International Journal of Economic Literature (INJOLE) e-ISSN: 3026-0221
Vol. 2 No. 12 September 2025, page., 1999-2016

DETERMINANTS OF POVERTY IN FIVE REGENCIES OF EAST JAVA PROVINCE

Noor Shania Wardaningrum
Faculty of Economics and Business, Udayana University
Corresponding author email: saniawardah233@gmail.com

Putu Ayu Pramitha Purwanti
Faculty of Economics and Business, Udayana University
Email: pramitha@unud.ac.id

Abstract

Poverty remains one of the main challenges in achieving sustainable economic development, particularly in regions with high industrial potential but persistent poverty rates. East Java Province is recognized as one of Indonesia's leading manufacturing hubs; however, several regencies still record relatively high poverty levels. This study aims to analyze the effects of the manufacturing sector's contribution, the Human Development Index (HDI), district minimum wages (UMK), and the open unemployment rate (OUR) on poverty levels in five key industrial regencies—Malang, Pasuruan, Mojokerto, Tuban, and Gresik—over the period 2014–2023. Panel data regression with a Fixed Effects Model (FEM) approach was employed. The findings reveal that, simultaneously, all four independent variables significantly affect poverty levels. Partially, only HDI exerts a negative and significant influence, while the manufacturing sector contribution, UMK, and OUR show no significant effect. These results underscore that improving quality of life through HDI enhancement is more effective in reducing poverty than relying solely on manufacturing sector growth. Therefore, poverty alleviation policies should prioritize human capital development and equitable distribution of economic benefits at the regional level.

Keywords: Poverty, Manufacturing Industry, Human Development Index, Minimum Wage, Unemployment

INTRODUCTION

Indonesia remains classified as a developing country, with poverty continuing to be a central concern. Poverty is a complex social problem and a major challenge for national development (Purnama, 2017). According to Todaro (2003), poverty represents one of the most pressing issues faced by developing nations in formulating economic development policies. It is closely linked to disparities in resource capabilities, including the ability to survive and improve economic conditions. Poverty also impedes development by undermining social stability and community welfare. Dagume (2021) emphasizes that eradicating poverty is a top priority for developing countries, as a large share of their populations live in poverty, constraining overall economic growth.

The Indonesian Central Statistics Agency (BPS) defines poverty as a condition of deprivation experienced by individuals or households, preventing them from meeting an acceptable standard of basic needs. In measurement, BPS applies the basic needs approach, which views poverty as the inability to fulfill basic food and non-food

requirements, measured through expenditure levels. Accordingly, the poor are those whose average monthly per capita expenditure falls below the poverty line (Kusumo, 2022).

East Java Province is a strategic hub of economic activity and serves as the gateway for economic interaction with eastern Indonesia. As the second-largest contributor to Indonesia's Gross Domestic Product (GDP) after Jakarta, East Java accounts for approximately 15% of the national GDP (Nur & Rakhman, 2019). Its economy is dominated by five key sectors: manufacturing; wholesale and retail trade, including motor vehicle and motorcycle repair; agriculture, forestry, and fisheries; construction; and accommodation and food services. Together, these sectors contributed 75.27% of regional GDP in 2023. The manufacturing industry plays the largest role, with a consistently stable contribution—30.32% in 2019 and rising in subsequent years (BPS, 2024).

Strengthening East Java's manufacturing sector not only drives economic growth but is also expected to improve community welfare by creating more jobs and reducing poverty. Supported by infrastructure, government policies, and increased investment, this sector holds substantial potential for sustainable regional development.

East Java consists of 29 regencies and 9 municipalities, making it one of Indonesia's provinces with the largest number of administrative regions. Areas surrounding major economic centers and industrial zones contribute the highest shares to manufacturing output. In several regencies, manufacturing dominates the economic structure, becoming the main driver of local economic activity. Geographic advantages, government support, and infrastructure development have established these regions as core manufacturing growth centers, attracting continuous investment and reinforcing East Java's status as a nationally competitive industrial hub.

Of East Java's 38 regencies and municipalities, seven contribute significantly to the regional manufacturing sector's Gross Regional Domestic Product (GRDP): Malang, Pasuruan, Sidoarjo, Mojokerto, Tuban, Gresik, and Kediri City. These industrial centers not only enhance GRDP but also play vital roles in job creation and improving local living standards. Their high manufacturing contributions reflect the presence of advanced industrial zones, adequate infrastructure, favorable government policies, and advantageous geographic positioning for access to major trade routes.

Focusing on five regencies Gresik, Malang, Pasuruan, Mojokerto, and Tuban data show that manufacturing is a critical pillar of their economies. For example, Gresik has successfully positioned manufacturing as its economic development icon (Rahman, 2019), while Malang records robust economic growth driven by manufacturing (Ariansyah, 2019). Pasuruan and Mojokerto also make substantial contributions to East Java's manufacturing GRDP (Mahaesa & Huda, 2022), and Tuban's economic potential in this sector is reinforced by large-scale industrial presence (Andayani et al., 2021).

The manufacturing sector, as defined by Cahyanti and Anjaningrum (2018), encompasses activities that transform raw materials into finished or semi-finished goods through mechanical, chemical, or manual processes, thereby increasing their value for end consumers. It includes facilities such as factories and machinery, both manually and mechanically operated, and covers subcontracting as well as in-house

production for direct sale (Muhammad Akbar Perdana et al., 2023). Given its high profitability relative to sectors like agriculture, manufacturing is often viewed as a primary engine of economic growth, prompting many countries to adopt industrialization strategies to improve public welfare (Niara & Zulfa, 2019).

Based on the above, studying the interplay between manufacturing sector contribution, human development, minimum wage, and unemployment in relation to poverty is both relevant and necessary. These variables are interconnected and influence poverty in complex ways. A deeper analysis of how they collectively shape poverty levels can provide valuable insights for policymakers seeking more effective strategies for poverty reduction.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study employs a quantitative method with an associative approach to analyze the relationship between independent variables—namely, the manufacturing sector's contribution, the Human Development Index (HDI), the regency minimum wage, and the open unemployment rate—and the dependent variable, poverty, in five regencies of East Java Province (Malang, Pasuruan, Mojokerto, Tuban, and Gresik). The data comprise a panel dataset combining time-series (2014–2023) and cross-sectional components, resulting in a total of 50 observations. Secondary data were obtained from publications by the East Java Provincial Statistics Agency (Badan Pusat Statistik, BPS) and the Probolinggo Regency BPS, while data collection was conducted using a non-participant observation method. The selection of research locations was based on the high poverty rates in these regions despite their relatively well-developed industrial sectors (Sugiyono, 2014; Zahra & Ramayani Yusuf, 2024).

Data analysis was conducted using descriptive statistics and panel data regression through three approaches: the Common Effect Model (CEM), the Fixed Effect Model (FEM), and the Random Effect Model (REM). The most suitable model was determined using the Chow Test, Hausman Test, and Lagrange Multiplier Test. The minimum wage variable was transformed into its natural logarithmic form (ln) to stabilize variance and reduce heteroskedasticity. Hypothesis testing was conducted simultaneously using the F-test to assess the joint effect of all independent variables, and partially using the t-test to examine the effect of each variable individually. Decision-making criteria were based on a 5% significance level (Basuki, 2017; Gujarati & Porter, 2009; Wooldridge, 2013).

Operational definitions of the variables are as follows: poverty is measured as the percentage of the population living below the poverty line; the manufacturing sector's contribution is measured as its percentage share of Gross Regional Domestic Product (GRDP); the Human Development Index is measured in points; the regency minimum wage is measured in Indonesian Rupiah; and the open unemployment rate is expressed as the percentage of the labor force that is unemployed. All variables were measured using official BPS data to ensure validity.

The panel data regression model used in this study is formulated as:

Y = β0 + β1X1 + β2X2 + β3ln(X3)+β4X4+eY = \beta_0 + \beta_1+β1X1+β2X2+β3 ln(X3)+β4X4+ε, where YYY is poverty, X1X_1X1contribution of the manufacturing sector, X2X_2X2human development index, X3X_3X3district minimum wage, and X4X_4X4open

unemployment rate. This model is expected to provide an accurate empirical picture of the relationship between variables (Suyana, 1999; Alamsyah et al., 2022).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Descriptive Statistical Analysis Results

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics Results

	Y	X1	X2	LNX3	X4
Mean	11.75480	44.99700	70.55680	14.90100	5.035800
Median	10.79000	48.59500	70.31500	14.93000	4.960000
Maximum	17.14000	60.59000	77.98000	15.32000	8.210000
Minimum	8.680000	29.59000	64.35000	14.13000	2,700,000
Std. Dev.	2.430675	11.93961	3.657893	0.312914	1.277475
Observations	50	50	50	50	50

Source: Data processed with Eviews 13, 2025

Table 1 shows that the number of observation points is 50. This means that 50 observational data were studied, consisting of five districts in East Java Province over the 10-year research period, 2014–2023. The results of the descriptive statistical tests for the research variables are as follows:

1. The Y variable, Poverty, can be seen in the table, showing that the average poverty rate in the research districts is quite diverse because it does not approach the maximum or minimum values. The standard deviation value of 2.430 is higher than the mean value of 11.754, indicating that there is quite high diversity between districts, indicating that poverty levels are not evenly distributed across the region. This indicates that some regions still have high poverty rates, while others have decreased.
2. Variable X1, namely the Processing Industry, shows that the average contribution of the processing industry sector in the research district is 44.997 percent, which is also classified as varied because it does not approach the minimum value of 29.59 or the maximum of 60.59. The standard deviation value of 11.939, which is higher than the mean value, indicates that the contribution of the processing industry between districts is not evenly distributed. Some regions have high industrial sector contributions, while others are still low.
3. Variable X2, the Human Development Index (HDI), shows that the average HDI in the five study districts is 70.556, with a maximum value of 77.98 and a minimum of 64.35. The standard deviation of 3.657 indicates a moderate level of human development difference between regions. Because the mean value is not too close to the lower or upper limits, the HDI can be said to be relatively stable but still leaves gaps between districts.
4. Variable X3, the District Minimum Wage (UMK), has an average of 14.901 with a maximum value of 15.320 and a minimum of 14.130. The standard deviation value of 0.313, which is quite small, indicates that the UMK value between districts is relatively homogeneous after log transformation, although there are still small differences between regions. The natural log is used to stabilize variation and indicates that wage differences between regions are not too extreme.

5. Variable X4, the Open Unemployment Rate, has an average of 5.035 percent, with a maximum value of 8.210 and a minimum of 2.700. The standard deviation of 1.277 is lower than the mean, indicating that the unemployment rate between districts is moderate and not too widespread. However, the difference between the highest and lowest values still indicates inequality in job opportunities between regions.

Panel Data Estimation Model Approach

This study uses four independent variables, namely the Contribution of the Manufacturing Industry Sector (X1), Human Development Index (X2), District Minimum Wage (X3) and Unemployment (X4) with one dependent variable, namely poverty (Y).

To select the most appropriate model for managing panel data, there are three (3) tests that need to be carried out, namely the Chow test, the Langrage multiplier test, and the Hausman test.

Panel Data Regression Model Selection

1. Chow Test

The Chow Test was conducted to select the appropriate model between the Common Effect Model and the Fixed Effect Model in this study. If the test results indicate that the null hypothesis () is rejected, then the next test is carried out using the Hausman Test.H_0

The hypothesis used in the Chow Test is as follows:

H_0: If the probability value (p-value) for the cross-section is greater than the significance level (α > 0.05), then it is accepted, and the most appropriate model to use is the Common Effect Model (CEM).FH_0

H_1: If the probability value (p-value) for the cross-section is smaller than the significance level (α < 0.05), then it is rejected, and the most appropriate model to use is the Fixed Effect Model (FEM).FH_0

Table 2. Chow Test Results

Redundant Fixed Effects Tests
Equation: Untitled
Test cross-section fixed effects

Effects Test	Statistic	d.f.	Prob.
Cross-section F	140.796524	(4,41)	0.0000
Cross-section Chi-square	134.515509	4	0.0000

Source: Data processed with Eviews 13, 2025

Based on the test results in Table 2, the probability value is 0.0000 < α = 0.05%, so the selected model is the Fixed Effect Model.

2. Hausman test

This test was conducted as a follow-up stage after obtaining the results of the Chow Test. Therefore, the Hausman Test serves as an essential tool to determine whether the Fixed Effect Model should continue to be applied or, alternatively, switched to the Random Effect Model.

The hypotheses for the Hausman Test are formulated as follows:

H_0: If the probability value (α > 0.05), then H_0 is accepted, indicating that the most appropriate model is the Random Effect Model (REM).

H_1: If the probability value ($\alpha < 0.05$), then H_0 is rejected, indicating that the most appropriate model is the Fixed Effect Model (FEM).
If the probability value ($\alpha > 0.05$), then H_0 is accepted, indicating that the most appropriate model is the Random Effect Model (REM).

Table 3. Hausman Test Results

Correlated Random Effects - Hausman Test
Equation: Untitled
Test cross-section random effects

Test Summary	Chi-Sq. Statistic	Chi-Sq. d.f.	Prob.
Cross-section random	563.186094	4	0.0000

Source: Data processed with Eviews 13, 2025

The test results in Table 3 state that the probability value is 0.0000 < α = 0.05 (5%), so the selected model is the Fixed Effect Model.

Based on the two test results above, if the Chow and Hausman tests indicate that the most appropriate model for the analysis is the Fixed Effect model, then the Lagrange Multiplier (LM) test is no longer necessary. The LM test is generally conducted to determine the suitability of the Random Effect model compared to the Common Effect model. However, if the Chow test selects the Fixed Effect model and the Hausman test confirms that the Fixed Effect model is more appropriate than the Random Effect model, then the decision to use the Fixed Effect model is correct, so the LM test is not necessary. (Rizki et al., 2022).

Fixed Effect Panel Data Regression Model

Table 4. Fixed Effect Model Results

Dependent Variable: Y
Method: Panel Least Squares
Date: 07/30/25 Time: 14:42
Sample: 2014 2023
Periods included: 10
Cross-sections included: 5
Total panel (balanced) observations: 50

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	31.16600	8.707337	3.579280	0.0009
X1	0.041008	0.111782	0.366858	0.7156
X2	-0.491552	0.157004	-3.130819	0.0032
LNX3	0.858795	1.175983	0.730279	0.4694
X4	0.124908	0.094803	1.317547	0.1950

		Mean dependent	
R-squared	0.964940	variable	11.75480
Adjusted R-squared	0.958099	SD dependent var	2.430675
SE of regression	0.497553	Akaike info criterion	1.603319
Sum squared residual	10.14991	Schwarz criterion	1.947483
Log likelihood	-31.08297	Hannan-Quinn criter.	1.734378
F-statistic	141.0529	Durbin-Watson stat	1.363025
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000		

Source: Data processed with Eviews 13, 2025

From the results of the panel data regression analysis, the following equation can be made:

Yit = 31.166 + 0.041 X1it – 0.492 X2it + 0.859 lnX3it + 0.125 X4it

Based on the results of the regression equation estimation with the Fixed Effect model, it is known that the manufacturing industry contribution variable (X1) has a probability value of 0.7156, which is greater than 0.05. This indicates that this variable does not have a significant effect on the poverty rate in the five districts studied during the 2014–2023 period. The Human Development Index variable (X2) has a probability value of 0.0032, which is less than 0.05, so it can be concluded that the HDI has a significant effect on the poverty rate. The Regency Minimum Wage variable (lnX3) has a probability value of 0.4694, and the open unemployment rate variable (X4) has a probability value of 0.1950. Both have probability values greater than 0.05, which means they do not have a significant effect on the poverty rate in this study.

Hypothesis Testing

a) Simultaneous Influence Test (F Test) of the Contribution of the Manufacturing Industry Sector, Human Development Index, District Minimum Wage, and Unemployment to Poverty

Table 5. F-Test Results (Simultaneous)

R-squared	0.964940	F-statistic	141.0529
Adjusted R-squared	0.958099	Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000
SE of regression	0.497553		

Source: Data processed with Eviews 13, 2025

Based on the regression results of $F_{count}141.05 > F_{table}2.81$ and a significance value of 0.000 < 0.05, H_0 is rejected and H1 is accepted, which means that simultaneously the variables of the contribution of the processing industry sector, human development index (HDI), district/city minimum wage (UMK), and unemployment rate simultaneously have a significant effect on the poverty rate in five districts in East Java Province.

b) Test Partial Influence (t-Test) of Contribution of Manufacturing Industry Sector, Human Development Index, District Minimum Wage, and Unemployment on Poverty

Table 6. Partial Test Results (t)

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	31.16600	8.707337	3.579280	0.0009
X1	0.041008	0.111782	0.366858	0.7156
X2	-0.491552	0.157004	-3.130819	0.0032
LNX3	0.858795	1.175983	0.730279	0.4694
X4	0.124908	0.094803	1.317547	0.1950
R-squared	0.964940	F-statistic		141.0529
Adjusted R-squared	0.958099	Prob(F-statistic)		0.000000

Source: Data processed with Eviews 13, 2025

1. Testing the hypothesis of the influence of the contribution of the manufacturing

Based on the regression results, it shows that the t-test is 0.366 < t_{table} 2.01 and the significance value (0.7156) is smaller than α = 0.05. Therefore, H_0 is accepted and H_1 is rejected. This means that the contribution variable of the manufacturing industry sector has no partial effect on poverty in the five districts of East Java Province.

2. Testing the hypothesis of the influence of HDI (X_2) on poverty (Y)

Based on the regression results, it shows that t count -3.1308 < t table -2.01. The significance value (0.0032) < α = 0.05. Therefore, H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted. This means that the HDI partially has a negative and significant effect on poverty. This shows that improving human quality can reduce poverty rates.

3. Testing the hypothesis of the influence of district minimum wages (UMK) (X_3) on poverty (Y)

Based on the regression results, t count 1.3175 < t table 2.01 and significance value (0.3332) > α = 0.05. Therefore, H_0 is accepted and H_1 is rejected. This means that the open unemployment rate partially does not have a significant effect on poverty in the five districts of East Java Province.

c) Coefficient of Determination Test

Table 7. Results of the Determination Coefficient Test

R-squared	0.964940	Mean dependent variable	11.75480
Adjusted R-squared	0.958099	SD dependent var	2.430675
SE of regression	0.497553	Akaike info criterion	1.603319
Sum squared residual	10.114991	Schwarz criterion	1.947483

Source: Data processed with Eviews 13, 2025

Regression results indicate that the Adjusted R-squared value is 0.958, meaning that approximately 95.8% of the variation in the dependent variable can be explained by the independent variables used in the model. The remaining 4.2% is influenced by other variables outside the model that are not analyzed in this study.

Discussion of Findings

Simultaneous Effect of the Contribution of the Manufacturing Sector, Human Development Index, District Minimum Wage, and Unemployment on Poverty in Five Regencies of East Java Province, 2014–2023

Based on the F-test results from the Fixed Effect panel data regression model, the F-statistic value is 141.0529 with a significance level of 0.000000. This value is smaller than the 0.05 significance threshold, thus rejecting the null hypothesis (H_0) and accepting the alternative hypothesis (H_1). This means that, simultaneously, the manufacturing sector contribution, human development index, district minimum wage, and open unemployment rate have a significant effect on poverty levels in the five regencies of East Java Province.

These results indicate that the four variables are interrelated in explaining variations in poverty levels in the study area. Theoretically, these findings align with Kuznets' (1955) view that economic development is marked by a shift from the agricultural to the industrial sector, which promotes GDP growth and poverty reduction. In addition, Becker (1964) emphasizes that improving the quality of human capital through education and health increases productivity and welfare, thereby reducing poverty.

These findings are supported by previous empirical studies. Riyandini (2024) found that the human development index, district/city minimum wage, open unemployment rate, and social assistance expenditure jointly affect poverty levels in East Java Province. Similarly, Syahputri and Fisabilillah (2023) reported that unemployment, minimum wage, and GRDP together have a significant effect on poverty levels in the province. These variables play a key role in determining poverty dynamics in the region.

Partial Effect of the Manufacturing Sector Contribution on Poverty in Five Regencies of East Java Province, 2014–2023

The regression results show that the contribution of the manufacturing sector variable has a coefficient of 0.041008 with a probability value of 0.7156. This probability exceeds the 5% significance level ($\alpha = 0.05$), indicating that, partially, the contribution of the manufacturing sector does not have a statistically significant effect on poverty in the five regencies of East Java Province. In other words, the magnitude of the manufacturing sector's contribution to the regional economic structure does not have a statistically significant relationship with variations in poverty levels during the study period.

In the context of five regencies with high manufacturing sector contributions—Malang, Pasuruan, Mojokerto, Tuban, and Gresik—the insignificance of the manufacturing sector's effect on poverty can be attributed to several factors. First, industries in these areas are generally capital-intensive (e.g., cement, fertilizer, and

metal production), relying more on technology and machinery than labor, thereby limiting job absorption, especially among low-educated poor populations. Second, many industrial workers are recruited from outside the region, so the economic benefits are not directly experienced by the local poor population. Third, industrial growth is not necessarily inclusive; while the sector may expand rapidly, the benefits and access are not evenly distributed, particularly for vulnerable and low-income groups.

Theoretically, these findings contradict Kuznets' (1955) theory that economic growth through labor shifts from agriculture to industry increases per capita income and reduces poverty. However, the results are consistent with Todaro and Smith (2015), who stress that economic growth, including in the industrial sector, only effectively reduces poverty when it is inclusive and its benefits are widely shared. Conversely, when growth is concentrated in capital-intensive modern sectors involving only a small share of the population, poverty can persist despite rising aggregate income. This is also in line with Lewis' (1954) Dual Sector Model, which posits that in developing countries, the economy consists of a traditional sector (including agriculture and informal activities) and a modern sector (including industry and other formal sectors). According to Lewis, industrial growth will only significantly reduce poverty when accompanied by substantial labor transfer from the traditional to the modern sector; otherwise, industrial growth contributes little to reducing unemployment or poverty.

Empirical evidence from Elmawati and Suparta (2025) also supports these findings, showing that industrial sector growth does not significantly affect poverty rates because most poor people remain in the informal sector or unemployed, and are not absorbed into the formal sector. This indicates that industrial expansion has not yet delivered widespread economic benefits, especially for vulnerable groups. Therefore, a high manufacturing sector contribution does not necessarily correlate with a decline in poverty unless supported by policies promoting economic inclusion and expanding formal employment opportunities for the poor.

Partial Effect of the Human Development Index on Poverty in Five Regencies of East Java Province, 2014–2023

The regression results show that the Human Development Index (HDI) variable has a coefficient of –0.491552 with a probability value of 0.0032, which is significant at the 1% level ($\alpha = 0.01$). This means that, partially, HDI has a negative and significant effect on poverty in the five regencies of East Java Province during 2014–2023. In other words, a 1-point increase in HDI compared to the previous year reduces poverty levels by 0.49 percentage points. This finding indicates that improving quality of life through access to education, healthcare, and decent living standards makes a tangible contribution to poverty reduction in the study area.

These results are consistent with Gary Becker's Human Capital Theory, which emphasizes that investment in human resources—particularly through improving access to and quality of education and healthcare—positively affects individual productivity. Individuals with higher education and adequate health are more likely to work optimally, secure decent employment, and increase income. Consequently, enhancing human capital quality significantly contributes to poverty reduction.

Furthermore, Lambot (2023) also found that HDI has a negative and significant impact on poverty rates, meaning that the higher a region's HDI, the lower its poverty level, and vice versa. This reinforces that improving HDI is a critical strategy in poverty alleviation efforts, including in the five regencies examined in this study.

Partial Effect of the District Minimum Wage on Poverty in Five Regencies of East Java Province, 2014–2023

The regression results show that the District Minimum Wage (UMK), transformed into its natural logarithm (LNX3), has a coefficient of 0.858795 with a probability value of 0.4694. Since this probability exceeds the 5% significance level (α = 0.05), UMK does not have a statistically significant effect on poverty in the five regencies. However, the positive coefficient suggests that increases in UMK tend to be followed by an increase in poverty, although the relationship is statistically insignificant. This insignificance, particularly in the five regencies dominated by manufacturing—Malang, Pasuruan, Mojokerto, Gresik, and Tuban—can be explained by several factors. First, despite high manufacturing contributions, most poor residents are not employed in the formal industrial sector earning the UMK; instead, they are engaged in informal work such as agricultural labor, casual work, or petty trade, which is not covered by the minimum wage policy. Second, an "economic leakage" phenomenon occurs when a large share of industrial workers come from outside the region, meaning local poor populations do not directly benefit from UMK increases.

Theoretically, this aligns with the Neoclassical Labor Market Theory, which posits that if the minimum wage is set above the market equilibrium level, labor surplus (unemployment) occurs. In such cases, higher minimum wages do not necessarily improve economic conditions for the poor, particularly if they are excluded from the formal labor market (Mankiw, 2012: 124).

Similar conclusions were drawn by Firmansya et al. (2023), who found that minimum wage increases do not significantly reduce poverty in East Java, mainly because most poor people do not work in the formal sector—or do not work at all—and thus do not directly experience the benefits. Riyandini (2024) also reported that higher district minimum wages have not had a significant impact on reducing poverty rates in East Java Province.

Partial Effect of the Open Unemployment Rate on Poverty in Five Regencies of East Java Province, 2014–2023

The regression results show that the open unemployment rate variable has a coefficient of 0.124908 with a probability value of 0.1950. Since this probability exceeds the 5% significance threshold, this variable does not have a statistically significant effect on poverty in the five regencies. This suggests that changes in the open unemployment rate during the study period do not directly affect poverty changes in the study area.
Theoretically, higher unemployment should worsen economic conditions and increase poverty. However, in developing countries such as Indonesia, the open unemployment rate often does not fully reflect poverty conditions (Todaro & Smith, 2015). In these five regencies, despite the manufacturing sector being a major contributor to GRDP, formal job creation has not optimally absorbed local labor. Most poor residents work in the

informal sector with low incomes but are still classified as employed by BPS, meaning they are excluded from open unemployment statistics.

This occurs because, by BPS definition, open unemployment only includes individuals not working and actively seeking jobs, whereas many poor people are engaged in informal or underemployed work with very low earnings, thus not classified as unemployed despite living in poverty (BPS, 2023).

Todaro and Smith (2015) note that in developing economies, disguised unemployment and informal employment are more prevalent than open unemployment. Therefore, open unemployment is not an accurate indicator for measuring poverty, as many poor individuals remain employed in low-productivity jobs. This is consistent with Lewis' (1954) Dual Sector Model, which explains that developing economies have labor surpluses in the traditional sector, statistically considered employed, but with minimal contribution to economic output—a condition known as disguised unemployment.

Irawan & Yusuf (2022) also found that in Indonesia, the relationship between the open unemployment rate and poverty is not always significant, particularly in regions with high informality. This suggests that having a job does not guarantee escaping poverty, especially when the work is informal and lacks social protection or decent wages.

CONCLUSION

Based on panel data analysis using the Fixed Effect Model (FEM) to examine the effects of the manufacturing sector contribution, human development index (HDI), district minimum wage (UMK), and open unemployment rate on poverty in five regencies of East Java Province during 2014–2023, the following conclusions are drawn:

1. Simultaneous Effect – The four independent variables manufacturing sector contribution, HDI, UMK, and open unemployment rate—significantly influence poverty. This suggests that the combination of structural economic and social factors can jointly explain regional poverty variations over the study period.
2. Partial Effect – Only HDI has a negative and significant effect on poverty, indicating that improving human capital quality plays a tangible role in reducing poverty. Meanwhile, the manufacturing sector contribution, UMK, and open unemployment rate do not significantly affect poverty. This implies that industrial growth and wage policies have not been fully inclusive, and unemployment reduction has not effectively targeted poor communities, meaning these three variables need to be optimized to have a stronger impact on poverty alleviation.

REFERENCES

A Astrini, N. M. M., & Purbadharmaja, I. B. P. (2013). Pengaruh PDRB, Pendidikan dan Pengangguran Terhadap Kemiskinan di Provinsi Bali. E-Jurnal Ekonomi Pembangunan Universitas Udayana, 2(8), 384–392.

Aini, S. N., & Nugroho, R. yuwono Y. (2023). Pengaruh Pertumbuhan Ekonomi, Pendidikan, Pengangguran, Dan Ketimpangan Pendapatan Terhadap Kemiskinan.

Buletin Ekonomika Pembangunan, 4(1), 20–36. https://doi.org/10.21107/bep.v4i1.19474

Aku, A. S., Suriade, L. O., Bakareng, S. W. A., Pagala, Muh. A., Zulkarnain, D., & Sandiah, N. (2019). Database pengangguran Berpendidikan TInggi di Sulawesi Tenggara.

Alhudhori, M. (2017). PENGARUH IPM, PDRB DAN JUMLAH PENGANGGURAN TERHADAP PENDUDUK MISKIN DI PROVINSI JAMBI. EKONOMIS: Journal of Economics and Business, 1(1), 113. https://doi.org/10.33087/ekonomis.v1i1.12

Amalia, R., Khafiah, L., Rajani, T., & Kurniawan, M. (2024). Pengaruh Upah Minimum, Tingkat Pengangguran Terbuka, Dan Pendidikan Terhadap Jumlah Penduduk Miskin di Jawa Timur Tahun 2014-2023. Journal Economic Excellence Ibnu Sina, 80–91.

Amalia Yunia Rahmawati. (2020). Pengaruh Pendidikan, Pengangguran dan Inflasi Terhadap Tingkat Kemiskinan di Kawasan Timur Indonesia (KTI) Periode 2001-2010. July, 1–23.

Andayani, K. D., Muljaningsih, S., & Asmara, K. (2021). Analisis Struktur Ekonomi dan Identifikasi Sektor Unggulan Kabupaten Tuban. In Analisis Struktur Ekonomi dan Identifikasi Sektor Unggulan Kabupaten Tuban (Vol. 17, Issue 1).

Ariansyah, T. S. (2019). Analisis Pengaruh Jumlah Penduduk, PDRB per Kapita, Tingkat Pendidikan dan Tingkat Kesehatan Terhadap Jumlah Penduduk Miskin di Kabupaten Malang Tahun 2001-2015. Jurnal Ilmiah, 10(2), 1–94.

Arsyad, L. (2010). Ekonomi Pembangunan Edisi Kelima (Yogyakarta). In Ekonomi Pembangunan Berkelanjutan (Vol. 05, Issue 01). UPP STIM YKPN.

Aziz, G. A., Rochaida, E., & Warsilan. (2016). Faktor-faktor yang Mempengaruhi Kemiskinan di Kabupaten Kutai Kartanegara. Jurnal Ekonomi Keuangan Dan Manajemen, 12(1), 29–48. http;//journal.feb.unmul.ac.id

Amanda, Y. Y., Sukamto, & Towaf, S. M. (2021). Peran Pasuruan Industrial Estate Rembang (PIER) terhadap kehidupan masyarakat (sosial-ekonomi) Desa Mojoparon Kecamatan Rembang Kabupaten Pasuruan. Jurnal Integrasi dan Harmoni Inovatif Ilmu-Ilmu Sosial (JIHI3S), 1(3), 285–292. https://doi.org/10.17977/um063v1i3p285-292

Badan Pusat Statistik. (2021). Indeks Pembangunan Manusia 2020. Jakarta: BPS RI.https://www.bps.go.id/publication/2021/04/30/8e777ce2d7570ced44197a37/indeks-pembangunan-manusia-2020.html

Badan Pusat Statistik Provinsi Jawa Timur (2024). Produk Domestik Regional Bruto Kabupaten Kota Jawa Timur Menurut Lapangan Usaha 2019-2023. https://jatim.bps.go.id/id/publication/2024/04/04/b77cd7c06d708092619550d09/produk-domestik-regional-bruto-kabupaten-kota-jawa-timur-menurut-lapangan-usaha-2019-2023.html

Badan Pusat Statistik Provinsi Jawa Timur (2024). Produk Domestik Regional Bruto Provinsi Jawa Timur Menurut Lapangan Usaha 2019-2023. https://jatim.bps.go.id/id/publication/2024/04/04/7e487b04ddf87919167c80dc/produk-domestik-regional-bruto-provinsi-jawa-timur-menurut-lapangan-usaha-2019-2023.html

Badan Pusat Statistik Provinsi Jawa Timur (2024). Persentase Penduduk Miskin Menurut Kabupaten/Kota di Jawa Timur (Persen).

https://jatim.bps.go.id/id/statistics-table/2/NDk3IzI=/persentase-penduduk-miskin-menurutkabupaten-kota-di-jawa-timur.html

Badan Pusat Statistik Provinsi Jawa Timur. (2024). Direktori Industri Manufaktur Provinsi Jawa Timur 2024. https://jatim.bps.go.id/id/publication/2024/12/20/17bf1b464dad4c2c1c61559d/direktori-industri-manufaktur-provinsi-jawa-timur-2024.html

Badan Pusat Statistik Provinsi Jawa Timur (2023). Indeks Pembangunan Manusia Menurut Kebupaten/Kota. https://jatim.bps.go.id/id/statistics-table/2/MzYjMg==/indeks-pembangunan-manusia-menurut-kebupaten-kota.html

Badan Pusat Statistik Kabupaten Probolinggo (2024). Upah Minimum Kabupaten/Kota di Jawa Timur (Rupiah). https://probolinggokab.bps.go.id/id/statistics-table/2/Mjg4IzI=/upah-minimum-kabupaten-kota-di-jawa-timur

Badan Pusat Statistik Provinsi Jawa Timur (2024). Tingkat Pengangguran Terbuka (TPT) Menurut Kabupaten/Kota (Persen). https://jatim.bps.go.id/id/statistics-table/2/NTQjMg==/tingkat pengangguran-terbuka-tpt-provinsi-jawa-timur.html

Becker, G. S. (1993). Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis with Special Reference to Education (3rd ed.). University of Chicago Press.

Cahyanti, M. M., & Anjaningrum, W. D. (2018). Faktor-Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Perkembangan Usaha Kecil Sektor Industri Pengolahan Di Kota Malang. Jurnal Ilmiah Bisnis Dan Ekonomi Asia, 11(2), 73–79. https://doi.org/10.32812/jibeka.v11i2.50

Dagume, M. A. (2021). FACTORS INFLUENCING POVERTY IN SOUTH AFRICA: TIME SERIES ANALYSIS. International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues, 11(5), 86–95. https://doi.org/10.32479/ijefi.11629

Devanto Shasta Pratomo, & Putu Mahardika Adi Saputra. (2011). KEBIJAKAN UPAH MINIMUM UNTUK PEREKONOMIAN YANG BERKEADILAN: TINJAUAN UUD 1945. Fakultas Ekonomi & Bisnis Universitas Brawijaya, 5(2), 269–285. https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.jiae.2011.005.02.3

Dharmmayukti, B., Rotinsulu, T. O., & Niode, A. O. (2021). Analisis Pengaruh Inflasi dan Indeks Pembangunan Manusia (IPM) Terhadap Tingkat Kemiskinan di Kota Manado 2004-2019. Jurnal Berkala Ilmiah Efisiensi, 21(05), 98–105.

Djohanputro, B. (2019). Manajemen risiko korporat terintegrasi (Vol. 8). In (S. F. Manalu, Ed.) Jakarta: PPM Manajemen. Penerbit PPM.

Elmawati, E., & Suparta, I. K. (2025). Pengaruh Pengangguran, IPM, dan Pertumbuhan Industri terhadap Kemiskinan di Provinsi Jawa Timur. Jurnal Ilmu Ekonomi dan Pembangunan, 23(1), 51–58.

Firmansah, R., Rizal, M., & Novianto, A. S. (2023). Pengaruh kesehatan, upah minimum, dan pendidikan terhadap kemiskinan di Jawa Timur 2020–2022. E–Jurnal Riset Manajemen, 12(2), 564–576.

Gujarati, D. N., & Porter, D. C. (2009). Bassic Econometrics. In Introductory Econometrics: A Practical Approach (5th ed.). Douglas Reine.

Haughton, J. H., & Khandker, K. (2009). Handbook on Poverty and Inequality (World Bank Training Series). World Bank Publications. World Bank Publications.

Ishak, R. A., Zakaria, J., & Arifin, M. (2020). Pengaruh Pertumbuhan Ekonomi, Pendidikan dan Pengangguran Terhadap Tingkat Kemiskinan di Kota Makassar.

PARADOKS: Jurnal Ilmu Ekonomi, 3(2), 41–53. https://doi.org/10.33096/paradoks.v3i2.463

Irawan, D., & Yusuf, A. A. (2022). Pengaruh Pengangguran dan Kualitas Pekerjaan terhadap Kemiskinan di Indonesia. Jurnal Ekonomi dan Pembangunan, 30(1), 12–25.

Irmansyah, M. (2024). Analisis sektor unggulan yang ada di Kabupaten Mojokerto Jawa Timur. JDEP (Jurnal Dinamika Ekonomi Pembangunan), 2(1), 7–13. https://doi.org/10.33005/jdep.v2i1.86

Junari, T., Rustiadi, E., & Mulatsih, S. (2020). Identifikasi Sektor Industri Pengolahan Unggulan Propinsi Jawa Timur (Analisis Input Output). Tataloka, 22(3), 308–320. https://doi.org/10.14710/tataloka.22.3.308-320

Kalsum, U. (2017). PENGARUH PENGANGGURAN DAN INFLASI TERHADAP PERTUMBUHAN EKONOMI DI SUMATERA UTARA. Jurnal Ilmu Ekonomi dan Studi Pembangunan, 17 (1), hal. 87-94.

Kirana, V., & Wijaya, H. B. (2014). Analisis Keterkaitan Peran Bkm Terhadap Modal Sosial Dalam Pelaksanaan Plp-Bk Di Kelurahan Pati Lor. Teknik PWK (Perencanaan Wilayah Kota), 3(3), 359–370.

Kotler, P., Keller, K. L., & Chernev, A. (2022). Marketing Management (16th Edition). Pearson Education. (16th ed.). Pearson Education.

Kuncoro, M. (1997). Ekonomi Pembangunan, Teori, Masalah, dan Kebijakan. Edisi Ketiga, Penerbit UPP AMP YKPN. Yogayakarta

Kusumo, B. H. (2022). Analisis Pengaruh Pertumbuhan Ekonomi, Tingkat Pengangguran, Pendidikan dan Upah Minimum Kabupaten (UMK) Terhadap Kemiskinan Provinsi Jawa Tengah. Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa FEB Universitas Brawijaya, 10(2), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1234/jppd.v1i2.56789

Loveman, G., & Sengenberger, W. (1991). The re-emergence of small-scale production: an international comparison. Small Business Economics, 1, 1–37.

Lambot, F. M. (2023). Pengaruh pertumbuhan ekonomi, pengangguran, dan indeks pembangunan manusia terhadap kemiskinan di Kabupaten Kepulauan Talaud (Skripsi, Universitas Sam Ratulangi). Institutional Repository Universitas Sam Ratulangi.

Lewis, W. A. (1954), Economic Development with Unlimited Supplies of Labour, The Manchester School.

Mahaesa, R., & Huda, S. (2022). Potensi Sektor Unggulan Kabupaten Pasuruan dan Kabupaten Mojokerto. Jurnal Dinamika Ekonomi Pembangunan, 5(1), 36–45. https://doi.org/10.33005/jdep.v5i1.314

Mandey, D. R., Engka, D. S. M., & Siwu, H. F. D. (2023). Analisis Pengaruh Produk Domestik Regional Bruto, Rata-Rata Lama Sekolah, Dan Indeks Pembangunan Manusia Terhadap Kemiskinan di Kabupaten Kepulauan Talaud. Jurnal Berkala Ilmiah Efisiensi, 23(1), 37–48.

Mankiw, N. G. (2007). Makroekonomi (cet (Ke-6), Trans.). Erlangga.

Marito, C., Nisa, F., Pardede, N. N., Erza, D. S. D. Y., Sinaga, D., Hidayat, N., & Suharianto, J. (2023). Analisis Tingkat Pengangguran Terbuka, Human Capital Dan Jumlah Penduduk Terhadap Kemiskinan di Sumatera Utara. Jurnal Dinamika Sosial Budaya, 25(2), 287. https://doi.org/10.26623/jdsb.v25i4.7943

Michael P. dan Smith, S. T. (2011). Pembangunan Ekonomi (11th ed.). Penerbit Erlangga.
Muhammad Akbar Perdana, Alviolita Tri Amanda, & Muhammad Yasin. (2023). Pengaruh Industri Pengolahan Terhadap Pertumbuhan Ekonomi di Jawa Timur. Student Research Journal, 1(3), 337–348. https://doi.org/10.55606/srjyappi.v1i3.343
Mukhtar, S., Saptono, A., & Arifin, A. S. (2019). The Analysis of The Effects Of Human Development Index And Opened Unemployment Levels To The Poverty In Indonesia. Ecoplan: Journal of Economics and Development Studies, 2(2), 77–89.
Niara, A., & Zulfa, A. (2019). Pengaruh Kontribusi Sektor Pertanian dan Industri Terhadap Kemiskinan Di Kabupaten Aceh Utara. Jurnal Ekonomi Regional Unimal, 2(1), 28–36. http://ojs.unimal.ac.id/index.php/ekonomi_regional
Ningrum, P. N. C., & Indrajaya, I. G. B. (2018). Pengaruh Pendidikan, Penanaman Modal Asing, dan Tenaga Kerja terhadap Pertumbuhan Ekonomi di Provinsi Bali. E-Jurnal EP Unud, 7(2), 230–259.
Nur, I., & Rakhman, M. T. (2019). ANALISIS PDRB SEKTOR EKONOMI UNGGULAN PROVINSI DKI JAKARTA. Indonesian Treasury Review Jurnal Perbendaharaan Keuangan Negara Dan Kebijakan Publik, 4(4), 351–370. https://doi.org/10.33105/itrev.v4i4.132
Nuriyah, siti R., Muafiqie, H., & Junaedi, J. (2017). Analisis Pengaruh Produk Domestik Regional Bruto (PDRB) Dan Kemiskinan Terhadap Indeks pembangunan manusia di kabupaten bojonegoro. Journal of Public Power, 97–109.
Okta Ryan Pranata Yudha Pembangunan, J. E., Ekonomi, F., & Semarang, U. N. (2013). Pengaruh pertumbuhan ekonomi, upah minimum, tingkat pengangguran terbuka, dan inflasi terhadap kemiskinan di indonesia tahun 2009-2011. In Pengaruh Pertumbuhan Ekonomi, Upah Minimum, Tingkat Pengangguran Terbuka Dan Inflasi Terhadap Kemiskinan di Indonesia Tahun 2009-2011, 91.
Oktaviana, D., Primandhana, W. P., & Wahed, M. (2021). Analisis pengaruh pertumbuhan ekonomi, upah minimum kabupaten, dan pengangguran terhadap kemiskinan di Kabupaten Madiun. Syntax Idea, 3(5), 1035–1049. https://doi.org/10.36418/syntax-idea.v3i5.1183
Palaneven, T. O. M., Walengwangko, E. N., & Sumual, J. I. (2018). Pengaruh Pengeluaran Pemerintah Sektor Pendidikan Dan Sektor Kesehatan Terhadap Ipm Dan Dampaknya Terhadap Kemiskinan di Sulawesi Utara. Jurnal Berkala Ilmiah Efisiensi, 18(4), 56.
Paramita, A. A. I. D., & Purbadharmaja, I. B. P. (2015). Pengaruh investasi dan pengangguran terhadap pertumbuhan ekonomi serta kemiskinan di Provinsi Bali. E-Jurnal EP Unud, 4(10), 1194–1218.
Purnama, N. I. (2017). Analisis Pengaruh Pertumbuhan Ekonomi Terhadap Tingkat Kemiskinan Di Sumatera Utara. EKONOMIKAWAN: Jurnal Ilmu Ekonomi Dan Studi Pembangunan, 17(1), 62–70. https://doi.org/10.30596/ekonomikawan.v17i1.1181
Purnomo, S. D. (2021). Analysis of Labor Absorption in Central Java Province. Ekonomis: Journal of Economics and Business, 5(1), 240. https://doi.org/10.33087/ekonomis.v5i1.311
Putra, R. A., Nasution, M. A., & Suriadi, A. (2021). Analisis Peranan Dinas Perindustrian Dan Perdagangan Dalam Pengembangan Industri Kecil di Kota Medan.

GOVERNANCE: Jurnal Ilmiah Kajian Politik Lokal Dan Pembangunan, 8(1). https://doi.org/10.56015/governance.v8i1.32

Rahman, I. F. (2019). Analisis Pengaruh Industri Besar Dan Sedang, Pendidikan, Dan Migrasi Terhadap Pengentasan Kemiskinan Di Kabupaten Gresik 2013-2017. In Jurnal Ilmiah. Jurnal Ilmiah Fakultas Ekonomi dan Bisnis Universitas Brawijaya.

Ramdhani, N., Anggraeni, Y., & Desmawan, D. (2022). Analisis Pengaruh Indeks Pembangunan Manusia (Ipm) Terhadap Kemiskinan Di Provinsi Dki Jakarta. Jurnal Ekonomi, Bisnis Dan Manajemen, 1(2), 136–144. https://journal.unimar-amni.ac.id/index.php/EBISMEN/article/view/79

Rezzylina D. A., Fardana, A. A., & Yasin, M. (2023). Sektor industri pengelompokkan dan perusahaan negara di Kecamatan Ngoro Kabupaten Mojokerto. Jurnal Ekonomi, Bisnis dan Manajemen, 2(2), 205–212. https://doi.org/10.58192/ebismen.v2i2.834

Ristika, E. D., Primandhana, W. P., & Wahed, M. (2021). Analisis Pengaruh Jumlah Penduduk, Tingkat Pengangguran Terbuka Dan Indeks Pembangunan Manusia Terhadap Tingkat Kemiskinan Di Provinsi Jawa Timur. Eksis: Jurnal Ilmiah Ekonomi Dan Bisnis, 12(2), 129. https://doi.org/10.33087/eksis.v12i2.254

Rohmat, N., & Indrawati, L. R. (2022). Pengaruh Sektor Pertanian, Industri Pengolahan, Dan Pariwisata Terhadap Kemiskinan di Jawa Tengah Tahun 2016-2020. Jurnal Jendela Inovasi Daerah, 5(1), 71–87. https://doi.org/10.56354/jendelainovasi.v5i1.111

Riyandini, S. (2024). Analisis pengaruh IPM, upah minimum, TPT dan bantuan sosial terhadap tingkat kemiskinan di Provinsi Jawa Timur tahun 2017–2022. Journal of Development Economic and Social Studies, 3(4), 1270–1285. https://doi.org/10.21776/jdess.2024.03.4.23

Safitri, R., Baihaqi, J., & Supriyadi, S. (2020). Pengaruh Upah Minimum Kabupaten/Kota (UMK) dan Pembangunan Manusia Berbasis Maqashid Syariah terhadap Jumlah Kemiskinan di Kabupaten Grobogan Jawa Tengah. Iqtishoduna, 16(1), 39–58. https://doi.org/10.18860/iq.v16i1.7498

Safuridar, & Putri, N. I. (2019). Pengaruh Indeks Pembangunan Manusia, Pengangguran dan Jumlah Penduduk 34. Jurnal Samudra Ekonomika, 3(1), 1–13.

Sugiyono (2017). Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D. Bandung: Alfabeta.

Sukirno. (1997). Pembangunan Ekonomi: Teori, Masalah, dan Kebijakan (Edisi Keempat). Jakarta: PT Raja Grafindo Persada.

Sartika, C., Balaka, My., Aya Rumbia, W., Jurusan Ilmu Ekonomi Universitas Halu Oleo, M., & Pengajar, S. (2016). Studi Faktor-Faktor Penyebab Kemiskinan Masyarakat Desa Lohia Kecamatan Lohia Kabupaten Muna. Jurnal Ekonomi (JE), 1(1), 106–118. http://ojs.uho.ac.id/index.php/JE

Sayifullah, S., & Gandasari, T. R. (2016). PENGARUH INDEKS PEMBANGUNAN MANUSIA DAN PENGANGGURAN TERHADAP KEMISKINAN DI PROVINSI BANTEN. Jurnal Ekonomi-Qu, 6(2). https://doi.org/10.35448/jequ.v6i2.4345

Suripto, & Subayil, L. (2020). Pengaruh Tingkat Pendidkan, Pengangguran, Pertumbuhan Ekonomi Dan Indeks Pembangunan Manusia Terhadap Kemiskinan Di D.I.Yogyakarta Priode 2010-2017. Jurnal Ilmiah Ekonomi Pembangunan, 1(2), 127.

Smith, A. (1759). The Theory of the Moral Sentiments. In Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books (pp. 1–508).

Solikatun, S., Masruroh, Y., & Zuber, A. (2018). Kemiskinan Dalam Pembangunan. Jurnal Analisa Sosiologi, 3(1), 70–90. https://doi.org/10.20961/jas.v3i1.17450

Sonny Sumarsono. (2009). Teori dan Kebijakan Publik Ekonomi Sumber Daya Manusia.

Sugiyono. (2014). Metode penelitian bisnis: pendekatan kuantitatif, kualitatif, kombinasi, dan R&D. Alfabeta.

Sukirno. (2008). Pembangunan Ekonomi: Teori, Masalah, dan Kebijakan (Edisi Keempat. PT Raja Grafindo Persada.

Sumarsono, S. (2003). Ekonomi Manajemen Sumberdaya Manusia dan Ketenagakerjaan.

Suryawati, C. (2005). Memahami Kemiskinan Secara Multidimensional. Jmpk, 08(03), 121–129.

Syahputri, R. K. R., & Fisabilillah, L. W. P. (2023). Pengaruh pengangguran, upah minimum, dan PDRB terhadap kemiskinan di Provinsi Jawa Timur. Fakultas Ekonomika dan Bisnis, Universitas Negeri Surabaya.

Tjandra, S., & dkk. (2007). Advokasi Pengupahan Di Daerah. TURC.

Todaro, M. P., & Smith, S. C. (2015). Economic Development (12th ed.). Pearson Education.

Todaro, M. P. (1998). Pembangunan ekonomi: di dunia ketiga = Economic development. Erlangga.

Vania Grace Sianturi, M. Syafii, & Ahmad Albar Tanjung. (2021). Analisis Determinasi Kemiskinan di Indonesia Studi Kasus (2016-2019). Jurnal Samudra Ekonomika, 5(2), 125–133. https://doi.org/10.33059/jse.v5i2.4270

Widyawati, D., & Muchlisoh, S. (2020). Seminar Nasional Official Statistics 2020: Statistics in the New Normal: A Challenge of Big Data and Official Statistics PENERAPAN METODE ELL-COUNTERFACTUAL UNTUK PEMETAAN KEMISKINAN LEVEL KECAMATAN DAN DESA/KELURAHAN Studi Kasus di Kota Yogyakarta Tahun 2018 (The Application of ELL-Counterfactual Method for Poverty Mapping at Sub-District and Village Level: Case Study in Kota Yogyakarta 2018).

Wooldridge, J. M. (2013). Introductory Econometrics: A Modern Approach (5th ed.). South-Western Cengage Learning.

Yunus, M. (2007). Creating a world without poverty: Social business and the future of capitalism. Public Affairs.

Zahra, A., & Ramayani Yusuf. (2024). Pengaruh Budaya Organisasi Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Pada PT. X. Jurnal Manajemen Dan Pemasaran (JUMPER), 3(1), 110–123. https://doi.org/10.51771/jumper.v3i1.1009