http://ejournal.seaninstitute.or.id/index.php/Ekonomi
Jurnal Ekonomi, Volume 11, No 03 2022
ISSN: 2301-6280 (print) ISSN: 2721-9879 (online)

DETERMINANTS OF POVERTY LEVEL IN INDONESIA

Mutmainnah[1], Hamid Paddu[2], Hamrullah[3]
[1] Masters Program in Development and Planning Economics, Hasanuddin University, Makassar
[2,3] Faculty of Economics and Business, Hasanuddin University, Makassar

ARTICLEINFO

Keywords:
Government Expenditure,
Investments.
wages,
Economic Growth,
Unemployment,
Poverty

E-mail:
mutmainnahmute08@gmail.co

ABSTRACT

This study observes that there is a slowdown in poverty reduction in Indonesia, so that in order to realize the achievement of no poverty in 2030 it is necessary to carry out further research related to the determinants of poverty in Indonesia. Researchers used panel data from 34 provinces in Indonesia for the 2015-2020 period. The model used is panel data regression using panel data regression analysis. The results of the study are that government spending directly has a significant effect on poverty and indirectly through unemployment has a significant effect but government spending does not have a significant effect on poverty through economic growth, investment has a significant effect on poverty but indirectly both through growth and unemployment have no significant effect,

1. INTRODUCTION

Poverty is indeed a controversial term in many fields, from several points of view that is why it is said to be multidimensional, multisectoral etc. Some people are of the view that poverty is in the eye of the beholder. Some describe poverty as an elephant that can be easily seen but difficult to define(Kware, 2015).

Poverty alleviation has become a fundamental development goal and has become a measuring tool for assessing the effectiveness of the implementation of various types of development programs. However, one thing that bothers us when faced with the phenomenon of poverty is that there are so many theories to explain and provide solutions to poverty alleviation, but it is undeniable that the phenomenon of poverty is still around us.(Jellyfish, 2011). This condition raises the question, why is poverty always there? Is the existing theory not enough to explain poverty?Are the efforts made by the government and society not optimal in overcoming poverty?

Poverty is not a new problem, but until now it has become a major issue, indicated by the placement of the issue of poverty as the first goal in the SDGs, which is stated as no poverty, which is the priority point of the SDGs, namely ending poverty in all its forms everywhere, whose target is to create a policy framework at the national, regional level. and internationally, based on pro-poor and gender-sensitive development strategies, to accelerate investment in poverty alleviation actions (SDG Indonesia, 2022). Indonesia is of course committed to overcoming this poverty problem where at Labor20 in the G20 presidency which was held in January 2022 also encouraged the eradication of poverty and unemployment and fought for benefits for vulnerable groups (www.ekon.go.id, 2022).

From the data from the Central Statistics Agency (BPS) after the Covid-19 pandemic, the number of poverty has also decreased gradually, from the Central Statistics Agency (BPS) data, although it has decreased in the last 5 years, the decline has tended to slow down so that the numbers are still large, even though in 2020 has seen an increase, but the number and percentage of poor people is still higher than before the Covid-19 pandemic.If we look at the development of the percentage of poor people in Indonesia and each province, the poverty rate in the provinces is still higher than the national poverty rate. According to BPS, one of the factors influencing the increase in poverty in Indonesia is the increase in rice prices so that the speed of reduction in poverty in 2018 is not as fast as in the 2017 period. One of the things that has caused an increase in poverty in the provinces is that the policies made by the government still do not differentiate between space or regional conditions, as is the case with the basic electricity tariff policy or the increase in the price of fuel oil (BBM) is the same.

Poverty is closely related to the lack of assets and access which is characterized by limitations, incapacity, and deprivation(Ramli, Jamil, and Karmila. 2020). Poverty and unemployment are like twin problems which are still confusing as to whether poverty causes unemployment or vice versa, according to Obadan inOsinubi (2005), unemployment has been identified as one of the main causes of poverty in sub-Saharan Africa.Paramita and Purbadharmaja (2015);Feriyanto, et al. (2020);Puspita (2015); andNurdiana et al. (2020)The results of his research show that unemployment has a positive and significant relationship to povertySumiyaarti (2022)reveals open unemployment has no significant effect on poverty,Akwara et al. (2013)examining the relationship between unemployment, poverty, and insecurity in Nigeria this study found that unemployment causes poverty, while poverty causes insecurity.Define (2002)states that the link between unemployment and poverty is strongly influenced by how poverty is measured.

Unemployment is not limited to people who have not worked. People who are looking for work and people who work but whose work is not productive can also be categorized as unemployed (Fahri, Jalil and Kasnelly, 2020). Unemployment is a labor problem that will have an impact on social and economic problems because unemployment will make a person enter poverty, and it is very possible for someone to work and remain poor(Mohammed and David 2019).Osinubi (2005);Chen et al. (2014)in his research revealed that when people become poor they tend to accept jobs with very low wages. The main mechanism for worker poverty is due to low income, so the government's first task is to increase workers' wages or income(Faharuddin et al. 2022), so that government intervention is needed through its policies, for this reason one of the government's policies to fulfill welfare is the minimum wage policy regulated in the Labor Law which is expected to increase productivity and can help the poor get out of poverty. Study(Kurniawati, Gunawan, and Ratna Indrasari 2017)minimum wage has a significant negative impact on poverty, every 1% increase in wages (Ceteris paribus) will reduce poverty by 5.7%, which is also in line with research(Corolina and Panjawa 2020).

Basically economic growth is the main condition for poverty alleviation, and the second is pro-poor economic growth(Tahir and Hasan 2018)According to Oband(Osinubi, 2005)Although economic growth is necessary for unemployment reduction and poverty alleviation, it is not sufficient, because growth alone cannot overcome all the important factors causing unemployment and poverty. Good economic growth will not result in a reduction in the number of poor people if it is not accompanied by equal distribution of income(Misini and Pantina, 2017)

Much can be done to eradicate poverty, namely increasing access to food, services and education for the poor. Create more and better jobs for the poor. Invest in social safety nets to protect vulnerable citizens (World bank, 2014). Efforts to reduce poverty are also inseparable from the amount of government spending issued by the government. Government spending is one of the important instruments to reduce poverty(Ketaren, 2018).Adegboyo (2020)social spending, transfer spending reduces poverty in Nigeria, temporarilyMustamin, et al. (2015)government spending has a negative effect on poverty in Makassar,Mehmood and Sadiq (2010)also disclose government spending or spending and appropriate sources of financing, certain subsidies for a certain period of time that are productive and efficient can increase private investment, employment opportunities, human resources through education and health reduce poverty. Investment cannot be separated from economic activities in increasing prosperity. Private investment can come from within and outside the country. Government investment is made to provide public goods and private investment both from within and outside the country can create jobs. So that people's income will increase and the number of poor people will decrease(Achyarnis, et.al 2020).

Poverty reduction efforts have been pursued by the government with government spending that continues to increase every year and adopts policies and programs aimed at reducing poverty and unemployment. However, is this effective in reducing poverty in Indonesia. For this reason, further research is needed regarding the relationship between government spending, investment and how wage stimulation is in poverty alleviation efforts.

2. METHODS

The type of data analyzed in this research is secondary data in the form of panel data with characteristics using the 2015-2020 period and cross sections of 34 provinces in Indonesia so that a total of 204 observations. The data used in this research is in the form of secondary data obtained from publication documents issued by the Central Statistics Agency (BPS), the Directorate General of Financial Balance (DJPK) and other institutions.

The structural functional model is as follows:

$$Y1it = (X1it, X2it, X3it)f \quad (3.1)$$

$$Y2it = (X1it, X2it, X3it)f \quad (3.2)$$

$$Y3it = (X1it, X2it, X3it, Y1it\ Y2it)f \quad (3.3)$$

Y1 = economic growth
Y2 = unemployed
Y3 = Poverty
X1 = government spending

X2 = investment
X3 = Wages
i = cross-section
t = time series

3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 Best Model Estimation Results

Equality	Chow test		Results	Hausman test		Results
Equation 1	prob	0.0000	FEM	prob	0.0000	FEM
Equation 2	prob	0.0000	FEM	prob	0.0000	FEM
Equation 3	prob	0.0000	FEM	prob	0.0123	FEM

From the test results it is concluded that the results of the model selection test show that the best model in equation 1, equation 2, and equation 3 is the Fixed Effect Model or abbreviated as FEM. FEM proved to be the best model based on the results of the Chow test and was strengthened by the Hausman test.

Table 2. Results Direct influence between independent variables to the dependent variable

Variable Relations	Coefficient	t count	Prob	Information
$LnX_1 -> LnY_1$	0.0433	5.3955	0.0000	Significant
$LnX_2 -> LnY_1$	0.0035	1.3138	0.1907	Not significant
$LnX_3 -> LnY_1$	0.4238	34.5203	0.0000	Significant
$LnX_1 -> Y_2$	-0.5572	-3.4999	0.0006	Significant
$LnX_2 -> Y_2$	-0.0007	-0.0144	0.9885	Not significant
$LnX_3 -> Y_2$	-0.6763	-2.6939	0.0078	Significant
$LnX_1 -> Y_3$	-0.2348	-2.6848	0.0080	Significant
$LnX_2 -> Y_3$	-0.0820	-2.4470	0.0154	significant
$LnX_3 -> Y_3$	-2.3320	-14.4585	0.0000	Significant
$LnY_1 -> Y_3$	0.0136	0.0721	0.9426	Not significant
$Y_2 -> Y_3$	0.2355	8.7826	0.0000	significant

Table 3. Results Indirect effect using the Sobel test

Variable relationship	Coefficient	t count	Prob	Information
$LnX_1 -> LnY_1 -> Y_3$	0.0006	0.0720	0.9425	Not significant
$LnX_1 -> LnY_2 -> Y_3$	-0.1312	-3.3215	0.0011	Significant
$LnX_2 -> LnY_1 -> Y_3$	0.0004	0.0719	0.9423	Not significant
$LnX_2 -> Y_2 -> Y_3$	-0.0001	-0.0128	0.9897	Not significant
$LnX_3 -> Y_1 -> Y_3$	0.0057	0.0720	0.9425	Not significant
$LnX_3 -> Y_2 -> Y_3$	-1.5722	-2.5760	0.0099	Significant

In observing the results of economic growth estimation, the variable that shows no significant effect is the investment variable. While the variables of government spending and wages have a significant effect with a significant level of 5 percent. And for the F test with a probability of 0.00, it means that the independent variables together can explain economic growth.

In observing the results of unemployment estimation, the variable that shows no significant effect is the investment variable. Meanwhile, government expenditure and wage variables have a significant effect with a significant level of 5 percent. And the F test with a probability of 0.00 means that the independent variables together can explain the unemployment rate

In observing the results of poverty estimation, the variable that shows no significant effect is the variable economic growth. While the variables of government spending, investment, wages and unemployment have a significant effect with a significance level of 5%. And the F test with a probability of 0.00 means that the independent variables together can explain the percentage level of poverty

Government spending and poverty

The significant negative effect of government spending on poverty means that increasing government spending in the form of capital can reduce poverty. Government spending shows that the allocation of capital expenditure is pro-poor. Government expenditure, in this case capital expenditure, is expected not only to be used for the construction of toll roads, flyovers, large buildings which will only be enjoyed by most of the middle and upper class, but government spending is used for productive capital expenditure which is pro-poor and provides many programs. -programs that can touch the poor such as the construction of education and health facilities and infrastructure to facilitate access to school affordability, training and health as an effort to improve the quality of human resources, development of access to electricity, sanitation and clean water for the poor and improvement of slums, as well as bridge and road rehabilitation projects in the regions which of course will be directly felt by the poor. in accordance with Nurkse's theory that poverty is limited access to it, with government intervention it will open access so that slowly the poor will get out of the cycle of poverty.

Then the significant and negative influence of government spending on poverty through unemployment. Of course, infrastructure development will absorb labor through these development projects which will reduce unemployment and will certainly have an impact on reducing poverty. This is in line with researchBudiarto. & Kartika I. (2019)namely capital expenditure has a significant negative effect on poverty through unemployment and then researchMustamin, et al. (2015);Nursini, et al. (2020)government spending has a significant negative effect on poverty.Mehmood & Sadiq (2010)that government spending is productive and efficient can increase private investment, employment opportunities, human resources and of course reduce poverty.

Meanwhile, the effect of government spending on the percentage of poor people through economic growth shows insignificant results. This shows that the size of changes in government spending, in this case capital expenditure, does not have an effect on changes in the poverty rate through economic growth, even though the results of the estimation of government spending are able to increase economic growth in linewith Barro (1990) and endogenous growth theory. However, in the results of this study an increase in economic growth will not necessarily reduce poverty, this is evidenced by the absence of the effect of economic growth on poverty.These results are in line with researchSasana and Kusuma, (2018)economic growth has a positive effect on poverty, the implication is that higher growth is not followed by the quality of the growth itself which can cause inequality between provincesAs statedPerkins et al., (2015)related to the pro-poor growth strategy,pro-poor growth does not represent a pro-growth and pro-poor choice, the strategy calls for combining faster growth with increased opportunities for the poor to participate in that growth.

Investment and poverty

The estimation results show that investment has a significant negative effect on poverty, which means that a decrease and increase in investment has an effect on reducing and increasing poverty. With the entry of investment into 34 provinces in Indonesia, it can help the community to continue to increase economic activity and of course will reduce poverty, one of which is with infrastructure investment and labor-intensive investment which requires more human resources that prioritize physical capital which is the main capital of the poor so that people those classified as poor can be absorbed and have income and can meet their needs. This significant negative effect is also in line with the researchersAchyarnis et al. (2020) explained that investment activities enable people to continue to increase economic activity and employment opportunities. increase income and increase the level of community prosperity. led to a reduction in poverty. And also in line withYolanda et al. (2020)that investment can reduce poverty.

However, the results of the indirect effect of investment on poverty through unemployment have a negative but not significant effect. This is due to the fact that investment is not significant for unemployment, every time there is a 1 percent increase in investment there is a decrease of 0.0007 in unemployment, while unemployment has a significant effect on the poverty rate, which means that every 1 percent increase in unemployment will increase poverty by0.2355. investment has a negative effect but does not have a significant effect on unemployment because one of the reasons is that investment is not evenly distributed in 34 provinces in Indonesia, this is evidenced from BPS data which shows investment across provinces is disproportionate.These differences related to investment create different jobs in each province,and also because most provinces in Indonesia still record high open unemployment rates compared to the national open unemployment rate and some open unemployed are educated unemployed, they will only look for jobs that are truly in line with the desired field and level of income, and there is a gap between the skills needed and the skills possessed by the unemployed, choosing to be unemployed is a luxury that only those who have savings and income outside of work have. The poor and near-poor with little education and those with physical means cannot be unemployed. They have to work anything to survive.(Mohammed & David, 2019).According to obadain Osinubi (2005)Unemployment has been identified as one of the main causes of poverty in sub-Saharan Africa.

While research finds that investment has no significant effect on poverty through economic growth. This is because investment does not have a significant effect on growth and economic growth does not have a significant effect on poverty. These findings are not in line with Harrod Dommar and Mankiw's theory that investment is the main key to economic growth. Investment can help increase the production capacity of goods and services so that it will increase the need for human resources and will increase per capita income while at the same time increasing welfare. This is also not in line with researchOcaya et al., (2012) which reveals that investment is a strong link for growtheconomy and poverty reduction. in modern growth theory it is explained that it is not only the number of K and L that is considered but the quality as well as various elements including elements of policy makers such as guarantees of legal certainty, of course with investment if the determination and proper allocation will be able to increase employment opportunities and open up many jobs and can create quality economic growth so as to reduce poverty.

Wages and poverty

The results of the estimation of wages on poverty show a negative and significant effect, which means that any changes in wage increases will reduce the percentage of poverty by 2.3320 percent or vice versa if there is a decrease in wages it will increase the percentage of poverty by 2.3320 percent. Wages are intended as a means of protection for the poor, with wages the poor are able to meet their needs and with wage improvements it will certainly help the poor get out of poverty and can help low-income workers not enter poverty. in line with what Todaro found thatstrategies to increase the incomes and living standards of the poor will contribute not only to their material well-being but also to the productivity and incomes of the economy as a whole(Todaro and Smith, 2013).The findings of this finding are in line withFebriandika et al. (2022);Marina et al. (2017);(Sasana and Kusuma, 2018).

This is reinforced by the findings of the results of the effect of wages on poverty through unemployment which has a significant negative effect. This significant negative effect comes from the significant negative effect of wages on unemployment and then continues with the positive effect of unemployment on poverty. which means that when wages increase by 1 percent (ceteris paribus) it reduces unemployment by 0.6763 percent. Furthermore, when unemployment falls by 0.6763 percent, it will be directly proportional to the reduction in poverty by 1.5722 percent and vice versa when wages fall, unemployment will increase and will be directly proportional to the increase in poverty. The negative effect of wages on unemployment means that increases and decreases in wages will have an impact on increases and decreases in unemployment. This shows that the policy of improving and increasing wages in accordance with the KHL will have an impact on reducing unemployment and poverty, the size of wages is very important because workers want a decent income so they can meet their needs and those of their families. These findings are in line withBudiarto. & Kartika I. (2019)that wages have a significant negative effect on poverty through unemployment, according to sukirnoin Yolanda et al., (2020)one of the important factors that determine the prosperity of a society is the level of income, the maximum income if the level of full employment is realized.The main mechanism for worker poverty is due to low income, so the government's first task is to increase workers' wages or income.the government must support productivity growth simultaneously with upgrading workers' skills through education and training Faharuddin et al. (2022), as well as research conducted by Res (2018) using observational data16 OECD countries between 1995 and 2011, found that an increase in the minimum wage could increase social welfare by increasing labor productivity, or an increase in labor productivity could lead to an increase in the minimum wage(Res, 2018).

Meanwhile, the effect of wages on poverty through economic growth has no significant effect. This is because even though the effect of wages has a significant positive effect on economic growth, economic growth does not have a significant effect on the percentage of poverty. the effect of wages on economic growth is appropriatethe theory of efficiency wages which says that an increase in the minimum wage will increase the work productivity of employees to increase, so that it will increase output growth and then will encourage the opening of employment in line with research. However, growth has not been able to reduce poverty, this is due to the lack of access of the poor to production factors,so growth is needed that is not only pro towards accelerated growth but must be accompanied by quality growth that is pro-poor, which also involves the poor.

4. CONCLUSION

The results of the study are that government spending directly has a significant effect on poverty and indirectly through unemployment has a significant effect but government spending does not have a significant effect on poverty through economic growth, investment has a significant effect on poverty but indirectly both through growth and unemployment have no effect significant, wages directly affect poverty and indirectly through unemployment have a significant effect, but indirectly through economic growth have no significant effect.The government should sort out capital expenditures that are really important by prioritizing spending on public facilities and infrastructure that can be enjoyed by all levels of society, especially those that are felt directly by the poor and will have an impact on poverty alleviation and the allocation of capital expenditures should be realized in development programs in the regions who really need it like poor areas in Indonesia.The government needs to review wages or income for both formal and informal workers so that low-income workers, especially poor workers, can meet their needs by increasing workers' income. As well as the government must support productivity growth simultaneously with increasing worker skills through education and training and providing access to information.

REFERENCE

[1] Achyarnis, L. A., Amin, P., & Setyadharma., A. (2020). Determinants of Poverty in Central Java Province 2013-2018. *Journal of Economic Education*, *9*(1), 81–88. https://doi.org/10.15294/jeec.v9i1.38671

[2] Adegboyo, O. S. (2020). Does government spending reduce poverty in Nigeria? Evidence from Auto-Regressive Distributed Lag Specification. *E-Journal Ekonomi Bisnis Dan Akuntansi*, *7*(2), 86. https://doi.org/10.19184/ejeba.v7i2.17322

[3] Akwara, A. F., Akwara, ;, Ngozi F, Enwuchola, ;, John, Adekunle, ;, Udaw, ;, & Joseph E. (2013). Unemployment and Poverty: Implications for National Security and Good Governance in Nigeria. *International Journal of Public Administration and Management Research*, *2*(1), 1–11.

[4] Barro, R. J. (1990). goverment spending in a simple model of enfogeneous growth. In *Journal of Political Economy* (Vol. 98, Issue 5, pp. 103–125).

[5] Blanchard, O., & Johnson, D. R. (2017). *Macroeconomics seventh edition*.

[6] Budiarto., Y., & Kartika I., N. (2019). Determinan Tingkat Pengangguran Dan Kemiskinan Di Kawasan Sarbagita. *E-Jurnal EP Unud*, *10*(10), 4172–4201. issn:2303-017

[7] bukan Sasana, H., & Kusuma, P. (2018). Government Expenditure and Poverty in Indonesia. *KnE Social Sciences*, *3*(10), 142. https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v3i10.3125

[8] Chen, Siyan, Desiderio, & Saul. (2014). Sticky wages , labor demand elasticity and rational unemployment Sticky wages , labor demand elasticity and rational unemployment. *MPRA, Munich Personal RePEc Archive*, *53260*, 1–12.

[9] Corolina, N. N., & Panjawa, J. L. (2020). Determinan Tingkat Pengangguran: Studi Kasus Wilayah Pengembangan Purwomanggung, Jawa Tengah. *Jurnal Ekonomi Pembangunan*, *9*(1), 45–55. https://doi.org/10.23960/jep.v9i1.77

[10] Defina, R. H. (2002). *The impact Of Unemployment on Alternative poverty Measures*. *02*, 1–32.

[11] Faharuddin, & Endrawati, D. (2022). Determinants of working poverty in Indonesia. *Journal of Economic and Development Studies*, *24*, 230–246. https://doi.org/10.1108/JED-09-2021-0151

[12] Febriandika, N. R., Rahayu, C., & Kumar, R. (2022). The Determinant Factors of Poverty in Eastern Indonesia: Evidence from 12 Province. *Journal Of Economics and Policy (JEJAK)*, *15*(2), 283–299. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.15294/jejak.v15i2.36675

[13] Feriyanto, N., El Aiyubbi, D., & Nurdany, A. (2020). The Impact of Unemployment, minimum wage, and real gross regional domestic product on poverty reduction in provinces of indonesia. *Asian Economic and Financial Review*, *10*(10), 1088–1099. https://doi.org/10.18488/journal.aefr.2020.1010.1088.1099

[14] Handayani, A. (2018). Pengaruh Tingkat Pendidikan, Kesehatan Dan Pengangguran Terhadap Tingkat Kemiskinan Di Kabupaten Bojonegorotahun 2002 -2015. *Jurnal EKBIS*, *19*(1), 1024–1038.

[15] Kalsum, U. (2017). pengaruh pengangguran dan inflasi terhadap pertumbuhan ekonomi di sumatera utara. *Ekonomikawan*, *17 No1*, 87–94.

[16] Ketaren, I. C. (2018). *Pengaruh pengeluaran pemerintah dan pengangguran terhadap kemiskinan provinsi sumatera utara*. *2*(2), 116–121.

[17] Kurniawati, A., Gunawan, B. T., & Ratna Indrasari, D. P. (2017). Dampak Upah Minimum Terhadap Kemiskinan Di Indonesia Tahun 2006-2014. *Jurnal Riset Ekonomi Dan Manajemen*, *17*(2), 233. https://doi.org/10.17970/jrem.17.170207.id

[18] Kware, A. A. (2015). Unemployment, Income Inequality and Poverty: The Hallmarks of the Africas Largest and Strongest Economy; Nigeria. *Asian Economic and Financial Review*, *5*(11), 1239–1250. https://doi.org/10.18488/journal.aefr/2015.5.11/102.11.1239.1250

[19] Marinda, A., Mukhlis, I., Witjaksono, M., Utomo, H. S., Wahyono, H., Soesilo, Y. H., Santoso, & Moeheriono. (2017). The Analysis of the Economic Growth , Minimum Wage , And Unemployment Rate to the Poverty level in East Java. *Internasional Journal of Economic Research*, *14*.

[20] Mehmood, R., & Sadiq, S. (2010). The relation between goverment expenditure and poverty: A cointegration. *Romanian Journal of Fiscal Policy*, *1*(1), 29–37.

[21] Misini, S., & Badivuku-Pantina, M. (2017). *The Effect of Economic Growth under Nominal GDP in Relation to Poverty*. *March 2017*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/333194719

[22] Mohammad, U. F., & David, J. (2019). The Relationship between Poverty and Unemployment in Niger State. *Signifikan: Jurnal Ilmu Ekonomi*, *8*(1), 71–78. https://doi.org/10.15408/sjie.v8i1.6725

[23] Mustamin, Siti Walida. Agussalim. Nurbayani, S. U. (2015). Pengaruh Variabel Ekonomi Makro Terhadap Kemiskinan Di Kota Makassar Provinsi Sulawesi Selatan. *Jurnal Analisis*, *4*(2), 165–173. ISSN 2303-100X

[24] Nurdiana, Hasan Muhammad, Arisah Nur, Riesso Sawe Andi, & Hasanah Faradilla Dillah. (2020). An Analysis of the Effect of Economic Growth, Inflation, and Open Unemployment on Poverty in South Sulawesi Province. *Quest Journals Journal of Research in Business and Management*, *8*(9), 2347–3002. www.questjournals.org

[25] Nursini, N., Fachry, M. E., & Nurbayani, S. U. (2020). *Government Expenditures on Productive Sectors and Poverty Reduction : Panel Data In South Sulawesi*.

[26] Ocaya, B., Ruranga, C., & Kaberuka, W. (2012). Dynamic Relationship between Gross Domestic Product and Domestic Investment in Rwanda. *World Journal of Education*, *2*(6). https://doi.org/10.5430/wje.v2n6p79

[27] Osinubi, T. S. (2005). Macroeconometric Analysis Og Growth, Unemployment And Poverty In Nigeria. *Pakistan Economic and Social Review*, *43*(2), 249–269. http://www.jstor.org/stable/25825276%5Cnhttp://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp%5Cnhttp://www.jstor.org

[28] Paramita, A. A. I. D., & Purbadharmaja. (2015). Pengaruh Investasi Dan Pengangguran Terhadap Pertumbuhan Ekonomi Serta Kemiskinan Di Provinsi Bali. *E-Jurnal EP Unud*, *4*(10), 1194–1218.

[29] Perkins, D. H., Radelet, S., Lindaue, D. L., & Block, S. A. (2015). *Economics Of Development* (Seventh Ed).

[30] Puspita, D. W. (2015). Analisis Determinan Kemiskinan Di Provinsi Jawa Tengah. *Jejak*, *8*(1), 100–107. https://doi.org/10.15294/jejak.v8i1.3858

[31] Ramli, A., Jamil, M., & Karmila., Y. (2020). Faktor-Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Tingkat Kemiskinan Dan Strategi Pengentasan Kemiskinan Di Kota Makassar. *International Conference on Science and Advanced Technology*, 1–7.

[32] Res, A. (2018). The Effect Of Minimum Wage Level On Labor Efficienncy : An Analysis On OECD Countries. *Journal of International Management*, *6*(2), 6. http://files/192/Yumuşak - 2015 - Journal of International Management, Educational a.pdf

[33] Seran, S. (2017). Hubungan antara pendidikan, pengangguran, dan pertumbuhan ekonomi dengan kemiskinan. *Jurnal Ekonomi Kuantitatif Terapan*, *10* no *2*, 59–71.

[34] Sumiyarti. (2022). Pengaruh Belanja Modal dan Belanj Bantuan Sosial Terhadap Pertumbuhan Ekonomi dan Kemiskinan. *Srikandi: Journal of Islamic Economics and Banking*, *1*(1), 28–43. https://journal.iaimnumetrolampung.ac.id/index.php/srikandi/article/view/1547

[35] Tahir, T., & Hasan, M. (2018). Poverty's characteristics and its reduction strategies: A case study. *European Research Studies Journal*, *21*(2), 426–440. https://doi.org/10.35808/ersj/1012

[36] Todaro, M. P., & Smith, S. C. (2013). *Economic Development, Thirteenth edition*.

[37] Ubur, H. (2011). Upaya penanggulan kemiskinan melalui pendekatan proses (studi kasus masyarakat wudi nusa tenggara timur). *Aspiirasi*, *2* no *2*, 209–224.

[38] Wahyudi. (2020). Pengeluaran Pemerintah dan Implikasinya Terhadap Pertumbuhan Ekonomi dan Tingkat Kemiskinan di Indonesia. *Prosiding Seminar Akademik Tahunan Ilmu Ekonomi Dan Studi Pembangunan*, 103–113.

[39] Yolanda, C., Lubis, I., Ruslan, D., & Hardianti, A. (2020). Analysis of the Effects of Investment and Unemployment on Economic Growth and Poverty in North Sumatra Province. *International Journal of Research and Review (Ijrrjournal.Com)*, *7*(8), 71.