Analysis determinant of poverty in the Barlingmascakeb regionalization: A panel data analysis

Muhammad Fahrur Rozi*
Faculty of Economics and Business, Diponegoro University, Indonesia

*) Corresponding Author (e-mail: rurzie04@gmail.com)

Abstract

This study aims to examine the impact of Economic Growth, Open Unemployment Rate, Regional Minimum Wage, and Human Development Index on poverty levels within the Barlingmascakeb Region (Banjarnegara, Purbalingga, Banyumas, Cilacap, and Kebumen) during the period 2019–2023. A quantitative approach is employed using panel data regression analysis with the Fixed Effect Model (FEM). The study relies on secondary data sourced from the Central Bureau of Statistics of Indonesia. The findings reveal that collectively, the independent variables significantly influence the dependent variable. However, in partial analysis, Economic Growth and Unemployment exhibit a positive but statistically insignificant effect on poverty. In contrast, the Regional Minimum Wage has a positive and significant influence on poverty levels. Meanwhile, the Human Development Index demonstrates a significant negative effect on poverty. Additionally, the coefficient of determination test indicates that the independent variables collectively account for a substantial proportion of the variation in poverty levels. The integration of local cultural elements into visual design aims to strengthen students' cultural literacy, as recommended in local wisdom-based learning.

Keywords: Poverty, Human Development Index, Economic Growth.

Abstrak

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengkaji pengaruh Pertumbuhan Ekonomi, Tingkat Pengangguran Terbuka, Upah Minimum Regional, dan Indeks Pembangunan Manusia terhadap tingkat kemiskinan di wilayah Regionalisasi Barlingmascakeb (Banjarnegara, Purbalingga, Banyumas, Cilacap, dan Kebumen) selama periode 2019–2023. Pendekatan yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini adalah pendekatan kuantitatif dengan metode analisis regresi data panel menggunakan Fixed Effect Model (FEM). Data yang digunakan merupakan data sekunder yang diperoleh dari Badan Pusat Statistik Indonesia. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa secara simultan, variabel independen berpengaruh signifikan terhadap variabel dependen. Secara parsial, Pertumbuhan Ekonomi dan Pengangguran berpengaruh positif namun tidak signifikan terhadap tingkat kemiskinan. Sebaliknya, Upah Minimum Regional berpengaruh positif dan signifikan, sedangkan Indeks Pembangunan Manusia berpengaruh negatif signifikan terhadap tingkat kemiskinan. Selain itu, hasil uji koefisien determinasi menunjukkan bahwa variabel independen secara keseluruhan memberikan pengaruh yang sangat besar terhadap variasi tingkat kemiskinan.

Kata kunci: Kemiskinan, IPM, Pengangguran, Pertumbuhan Ekonomi.

1. Introduction

Economic growth is frequently utilized as a primary benchmark to evaluate the success of national development. However, empirical evidence indicates that a high rate of economic growth does not always correlate with enhancements in socio-economic conditions. In many cases, it is accompanied by rising poverty, unemployment, income inequality, and other structural disparities (Nurafni et al., 2021). Kuznets highlighted a strong link between economic growth and poverty, noting that in the early stages of development, poverty often increases due to the concentration of income in large-scale, development focused sectors. Over time, however, poverty levels are expected to decline gradually. As such, the effectiveness of economic development is better measured by a country's ability to reduce poverty, social inequality, and structural injustices.

Poverty is defined as the inability of individuals or communities to meet minimum living standards, particularly concerning income and consumption (Todaro & Smith, 2015). According to Arsyad, (2010), poverty is a multidimensional issue that encompasses basic human needs. Its primary dimensions include limited asset ownership, low education, and inadequate skills, while secondary dimensions involve restricted access to social networks, financial resources, and information. At a marco level, this is reflected in low per capita income that fails to fulfill basic individual needs.

As a multidimensional challenge, poverty spans across sectors, regions, and generations, thus requiring an integrated, comprehensive, and sustainable approach to resolve. Todaro and Smith (2015), argue that poverty primarily stems from individual limitations, particularly restricted access to education, healthcare, and employment opportunities. Consequently, poverty reduction demands the design of development programs tailored to the actual needs of the poor and backed by strong political will (Wahyudi & Rejekingsih, 2013).

In Indonesia, poverty remains a structural issue that demands serious attention, given the significant number of people still living below the poverty line. This is underscored in the 2020–2025 National Medium Term Development Plan (RPJMN), which prioritizes poverty reduction and the gradual fulfillment of basic rights for the poor. Aligned with global commitments outlined in the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), specifically Goal 1: "End poverty in all its forms everywhere" the Indonesian government has demonstrated a strong commitment to combating poverty, achieving notable progress over time.

According to data from BPS Statistics Indonesia (2021), the highest concentration of poverty in Indonesia remains on the island of Java, accounting for 50% of the nation's total poor population. Central Java Province, the focus of this study, ranks second in terms of poverty levels on the island, following the Special Region of Yogyakarta. In 2015, Central Java even recorded the highest poverty rate in the region.

In 2014, Central Java's poverty rate stood at 13.58%, decreasing to 10.8% by 2019. However, this figure rose to 11.41% in 2020 due to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. These fluctuations reflect that while poverty alleviation initiatives have had

positive effects, the poverty rate in Central Java remains above the national average. This progress aligns with the policy direction set out in the 2018–2023 Central Java Provincial Medium Term Development Plan (RPJMD), which identifies poverty reduction as a key priority to promote inclusive economic growth. For effective implementation, the provincial government has divided the administrative area into eight regional zones, including the Barlingmascakeb area comprising Banjarnegara, Purbalingga, Banyumas, Cilacap, and Kebumen Regencies.

Table 1. Percentage of Poor Population in Central Java (10 poorest districts) 2015-2023 (in percent)

No	Region	Poverty, Percentage of poor population (percent)									
		2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Average
1	JATENG	13.6	13.6	13.3	13	11.3	10.8	11.79	10.93	11.4	12.1911
2	Cilacap	14.2	14.4	14.1	13.9	11.3	10.7	11.67	11.02	11.5	12.5322
3	Banyumas	17.7	17.5	17.2	17.1	13.5	12.5	13.66	12.84	13.3	15.0333
4	Purbalingga	19.7	19.7	19	18.8	15.6	15	16.24	15.3	15.9	17.2489
5	Banjarnegara	17.8	18.4	17.5	17.2	15.5	14.8	16.23	15.2	15.6	16.47
6	Kebumen	20.5	20.4	19.9	19.6	17.5	16.8	17.83	16.41	17.6	18.5044
7	Purworejo	14.4	14.3	13.9	13.8	11.6	11.5	12.4	11.53	11.8	12.8033
8	Wonosobo	21.4	21.5	20.5	20.3	17.6	16.6	17.67	16.17	17.6	18.8156
9	Klaten	14.6	14.9	14.5	14.2	13	12.3	13.49	12.33	12.9	13.58
10	Sragen	14.9	14.8	14.4	14	13.1	12.8	13.83	12.94	13.4	13.7967
11	Rembang	19.5	19.3	18.5	18.4	15.4	15	15.8	14.65	15.6	16.9056

Source : (Badan Pusat Statistik Kota Surakarta, 2025)

According to the data presented in Table 1, over the past nine years, Wonosobo Regency has consistently recorded the highest poverty rate in Central Java Province. Following Wonosobo, the highest poverty levels were successively found in the regencies of Banyumas, Purbalingga, Banjarnegara, Cilacap, and Kebumen. These regencies, which together form the Barlingmascakeb regional area, are recognized as the zones with the highest poverty rates in the province, with most of them exceeding both the provincial and national poverty averages. An exception is Cilacap Regency, which, despite being part of this regional cluster, reported a poverty rate of 12.5% slightly above the Central Java average of 12.1%.

Poverty today is no longer interpreted merely as a condition of economic inability, but rather as a manifestation of failure to fulfill basic rights and unequal treatment of individuals and groups in living life. The phenomenon of poverty is influenced by a number of interrelated determinants, including income level, unemployment rate, health conditions, access and quality of education, availability of goods and services, geographic factors, gender disparities, and characteristics of the residential environment.

Inclusive growth, as described by Todaro and Smith (2015), refers to a development strategy that emphasizes job creation, poverty reduction, and equitable distribution of development outcomes so that all societal groups can benefit. According to Lestari et al. (2021) one effective way to lower poverty is by increasing real Gross Regional Domestic Product (GRDP). However, research by Syaifullah and Malik (2017) highlights that a high GRDP growth rate has not always translated into effective long-term development, particularly regarding poverty alleviation. This is largely due to the

uneven distribution of growth benefits, which are not felt by all segments of the population. Consistent with this, Wahyudi and Rejekingsih (2013) in their study on poverty in Central Java, emphasize that while economic growth can help reduce poverty, the benefits must be evenly distributed to truly improve societal welfare.

Sharp suggests that the roots of poverty from an economic perspective lie in several main causes (Kuncoro, 2010). At the micro level, poverty is driven by unequal ownership of resources. Additionally, disparities in the quality of human capital deepen economic inequality. Finally, limited access to infrastructure and financial resources constrains opportunities for improving living standards. These factors contribute to a vicious cycle of poverty, where underdevelopment, market inefficiencies, and capital shortages result in low productivity, which then suppresses income, savings, and investment, thereby reinforcing poverty.

In Indonesia, one major contributor to persistent poverty is the lack of adequate employment opportunities, which elevates the unemployment rate. Sukirno (2015) notes that income levels are a key determinant of welfare, and optimal income can only be achieved when labor utilization reaches full employment. Ningrum (2017) in a study on the effects of unemployment, HDI, and minimum wage on poverty, found a positive correlation between unemployment and poverty, individuals without jobs often struggle to meet their basic needs.

Over the past decade, Cilacap Regency has recorded an average open unemployment rate of 7.62 percent, the highest among areas in the Barlingmascakeb regional area. This means that out of every 100 workers, around 8 people are unemployed. In contrast, other regencies in the same regionalization, such as Banjarnegara, Purbalingga, Banyumas, and Kebumen, show relatively lower open unemployment rates, ranging from 4 to 5 percent. In aggregate, the unemployment rate in the Barlingmascakeb area experienced a significant increase in 2020. This increase is closely correlated with the economic crisis due to the COVID-19 pandemic, which triggered the closure of a number of industries and a wave of layoffs (PHK) in various sectors.

Research Aprilia (2016) found that unemployment is also affected by the level of the minimum wage, which serves as a benchmark for employers when compensating workers (Utami, 2018). Minimum wage policies aim to ensure that workers can meet minimum living standards over time. However, theoretically, increases in minimum wages may reduce labor demand, thereby increasing unemployment, and vice versa. Romi and Umiyati (2018), in their research on Jambi City, argue that minimum wage increases do not directly reduce poverty due to simultaneous increases in the cost of living, which require wage adjustments to maintain workers' welfare.

Supporting this view, Sutikno et al. (2019) found in North Sulawesi that higher minimum wages were associated with increased poverty levels, as businesses facing higher labor costs often reduced their workforce, particularly unskilled labor by adopting labor saving technologies. Conversely, Prasetyoningrum and Sukmawati (2018) observed that in highly industrialized regions, minimum wage changes did not

significantly affect poverty. instead, the key factor was human resource quality. Skilled workers tend to be more productive and innovative, which enhances their incomegenerating potential.

Human capital quality plays a crucial role in reducing unemployment and poverty. Sayifullah and Gandasari (2016) in a study on Banten Province, found that improvements in the Human Development Index (HDI) significantly reduced unemployment. This indicates that better education and healthcare access can improve individual competitiveness and overall economic conditions. Todaro and Smith (2015), likewise stress the role of inclusive development, where economic growth is accompanied by improved human well-being. HDI, which measures life expectancy, educational attainment, and standard of living, serves as a key indicator of quality of life.

Between 2011 and 2020, the Barlingmascakeb region experienced a consistent increase in HDI, ranging between 60% and 70%. Nevertheless, the region's HDI remained below the provincial average. Dewi et al. (2017) found that poverty significantly influences HDI, as those living in poverty often lack access to education and health services, limiting their capacity to engage in productive economic activities. From a Human Capital Theory perspective by Solow-Swan, people are vital inputs in the production process (Kheng et al., 2017). Enhancing human capital, especially through education can improve technological adoption and innovation, boosting productivity. Likewise, better health strengthens individual independence and active participation in development efforts.

Poverty occurs due to the failure to fulfill basic rights manifested in limited access to needs such as food, health care, quality education, employment opportunities, decent housing, clean water, a safe environment and adequate income, therefore this study emphasizes socio-economic variables to analyze the relationship of poverty. This study analyzes poverty based on regionalization which is still limited from previous research and only use 5 years of data to highlight the variables that influence poverty during covid 19. By lifting certain regions, this study shows the existence of unique patterns and determinants of poverty, different from national trends.

In conclusion, the Barlingmascakeb region has consistently recorded higher poverty levels than other development areas in Central Java over the past decade. This highlights the need for further research on the determinants of poverty in the Barlingmascakeb region during the 2019–2023 period, focusing on GRDP, open unemployment rate (TPT), minimum wages (UMK), and Human Development Index (HDI).

2. Research Method

This study employs panel data regression analysis covering the period from 2019 to 2023. The analysis incorporates four independent variables: Economic Growth, Unemployment, Minimum Wage, and the Human Development Index (HDI), while the dependent variable is Poverty. The research focuses on the Barlingmascakeb regional

area, which comprises five regencies: Banjarnegara, Purbalingga, Banyumas, Cilacap, and Kebumen. The basic functional equation model used in this study is as follows:

$$P = f(GRDP, U, Wage, HDI)$$

Drawing from the previous discussion, the econometric equation utilized in this research is structured as follows:

$$P_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 GRDP_{it} + \beta_2 U_{it} + \beta_3 Wage_{it} + \beta_4 HDI_{it} + \varepsilon_{it}$$

Variable definitions:

P = Poverty (percent)
GRDP = Economic growth (ADHK GRDP rate in percent)
U = Open Unemployment Rate (percent)
Wage = District Minimum Wage (million rupiah)
HDI = Human Development Index (index)
i = unit cross-section
t = waktu
ε = error term

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Results

Regression Analysis Results

Table 2. Fixed Effect Model (FEM) Regression Results

Variable	Coefficient	t- Statistic	P-Value
C	-55.54503	-1.871115	0.0810
GRDP	0.048794	2.032926	0.0602
U	0.224603	1.822719	0.0883
LOGWage	11.72945	3.641488	0.0024
HDI	-0.014474	-5.237285	0.0001
R square	0.984347		
Adjusted R-squared	0.984347		
Prob (f Statistic)	0.000000		
F-Statistic	181.7923		

The regression analysis indicates that

1. The coefficient for the economic growth variable in relation to poverty in the Barlingmascakeb region is 0.048794. This positive coefficient suggests that a 1 percent increase in economic growth would lead to a 0.048794 percent increase in the poverty rate, assuming ceteris paribus or that other independent variables remain constant. However, with a significance probability value of 0.0602, which exceeds the threshold of α = 0.05, the effect of economic growth on poverty is statistically insignificant.

2. The coefficient for the open unemployment rate variable in relation to poverty in the Barlingmascakeb region is 0.224603. This positive coefficient implies that a 1 percent increase in the unemployment rate is associated with a 0.224 percent rise in poverty, assuming ceteris paribus, or that other independent variables remain constant. However, the probability value of 0.0883 exceeds the 5% significance

level (α = 0.05), indicating that the effect of unemployment on poverty is statistically insignificant.

3. The coefficient for the minimum wage variable in relation to poverty in the Barlingmascakeb region is 1.172945. This positive coefficient suggests that a minimum wage increase of IDR 100,000 would lead to a 1.172 percent rise in the poverty rate, assuming ceteris paribus, or that other independent variables remain constant. With a significance probability of 0.0024, which is below the 5% threshold (α = 0.05), the relationship is statistically significant—indicating that minimum wage has a positive and significant effect on poverty in the region.

4. The coefficient for the Human Development Index (HDI) variable in relation to poverty in the Barlingmascakeb region is -0.014474. This negative coefficient suggests that a one-point increase in the HDI would reduce the poverty rate by approximately 0.014 percent, assuming ceteris paribus—meaning that other independent variables remain constant. With a significance probability of 0.00001, which is well below the 5% level (α = 0.05), the HDI variable exerts a statistically significant and negative influence on poverty in the region.

Simultaneous Test (F Test)

According to the estimation results shown in Table 2, the probability value of the F-statistic is 0.000000, which is below the 5% significance level (α = 0.05). This indicates that, statistically, all independent variables collectively have a significant effect on the dependent variable. Therefore, economic growth, the open unemployment rate, the regional minimum wage, and the Human Development Index (HDI) significantly influence the poverty rate in the Barlingmascakeb regional area when considered simultaneously.

Coefficient of Determination Test

Based on the output results Table 2, it is known that the Adjusted R-square value is 0.984347, which means that 98.4% of poverty in the Barlingmascakeb regionalization is influenced by economic growth, open unemployment rate, district minimum wage, and human development index (HDI), while 1.6% is influenced by variables outside the model.

3.2. Discussion

Economic Growth and Poverty

The results of the regression analysis indicate that economic growth has a positive but insignificant effect on poverty levels in the Barlingmascakeb region. This positive coefficient indicates that increased economic growth has not reduced poverty rates. In fact, it tends to be associated with higher poverty rates, though the effect is not statistically significant.

Economic growth should encourage increased employment opportunities, income, and access to basic services. However, these empirical findings indicate that the growth occurring in Barlingmascakeb is enjoyed primarily by certain groups and high productivity sectors, while the majority of the poor remain dependent on the informal

sector with low incomes. As a result, increased regional output does not directly translate into improved welfare for the poor.

Furthermore, the uneven regional economic structure also contributes to disparities in the distribution of the benefits of growth. Economic growth concentrated in certain regions or sectors is unable to create a significant multiplier effect for the poor. This weakens the relationship between economic growth and poverty reduction. Thus, economic growth without equity has the potential to widen disparities and is ineffective in reducing poverty. These results are consistent with the study by Budhijana (2020), Nabila (2021), which also found no significant relationship between economic growth and poverty reduction. This suggests that the economic growth experienced has not been inclusive or impactful enough to reduce poverty.

Unemployment Rate and Poverty

The estimation results show that the poverty rate has a positive but insignificant effect on the poverty rate in the Barlingmascakeb area. The positive coefficient indicates that increases in poverty tend to be followed by further increases, but the effect is not statistically significant. This weak effect indicates that poverty in Barlingmascakeb is not always synonymous with total income loss, as many unemployed people remain engaged in low productivity informal sector activities. These activities allow them to earn a minimum income to survive, although they have not yet escaped poverty.

Furthermore, government social assistance, family support, and community social networks serve as economic buffers for unemployed households. These mechanisms buffer against increases in poverty, thus weakening the statistical relationship between poverty and poverty. Thus, while unemployment is theoretically an important determinant of poverty, the research results indicate that its influence has not yet emerged significantly in Barlingmascakeb due to the presence of the informal sector and the social protection system, which absorb the economic impact of poverty.

These findings align with research by Dahliah and Nur (2021), Nurdianti and Samsuddin (2024) which also found that unemployment does not have a significant effect on poverty levels. The connection between unemployment and poverty remains relevant, as both relate directly to income and the fulfillment of basic welfare, as emphasized by Todaro and Smith (2015).

Minimum Wage and Poverty

The estimation results show that the minimum wage has a positive and significant effect on poverty levels in the Barlingmascakeb region. This positive coefficient indicates that increases in the minimum wage tend to be followed by increases in poverty. This effect suggests that minimum wage increases do not always lead to poverty reduction, as several economic mechanisms influence this relationship. When labor costs increase, companies tend to reduce the number of workers or shift to more efficient technology, potentially causing some workers to lose their jobs or be forced to move into the low productivity informal sector. Workers in the informal sector can still earn a minimum income to survive, although they have not yet fully escaped poverty.

Furthermore, minimum wage increases also increase production costs for companies, which drives up the prices of goods and services, leading to increased inflation. This inflation reduces the purchasing power of the poor because their income is insufficient to keep up with rising prices for basic necessities. Inequality between the formal and informal sectors also plays a role, workers in the formal sector can escape poverty as wages increase (Gindling & Terrell, 2010), while informal sector workers do not experience an increase, so that the gap between sectors widens and poverty remains high (Campos-Vazquez & Esquivel, 2023; Merdikawati & Izzati, 2025). This finding aligns with research conducted by Alifah and Imaningsih (2023), which also concluded that the minimum wage level has a significant effect on poverty levels in Yogyakarta.

Human Development Index and Poverty

The estimation results show that the Human Development Index (HDI) has a negative and significant effect on poverty levels in the Barlingmascakeb region. This negative coefficient indicates that increases in the HDI tend to be followed by decreases in poverty. This effect suggests that improvements in the quality of human resources not only impact individuals' ability to earn better incomes but also encourage wider access to decent work and basic services, such as education and health, which directly reduce the risk of poverty.

An increase in the HDI is reflected in higher human capital accumulation, including better quality education, improved public health, and higher per capita income(Bloom & Canning, 2003). Progress in these dimensions increases individual productivity, which in turn generates more stable and decent incomes, thus reducing poverty. Furthermore, improvements in the quality of human resources also encourage more inclusive and sustainable economic development, as a more skilled workforce can contribute more effectively to local economic growth. This finding is consistent with research by Rifkah and Nabila (2021), Simarmata and Iskandar (2022), which showed that the HDI has a significant effect on poverty reduction. Thus, improving the quality and availability of human resources is one of the key factors in poverty alleviation efforts in the Barlingmascakeb area.

4. Conclusion

The conclusion must be present throughout the study findings. Writing the conclusion must be simple and concise sentences so easily to be understood by the reader. Accompanied with new understanding/perspective/insight refers to the research results obtained. Economic growth has a positive but insignificant effect on poverty, meaning that an increase in growth tends to raise poverty levels, though not significantly. This is likely due to the early stage, non inclusive nature of growth in Barlingmascakeb, consistent with the inverted U-shape of the Kuznets curve, where poverty rises initially before gradually declining. Similarly, the unemployment rate also has a positive but insignificant impact, indicating that a rise in unemployment only slightly affects poverty.

In contrast, the minimum wage has a significant positive effect on poverty. This may be attributed to mass layoffs during the COVID-19 pandemic, where increased labor costs led companies to reduce their workforce. Meanwhile, the Human Development Index (HDI) shows a significant negative relationship with poverty, suggesting that improvements in education, health, and income levels contribute meaningfully to poverty reduction.

Interestingly, the effects of HDI and minimum wage in this study diverge from conventional economic theory, which typically links both variables to poverty alleviation. This discrepancy can be explained by pandemic related disruptions that limited the effectiveness of human capital development and wage policies. Additionally, the lack of significant effects from economic growth and unemployment on poverty highlights the limitations of these indicators during periods of economic instability, where growth may not be inclusive and unemployment figures may not fully capture labor market realities. One possible cause is non inclusive growth, where the benefits of growth do not reach the poor, or because many workers leave the workforce so that unemployment data does not represent the actual conditions. Thus, the pandemic not only has a direct impact on people's welfare, but also breaks the chain of transmission from macroeconomic variables to social improvement. The policy recommendation for this phenomenon is that the government must provide social assistance so that people can meet basic needs and create jobs when economic conditions stabilize.

The limitation of this study is that the researcher used 5 years to estimate poverty in the Barlingmascakeb Region. This is because the researcher wants to explain poverty when the economy is unstable and it is hoped that further researchers will expand the data in the study and add research variables to capture the problem more deeply.

References

Alifah, K. I., & Imaningsih, N. (2023). Tingkat Pendidikan, Upah Minimum, & Tingkat Pengangguran Tebuka Terhadap Tingkat Kemiskinan Di Provinsi Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta. *Equilibrium : Jurnal Ilmiah Ekonomi, Manajemen Dan Akuntansi*, *12*(1), 1. https://doi.org/10.35906/equili.v12i1.1179

Aprilia, R. D. (2016). Pengaruh Pertumbuhan Ekonomi, Upah Minimum, Pendidikan Dan Tingkat Pengangguran Terhadap Tingkat Kemiskinan (Studi Kasus Kabupaten/Kota di Jawa Timur Tahun 2008-2013). *Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa FEB*, *4*(2), 1–19.

Arsyad, L. (2010). *Ekonomi Pembangunan* (5th ed.). UPP STIM YKPN.

Badan Pusat Statistik Kota Surakarta. (2025). *Persentase Penduduk Miskin Menurut Kabupaten/Kota di Provinsi Jawa Tengah (persen)*. Surakartakota.bps.go.id.

Bloom, D., & Canning, D. (2003). Health As Human Capital And Its Impact On Economic Performance. *The Geneva Papers on Risk and Insurance. Issues and Practice*, *28*(2), 304–315. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0440.00225

BPS-Statistics Indonesia. (2021). *Penghitungan dan Analisis Kemiskinan Makro Indonesia 2021*. Badan Pusat Statistik (BPS) Indonesia.

Budhijana, R. B. (2020). Analisis Pengaruh Pertumbuhan Ekonomi, Index Pembangunan Manusia (IPM) dan Pengangguran Terhadap Tingkat Kemiskinan Di Indonesia Tahun 2000-2017. *Jurnal Ekonomi, Manajemen Dan Perbankan (Journal of Economics, Management and Banking)*, *5*(1), 36. https://doi.org/10.35384/jemp.v5i1.170

Campos-Vazquez, R. M., & Esquivel, G. (2023). The Effect of the Minimum Wage on Poverty: Evidence from a Quasi-Experiment in Mexico. *The Journal of Development Studies*, *59*(3), 360–380. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220388.2022.2130056

Dahliah, D., & Nur, A. N. (2021). The Influence of Unemployment, Human Development Index and Gross Domestic Product on Poverty level. *Golden Ratio of Social Science and Education*, *1*(2), 95–108. https://doi.org/10.52970/grsse.v1i2.84

Dewi, N., Yusuf, Y., & Iyan, R. Y. (2017). Pengaruh Kemiskinan dan Pertumbuhan Ekonomi terhadap Indeks Pembangunan Manusia di Provinsi Riau. *Jurnal Online Mahasiswa Fakultas Ekonomi Universitas Riau*, *4*(1), 870–882.

Gindling, T. H., & Terrell, K. (2010). Minimum Wages, Globalization, and Poverty in Honduras. *World Development*, *38*(6), 908–918. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2010.02.013

Kheng, V., Sun, S., & Anwar, S. (2017). Foreign Direct Investment And Human Capital In Developing Countries: A Panel Data Approach. *Economic Change and Restructuring*, *50*, 341–365. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10644-016-9191-0

Kuncoro, M. (2010). *Masalah, Kebijakan, Dan Politik Ekonomika Pembangunan*. Erlangga.

Lestari, D. W., Sari, P. P., & others. (2021). Analisis pengaruh produk domestik regional bruto (PDRB) terhadap angka kemiskinan di Kabupaten Pemalang tahun 2003-2019. *Unnes Journal of Mathematics*, 1–7.

Merdikawati, N., & Izzati, R. Al. (2025). Minimum Wage Policy and Poverty in Indonesia. *The World Bank Economic Review*, *39*(1), 191–210. https://doi.org/10.1093/wber/lhae022

Nabila, R. (2021). The effect of macroeconomic variables on the poverty rate in Indonesia. *Journal of Economics Research and Policy Studies*, *1*(2), 69–77. https://doi.org/10.53088/jerps.v1i2.87

Ningrum, S. S. (2017). Analisis Pengaruh Tingkat Pengangguran Terbuka, Indeks Pembangunan Manusia, Dan Upah Minimum Terhadap Jumlah Penduduk Miskin Di Indonesia Tahun 2011-2015. *Jurnal Ekonomi Pembangunan*, *15*(2), 184. https://doi.org/10.22219/jep.v15i2.5364

Nurafni, H., R, M. R., & Safri, M. (2021). Analisis determinan kemiskinan dan hubungannya dengan program pengentasannya Kabupaten/Kota di Provinsi Jambi. *Jurnal Paradigma Ekonomika*, *16*(4), 689–704. https://doi.org/10.22437/jpe.v16i4.15367

Nurdianti, L., & Samsuddin, A. (2024). Pengaruh Pertumbuhan Ekonomi, Tingkat Pengangguran, Kesehatan, dan Jumlah Penduduk Terhadap Kemiskinan di Provinsi Kalimantan Barat. *Buletin: Ekonomika Pembangunan*, *5*(1), 70–79. https://doi.org/10.21107/bep.v5i1.25851

Prasetyoningrum, A. K., & Sukmawati, u sulia. (2018). Analisis Pengaruh Indeks Pembangunan Manusia (IPM), Pertumbuhan Ekonomi dan Pengagguran Terhadap Kemiskinan di Indonesia. *Equilibrium: Jurnal Ekonomi Syariah*, 6(2), 217–8316. https://doi.org/10.21043/equilibrium.v6i2.3663

Rifkah, N. R., & Nabila, R. (2021). Analysis of factors that improve welfare in Java Island. *Indonesian Journal of Islamic Economics Research*, 3(1), 15–26. https://doi.org/10.18326/ijier.v3i1.5269

Romi, S., & Umiyati, E. (2018). Pengaruh pertumbuhan ekonomi dan upah minimum terhadap kemiskinan di Kota Jambi. *Perspektif Ekonomi Dan Pembangunan Daerah*, 7(1), 1–7.

Sayifullah, S., & Gandasari, T. R. (2016). Pengaruh Indeks Pembangunan Manusia Dan Pengangguran Terhadap Kemiskinan Di Provinsi Banten. *Jurnal Ekonomi-Qu*, 6(2), 236–255. https://doi.org/10.35448/jequ.v6i2.4345

Simarmata, Y. W., & Iskandar, D. D. (2022). Pengaruh Pengeluaran Pemerintah, Investasi, Jumlah Penduduk, Kemiskinan Terhadap Pertumbuhan Ekonomi Dan Indeks Pembangunan Manusia: Analisa Two Stage Least Square untuk Kasus Indonesia. *Jurnal Dinamika Ekonomi Pembangunan*, 5(1), 78–94. https://doi.org/10.14710/jdep.5.1.78-94

Sukirno, S. (2015). *Makroekonomi : Teori Pengantar*. Rajagrafindo Persada.

Sutikno, R. Y., Rotinsulu, D. C., & Tumangkeng, S. Y. L. (2019). Pengaruh Upah Minimum Dan Investasi Terhadap Kemiskinan Di Provinsi Sulawesi Utara. *Jurnal Berkala Ilmiah Efisiensi*, 19(01).

Syaifullah, A., & Malik, N. (2017). Pengaruh indeks pembangunan manusia dan produk domestik bruto terhadap tingkat kemiskinan di ASEAN-4 (Studi pada 4 negara ASEAN). *Jurnal Ilmu Ekonomi*, 1(1), 107–119. https://doi.org/10.22219/jie.v1i1.6071

Todaro, M. P., & Smith, S. C. (2015). *Economic Development* (Twelfth Ed). Pearson.

Utami, H. W. (2018). Pengaruh Pertumbuhan Ekonomi, Upah Minimum, Tingkat Pengangguran Terbuka Dan Pendidikan Terhadap Jumlah Penduduk Miskin Kabupaten/Kota di Provinsi Jawa Timur Tahun 2008-2013. *EKOSIANA: Jurnal Ekonomi Syari'ah*, 4(01), 11–20. https://doi.org/10.30957/ekosiana.v4i01.41

Wahyudi, D., & Rejekingsih, T. W. (2013). Analisis Kemiskinan Di Jawa Tengah. *Diponegoro Journal of Economics*, 2(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.14710/djoe.1914