# CAUSES OF EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES AND POVERTY IN THE PROVINCE OF WEST NUSA TENGGARA, INDONESIA

Nindya Ayu Angghita
Candra Fajri Ananda
Rachmad Kresna Sakti

## ABSTRACT

*This study aims to examine regional government expenditure, leading sectors, and school participation rates on economic growth that give impacts on employment opportunities and poverty. Regional government expenditure involves direct and indirect expenditure, and the leading sectors in this research measured from agriculture and mining. While the school participation rate is measured by the number of societies who study until Elementary School (SD) level, Junior High School (SMP) level, and Senior High School (SMA) level. The sample of this research is 10 regencies or cities in West Nusa Tenggara during 2010-2017. This research uses multivariate analysis using SPSS program (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences). This research uses three models. The first model analyzes the relationship between regional government expenditure variables, leading sectors, and school participation rates on economic growth. The second and third models analyze their impacts on employment opportunities and poverty rates. The results prove that only the direct and indirect expenditure variable, the agricultural sector, the mining sector, and Senior High School participation affect economic growth, which affect employment opportunities and poverty. While the school participation rates of the Elementary School (SD) level, and at the Junior High School (SMP) level do not affect economic growth. But, it has an impact on employment opportunities and poverty in West Nusa Tenggara. The impact given by the dependent variables on economic growth is greater at the poverty level. This is due to the reduced poverty rate, indicating that the population has had the opportunity to work.*

*Keywords: Employment Opportunities, Poverty, Regional Economy.*

## INTRODUCTION

An area is developed based on the basic principle of regional autonomy. Regions are given the freedom to manage their territories based on the potential of the region, both in terms of natural resources and human resource potential. Each region manages its region to grow greater so, in the end, it will improve the welfare of the community (Agustini and Kurniasih, 2017). Even so, each region has different potential, so each region has the capability to develop differently (Kurniawan, 2005).

West Nusa Tenggara has many potential regionals that consist of mining, agriculture, forest, and tourism which are currently being developed on a large scale. One of West Nusa Tenggara's potentials is mining, which is starting to be considered by both foreign and domestic investors. Based on data from Statistics Indonesia during 2014, the biggest potential of metal mineral materials that has been spreading in West Nusa Tenggara included sulfur, gold, iron sand, irond sand, copper, manganese, lead, and silver. The value of the metal is scattered at several points in the regencies or cities in West Nusa Tenggara.

Besides, food crop commodities also have very good potentials so the livelihoods of most people in West Nusa Tenggara are agriculture. West Nusa Tenggara is known as a region that produces quite high onions with the highest production reaching 89 thousand tons (Bappeda NTB, 2015). West Nusa Tenggara is also the largest tobacco producer in national products and a major supplier to the national cigarette industry. Knowing the quality of the the quality of these natural resources, so it is not surprised if the economic growth in West Nusa Tenggara is dominated by the agriculture and mining sectors. Based on data from Statistics Indonesia in 2017, the contribution of the agricultural sector in West Nusa Tenggara reached 21.97%, and the mining sector reached 19.45%.

Human resources in West Nusa Tenggara are also quite high. When it is viewed from the School Participation Rate (SPR) at the Elementary School (SD), Junior High School (SMP), and Senior High School levels (SMA) for 5 years starting from 2013-2017 in West Nusa Tenggara, it is higher than the national level. West Nusa Tenggara SPR increases from year to year. From 2013 to 2015, the Elementary School level increased from 98.2% to 99.48% and it is continued to increase until 2017. The Junior High School level also continued to increase gradually from 2013 to 2016, from 92.23% to 97.6%. Until 2017, it was quite stable at 97.69%.

Regional government as a public service is also a benchmark of regional economic growth. The government plays an important role as public services suppliers such as infrastructure, public health, and education because the private sector cannot adequately meet the needs of the community. Government intervention will lead to greater economic growth through sectors where market failures occur (Hajamimi and Falahi, 2018).

The West Nusa Tenggara Government during 2013-2017 had allocated 58% of indirect expenditure and 42% of indirect expenditure (Statistics Indonesia Data). The expenditure realization value of the regional government has been optimally allocated every year, even though the proportion of indirect expenditure is larger than direct expenditure.

Although the potential of natural resources, human resources, and regional government expenditure has been maximized, economic growth in West Nusa Tenggara is still very fluctuating. In 2016, West Nusa Tenggara's economic growth reached 5.82%, but in 2017 it was only 0.11. This value is much lower than the national rate that reached 5.07%. The West Nusa Tenggara economy is also much lower when it is compared to the surrounding regions, such as Bali and East Nusa Tenggara.

The fluctuating economic growth also has an impact on the level of employment opportunities that are still low in West Nusa Tenggara. During 2010-2017, the average of employment opportunities rate in West Nusa Tenggara was only 9.5% compared to the national employment opportunities which was 94%. Besides, the poverty rate is also still high in that area. Based on data from Statistics Indonesia in 2017, the poverty rate in West Nusa Tenggara was still high when it was compared to

the national level. The poverty percentage in West Nusa Tenggara was 16.07%, while the national poverty percentage was only 10.12%.

Based on this phenomenon, it can be said that the carrying capacity of natural resources and human resources has not been able to encourage higher economic growth. There are indications that fluctuations on economic growth are caused by government expenditure that is not maximal, so it has an impact on high poverty rates and low employment opportunities in the West Nusa Tenggara region. Based on this explanation, this study aims to know the extent regional government expenditure, leading sectors, and school participation rates that affect economic growth, which will have an impact on the increase of employment opportunities and poverty in the province of West Nusa Tenggara, Indonesia.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### SOURCE OF ECONOMIC GROWTH

Previous researchers show that a successful economy is one that has a high level of accumulation of human capital and physical capital that are balanced with sustainable technological advances (Snowdon and Vane, 2005). The determinants factor of economic growth are shown on outputs which are indirectly influenced by the contribution of labor (Lt), physical capital (Kt), natural resources (Nt), and resources productivity (At). The most important growth resources in the economy are the potential of natural resources and adequate human resources.

According to Adam Smith's classic theory, an increase in production factors can be based on the natural wealth found in a country. This natural wealth includes the extent and fertility of the soil, climate and weather conditions, the number and types of forest products, marine products, the number and various types of mining commodity (Sukirno, 2013: 429). If a country has natural resources that have benefits, then a country's economic growth can be accelerated. A country that lacks natural resources or land will not be able to develop quickly (Syahroni, 2016). According to Sutikno (2006), natural resources have characteristics that are in line with economic growth. The more natural resources, the higher the rate of economic growth and vice versa. This happens if in a successful development, more natural resources can be extracted.

In addition, to see the quality of human resources according to the Endogenous Growth theory, savings and investments can drive sustainable growth, with K (capital) which is assumed more broadly including science. Endogenous Growth Theory explains the factors that determine the magnitude of A is the GDP growth rate that is not explained and considered as an exogenous variable in the Solow Residual calculation. Paul Romer explains three basic elements in endogenous growth, namely technological change that is endogenous through a process of accumulation of knowledge, new ideas from the company as a result of the knowledge spillover, and the production of consumer goods produced by the factors of science production that will grow without limits (Lincolin, 2010)

### REGIONAL GOVERNMENTS EXPENDITURE

Based on Keynes's approach, there is a causal relationship from government expenditure toward economic growth. According to the Keynes's approach, the role of the government in the economy is very important to overcome market failures. Keynes's thoughts put more emphasis on the fiscal policy in which it is a government policy on the purchase of goods or services, transfers, and tax structures. The existence of government intervention in the fiscal policy can increase national income (Ma'ruf and Wihastuti, 2008). To increase economic growth, one of the ways that can be done by underdeveloped regions is increasing regional government expenditure.

Regional government expenditure is the value of spending done by regional governments with the aim of community interests such as the provision of educational facilities, health facilities, salaries for government employees, and infrastructure. Haryanto (2013) argues that regional government expenditure is a form of regional government efforts as a provider of public goods and services to avoid market failures in private investments.

According to Mahmudi (2010: 87) based on its activities, government expenditure is divided into direct expenditure and indirect expenditure. Direct expenditure is a cost that is directly related to government activities or programs in improving community welfare, which includes labor costs which are directly related to the programs, costs of goods and services and capital expenditures. While indirect expenditure is a cost that is not directly related to government programs such as employee training costs, research costs, general administrative costs, and depreciation costs.

### EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

Employment opportunities are the number of employees that can be absorbed in a company or a business. Employment opportunities can be defined as the availability of employment that allows employ to do their productive activities. In general, employment opportunities can be interpreted as a demand for labors (Djunaedi, 2009).

The classical experts argue that in the economy, full employment opportunities will always be reached. This means that unemployment will never occur. Although unemployment can occur, it is only temporary, because the market system will be adjusted so the full employment opportunities will be achieved again (Sukirno, 2000: 18). The existence of a balance between supply and demand for labors is due to economic activities adhering to the free market system. So, based on the Classical theory, there is no need for the government intervention because the market system will work and adjust. The government only needs to support infrastructure and social provisions, as well as regulations that increase the efficiency of the private sector.

### POVERTY

According to Machmud (2016: 281), poverty is the inability to meet a minimum standard of living, measured by consumption. The poverty line based on consumption divided into two elements, namely: (1) expenditures to buy minimum

nutritional standards and other basic needs, and (2) the amount of other various needs that reflect the participation expenses in daily lives.

Economic growth and poverty are important indicators to see the extent of the success achieved by the country. Each country will strive to achieve optimal growth to minimize poverty (Jonaidi, 2012). The high of poverty line in developing countries is often associated with the low economic growth. Growth should be pro with poor residents. Based on this definition, three potential sources of pro-poor growth are (a) a high growth rate of average incomes, (b) a high sensitivity of poverty to growth in average incomes, and (c) a poverty-reducing patterns of growth in relative incomes (Kraay, 2006).

## RESEARCH METHODS

This research uses a quantitative descriptive approach. The quantitative research is an approach that uses ratio data and statistics to answer the research objectives. The sample used in this research is ten regencies or cities in West Nusa Tenggara Province with the determination of the place that was done *purposively* with eight regencies and two cities. The West Nusa Tenggara was chosen because it is an underdeveloped region that has low level of employment opportunities and high poverty rates. This research uses secondary data sources from the Statistics Indonesia.

Then, the data analysis method uses multivariate regression with the merger of multiple regression models. Regression was performed three times with the first model looking at the effect of independent variables on the dependent variables. After the first model regression was performed, it was found the beta coefficient (Y') that was tested for its effect on $Z_1$ and $Z_2$ as seen in model 2 and model 3. The structure of the model is as follows:

Structure 1: $Y = \rho_{yx1} X_1 + \rho_{yx2} X_2 + \rho_{yx3} X_3 + \rho_{yx4} X_4 + \rho_{yx5} X_5 + \rho_{yx6} X_6 + \rho_{yx7} X_7 + \varepsilon_1$
Structure 2: $Z_1 = \rho_{Z1Y} Y' + \varepsilon_2$
Structure 3: $Z_2 = \rho_{Z2Y} Y' + \varepsilon_3$

Dependent Variables:

a. $Y_1$ is economic growth measured by changes in Gross Domestic Regional Product (GDRP). Economic growth is a relative change of the GDRP rate based on 2000 constant prices in West Nusa Tenggara and it is expressed in percent units.
b. $Z_1$ is an employment opportunity variable defined as the amount of employees absorbed in a business or employment to carry out theirs productive activities.
c. $Z_2$ is a poverty variable that refers to the ratio of poor people in regencies or cities in West Nusa Tenggara published by the Statistics Indonesia where Y 'is the regression result of $Y_1$.

Independent Variables

a. $X_1$ is government expenditure in the form of direct expenditure expressed in percent units.
b. $X_2$ is government expenditure in the form of indirect expenditure, which is also expressed in percent units.
c. $X_3$ is the agricultural sector contribution measured by the agricultural sector contribution ratio to a total of GDRP.
d. $X_4$ is the mining sector contribution measured by the mining sector contribution ratio to the total of GDRP.
e. $X_5$ to $X_7$ is the variable number of Elementary School, Junior, and Senior High School participation measured by the ratio of the student population based on the schoolage toward the population based on the age groups.

## RESULTS

Based on the classic assumption test result, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov value was greater than the alpha value by 0.05, so it can be concluded that all residual data were normally distributed. The multicollinearity test of the three models was also carried out. The test results showed that all VIF values were less than 10, and the value of *tolerance* was higher than 0.10, so it was concluded that there was no multicollinearity. Furthermore, the results of the heteroskedasticity test were conducted with a glesjer test that all models were more than 0.05, which means it passed the heteroskedasticity test.

Table 1:Regression Analysis Results

| Model | Variable | Coef (B) | t | Sig | R | $R^2$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Constants (α) | 5.607 | 0.127 | 0.33 | 0.824 | 0.678 |
| | Direct Expenditure | 6.051E-12 | 5.283 | 0.00 | | |
| | Indirect Expenditure | -3.534E-12 | -4.812 | 0.00 | | |
| | Agriculture Sector | 0.117 | 8.217 | 0.00 | | |
| | Mining Sector | 0.052 | 5.030 | 0.00 | | |
| | SPR of Elementary School | 0.04 | 0.135 | 0.893 | | |
| | SPR of Junior High School | 0.02 | 0.110 | 0.913 | | |
| | SPR of Senior High School | 2.4283 | 6.731 | 0.023 | | |
| 2 | Constants (α) | 0.933 | 193,541 | 0.000 | 0.333 | 0.111 |
| | Employment | 0.002 | 3.115 | 0.003 | | |

| 3 | Opportunities | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | Constants (α) | 121375,340 | 2,311 | 0.000 | 0.226 | 0.051 |
| | Poverty | -5513,368 | -2.046 | 0.044 | | |

Statistical test results are explained in table 1. The results show that the direct expenditure, indirect expenditure, the agricultural and mining sector contribution, and the senior high school participation variable affect economic growth. Furthermore, the impact of the independent variables on employment opportunities and poverty are explained in model 2 and 3. The value of $R^2$ or R-Square for model 1 is 0.678.This means that 67.8% of the proposed independent variables are able to explain economic growth. Then, 32.2% of the remains are explained in other variables that are not explained in this research. While the impact on employment opportunities described in model 2 has an R-square of 0.111. This means that the impact that can be explained by the independent variable on employment opportunities by 11%. Furthermore, the impact that can be explained from the dependent variable on poverty levels is 0.051 or 5.1%.

Based on testing in model 1, the direct expenditure variable has a positive and significant effect on economic growth with a t value of 5,283 and significance value of 0.00 (0.00 <0.05 so it is significant). And the beta coefficient is 6.051E-12. While indirect expenditure has a negative and significant effect on economic growth with a t value of -4,812 and a significance value of 0.00 (0.00 <0.05 so it is significant). The beta coefficient is -3.534E-12.

The agricultural sector contribution has a positive and significant effect on economic growth with a t value of 8,217 and a significance value of 0.00 (0.00 < 0.05 so it is significant). The beta coefficient value in the agricultural sector is the highest, it reachs 0.117. While the mining sector also has a positive and significant effect on economic growth with t value of 5.030 and a significance value of 0.00 (0.00<0.05 so it is significant). The beta coefficient value is 0.052.

School Participant Rate (SPR) of Elementary school (SD) and Junior High School (SMP) levels have a positive effect but it does not significantly effect the economic growth. The t value at the Elementary School (SD) level is 0135, and the significance value is 0893 (0.893 > 0.005 so it is not significant) with a beta coefficient of 0.04. While the Junior High School (SMP) level has a t value of 0.110, and a significance value of 0.913 (0.913 > 0.005 so it is not significant) with a beta coefficient value of 0.02. Moreover, for the Senior High School (SMA) level has a positive and significant effect on economic growth. The t value is 6.731 and the significance value is 0.023 (0.023<0.05 so it is significant) with a beta coefficient value of 2.4283.

All independent variables of economic growth that have the impact on the employment opportunities are explained on the Model 2 which have a positive and significant effect. The t value is 3.115 and a significant value is 0.003 (0.003<0.005 so it is significant). The beta coefficient is 0.002. Meanwhile, the impact on poverty rates is negative and significant, with the t value of -2.046 and the significance value of 0.044 (0.044<0.05 is significant). The beta coefficient is 5513.368.

## DISCUSSION

Based on the hypothesis testing results, regional government expenditure in the form of direct expenditure (X1) positively affects economic growth. The higher direct expenditure will affect economic growth. In contrast, indirect expenditure (X2) gives negative effect significantly on economic growth. The lower indirect expenditure allocation will increase economic growth. The greater direct expenditure than indirect expenditure indicates that the economy in West Nusa Tenggara Province is more dependent on the budget allocation of the direct expenditure. This is due to the fact that in direct expenditure, one of the components is capital expenditure. The large proportion of capital expenditure in an economy will have long-term benefits that are directly felt by the society. A large capital expenditure allocation will be able to increase investment or add assets to improve public facilities and infrastructure that are directly felt by the society in the long run. Meanwhile, the significance of indirect expenditure is due to the distribution of government expenditure that is carried out by government officials through public services. However, the effect is negative. It indicates that government organizations are larger, so more effective government efforts are needed to maximize the allocation of regional expenditure that is more focused on the quality improvement of public services. The higher direct expenditure allocation will affect the number of local government programs as a provider of public facilities. With the fulfillment of public facilities, it will influence economic growth and it gives impacts on employment opportunities and poverty. It is in line with the research of Lantu et al (2017), which shows that indirect expenditure has no impact on economic growth. Haryanto (2013) and Sodik (2007) find that direct expenditure has impacts on economic growth.

Moreover, the contribution of the agricultural sector (X3) and mining (X4) has a positive and significant impact on economic growth in West Nusa Tenggara. It means that the higher of the agricultural and mining sectors productivity will have an impact on economic growth. However, the beta coefficient shows that the agricultural sector is larger, indicating that the agriculture sector is still the sector that dominates the West Nusa Tenggara. This is because some regions in West Nusa Tenggara are rural areas, so it is not surprising if the majority of people in the West Nusa Tenggara are farmers. Several areas in West Nusa Tenggara, such as Bima Regency is one of the agricultural centers of onions and become one of the largest producers of onions in Indonesia. Besides onion commodities, West Nusa Tenggara is also one of the suppliers of soybeans, rice, and corn. Based on these findings, it is necessary to have a government policy to provide trainings to farmers so that their productivity can be improved. Moreover, strengthening institutional systems such as capital assistance, fertilizer and seed subsidies are needed.

Even so, the mining sector still becomes a leading sector which is in line with the many gold and other mineral exploration activities in several regions in West Nusa Tenggara. Mining sector in West Nusa Tenggara is begun to be considered by foreign and domestic investors. One of the mining points that is often highlighted in the area is PT Newmont, which has gone through an acquisition process to become PT Amman Mineral. This makes people in the West Nusa Tenggara interested in working in the mining sector. This result of the research is in line with Sukirno's theory (2013: 429). He says that if an area has

natural wealth that includes soil fertility, forest products, sea products and various types of mining commodities, so the economic growth of a region can be accelerated. As supported by the theory of Djojohadikusumo (1994: 257) that natural resources contain a very potential possibility to be utilized as productive resources which are very effective. The results of this research are in line with a previous research conducted by Akarue and Eyuvwunu (2017), which shows that countries that have potential in the agricultural sectors, so the sectors has significant effects on the country's growth and development. Umaru and Zubairu (2012) also show that the agriculture and mining sectors have a large contribution to economic growth in Nigeria. Although the contribution of the agricultural sector is greater than the mining sector.

Furthermore, the school participation rate (SPR) of Elementary School (SD) level (X5) and Junior High School (SMP) (X6) give negative effect and it does not significantly effect the economic growth. This means that the smaller students that have Elementary and Junior High School background do not affect economic growth. Only the SPR of Senior High School level (X7) has a positive and significant effect on economic growth. The more people who study until Senior High School level, the higher economic growth that can be reached by the government. This indicates that formal education at the Senior High School (SMA) level in West Nusa Tenggara is more needed in economic growth. Many people are more aware of the importance of education. However, the low participation of Elementary School (SD) and Junior High Schools (SMP) levels also indicate that West Nusa Tenggara people are more inclined to explore informal education, such as trainings. The insignificance of participation at the educational levels of Eelementary (SD) and Junior High School (SMP) is due to the fact that at that level of education, an individual is deemed unable to find works in the productive economic sector which will affect economic growth. This is in line with Romer's endogenous growth theory and research conducted by Pambudi and Miyasto (2013) that in rural areas, investment in human resources at the Junior High School (SMP) level is still low. Hanif and Arshed (2016) also find similar results that only the level of high or tertiary education affects economic growth. This is because people who graduate from Elementary (SD) and Junior High School (SMP) are still not qualified to get better jobs.

Based on the results of the model 2 test toward the impact of employment opportunities, economic growth measured by independent variables has a significant positive effect on economic growth. This means that the greater the potential for natural resources, human resources, and well-managed government expenditure will increase employment opportunities in the West Nusa Tenggara. The results of this study are the same as Dona et al (2018) and Idris et al (2014) that economic growth has a positive effect on employment opportunities.

Furthermore, based on the results of the model 3 test, economic growth measured by independent variables has a significant negative effect on poverty levels in this region. This means that with the number of natural resources, human resources, and the proper allocation of regional government expenditure will affect the reduction in poverty levels. The better resources are allocated, the better it will give an impact on the welfare of the people in an area. As supported by Stevans and Sessions (2008), Jonaidi (2012), and Tahir et al (2014) that economic improvement is significantly associated with reducing poverty levels. This is also in line with Jonaidi (2012) that economic growth and poverty reduction have a significant impact, especially in rural areas that have relatively high poverty rates.

Economic growth caused by the performance of independent variables has a greater impact on poverty levels. This means that the government policy is more focused on reducing poverty rates. That is due to the more people who have less welfare. They will work hard to get proper jobs. In other words, when an individual lives on the poverty line, they will try to find employments. Based on these results, the government as a policy maker should provide more employment so that workers who graduate from Senior High School or below can be employed properly and evenly in all sectors. Ultimately, with policies that lead to the sector performance, the quality improvement of the education and the government expenditure will affect the availability of more jobs.

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the results of this research, the conclusions and suggestions in this research are:

1.  Based on the testing results of the effect of government expenditure on economic growth, only direct expenditure has a significant positive effect on economic growth. But, indirect expenditure significantly have negative effects. The results of this study are in line with Keynes's theory that one of the main components in the economy is government expenditure. In an economy, there is a need for government intervention as seen from the allocation of government expenditure. According to Sun'an and Astuti (2008), government intervention is needed by implementing fiscal policies used to regulate the economy by determining the amount of government revenue and expenditure.
2.  The agricultural and mining sector contribution has a positive and significant effect on economic growth. But, the agricultural sector contribution is greater. It shows that the greater the agriculture and mining sectors contribution will increase economic growth in the West Nusa Tenggara. The results of the study are in line with Adam Smith's classical theory that if a region has natural wealth which includes soil fertility, forest products, sea products, and various types of mining commodities, so the economic growth of a region can be accelerated. The theory is also in line with the theory of Djojohadikusumo (1994: 257) that natural resources contain very potential possibilities to be utilized as productive resources that are very effective.
3.  The School Participation Rate (SPR) at Elementary School (SD) and Junior High School (SMP) give negative effect and it does not significantly effect the economic growth. Only the Senior High School level has a positive and significant effect on economic growth. The results of this study are in line with the Romer's endogenous growth theory (1990) that an educated worker can create, implement, and adopt technological innovations that will affect growth in general. The educated worker will increase human capital that can affect the total growth of production factors from the existence of the technology. In a result, the growth of production factors will be able to expand the domestic products of a country and the regional gross domestic product of a region.

4. Regional government expenditure, leading sector contributions, and school participation rates of economic growth that have an impact on employment opportunities have a positive and significant impact. Meanwhile, the impact on poverty levels is negative and significant. The results of this study are in line with Todaro's theory (2011: 152) that government expenditure can create various facilities and infrastructure which are needed by the society in the development process that will increase employment opportunities and decrease poverty rates.

**IMPLICATION**

Based on the results of this research, the local government should prioritize the development that concerns on agricultures. Because West Nusa Tenggara is still very dependent on the agricultural sector, it is better if the industries that are built also based on agriculture, such as developing agroindustry. Besides, agro-tourism can also be developed considering that West Nusa Tenggara has begun to favor the beauty of tourism objects such as Lombok Island.

This research finds that the people of West Nusa Tenggara are more interested in exploring informal education than formal education. So the regional government budget should make more training programs in agriculture to open more available employment opportunities and to reduce poverty levels, especially in sub-districts that still have a high dependency on agriculture.

Moreover, related to the mining sector, the government should provide socializations to the public who carry out illegal mining activities around the mining area. Regional governments should conduct informal training programs that train the skills of people around the mine, such as conducting training to manage mining technology because the mining sector is a high technology sector, so human resources that are experts in technology are needed.

**REFERENCES**

Akarue, & Eyovwunu.(2017).An Empirical Assessment of the Contribution of Agricultural Sector to Nigerian Economy.*International Journal of Innovativ Agriculture & Biology Research*, 5 (1), 62-71.

Agustini, Y., & Kurniasih, E. P. (2017).Pengaruh Investasi PMDN, PMA dan Penyerapan Tenaga Kerja Terhadap Pertumbuhan Ekonomi dan Jumlah Penduduk Miskin Kabupaten/Kota di Provinsi Kalimantan Barat.*Jurnal Ekonomi Bisnis dan Kewirausahaan*, 6 (2), 97-119.

Djojohadikusumo, S. (1994).*Perkembangan Pemikiran Ekonomi:Dasar Teori Ekonomi Pertumbuhan dan Ekonomi Pembangunan.*Jakarta:PT Pustaka LP3ES Indonesia.

Djunaedi, M. H. (2009).Analisis Proyeksi Kesempatan Kerja dan Produktivitas Tenaga Kerja di Kabupaten Lombok Barat 2010-2025.*Jurnal Ekonomi Pembangunan*, 7 (2), 112-124.

Dona, D. R., Effendi, A. S., & Muliati.(2018).Analisis Faktor-Faktor yang Mempengaruhi Kesempatan Kerja.*Forum Ekonomi*, 20 (1), 12-18.

Hajamimi, M., & Falahi, M. A. (2018).Economic Growth and Government Size in Developed European Coutries:A Panel Threshold Approach.*Economic Analysis and Policy*, 58, 1-13.

Hanif, N., & Arshed, N. (2016).Relationship Between School Education and Economic Growth:SAARC Countries.*International Journal of Economic and Financial Issues*, 6 (1), 294-300.

Haryanto, T. P. (2013).Pengaruh Pengeluaran Pemerintah Terhadap Pertumbuhan Ekonomi Kabupaten/Kota di Provinsi Jawa Tengah tahun 2007-2011.*Economics Development Analysis Journal*, 2 (3), 148-158.

Idris, K., Syaparuddin, & Hodijah, S. (2014).Pertumbuhan Ekonomi, Kesempatan Kerja, Kemiskinan dan Ketimpangan Pendapatan di Provinsi Jambi.*Jurnal Paradigma Ekonomika*, 9 (1), 41-62.

Jonaidi, A. (2012).Analisis Pertumbuhan Ekonomi dan Kemiskinan di Indonesia.*Jurnal Kajian Ekonomi*, Volume 1 (1), 141-164.

Kraay, A. (2006).When is Growth Pro-Poor?Evidence From A Panel Countries.*Journal of Development Economics*, 80, 198-227.

Kurniawan, A. (2005).Fungsi Daya Dukung Sumberdaya Alam Terhadap Perkembangan Ekonomi Wilayah di Kabupaten Sleman.*Majalah Geografi Indonesia*, 19 (2), 141-154.

Lantu, Y. M., Koleangan, R., & Rotinsulu, T. O. (2017).Pengaruh Belanja Pemerintah terhadap Pertumbuhan Ekonomi dan Pengentasan Kemiskinan di Kota Bitung.*Jurnal Pembangunan Ekonomi dan Keuangan Daerah*, 19 (2), 1-19.

Lincolin, A. (2010).*Ekonomi Pembangunan.*Yogyakarta:UPP STIM YKPN.

Machmud, A. (2016).*Perekonomian Indonesia Pasca Reformasi.*Jakarta:Penerbit Erlangga.

Mahmudi.(2010).*Manajemen Keuangan Daerah.*Jakarta:Penerbit Erlangga.

Pambudi, E. W., & Miyasto.(2013).Analisis Pertumbuhan Ekonomi dan Faktor-Faktor yang Mempengaruhi (Kabupaten/kota di Provinsi Jawa Tengah).*Diponegoro Journal of Economics*, 2 (2), 1.

Snowdon, B., & Vane, H. R. (2005). *Modern Macroeconomics Its Origins, Development and Current State.* Massachusetts, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Sodik, J. (2007). Pengeluaran Pemerintah dan Pertumbuhan Ekonomi Regional: Studi Kasus Data Panel di Indonesia. *Jurnal Ekonomi Pembangunan*, 12 (1), 27-36.

Stevans, L., & Sessions, D. (2008). The Relationship Between Poverty and Economic Growth Revisited. *Journal of Income Distribution*, 7 (1), 5-20.

Sukirno, S. (2013). *Makroekonomi Teori Pengantar Edisi Ketiga.* Jakarta: PT RajaGrafindo Persada.

Sukirno, S. (2000). *Makroekonomi Modern: Perkembangan Pemikiran Dari Klasik Hingga Keynesian Baru.* Jakarta: PT Raja Grafindo Persada.

Syahroni. (2016). Analisis Peranan Sektor Pertanian dalam Perekonomian Kabupaten Sarolangun. *Perspektif Ekonomi dan Pembangunan Daerah*, Volume 5 no 1 halaman 36-44.

Tahir, S. H., Perveen, N., Ismail, A., & Sabir, H. (2014). Impact of GDP Growth Rate on Poverty of Pakistan: A Quantitative Approach. *Euro-Asian Journal of Economics and Finance*, 2(2), 119-126.

Todaro, M., & Smith, S. (2011). *Pembangunan Ekonomi Edisi Kesebelas.* Jakarta: Penerbit Erlangga.

Umaru, A., & Zubairu, A. A. (2012). An Empirical Analysis of the Contribution of Agriculture and Petroleum Sector to the Growth and Development of the Nigerian Economy 1960-2010. *International J. Soc. Sci & Education*, 2(4), 758-769.

Nindya Ayu Angghita, S.Akun
*Master Program in Economics*
*Brawijaya University, Malang, Indonesia*
*Email: ayuangghita@gmail.com*

Prof.Dr.Candra Fajri Ananda, SE., M.Sc
*Master Program in Economics*
*Brawijaya University, Malang, Indonesia*

Dr.Rachmad Kresna Sakti, SE., M.si
*Master Program in Economics*
*Brawijaya University, Malang, Indonesia*