deductively, the review begins with theoretical codes such as household demand, fiscal impulse, investment quality, external vulnerability, commodity cushioning, wage transmission, informality, and spatial unevenness. Inductively, it adds codes that emerge from the Q1 2026 materials themselves, especially festive timing, mobility effects, MBG-related demand, THR disbursement, construction linked to public priorities, and the distinction between output growth and felt welfare. These codes are then organized into three overarching evaluative clusters: health, sustainability, and inclusivity. The analysis proceeds by triangulating across output-side evidence, expenditure-side evidence, contextual domestic indicators, and the literature’s cautionary interpretation.

Quantitative indicators are thus used as anchors within a qualitative argument, not as variables inside an econometric model. GDP growth, expenditure shares, source-of-growth percentages, mobility indicators, price movements, and reported wage concerns are treated as evidence of patterns. This allows the article to ask questions such as whether the quarter was unusually dependent on public spending, whether investment looks productivity-enhancing, whether commodity conditions protected or threatened domestic growth, and whether wage and labor-quality evidence is consistent with the idea that growth was broadly felt.

This approach also requires transparency about limitations. First, some welfare indicators are lagged relative to the publication of GDP. Second, some of the cautionary labor-market numbers available in the literature are not fully reproduced in the directly accessible official BPS tables within the file set used here, even though the note attributes them to BPS labor data. Those numbers are therefore treated as analytically important but still require final verification before external submission. Third, the paper does not claim to establish exact causal weights; it offers a strong, evidence-based interpretation of a current macroeconomic episode. Under the circumstances, that is not a weakness of the design but its intended purpose.

RESULTS

The first major result is that **household consumption remained the central anchor of Q1 2026 growth**, and the evidence is strong. The expenditure table shows that household consumption accounted for **54.36 percent** of GDP and contributed **2.94 percentage points** to the 5.61 percent year-on-year growth rate. The BPS expenditure narrative adds important detail: household consumption grew **5.52 percent**, with especially strong gains in **restaurants and hotels (7.38 percent)** and **transportation and communication (6.91 percent)**. This indicates that the quarter's consumption strength was not evenly spread across all household categories; it was particularly concentrated in service components closely associated with mobility, tourism, festive travel, and faster transactional activity [1].

The contextual slides reinforce that interpretation. Restaurant and hotel consumption per capita rose **11.63 percent**, electronic retail activity rose **6.19 percent quarter-to-quarter**, consumer imports grew **6.12 percent**, retail sales grew **4.74 percent**, and electronic payments increased **4.20 percent**. In parallel, domestic tourist trips grew **13.14 percent**, foreign tourist visits **8.62 percent**, and transport passenger flows rose across multiple modes. These are precisely the indicators one would expect in a quarter shaped by Ramadan, Eid al-Fitr, and mass mobility. The evidence strongly suggests that household demand in Q1 2026 was both real and seasonally amplified. This does not make the growth less real; rather, it clarifies the mechanism through which it occurred [1].

At the same time, the quality of household demand is more ambiguous than its quantity. The literature points out that while headline household consumption growth was solid and contributed around **52 percent of total GDP growth**, real purchasing power may not have improved by nearly as much as nominal spending suggested. The note argues that February and March inflation, combined with only modest wage gains and a deterioration in employment quality, imply that the real-income experience of many households was weaker than the GDP headline suggests. Because this labor-market reading comes through the literature rather than through a directly accessible BPS labor table in the present file set, it should be treated cautiously. Even so, as an interpretive proposition, it is persuasive: stronger tourism, transport, and restaurant spending can coexist with limited real wage gains, especially if inflation and labor-market informality remain elevated [12], [13], [14].

The second major result is that **government consumption was an unusually important accelerator of growth in Q1 2026**. The expenditure slides show that government consumption grew by **21.81 percent year-on-year, making it by far the fastest-growing demand component and contributing 1.26 percentage points** to total growth. BPS explicitly attributes this rise to higher personnel spending associated with the payment of **THR (Allowance for Religious Festive)** and to stronger goods-and-services spending, especially spending on goods handed to communities through the *Makan Bergizi Gratis (MBG- Free Nutritious Meals)* program. The contextual policy slides reinforce this by citing transport incentives for Ramadan-Idulfitri, greater central spending on goods transferred to communities, and broader expenditure reallocation toward strategic sectors [1], [15], [16], [17].

This result matters because it changes how the headline number should be interpreted. Without the large public-consumption impulse, Q1 2026 would still likely have posted respectable growth because household consumption and PMTB were both strong, but it would almost certainly have been lower than 5.61 percent. The literature underscores this point, arguing that the surge in public consumption reflected both **base effects** and **program expansion** rather than an ordinary annual spending pattern. It also notes that government consumption contracted in Q1 2025, making the year-on-year comparison more favorable for Q1 2026. This suggests that a non-trivial part of the quarter's acceleration was linked to the specific budgetary and programmatic context of early 2026 rather than to a fully generalized private-sector upswing [16], [18], [19].

The third major result is that **investment remained supportive and was not merely a statistical residual**. PMTB grew **5.96 percent year-on-year** and contributed **1.79 percentage points** to headline growth, making it the second-largest direct source of growth after household consumption. The subcomponent breakdown is analytically useful. Vehicles grew **12.39 percent**, machinery and equipment **10.78 percent**, buildings **5.29 percent**, and intellectual property products **5.80 percent**. That profile is important because it suggests that the quarter's investment strength was not limited only to construction; it also included equipment and motor-vehicle components that may be more closely associated with productive capacity and business activity [1], [20], [21].

The BPS narrative supports that reading. It notes that PMTB was driven by government priority programs as well as private investment, that capital-goods imports grew **14.27 percent**, and that realized PMDN and PMA rose **7.22 percent year-on-year**. Manufacturing- and business-climate indicators were also in expansion territory, with the Index Kondisi dan Prospek Bisnis Manufaktur at **51.37** and BI's Prompt Manufacturing Index at **52.03**. This does not prove that investment quality is uniformly high, but it does make it difficult to dismiss Q1 2026 as a purely government-consumption story. There was a genuine investment dimension to the quarter, even if construction and public-program implementation clearly played a large role [1], [22], [23].

The fourth major result is that **the external sector was an important constraint rather than the main growth engine**. The expenditure contribution chart shows that **net exports subtracted 1.15 percentage points** from total growth. Export growth was only **0.90 percent year-on-year**, while imports grew **7.18 percent**. This is one of the most revealing features of the quarter because it shows that Q1 2026 was carried domestically. A country can still experience healthy growth under such conditions, especially if domestic absorption is strong, but this also means that Indonesia's Q1 expansion was not driven by a major external-demand boom [1], [2], [24].

At the same time, the commodity and trade context was not irrelevant. The BPS slides show notable quarter-to-quarter increases in several of Indonesia's key commodities, including oil, gas, coal, nickel, and palm oil. This implies a two-sided external story. On the one hand, commodity-linked sectors and export channels still provided a cushion and income support. On the other hand, energy and imported inputs became a greater source of cost pressure. The

literature emphasizes this tension precisely by worrying that higher oil prices, a weaker rupiah, and rising import costs for raw materials could compress future domestic demand and complicate fiscal management. In this sense, the external sector in Q1 2026 was neither a dramatic collapse nor a clear boom. It was a mixed environment: helpful for some sectors, but risky for macro sustainability [1], [25], [26], [27], [28], [29].

The palm-oil story sits within that mixed external picture but deserves separate treatment because of the user's request and because the BPS report itself signals its relevance. On the commodity page, palm oil prices were higher quarter-to-quarter, and on the manufacturing narrative page, BPS attributes part of food-and-beverage manufacturing growth to export demand for **CPO and CPKO**. This implies that palm oil and related agro-industrial chains were part of the quarter's resilience architecture. A neutral-to-positive treatment is therefore empirically justified. Palm oil should not be romanticized as a sufficient growth solution, but neither should it be omitted from the analysis when official materials point to its contribution to demand, exports, agro-processing, and rural activity [1], [26], [27], [29].

The fifth major result is that **the growth episode was sectorally broader than a hospitality boom alone**. The output-side presentation shows that the largest sectors were manufacturing (**19.07 percent of GDP**), trade (**13.28 percent**), agriculture (**12.67 percent**), construction (**9.81 percent**), and mining (**8.69 percent**). Among these, manufacturing grew **5.04 percent**, trade **6.26 percent**, agriculture **4.97 percent**, and construction **5.49 percent**, while mining contracted **2.14 percent** year-on-year. Meanwhile, accommodation and food services, transport and warehousing, and "other services" all grew rapidly. The source-of-growth chart then shows that manufacturing, trade, agriculture, construction, and "other sectors" together accounted for the bulk of the 5.61 percent result. This is evidence of **broad participation**, even though intensity differed across sectors [1], [30], [31].

The industry narratives on the BPS slides make the breadth even clearer. Manufacturing grew because food and beverage processing benefited from Ramadan and Eid al-Fitr demand, higher rice production, and export demand for CPO and CPKO; metal, electronics, and electrical equipment benefited from external demand for electronics components and batteries; and chemicals, pharmaceuticals, and traditional medicines grew because of both domestic and foreign demand. Agriculture gained from paddy harvests and livestock demand, including eggs and chicken meat, is tied to both Eid demand and MBG-related needs. Trade benefited from stronger production, higher imports of consumer, capital, and intermediate goods, and stronger household spending. Construction benefited from government capital spending, private physical activity, and the supply of supporting materials. This is a much richer output story than simple "government spending caused growth" reductionism [1], [32], [33].

The sixth major result concerns **regional distribution**. BPS shows that all major island groups grew positively in Q1 2026, with **Bali and Nusa Tenggara** posting the highest year-on-year growth at **7.93 percent**, followed by **Sulawesi** at **6.95 percent**, **Java** at **5.79 percent**, **Sumatra** at **5.13 percent**, **Maluku and Papua**

at **4.46 percent**, and **Kalimantan** at **4.08 percent**. Yet Java still accounted for **57.24 percent** of the national economy, compared with **22.08 percent** for Sumatra and materially smaller shares for the other regions. This means that the expansion had national reach but remained territorially uneven in weight. It is therefore possible for all regions to grow positively while the national felt experience of growth remains dominated by the economic center of gravity on Java [1], [33], [34], [35], [36].

The regional composition also suggests that Q1 2026 combined old and new growth geographies. Java remained dominant because of manufacturing, trade, and information-communication activity, while Bali-Nusra and Sulawesi outperformed the national rate, helped by combinations of mining, manufacturing, agriculture, and trade. That dispersion is positive in terms of national breadth. But the continuing dominance of Java means that the social question—whether growth is broadly felt—cannot be answered by positive growth alone at the island level. One must still ask how the gains were distributed across jobs, local price conditions, and household livelihoods [37], [38], [39], [40].

The seventh and final result concerns **labor quality and household welfare transmission**, where the evidence becomes more suggestive than definitive. The BPS presentation itself emphasizes the demand and mobility sides of the quarter, but the literature raises concerns that real wage improvements may have been limited and that informality may have risen. It also argues that while household consumption contributed the largest share of GDP growth, real income gains for the majority may have been closer to **2 percent once inflation is accounted for, and that consumer credit data did not signal a broad surge in household financing**. Even if one takes those precise numbers as provisional pending final verification, the note's analytic implication is clear: part of the consumption-led story may have reflected timing, selective spending, and public support rather than a generalized and durable lift in household welfare [41], [42], [43], [44].

This means that the results section points to a coherent but qualified picture. Q1 2026 was driven by **real domestic demand**, materially supported by **public disbursement**, complemented by **positive investment**, broadened by **manufacturing, trade, agriculture, and construction**, and shaped by a **mixed external environment** in which commodities provided cushioning while energy costs raised medium-run risks. These are strong fundamentals for a respectable quarter. But they are not yet enough, by themselves, to prove that the growth was equally strong as a matter of **future durability** or **broad social transmission** [11], [45].

DISCUSSION

The first evaluative question is whether Indonesia's Q1 2026 growth was **healthy**. On balance, the answer is **yes, but not unconditionally**. The case for a healthy-growth reading is substantial. The growth rate was objectively high by recent Indonesian standards, the contraction relative to Q4 followed a familiar seasonal pattern, household consumption and PMTB were both strong, and output growth was not restricted to a single sector. Manufacturing remained the largest contributor to growth, while trade, agriculture, construction, transport, and services also contributed. Public spending supported households and activity without eliminating the role of private demand. In short, there is genuine breadth in the quarter's composition, which is a major reason the headline number should not be dismissed [1], [46], [47].

The quarter also appears reasonably healthy from a **stabilization policy** standpoint. The BPS contextual material indicates that BI maintained a stable rate setting throughout Q1 2026, manufacturing and industry indicators remained in expansion, and public policy deliberately supported household demand during a globally adverse period. In that sense, the Q1 result can be read as evidence that Indonesia's macroeconomic policy mix remained capable of stabilizing demand and supporting activity under external turbulence. A purely skeptical reading would miss this point. When global trade, capital flows, and energy prices are unstable, a quarter in which domestic demand holds up, and production responds across several sectors, is not a trivial achievement [1], [48], [49], [50], [51].

However, a stronger claim—that Q1 2026 displayed fully balanced and intrinsically low-risk growth—would be more difficult to defend. Net exports were negative contributors. Government consumption grew at a pace much faster than the rest of the economy. The literature makes a plausible argument that some of the surge reflected base effects and program timing rather than a durable shift in the economic growth path. It also raises the possibility that imported inflationary pressure from oil and other inputs would be felt more fully in later quarters. A quarter can therefore be healthy in the sense of macro resilience without yet being healthy in the deeper sense of self-sustaining, low-fragility expansion. That distinction is essential [2], [52], [53], [54].

The second evaluative question is whether the growth was **sustainable**. Here, the article's answer is more qualified. Some Q1 2026 supports are plausibly persistent. Indonesia remains a large domestic-demand economy. Investments in buildings, equipment, vehicles, and public infrastructure do not vanish after one quarter. Manufacturing and agriculture displayed genuine production momentum, and the quarter's breadth suggests that the economy was not simply coasting on a single policy lever. Moreover, the production-side BPS narrative indicates that several sectors responded to both domestic demand and specific output-side improvements, such as rice harvests, agro-industrial processing, and electronics demand [1], [2], [55], [56].

Yet the sustainability test is stricter than the health test. To say that Q1 2026 growth was sustainable in a strong sense would require evidence that the same or stronger performance will continue once festive effects fade, base effects

become less favorable, and government consumption normalizes. The literature explicitly doubts that the very high growth rate of government consumption can persist in subsequent quarters. It also worries that higher oil prices, a weaker rupiah, and fiscal strain could weigh on demand in late 2026. These concerns cannot be dismissed as ideological pessimism; they are analytically relevant because the quarter's arithmetic does show a very visible public-demand accelerator and a negative net-export contribution [2], [11], [57], [58].

The more structural sustainability challenge is the one emphasized in the broader literature: **productivity, investment quality, and labor-market upgrading**. A large part of the medium-run development question in Indonesia is not whether the economy can post a good quarter, but whether it can turn public support and domestic consumption into productivity-rich private expansion. In this respect, Q1 2026 should be read as a useful but incomplete episode. The quarter shows that Indonesia can absorb external shocks and still grow respectably. What it does not yet show is that Indonesia has fully solved the deeper issues of industrial upgrading, formal job creation, and high-quality capital deepening that would make such growth easier to sustain across multiple years [5], [6], [59], [60].

The third evaluative question is whether the growth was **broadly felt by Indonesians**. This is the most socially important and analytically difficult part of the paper. The optimistic case should be taken seriously. A quarter in which household demand, tourism, transport, retail, trade, agriculture, and food-related manufacturing all strengthen will almost certainly be felt positively in many parts of society. The BPS material shows exactly such a pattern. Paddy production grew, livestock activity increased, tourist and passenger movement accelerated, restaurants and hotels did more business, and trade responded to both domestic production and stronger import flows. It would be implausible to claim that none of this mattered to households. Growth of this kind almost certainly supported incomes and activity for many workers, enterprises, and regions [1], [61], [62], [63], [64].

That said, a stronger statement – that the growth was clearly and equally felt by **all** Indonesians – goes beyond the evidence. The literature gives a plausible explanation of why many households might still have experienced the economy as tighter than the GDP number suggests. If real wages rose modestly, if inflation temporarily compressed purchasing power, if workers shifted toward more informal or uncertain employment, and if public support rather than durable market income carried much of the quarter's strength, then the felt experience of growth would be real but incomplete. That interpretation is further supported by the literature on informality, which shows that macro gains are often filtered through weak employment security and uneven social protection in Indonesia [5], [11], [65], [66], [67], [68].

The regional evidence also complicates any claim of universal transmission. All island groups grew, and that is an encouraging sign. Bali-Nusra and Sulawesi even outperformed the national average. But the continuing **57.24 percent** dominance of Java in national GDP means that national growth remains heavily mediated through one region's economic base. Regional breadth is

therefore improving relative to a worst-case concentration story, but it is not yet tantamount to evenly distributed prosperity. This is exactly why territorial and labor-market lenses matter in interpreting growth: a national aggregate can improve faster than the everyday economic security of many citizens [1], [4], [69], [70].

The palm-oil dimension also deserves a final interpretive note. The quarter's manufacturing and commodity narrative suggests that demand for **CPO and CPKO** remained supportive of food and beverage manufacturing, while palm oil prices rose quarter-to-quarter. In a year marked by geopolitical fragmentation and energy-security concerns, palm oil and related agro-industrial chains should be viewed as part of Indonesia's resilience rather than as external to the growth conversation. A neutral-to-positive stance is thus not only consistent with the user's instruction but also with the evidence. Palm oil is one of the channels through which Indonesia can support export earnings, agro-processing, and rural incomes. The deeper issue is not whether palm oil belongs in a positive growth narrative – it does – but how far commodity-linked support can be translated into broader and more durable welfare gains [1], [71], [72], [73], [74].

The most balanced judgment, then, is that Q1 2026 represented **qualified resilience**. It was more than a statistical illusion, more than a single-sector spike, and more than pure state spending. The breadth on the production side, the investment component, the household-demand response, and the regional positivity all matter. But the same quarter also showed features that limit how strongly one should generalize from it: visible dependence on public demand, a negative net-export contribution, likely festive amplification, and unresolved questions about job quality and real household gains. These tensions are not signs of analytical failure; they are the core of what makes the Q1 2026 episode worth studying [2], [11].

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This article has argued that Indonesia's Q1 2026 growth should be interpreted neither as empty-headline triumphalism nor as a fragile policy artifact. The quarter was underpinned by a recognizable and empirically traceable set of drivers. On the expenditure side, the main supports were **household consumption, PMTB, and government consumption**. On the output side, the main supports were **manufacturing, trade, agriculture, and construction**, supplemented by strong mobility- and hospitality-related services. The wider context also mattered: mobility and tourism indicators improved, manufacturing sentiment remained expansionary, capital-goods imports rose, and commodity conditions provided both support and risk. Palm oil and related agro-industrial channels were part of that support structure, particularly through CPO- and CPKO-linked demand.

The article's direct evaluative answers are therefore best stated clearly. **Was the growth healthy?** Yes, in the sense that it was broad enough, macro-relevant enough, and policy-coherent enough to count as genuine short-run resilience under difficult global conditions. **Was it sustainable?** Only conditionally. Some of the quarter's strength looks durable, especially where it

reflects production breadth and investment, but an important share of the acceleration appears linked to public disbursement, program timing, and favorable annual comparison effects. **Was it broadly felt?** Partly. Many households and sectors almost certainly benefited from the stronger domestic-demand environment, but the evidence also indicates that real welfare transmission was likely incomplete, uneven, and mediated by job quality, inflation, and regional concentration.

The short-run policy implication is that Indonesia should preserve the elements of Q1 2026 that were genuinely supportive—purchasing-power protection, investment continuity, and credible macro stabilization—while avoiding overreliance on temporary demand spikes. That means targeted support to food security, transport affordability, and demand-sensitive households where appropriate, but also disciplined attention to inflation spillovers and imported-cost risks, especially if energy prices remain elevated. The quarter suggests that supportive fiscal and monetary coordination can work; it does not suggest that demand support alone can secure lasting prosperity.

The medium-run policy implication is more demanding. If Indonesia wants Q1 2026 to be remembered as the start of a stronger trajectory rather than as a strong but temporary quarter, it must deepen the growth model beyond public demand and seasonal consumption. That requires stronger **investment quality**, continued support for **manufacturing and agro-industry**, more **formal and better-paid employment**, broader **regional productivity gains**, and institutional conditions that turn macro resilience into microeconomic upgrading. Palm oil, agriculture, trade, tourism, and public services can all remain part of that process, but the decisive transition will be whether Indonesia can make growth more **productive**, more **job-rich**, and more **widely enjoyed**.

The final judgment of this article is therefore deliberately balanced. Indonesia's Q1 2026 expansion was a meaningful achievement, especially given the geopolitical and commodity turbulence of the period. It deserves recognition as a quarter of real resilience. Yet it also deserves a cautious and honest reading. A growth rate of 5.61 percent becomes historically significant only if it evolves from a quarter of strong domestic support into a broader process of structural improvement and more complete social transmission. That is the standard against which the next quarters and the wider 2026 experience should be judged.

FURTHER STUDY

This study still has limitations, so further research is needed on the topic of Growth With Depth or Growth With Gaps? A Review of Indonesia's Q1 2026 Expansion, Its Sustainability, and Its Social Reach to perfect this study and increase insight for readers and authors.

REFERENCES

- A. Ahdiat, "Indonesia's Economic Growth in the Q1 2026 Strengthened, the Highest Since the Pandemic Ended," *Databoks Economics & Macro*. Accessed: May 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://databoks.katadata.co.id/en/economics-macro/statistics/69f97b30a455c/indonesias-economic-growth-in-the-q1-2026-strengthened-the-highest-since-the-pandemic-ended>
- A. G. L. Tobing, "Jakarta's Economy Records Robust Growth in Q1 2026," *Berita Jakarta: Economy*. Accessed: May 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://m.beritajakarta.id/en/read/152519/jakartas-economy-records-robust-growth-in-q1-2026>
- A. Kurmala, "Accelerated govt spending helps sustain domestic demand: economist," *Antara News: Business & Investment*. Accessed: May 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://en.antaranews.com/news/415837/accelerated-govt-spending-helps-sustain-domestic-demand-economist>
- A. Kurmala, "Indonesia records 5.61 percent economic growth in Q1 2026," *ANTARA News*. Accessed: May 12, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://en.antaranews.com/news/414687/indonesia-records-561-percent-economic-growth-in-q1-2026>
- A. L. Yudi, "Indef: Indonesia's Economic Growth Remains Weak as Worker Wages Stagnate," *TEMPO English: Economy & Business*. Accessed: May 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://en.tempo.co/read/2047900/indef-indonesias-economic-growth-remains-weak-as-worker-wages-stagnate>
- A. M. Warner, "Inclusive Growth in Natural Resource-Intensive Economies," in *Commodity Price Volatility and Inclusive Growth in Low-Income Countries*, 1st ed., R. Arezki, C. A. Patillo, M. G. Quintyn, and M. Zhu, Eds., IMF Publications, 2012, ch. 9, pp. 1-408. doi: 10.5089/9781616353797.071.
- A. N. Pratiwi, "Factors Behind Indonesia's 5.61% Economic Growth," *TEMPO English: Economy & Business*. Accessed: May 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://en.tempo.co/read/2102038/factors-behind-indonesias-5-61-economic-growth>
- A. Novarina, "Indonesia's Q1 investment tops target, jobs rise," *Antara News: Business & Investment*. Accessed: May 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://en.antaranews.com/news/413239/indonesias-q1-investment-tops-target-jobs-rise>
- A. T. Wahyuni and D. Hariyanti, "Determination of the Growth Rate of Gross Domestic Regional Product (GDRP) of the Agricultural Sector in Indonesia, Period 2012 - 2021," in *Advance in Economics, Business and Management Research 269 - Prodedings of te International Conference on Entrepreneurship, Leadership and Business Innovations (ICELBI 2022)*, D. Games and Maruf, Eds., 2023, pp. 176-184. doi: 10.2991/978-94-6463-350-4_17.

- ADB, "Asian Economic Integration Report 2026: Leveraging Regional Cooperation and Integration to Navigate Global Uncertainties," Manila, 2026. doi: 10.22617/SGP260050-2.
- Andriansyah, A. Nurwanda, and B. Rifai, "Structural Change and Regional Economic Growth in Indonesia," *Bull. Indones. Econ. Stud.*, vol. 59, no. 1, pp. 91-117, Jan. 2023, doi: 10.1080/00074918.2021.1914320.
- B. A. Sidik, "Indonesia's Economic Progress Centered in Java," *Kompas.id*. Accessed: May 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://www.kompas.id/artikel/en-kemajuan-perekonomian-indonesia-berpusat-di-jawa>
- BI, "BI-Rate Held at 4.75%: Maintaining Stability, Supporting Economic Growth," BI News Release. Accessed: May 10, 2026. [Online]. Available: https://www.bi.go.id/en/publikasi/ruang-media/news-release/Pages/sp_288426.aspx
- BPS, "Indonesia's Economic Growth in Q1-2026 was 5.61 Percent (Y-on-Y)," BPS Press Release. Accessed: May 10, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://www.bps.go.id/en/pressrelease/2026/05/05/2575/indonesia-s-economic-growth-in-q1-2026-was-5-61-percent--y-on-y-.html>
- BPS, "The year-on-year (y-on-y) inflation rate in April 2026 was 2.42 percent," BPS Official Statistics News. Accessed: May 12, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://www.bps.go.id/en/pressrelease/2026/05/04/2570/inflasi-year-on-year--y-on-y--pada-april-2026-sebesar-2-42-persen-.html>
- C. Hornok and D. G. S. Raeskyesa, "Economic zones and local income inequality: Evidence from Indonesia," *J. Econ. Inequal.*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 69-100, Mar. 2024, doi: 10.1007/s10888-023-09581-x.
- C. Thawley, M. Crystallin, and K. Verico, "Towards a Higher Growth Path for Indonesia," *Bull. Indones. Econ. Stud.*, vol. 60, no. 3, pp. 247-282, Sep. 2024, doi: 10.1080/00074918.2024.2432035.
- D. Caldara and M. Iacoviello, "Measuring Geopolitical Risk," *Am. Econ. Rev.*, vol. 112, no. 4, pp. 1194-1225, Apr. 2022, doi: 10.1257/aer.20191823.
- D. Trisfian, "High Informal Employment in Indonesia Reflects Structural Poverty, Says Economist at UGM," UGM News Report. Accessed: May 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://ugm.ac.id/en/news/high-informal-employment-in-indonesia-reflects-structural-poverty-says-economist-at-ugm/>
- D. W. Nugraha, "Economic Growth in the First Quarter of 2026 is Projected to Remain Above 5 Percent," *Kompas.id*. Accessed: May 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://www.kompas.id/artikel/en-pertumbuhan-ekonomi-triwulan-i-2026-diproyeksi-masih-di-atas-5-persen>
- E. Ginting, C. Manning, and K. Taniguchi, "Indonesia: Enhancing Productivity through Quality Jobs," Manila, 2018. doi: 10.22617/TCS189213-2.
- F. Antman and D. J. McKenzie, "Earnings Mobility and Measurement Error: A Pseudo-Panel Approach," *Econ. Dev. Cult. Change*, vol. 56, no. 1, pp. 125-161, Oct. 2007, doi: 10.1086/520561.

- F. P. Putra and A. Patunru, "Examining Policies on Controlling Prices: Indonesian Crude Palm Oil (CPO) and Cooking Oil," *Southeast Asian Econ.*, vol. 41, no. 2, pp. 125–151, 2024, doi: 10.1355/ae41-2c.
- G. Adler, "Volatility in External Demand: Indonesia's Commodity Boom and Overall Competitiveness," in *Indonesia: Sustaining Growth during Global Volatility*, 1st ed., T. Rumbaugh, Ed., IMF Publications, 2012, ch. 4, p. 141. doi: <https://doi.org/10.5089/9781616352028.071>.
- GAPKI, "Balancing Growth and Green Mandates: Indonesia's Strategic Use of Palm Oil in Global Economic Diplomacy," GAPKI Publication Recent News. Accessed: May 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://gapki.id/en/news/2025/10/10/balancing-growth-and-green-mandates-indonesias-strategic-use-of-palm-oil-in-global-economic-diplomacy/>
- H. Widi, "Indonesia's Export Resilience Test," *Kompas.id*. Accessed: May 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://www.kompas.id/artikel/en-ujian-resiliensi-ekspor-indonesia>
- H. Widi, "Parody of Economic Growth," *Kompas.id*. Accessed: May 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://www.kompas.id/artikel/en-parodi-pertumbuhan-ekonomi>
- I. Balindra, "BPS: Pertumbuhan Ekonomi Q1 2026 Tertinggi dalam 5 Tahun," *Tempo Bisnis*. Accessed: May 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://www.tempo.co/ekonomi/bps-pertumbuhan-ekonomi-q1-2026-tertinggi-dalam-5-tahun-2133771>
- I. M. Hapsari, S. Yu, U. J. Pape, and W. Mansour, "Informality in Indonesia: Levels, Trends, and Features," *The World Bank*, Washington DC, 10586, Oct. 2023. doi: 10.1596/1813-9450-10586.
- IBC, "IBC Stresses the Importance of Sustainable Foundations Behind the 5.61 Percent Growth," *Indonesia Business Council Press Release & Statement*. Accessed: May 12, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://business-council.id/ibc-stresses-the-importance-of-sustainable-foundations-behind-the-561-percent-growth>
- IMF, "Indonesia: 2025 Article IV Consultation-Press Release; Staff Report; and Statement by the Executive Director for Indonesia," *IMF Staff Ctry. Reports*, vol. 2026, no. 010, p. 1, Jan. 2026, doi: 10.5089/9798229035576.002.
- IMF, "World Economic Outlook: Global Economy in the Shadow of War," 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://www.imf.org/en/publications/weo/issues/2026/04/14/world-economic-outlook-april-2026>
- IPOSS, "2026 Palm Oil Outlook," Jakarta, 2026.
- J. F. Reki et al., "Indonesia Economic Outlook 2026: Suboptimal Quality of 5% Growth," Jakarta, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://lpem.org/repec/lpe/queueouts/IEO202504.pdf>
- J. N. Shofa, "Indonesia Aims 6.5% Growth in 2027 with New Export Scheme," *Jakarta Globe: Business*. Accessed: May 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://jakartaglobe.id/business/indonesia-aims-65-growth-in-2027-with-new-export-scheme>

- K. Russell et al., "The enterprising archipelago: Propelling Indonesia's productivity," 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://www.mckinsey.com/mgi/our-research/the-enterprising-archipelago-propelling-indonesias-productivity>
- KADIN, "Economy Grows 5.61% in Q1 2026, Kadin Commends Government Performance," Berita Indonesia: Latest News from Kadin Indonesia. Accessed: May 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://kadin.id/en/kabar/tumbuh-561-di-kuartal-i-2026-kadin-apresiasi-kinerja-pemerintah/>
- KataData, "East Ventures - Digital Competitiveness Index 2023 - Equitable Digital Nation: Mapping the Digital Competitiveness of 38 Provinces and 8 Digital Economy Sectors in Indonesia," Jakarta, 2023. [Online]. Available: [https://east-ventures-reports.s3.ap-southeast-1.amazonaws.com/East+Ventures+-+Digital+Competitiveness+Index+2023+\(English+Version\).pdf](https://east-ventures-reports.s3.ap-southeast-1.amazonaws.com/East+Ventures+-+Digital+Competitiveness+Index+2023+(English+Version).pdf)
- Khoirunnisa, H. D. Fridayani, and M. E. Atmojo, "Analysis of Economic and Political Policies on the Performance of the Coconut Oil Export Industry in Indonesia," J. Gov. Polit. Soc. UMA, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 209-228, 2025, doi: 10.31289/jppuma.v13i2.15425.
- L. Judijanto, "Navigating Uncertainty: Palm Oil Sector Outlook for 2026 through the Lens of Smallholder Welfare and Sustainability Imperatives," Rev. Geopolítica, vol. 17, no. 1, p. e1386, Jan. 2026, doi: 10.56238/revgeov17n1-127.
- L. Monica and D. Priambodo, "Government: Indonesian economy remains strong amidst global dynamics," IDN Financials. Accessed: May 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://www.idnfinancials.com/news/62524/government-indonesian-economy-remains-strong-amidst-global-dynamics>
- L. Monica and K. Rafsanjani, "Experts say Indonesia's growth should be under 5%," IDN Financials. Accessed: May 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://www.idnfinancials.com/news/63873/experts-say-indonesias-growth-should-be-under-5>
- M. F. Alfarisy, "How Regional Economic Growth, Population, and Manufacturing Value-Added Contribute to Regional Labor Force Participation," JERSS J. Econ. Res. Soc. Sci., vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 154-164, Aug. 2025, doi: 10.18196/jerss.v9i2.23220.
- M. Ikhsan and T. Riefky, "Indonesia GDP Growth - First Quarter 2026: Behind the 5.61% Headline - Permanent-Cyclical Decomposition, Internal Consistency Checks, and 2026 Growth Projections Amid Global Risks," Jakarta, 2026. [Online]. Available: https://lpem.org/wp-content/uploads/2026/05/LPEM_PDB_Q1_2026_English_FINAL_2_edit-revisi-preview-2.pdf
- M. Jansen, R. Peters, and J. M. Salazar-Xirinachs, "Trade and Employment: From Myths to Facts," Geneva, 2011. [Online]. Available: https://www.academia.edu/45073736/Trade_and_Employment_From_Myths_to_Facts

- M. Juntunen and M. Lehenkari, "A narrative literature review process for an academic business research thesis," *Stud. High. Educ.*, vol. 46, no. 2, pp. 330–342, Feb. 2021, doi: 10.1080/03075079.2019.1630813.
- M. K. Rahmad and F. Widhiyanto, "Indonesia Leads G-20 Growth as 5.61% GDP Surge Crushes Market Expectations," *Investortrust Macro*. Accessed: May 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://investortrust.id/macro/102422/indonesia-crushes-expectations-with-561-gdp-growth-defying-global-slump-to-lead-g-20?page=english-edition>
- M. K. Rahmad and F. Widhiyanto, "PMI Manufaktur BI: Kinerja Industri Pengolahan Meningkatkan pada Kuartal I-2026," *Investor Trust: Macro*. Accessed: May 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://investortrust.id/macro/100447/pmi-manufaktur-bi-kinerja-industri-pengolahan-meningkat-pada-kuartal-i-2026>
- M. Krisnawati, "Indonesia's Economy Grows 5.61 Percent in Q1-2026: BPS," *RRI-Voic of Indonesia: News*. Accessed: May 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://rri.co.id/en/business/2391170/indonesias-economy-grows-561-percent-in-q1-2026-bps>
- M. M. Wihardja and W. Cunningham, "Pathways to Middle-Class Jobs in Indonesia," Washington DC, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/891451624897518888/pdf/Technical-Report.pdf>
- M. Muhyiddin, "Indonesia Economic and Development Outlook 2026: Why Five Percent Growth Is No Longer Enough for a Rising Economy," *J. Perenc. Pembang. Indones. J. Dev. Plan.*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 292–297, May 2026, doi: 10.36574/jpp.v9i3.791.
- M. N. R. Al-Arif, "Indonesia's Q1 2026 Economy Goes to the Moon," *UIN Jakarta Article*. Accessed: May 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://www.uinjkt.ac.id/en/indonesias-q1-2026-economy-goes-to-the-moon>
- M. Nanga and W. Widjaja, "Structural Transformation in the Indonesian Economy: Why does 'Financial Development' Matter?," *Ekuilibrium J. Ilm. Bid. Ilmu Ekon.*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 213–222, Sep. 2024, doi: 10.24269/ekuilibrium.v19i2.2024.pp213-222.
- M. R. Rahman, "Indonesia records strong growth as spending rises 21.81 pct: Economist," *Antara News: Business & Investment*. Accessed: May 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://en.antaranews.com/news/415765/indonesia-records-strong-growth-as-spending-rises-2181-pct-economist>
- M. R. Rahman, "Indonesia's Q1 2026 growth hits 5.61 pct, highest in G20: Kadin," *Antara News: Business & Investment*. Accessed: May 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://en.antaranews.com/news/414833/indonesias-q1-2026-growth-hits-561-pct-highest-in-g20-kadin>

- M. Sukaesih, "Unlocking regional potential to boost economic growth," *The Jakarta Post: Business Economy*. Accessed: May 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://www.thejakartapost.com/business/2026/02/17/unlocking-regional-potential-to-boost-economic-growth.html>
- M. W. Askar, G. D. Muhammad, J. Darmawan, A. H. Imaduddin, and B. Yudhistira, "Indonesia Inequality Report 2024: Private Jets for the Rich, Bicycles for the Poor," Jakarta, 2024. [Online]. Available: https://celios.co.id/wp-content/uploads/2024/09/Indonesia_Inequality_Report_2024_EN_37e4b29d3b.pdf
- MoF, "Pemerintah Jaga Momentum Pertumbuhan, APBN 2026 Tetap Ekspansif dan Terukur," *Kementerian Keuangan - Direktorat Jenderal Strategi Ekonomi dan Fiskal*. Accessed: May 10, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://fiskal.kemenkeu.go.id/baca/2026/05/05/4601-pemerintah-jaga-momentum-pertumbuhan-apbn-2026-tetap-ekspansif-dan-terukur>
- N. N. Rahmah, "BPS Records Indonesia's Q1 2026 Economic Growth at 5.61%, Surpassing Forecast," *Business Indonesia News*. Accessed: May 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://business-indonesia.org/news/bps-records-indonesia-s-q1-2026-economic-growth-at-5-61-surpassing-forecast>
- N. Putra, "Indonesia Seeing Investment Growth Outside Java Island in First Half of 2025," *TEMPO English: Economy & Business*. Accessed: May 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://en.tempo.co/read/2043243/indonesia-seeing-investment-growth-outside-java-island-in-first-half-of-2025>
- N. Tremblay, "The Impact of Inflation on Household Consumption: An Econometric Analysis from Emerging Markets," *OTS Can. J.*, vol. 4, no. 5, p. 20, May 2025, doi: 10.58840/jfcapb20.
- P. Dorimulu, "Indonesia's Business Pulse Weakens as Global Uncertainty Forces Defensive 'Wait and See' Stance," *Investor Trust: Market*. Accessed: May 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://investortrust.id/market/101317/indonesias-business-pulse-weakens-as-global-uncertainty-forces-defensive-wait-and-see-stance?page=english-edition>
- P. Pamungkas, F. Septianto, I. Trinugroho, R. Ab-Rahim, M. M. Ridhwan, and B. S. Sergi, "Monetary Policy via Bank Lending Channel: Evidence from Lending Decomposition," *J. Risk Financ. Manag.*, vol. 18, no. 5, p. 249, May 2025, doi: 10.3390/jrfm18050249.
- R. Andrianto, "Ekonomi Bali & Nusa Tenggara Tembus 7,93%, Sukses Salip Sulawesi," *CNBC Indonesia News*. Accessed: May 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://www.cnbcindonesia.com/news/20260505114043-4-732327/ekonomi-bali-nusa-tenggara-tembus-793-sukses-salip-sulawesi>
- R. Andriyanto, "Indonesia Manufacturing Hits 2.5-Year High, BI Confident," *GoTrade News*. Accessed: May 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://www.heygotrade.com/en/news/indonesia-manufacturing-hits-25-year-high-bi-confident/>

- R. F. Wijaya, "Indonesia Sees Early 2026 Consumption Boost as Ramadan, Eid Fall in Q1: BPS," *Jakarta Globe: Business*. Accessed: May 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/891451624897518888/pdf/Technical-Report.pdf>
- R. F. Wijaya, "Indonesia's Growth Has 'Plateaued' at 5%, Economist Says," *Jakarta Globe: Business*. Accessed: May 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://jakartaglobe.id/business/indonesias-growth-has-plateaued-at-5-economist-says>
- R. Shrestha and I. Coxhead, "Can Indonesia Secure a Development Dividend from Its Resource Export Boom?," *Bull. Indones. Econ. Stud.*, vol. 54, no. 1, pp. 1–24, Jan. 2018, doi: 10.1080/00074918.2018.1458702.
- S. M. Indrawati, E. Satriawan, and Abdurohman, "Indonesia's Fiscal Policy in the Aftermath of the Pandemic," *Bull. Indones. Econ. Stud.*, vol. 60, no. 1, pp. 1–33, Jan. 2024, doi: 10.1080/00074918.2024.2335967.
- S. Syahril, T. Zulham, I. Hasan, J. Saputra, H. Noviar, and O. R. Risma, "Does the World Price of Crude Palm Oil and Total of Production Determine Palm Oil Marketing Margins in Indonesia?," *Ind. Eng. Manag. Syst.*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 520–526, Sep. 2020, doi: 10.7232/iems.2020.19.3.520.
- Samuel Sekuritas Indonesia, "Quarterly Economic Insights 1st Week of May 2026," *Samuel Sekuritas Indonesia Quarterly Economic Insights*. Accessed: May 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: https://samuel.co.id/wp-content/uploads/2026/05/1st-Week-Report-of-May_Macro-Economics_11052026_EN.pdf
- World Bank, "Commodity Markets Outlook," Washington DC, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://thedocs.worldbank.org/en/doc/f3138644a1e8e2bb631399ae11d6c408-0050012026/original/CMO-April-2026.pdf>
- Z. Hannany, "Indonesia economy at risk of slowing after first-quarter peak," *IDN Financials*. Accessed: May 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://www.idnfinancials.com/news/63823/indonesia-economy-at-risk-of-slowing-after-first-quarter-peak>
- Z. Said, P. Vigneshwaran, S. Shaik, A. Rauf, and Z. Ahmad, "Climate and carbon policy pathways for sustainable food systems," *Environ. Sustain. Indic.*, vol. 27, p. 100730, Sep. 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.indic.2025.100730.