

## DAFTAR PUSTAKA

- Abiodun, B. Y. (2007). Significance of Accounting Information on Corporate Values of Firms in Nigeria. *Research Journal in Organizational Psychology & Educational Studies*, 1(2), 121–128.
- Artaya, M., Purbawangsa, I. B. A., & Artini, L. G. S. (2014). Pengaruh Faktor Ekonomi Makro, Risiko Investasi Dan Kinerja Keuangan Terhadap Return Saham Perusahaan Di Bursa Efek Indonesia (Bei). *E-Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Bisnis Universitas Udayana* 3.12 (2014) : 689-701, 12, 689–701.
- Astutik, E. P. (2005). Pengaruh Earning Per Share (Eps), Price Earning Ratio (Per), Dan Debt To Equity Ratio (Der) Terhadap Return Saham Pada Perusahaan Properti Yang Terdaftar Di Bursa Efek Jakarta. *Skripsi. Fakultas Ilmu Sosial. Universitas Negeri Semarang*.
- Baker, M., & Wurgler, J. (2006). Investor sentiment and the cross-section of stock returns. *Journal of Finance*, 61(4), 1645–1680. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.2006.00885.x>
- Ball, R., & Brown, P. (2013). An empirical evaluation of accounting income numbers. *Financial Accounting and Equity Markets: The Selected Essays of Philip Brown, 1929*, 27–46. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203067024>
- Beaver, W. H. (1968). The Information Content of Annual Earnings Announcements. *Journal of Accounting Research*, 67–92.
- Brown, G. W., & Cliff, M. T. (2004). Investor sentiment and the near-term stock market. *Journal of Empirical Finance*, 11(1), 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jempfin.2002.12.001>
- Cooper, R. N., & Layard, R. (2005). Happiness: Lessons from a New Science. *Foreign Affairs*, 84(6), 139. <https://doi.org/10.2307/20031793>
- Dimitropoulos, P. E., & Asteriou, D. (2009). The Relationship between Earnings and Stock Returns: Empirical Evidence from the Greek Capital Market. *International Journal of Economics and Finance*, 1(1), 40–50. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijef.v1n1p40>
- Dodds, P. S., Clark, E. M., Desu, S., Frank, M. R., Reagan, A. J., Williams, J. R., Mitchell, L., Harris, K. D., Kloumann, I. M., Bagrow, J. P., Megerdooomian, K., McMahon, M. T., Tivnan, B. F., & Danforth, C. M. (2015). Human language reveals a universal positivity bias. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 112(8), 2389–2394. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1411678112>
- Dodds, P. S., Harris, K. D., Kloumann, I. M., Bliss, C. A., & Danforth, C. M. (2011). Temporal patterns of happiness and information in a global social network: Hedonometrics and Twitter. *PLoS ONE*, 6(12). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0026752>
- Donald E. Kieso, Jerry J. Weygandt, P. D. K. (2011). *Intermediate Accounting: IFRS Edition* (p. 7).

- Fahmi, I. (2012). *Manajemen Investasi (Teori dan Soal Jawab)*. Alfabeta Bandung.  
<https://kin.perpusnas.go.id/DisplayData.aspx?pld=76961&pRegionCode=UN IAD&pClientId=125>
- Frey, Bruno S. Stutzer, A. (2012). The economics of happiness. *Sustainability*, 5(5), 289–294. <https://doi.org/10.1089/SUS.2012.9931>
- Hai, T. T. T., Diem, N. N., & Binh, H. Q. (2015). The Relationship between Accounting Information Reported In Financial Statements And Stock Returns - Empirical Evidence From Vietnam. *International Journal of Accounting and Financial Reporting*, 1(1), 229. <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijaf.v5i1.7473>
- Hejazi, R., Jafari, M., & Karimi, A. (2011). The Information content of Accounting Variables In Companies listed in Tehran Stock Exchange (TSE). *Business Management Dynamics*, 1(2), 32–38. [www.bmdynamics.com](http://www.bmdynamics.com)
- J. Bradford De Long, Andrei Shleifer, Lawrence H. Summers, R. J. W. (1990). Noise Trader Risk in Financial Markets. *The Journal of Political Economy*, 98(4), 703–738. <https://doi.org/10.1093/0198292279.003.0002>
- Khanagha, J. B. (2011). Value Relevance of Accounting Information in the United Arab Emirates. *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*, 1(2), 33–45. [www.econjournals.com](http://www.econjournals.com)
- Kim, S. H., & Kim, D. (2014). Investor sentiment from internet message postings and the predictability of stock returns. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 107(PB), 708–729. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2014.04.015>
- Li, X., Shen, D., Xue, M., & Zhang, W. (2017). Daily happiness and stock returns: The case of a Chinese company listed in the United States. *Economic Modelling*, 64(October 2016), 496–501. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econmod.2017.03.002>
- Lintner, G. (1998). Behavioral Finance: Why Investors Make Bad Decisions. *The Planer*, 7–8.
- López-Cabarcos, M. Á., Piñeiro-Chousa, J., & Pérez-Pico, A. M. (2017). The impact technical and non-technical investors have on the stock market: Evidence from the sentiment extracted from social networks. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Finance*, 15, 15–20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbef.2017.07.003>
- Lou, D. (2014). Attracting investor attention through advertising. *Review of Financial Studies*, 27(6), 1797–1829. <https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hhu019>
- Miller, M. H., Modigliani, F., The, S., Economic, A., & Dec, N. (2014). Some Estimates of the Cost of Capital to the Electric Utility Industry. *American Economic Review*, 57(5), 1288–1300. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1814415>.
- Mayuni, I. A. I., & Suarjaya, G. (2018). Pengaruh Roa, Firm Size, Eps, Dan Per Terhadap Return Saham Pada Sektor Manufaktur Di Bei. *E-Jurnal Manajemen Universitas Udayana*, 7(8), 4063.
- Nofsinger, J. R. (2001). *Investment Madness: How Psychology Affects Your*

*Investing and What to Do About It*. Financial Times Prentice Hall books

- Nuralita, L., & Surjawati. (2021). Faktor-Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Return Saham (Studi Empiris Pada Perusahaan Manufaktur yang Terdaftar di Bursa Efek Indonesia Tahun 2017-2019). *Jurnal Ilmiah Bidang Ilmu Ekonomi*, 19(3), 173–180.
- Oyerinde, D. (2012). Value Relevance of Accounting Information in the Nigerian Stock Market. (Thesis, Covenant University).
- Shefrin, H. (2003). Beyond Greed and Fear. *Beyond Greed and Fear, September*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/0195161211.001.0001>
- Shen, D., Liu, L., & Zhang, Y. (2018). Quantifying the cross-sectional relationship between online sentiment and the skewness of stock returns. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and Its Applications*, 490, 928–934. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physa.2017.08.036>
- Slovic, P. (1972). Psychological Study of Human Judgment: Implications for Investment Decision Making. *The Journal of Finance*, 27(1), 779–799. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jofi.13000>
- Syafi'i, M. I., Purnomo H., dan M. W. (2018). Analisis Faktor – Faktor yang Mempengaruhi Return Saham Pada Perusahaan yang Terdaftar di BEI. *Jurnal Riset Akuntansi*, 1(2), 171–182.
- Tripathi, S., Dhardwivedi, H., Saxena, P., Naduvil-Vadukootu, S., Angryk, R. A., Riley, P., Krouska, A., Troussas, C., Virvou, M., Bose, R., Dey, R. K., Roy, S., Sarddar, D., & Liu, B. (2015). Introduction & The Problem of Sentiment Analysis. In *Sentiment Analysis: mining sentiments, opinions, and emotions* (Vol. 933, Issue November 2017). <http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/6691379/>
- Wang, Y., Jian, X., Li, L. (2010). Does fair value measurement model have value relevance? Empirical evidence from financial assets investigation. *China Accounting Review*, 8(4), 383–398.
- You, W., Guo, Y., & Peng, C. (2017). Twitter's daily happiness sentiment and the predictability of stock returns. *Finance Research Letters*, 23, 58–64. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.frl.2017.07.018>
- [www.hedonometer.org](http://www.hedonometer.org) diakses oleh : Rezky Ramadhani tanggal 30 Februari 2022 pukul 12.00 WITA
- [www.keminfo.co.id](http://www.keminfo.co.id) diakses oleh : Rezky Ramadhani tanggal 15 Februari 2022 pukul 10.00 WITA
- [www.yahooofinance.co.id](http://www.yahooofinance.co.id) diakses oleh : Rezky Ramadhani tanggal 30 Januari 2022 pukul 12.00 WITA
- Zhang, W., Li, X., Shen, D., & Teglio, A. (2016). Daily happiness and stock returns: Some international evidence. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and Its Applications*, 460, 201–209. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physa.2016.05.026>
- Zhang, W., Wang, P., Li, X., & Shen, D. (2018). Twitter's daily happiness sentiment and international stock returns: Evidence from linear and nonlinear causality tests. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Finance*,

18, 50–53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbef.2018.01.005>

Zhao, R. (2019). Quantifying the correlation and prediction of daily happiness sentiment and stock return: The Case of Singapore. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and Its Applications*, 533. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physa.2019.122020>

## Lampiran

### Lampiran 1 Peta Teori

No	Nama Peneliti; Judul; Tahun	Tujuan Penelitian	Metode	Hasil	Persamaan	Perbedaan
1	Ruwei Zhao/ Mengukur korelasi dan prediksi sentimen kebahagiaan harian dan pengembalian saham: Kasus Singapura) / 2019	Mengukur korelasi dan prediksi sentimen kebahagiaan harian dan pengembalian saham	a) Kuantitatif b) regresi VAR, uji kausalitas Granger linier, dan nonlinier	1. Hasil empiris mengungkapkan bahwa DHS menyajikan prediktabilitas yang signifikan dengan pengembalian Stock Return di masa depan. 2. Volatilitas yang direalisasikan, tidak ada kekuatan peramalan yang terdeteksi. 3. Dua pengujian subsampel lainnya sebagai pemeriksaan ketahanan. Secara umum, hasil subsampel sesuai dengan sampel penuh..	Sama-sama berfokus Sentimen Kebahagiaan Harian Twitter dan Stock return dan Uji Kausalitas	a. Objek penelitian: Kasus Singapore. b. Variabel Penelitian: Earning Per Share dan Stock Return. c. Metode Penelitian: Menggunakan robustness check.
2	Wei Zhang a, b, Pengfei Wang A, Xiao Li C dan Dehua She / Sentimen Kebahagiaan Harian Twitter dan Pengembalian Saham Internasional:	Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengukur Bukti dari Uji Kausalitas Linier dan nonlinier Sentimen	a) Kuantitatif b) Uji Kausalitas Granger	1. Dengan sentimen kebahagiaan harian (dhs) yang baru muncul dari Twitter, kami menemukan bukti kuat bahwa dhs dapat menyebabkan Granger menyebabkan pengembalian indeks	Sama-sama berfokus SKH dan Stock return	a. Periode penelitian : 2018 b. Objek Penelitian : Saham Internasional

	Bukti dari Uji Kausalitas Linier dan Nonlinier/ 2018	Kebahagiaan Harian Twitter dan Pengembalian Saham Internasional:		dalam uji kausalitas linier, sedangkan arah sebaliknya lebih menonjol dalam uji kausalitas nonlinier. 2. pengembalian dhs dan indeks menunjukkan hubungan nonlinier yang kuat di Amerika, sementara dhs tidak dapat menyebabkan pengembalian indeks di Timur Tengah dan Afrika Utara.		
3	Wanhai Kamu., Yawei Guo, Cheng Peng / Sentimen kebahagiaan harian Twitter dan prediksi pengembalian saham / 2017	Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis pengaruh Sentimen kebahagiaan harian Twitter dan prediksi pengembalian saham	a) Kuantitatif b) Peneitian Model Uji Kausalitas Granger	1. Hasil empiris kami menunjukkan bahwa hubungan kausal bervariasi di berbagai kuantil. 2. Hubungan kausal dari sentimen kebahagiaan hingga pengembalian saham hanya ada di kuantil tinggi. Hubungan kausal dari return saham ke sentiment kebahagiaan hanya ada di daerah ujung.	Sama-sama berfokus SKH dan Stock return	a. Periode penelitian: Time series 2011-2021  b. Objek Penelitian : 10 pasar saham internasional, termasuk Amerika Serikat, Kanada, Prancis, Jerman, Inggris. Hong Kong, Korea Selatan,

						Jepang, Australia dan Selandia Baru.
4	Ruwei Zhao/ Mengukur hubungan lintas bagian dari sentimen kebahagiaan harian dan kemiringan pengembalian: Bukti dari industri AS/ 2020	Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui Mengukur hubungan lintas bagian dari sentimen kebahagiaan harian dan kemiringan pengembalian: Bukti dari industri AS	b) Kuantitatif c) Uji Cross sectional dan skewness	kami memecah sampel lengkap kami menjadi lima subsampel dan mendeteksi perbedaan kemiringan yang jelas dan andal di antara subkelompok DHS. Kami selanjutnya menerapkan pemeriksaan ketahanan dengan subkelompok yang diubah untuk peningkatan kredibilitas. Singkatnya, hasil kekokohan mengikuti langkah-langkah temuan asli.	Sama-sama berfokus SKH dan Stock return	a. Periode penelitian: Cross sectionanal 2008-2018 b. Objek Penelitian:U S industry
6	Muhammad Abubakar Naeem A,B, Imen Mbarki C, Syed Jawad Hussain Shahzad D / Peran prediktif sentimen investor online untuk pasar cryptocurrency: Bukti dari kebahagiaan dan ketakutan / 2021	Penelitian bertujuan ini adalah untuk Peran prediktif sentimen investor online untuk pasar cryptocurrency: Bukti dari kebahagiaan dan ketakutan	a) Kuantitatif b) kuantilogram silang bivariat	1. Indeks sentimen kebahagiaan secara signifikan memprediksi pengembalian Bitcoin serta cryptocurrency utama lainnya di dua kondisi pasar yang ekstrem dan untuk tingkat sentimen yang ekstrem. 2. Mengenai FEARS, prediktabilitas juga ada tetapi agak menonjol untuk tingkat sentimen yang rendah.	Sama-sama berfokus pada SKH	a. Periode penelitian: 2021 b. Variabel independen: pasar cryptocurren cy

				3. Secara keseluruhan, sentiment Happiness mengungkapkan sebagai prediktor yang gigih dan kuat untuk sebagian besar pengembalian cryptocurrency. Indeks FEARS juga menunjukkan prediktabilitas pengembalian yang signifikan, tetapi prediktabilitasnya lebih lemah dan terutama dalam jangka pendek.		
6	Arya <i>et al</i> / Pengaruh Faktor ekonomi makro, risiko investasi dan kinerja keuangan terhadap return saham perusahaan di bursa efek Indonesia (BEI) / 2014	Signifikansi pengaruh faktor ekonomi makro, risiko investasi dan kinerja keuangan terhadap return saham	a) Kuantitatif b) Analisis Multi variat dan path analysis.	1. tingkat suku bunga berpengaruh positif tidak signifikan terhadap risiko investasi dan kurs rupiah berpengaruh positif signifikan terhadap risiko investasi, 2. tingkat suku bunga berpengaruh positif tidak signifikan terhadap Earning Per Share (EPS), tingkat suku bunga berpengaruh negatif tidak signifikan terhadap Price Earning Ratio (PER), kurs rupiah berpengaruh negatif tidak signifikan	Sama-sama berfokus pada EPS dan Stock Return	a. Periode penelitian: 2008-2018 b. Variabel independent penelitian: tingkat suku bunga, kurs rupiah dan PER



				<p>terhadap EPS dan kurs rupiah berpengaruh positif tidak signifikan terhadap PER.</p> <p>3. Tingkat suku bunga berpengaruh positif signifikan terhadap return saham dan kurs rupiah berpengaruh tidak signifikan terhadap return saham</p> <p>4. risiko investasi berpengaruh negatif tidak signifikan terhadap return saham</p> <p>5. EPS berpengaruh positif signifikan terhadap return saham dan PER berpengaruh positif signifikan terhadap return saham</p>		
7	Leny Nuralita dan Surjawati/ Faktor-Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Return Saham Empiris Pada Perusahaan Manufaktur Terdaftar Di Bursa	Bertujuan untuk menguji factor-faktor yang berpengaruh terhadap return saham pada perusahaan manufaktur yang terdaftar	a. Kuantitatif b. Metode penelitian regresi berganda	Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa debt to equity ratio (DER) dan current ratio (CR) tidak berpengaruh terhadap return saham. Return on asset (ROA) dan earning per	Sama-sama berfokus pada EPS dan Stock Return	a. Periode penelitian: 2017-2019 b. Variabel independent penelitian: debt to equity ratio (DER),

	Effek Indonesia Tahun 2017- 2019/ 2021	di Bursa Efek Indonesia tahun 2017- 2019		share (EPS) berpengaruh terhadap return saham.		current ratio (CR), dan Return on asset (ROA)
8	Ida Ayu Ika Mayuni dan Gede Suarjaya/ Pengaruh Roa, Firm Size, Eps, Dan Per Terhadap Return Saham Pada Sektor Manufaktur Di Bei/ 2018	Tujuan penelitian ini dilakukan yakni untuk mengetahui pengaruh Return On Asset(ROA), Firm Size, Earning per Share (EPS) dan Price Earning Ratio(PER) terhadap Return Saham pada perusahaan manufaktur. Penelitian ini dilakukan di Bursa Efek Indonesiatahun 2016	a. Kuantitatif b. Metode penelitian regresi linier berganda	Hasil analisis ditemukan bahwa Return On Asset (ROA), Firm Size, Earning Per Share (EPS) dan Price Earning Ratio (PER) secara simultan berpengaruh signifikan terhadap return saham. Hasil analisis secara parsial menunjukkan bahwa Return on Asset ROA) berpengaruh positif signifikan terhadap return saham. Earning Per Share (EPS) berpengaruh positif signifikan terhadap Return Saham. Sedangkan Firm Size dan Price Eaning Ratio (PER) tidak berpengaruh signifikan terhadap Return	Sama-sama berfokus pada EPS dan Stock Return	a. Periode penelitian: 2016 b. Variabel independent penelitian: Firm Size dan Price Eaning Ratio (PER) dan Return on asset (ROA)

				Saham.		
9	Esti Puji Astutik/ Pengaruh Earning Per Share (Eps), Price Earning Ratio (Per), Dan Debt To Equity Ratio (Der) Terhadap Return Saham Pada Perusahaan Properti Yang Terdaftar Di Bursa Efek Jakarta/2005	Untuk Mengetahui Pengaruh Earning Per Share (Eps), Price Earning Ratio (Per), Dan Debt To Equity Ratio (Der) Terhadap Return Saham Pada Perusahaan Properti Yang Terdaftar Di Bursa Efek Jakarta	a. Kuantitatif b. Metode penelitian regresi linier berganda	Berdasarkan hasil penelitian, dapat disimpulkan bahwa secara simultan variabel EPS, PER, dan DER berpengaruh secara signifikan terhadap return saham, dan besarnya pengaruh adalah 37,1%. Namun secara parsial hanya variabel EPS yang berpengaruh terhadap return saham, dan pengaruhnya sebesar 32%. Sedangkan variabel PER dan DER tidak berpengaruh terhadap return saham, besarnya sumbangan PER dan DER untuk memprediksi return saham adalah 2,1% dan 2,9%. Dengan demikian hanya variabel EPS yang dominan dan dapat digunakan untuk memprediksi return saham	Sama-sama berfokus pada EPS dan Stock Return	c. Periode penelitian: 2004 d. Variabel independent penelitian: Price Eaning Ratio (PER) dan debt to equity ratio (DER),

## Lampiran 2 Uji Statistik Deskriptif

Date: 08/13/22 Time: 02:19  
Sample: 2011 2021

	Y	X1	X2
Mean	0.001364	340.0655	5.938889
Median	-0.000205	387.1668	5.954317
Maximum	0.019133	531.7803	5.985604
Minimum	-0.012162	131.9112	5.878522
Std. Dev.	0.010484	134.9879	0.037732
Skewness	0.326760	-0.359985	-0.498808
Kurtosis	2.033110	1.926855	1.892837
Jarque-Bera Probability	0.624233 0.731896	0.765415 0.682012	1.017980 0.601102
Sum	0.015003	3740.720	65.32778
Sum Sq. Dev.	0.001099	182217.3	0.014237
Observations	11	11	11

Breusch-Godfrey Serial Correlation LM Test:  
Null hypothesis: No serial correlation at up to 2 lags

F-statistic	3.532196	Prob. F(2,6)	0.0969
Obs*R-squared	5.948100	Prob. Chi-Square(2)	0.0511

Test Equation:  
Dependent Variable: RESID  
Method: Least Squares  
Date: 08/12/22 Time: 11:56  
Sample: 2011 2021  
Included observations: 11  
Presample missing value lagged residuals set to zero.

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	0.788609	0.663289	1.188936	0.2794
X1	1.69E-05	2.89E-05	0.583743	0.5807
X2	-0.133642	0.112865	-1.184080	0.2812
RESID(-1)	-1.052628	0.399485	-2.634960	0.0388
RESID(-2)	-0.613018	0.399545	-1.534291	0.1759
R-squared	0.540736	Mean dependent var		-1.61E-16
Adjusted R-squared	0.234561	S.D. dependent var		0.009115
S.E. of regression	0.007974	Akaike info criterion		-6.522230
Sum squared resid	0.000382	Schwarz criterion		-6.341368
Log likelihood	40.87226	Hannan-Quinn criter.		-6.636238
F-statistic	1.766098	Durbin-Watson stat		2.234532
Prob(F-statistic)	0.254012			

### Lampiran 3 Uji Stasioner

Null Hypothesis: X1 has a unit root  
 Exogenous: None  
 Lag Length: 0 (Automatic - based on SIC, maxlag=1)

	t-Statistic	Prob.*
Augmented Dickey-Fuller test statistic	-1.746336	0.0770
Test critical values:		
1% level	-2.816740	
5% level	-1.982344	
10% level	-1.601144	

\*MacKinnon (1996) one-sided p-values.

Warning: Probabilities and critical values calculated for 20 observations and may not be accurate for a sample size of 10

#### Augmented Dickey-Fuller Test Equation

Dependent Variable: D(X1)

Method: Least Squares

Date: 08/13/22 Time: 08:02

Sample (adjusted): 2012 2021

Included observations: 10 after adjustments

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
X1(-1)	-0.117288	0.067163	-1.746336	0.1147
R-squared	0.090213	Mean dependent var		-37.29110
Adjusted R-squared	0.090213	S.D. dependent var		84.17514
S.E. of regression	80.28856	Akaike info criterion		11.70377
Sum squared resid	58016.27	Schwarz criterion		11.73403
Log likelihood	-57.51885	Hannan-Quinn criter.		11.67058
Durbin-Watson stat	2.453617			

Null Hypothesis: X2 has a unit root  
 Exogenous: None  
 Lag Length: 0 (Automatic - based on SIC, maxlag=1)

	t-Statistic	Prob.*
Augmented Dickey-Fuller test statistic	-0.071232	0.6347
Test critical values: 1% level	-2.816740	
5% level	-1.982344	
10% level	-1.601144	

\*MacKinnon (1996) one-sided p-values.  
 Warning: Probabilities and critical values calculated for 20 observations  
 and may not be accurate for a sample size of 10

Augmented Dickey-Fuller Test Equation  
 Dependent Variable: D(X2)  
 Method: Least Squares  
 Date: 08/13/22 Time: 08:10  
 Sample (adjusted): 2012 2021  
 Included observations: 10 after adjustments

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
X2(-1)	-0.000104	0.001466	-0.071232	0.9448
R-squared	0.000097	Mean dependent var		-0.000564
Adjusted R-squared	0.000097	S.D. dependent var		0.027542
S.E. of regression	0.027540	Akaike info criterion		-4.251685
Sum squared resid	0.006826	Schwarz criterion		-4.221426
Log likelihood	22.25842	Hannan-Quinn criter.		-4.284878
Durbin-Watson stat	0.881193			

Null Hypothesis: Y has a unit root  
 Exogenous: None  
 Lag Length: 0 (Automatic - based on SIC, maxlag=1)

	t-Statistic	Prob.*
Augmented Dickey-Fuller test statistic	-4.703437	0.0003
Test critical values:		
1% level	-2.816740	
5% level	-1.982344	
10% level	-1.601144	

\*MacKinnon (1996) one-sided p-values.

Warning: Probabilities and critical values calculated for 20 observations and may not be accurate for a sample size of 10

Augmented Dickey-Fuller Test Equation

Dependent Variable: D(Y)

Method: Least Squares

Date: 08/13/22 Time: 08:11

Sample (adjusted): 2012 2021

Included observations: 10 after adjustments

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
Y(-1)	-1.422022	0.302337	-4.703437	0.0011
R-squared	0.710813	Mean dependent var		-7.46E-05
Adjusted R-squared	0.710813	S.D. dependent var		0.018804
S.E. of regression	0.010112	Akaike info criterion		-6.255589
Sum squared resid	0.000920	Schwarz criterion		-6.225330
Log likelihood	32.27794	Hannan-Quinn criter.		-6.288782
Durbin-Watson stat	1.922491			

#### Lampiran 4 Uji ADF

Null Hypothesis: D(X1) has a unit root  
 Exogenous: None  
 Lag Length: 0 (Automatic - based on SIC, maxlag=1)

	t-Statistic	Prob.*
Augmented Dickey-Fuller test statistic	-4.291723	0.0008
Test critical values:		
1% level	-2.847250	
5% level	-1.988198	
10% level	-1.600140	

\*MacKinnon (1996) one-sided p-values.

Warning: Probabilities and critical values calculated for 20 observations and may not be accurate for a sample size of 9

Augmented Dickey-Fuller Test Equation  
 Dependent Variable: D(X1,2)  
 Method: Least Squares  
 Date: 08/13/22 Time: 07:14  
 Sample (adjusted): 2013 2021  
 Included observations: 9 after adjustments

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
D(X1(-1))	-1.216163	0.283374	-4.291723	0.0026
R-squared	0.690047	Mean dependent var		20.43925
Adjusted R-squared	0.690047	S.D. dependent var		141.1929
S.E. of regression	78.60687	Akaike info criterion		11.67123
Sum squared resid	49432.32	Schwarz criterion		11.69315
Log likelihood	-51.52056	Hannan-Quinn criter.		11.62394
Durbin-Watson stat	1.140712			



Null Hypothesis: D(X2) has a unit root  
 Exogenous: None  
 Lag Length: 1 (Automatic - based on SIC, maxlag=1)

	t-Statistic	Prob.*
Augmented Dickey-Fuller test statistic	-1.889793	0.0603
Test critical values:		
1% level	-2.886101	
5% level	-1.995865	
10% level	-1.599088	

\*MacKinnon (1996) one-sided p-values.  
 Warning: Probabilities and critical values calculated for 20 observations  
 and may not be accurate for a sample size of 8

Augmented Dickey-Fuller Test Equation  
 Dependent Variable: D(X2,2)  
 Method: Least Squares  
 Date: 08/13/22 Time: 07:16  
 Sample (adjusted): 2014 2021  
 Included observations: 8 after adjustments

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
D(X2(-1))	-0.769860	0.407378	-1.889793	0.1077
D(X2(-1),2)	0.612874	0.414629	1.478128	0.1898
R-squared	0.403090	Mean dependent var		0.003024
Adjusted R-squared	0.303605	S.D. dependent var		0.029006
S.E. of regression	0.024205	Akaike info criterion		-4.392171
Sum squared resid	0.003515	Schwarz criterion		-4.372311
Log likelihood	19.56868	Hannan-Quinn criter.		-4.526121
Durbin-Watson stat	2.007439			

Null Hypothesis: D(Y) has a unit root  
 Exogenous: None  
 Lag Length: 1 (Automatic - based on SIC, maxlag=1)

	t-Statistic	Prob.*
Augmented Dickey-Fuller test statistic	-4.354826	0.0009
Test critical values:		
1% level	-2.886101	
5% level	-1.995865	
10% level	-1.599088	

\*MacKinnon (1996) one-sided p-values.

Warning: Probabilities and critical values calculated for 20 observations  
 and may not be accurate for a sample size of 8

Augmented Dickey-Fuller Test Equation

Dependent Variable: D(Y,2)

Method: Least Squares

Date: 08/13/22 Time: 07:16

Sample (adjusted): 2014 2021

Included observations: 8 after adjustments

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
D(Y(-1))	-2.712014	0.622761	-4.354826	0.0048
D(Y(-1),2)	0.578387	0.339895	1.701663	0.1397
R-squared	0.907373	Mean dependent var		0.002628
Adjusted R-squared	0.891935	S.D. dependent var		0.038551
S.E. of regression	0.012673	Akaike info criterion		-5.686380
Sum squared resid	0.000964	Schwarz criterion		-5.666519
Log likelihood	24.74552	Hannan-Quinn criter.		-5.820330
Durbin-Watson stat	1.728016			

## Lampiran 5 Uji Kointegrasi

Date: 08/13/22 Time: 22:14  
 Sample (adjusted): 2013 2021  
 Included observations: 9 after adjustments  
 Trend assumption: No deterministic trend  
 Series: X1 X2 Y  
 Lags interval (in first differences): 1 to 1

### Unrestricted Cointegration Rank Test (Trace)

Hypothesized No. of CE(s)	Eigenvalue	Trace Statistic	0.1 Critical Value	Prob.**
None *	0.997903	77.90629	21.77716	0.0000
At most 1 *	0.848185	22.40095	10.47457	0.0008
At most 2 *	0.453327	5.435141	2.976163	0.0234

Trace test indicates 3 cointegrating eqn(s) at the 0.1 level

\* denotes rejection of the hypothesis at the 0.1 level

\*\*MacKinnon-Haug-Michelis (1999) p-values

### Unrestricted Cointegration Rank Test (Maximum Eigenvalue)

Hypothesized No. of CE(s)	Eigenvalue	Max-Eigen Statistic	0.1 Critical Value	Prob.**
None *	0.997903	55.50533	15.71741	0.0000
At most 1 *	0.848185	16.96581	9.474804	0.0045
At most 2 *	0.453327	5.435141	2.976163	0.0234

Max-eigenvalue test indicates 3 cointegrating eqn(s) at the 0.1 level

\* denotes rejection of the hypothesis at the 0.1 level

\*\*MacKinnon-Haug-Michelis (1999) p-values

### Unrestricted Cointegrating Coefficients (normalized by b\*\*S11\*b=I):

X1	X2	Y
-0.000794	0.118077	-189.6879
-0.012132	0.576201	155.7400
-0.009580	0.716022	95.52187

### Unrestricted Adjustment Coefficients (alpha):

D(X1)	25.05329	17.84820	-26.12226
D(X2)	0.020217	0.003660	0.000565
D(Y)	0.008241	-0.006366	-0.001646

1 Cointegrating Equation(s): Log likelihood 33.24704

### Normalized cointegrating coefficients (standard error in parentheses)

X1	X2	Y
1.000000	-148.6360	238780.3
	(5.60323)	(5159.03)

### Adjustment coefficients (standard error in parentheses)

D(X1)	-0.019902
	(0.01541)
D(X2)	-1.61E-05
	(1.5E-06)
D(Y)	-6.55E-06
	(2.6E-06)

2 Cointegrating Equation(s): Log likelihood 41.72995

### Normalized cointegrating coefficients (standard error in parentheses)

X1	X2	Y
1.000000	0.000000	-130985.4
		(4676.21)
0.000000	1.000000	-2487.725
		(53.7748)

### Adjustment coefficients (standard error in parentheses)

D(X1)	-0.236444	13.24237
	(0.21501)	(10.4012)
D(X2)	-6.05E-05	0.004496
	(1.1E-05)	(0.00052)
D(Y)	7.07E-05	-0.002695
	(2.0E-05)	(0.00096)

Roots of Characteristic Polynomial  
 Endogenous variables: D(X1) D(X2) D(Y)  
 Exogenous variables: C  
 Lag specification: 0 1  
 Date: 08/13/22 Time: 21:04

Root	Modulus
-0.762169	0.762169
0.445224	0.445224
-0.190901	0.190901

No root lies outside the unit circle.  
 VAR satisfies the stability condition.

### Lampiran 6 Uji Kausalitas Granger

Pairwise Granger Causality Tests  
 Date: 08/15/22 Time: 00:22  
 Sample: 2011 2021  
 Lags: 1

Null Hypothesis:	Obs	F-Statistic	Prob.
X2 does not Granger Cause X1	10	4.28641	0.0772
X1 does not Granger Cause X2		0.38731	0.5534
Y does not Granger Cause X1	10	0.57419	0.4733
X1 does not Granger Cause Y		6.43133	0.0389
Y does not Granger Cause X2	10	1.05596	0.3383
X2 does not Granger Cause Y		5.13126	0.0579

## Lampiran 7 Indikator Sentimen Kebahagiaan

Rank	Word	Word in English	Happiness Score
0	kebahagiaan	happiness	8,42
1	bahagia	happy	8,26
2	hahahahahaha	hahahahahaha	8,14
3	hahahahaha	hahahahaha	8,14
4	hahahhaha	hahahhaha	8,14
5	berbahagia	be happy	8,1
6	surga	heaven	8,06
7	tertawa	laugh	8,06
8	hahaha	hahaha	8,04
9	gembira	excited	8,04
10	hahahahha	hahahahha	8,02
11	kegembiraan	excitement	8
12	happiness	happiness	7,98
13	success	success	7,98
14	hahahahah	hahahahah	7,96
15	sukses	success	7,94
16	huahahaha	huahahaha	7,94
17	happy	happy	7,94
18	love	love	7,94
19	hahahaha	hahahaha	7,92
20	ceria	cheers	7,9
21	cinta	love	7,88
22	keberhasilan	success	7,86
23	wakakakak	wakakakak	7,86
24	tuhan	God	7,84
25	hahaha	hahaha	7,82
26	perfect	perfect	7,82
27	sempurna	perfect	7,82
28	hhahaha	hhahaha	7,82
29	menikah	married	7,82
30	hahahaha	hahahaha	7,82
...	..	...	...
9994	Membunuh	Membunuh	1,94
9995	bunuh	bunuh	1,92
9996	brengsek	jerk	1,92
9997	tewas	tewas	1,9
9998	dibunuh	dibunuh	1,82
9999	neraka	hell	1,68
10000	pembunuhan	murder	1,52

