Socio-Demography: What Are The Basic Incomes Of The Working Poor Group In The South West Region Of Aceh?

T.Zulham[1], Yayuk Eko Wahyuningsih[2], Rollis Juliansyah[3*]

[1]*Department of Development Economics Syiah Kuala University Banda Aceh, Indonesia (teukuzulham@unsyiah.ac.id)*
[2]*Department of Development Economics Teuku Umar University Meulaboh, Indonesia (yayukew@utu.ac.id)*
[*3]*Department of Development Economics Teuku Umar University Meulaboh, Indonesia (rollisjuliansyah@utu.ac.id)*

[*]*corresponding author: rollisjuliansyah@utu.ac.id*

ABSTRACT

This research is a continuation of our previous research, which looked at the comparison of the incomes of the working poor in 2010 and 2020 in the South West region of Aceh (Regencies, Aceh Jaya, Aceh Barat, Nagan Raya, Aceh Barat Daya, Simeulue, Aceh Selatan, Subulussalam, and Singkil). Still at the same locus, we try to present what other effects are on the income of a working poor. Armed with the MCA method as an analytical tool, it makes this even more interesting and adds to the newness of the data that we obtained directly in the field. From the test results we found that; The income of the working poor in the South West is influenced by gender, where the urban working poor category in the informal and non-agricultural sectors earn better than the rural poor in the agricultural sector, and the effect of age has an impact on the incomes of the working poor. The existence of the age factor makes poor workers tend to be able to migrate, it is possible for workers in the informal sector to be high in urban areas. Although not so large, the income of the working poor has an influence on other variables that we use, such as marital status, education level, and number of hours worked.

Keywords: Working poor, South West Aceh, Socioeconomic, Income.

INTRODUCTION

Poverty is a complex and urgent problem to be solved and is influenced by many interrelated factors, such as economic and non-economic factors. Percentage, education, access to capital, gender and environmental conditions. Lee et al. (2021) Income uncertainty has a close relationship with poverty, this participation is exacerbated by the condition of the social order and the pessimistic attitude of a worker which makes conditions worse. Poverty itself is material and non-material (Wahyudin, 2012). When viewed from the burden received, poor families get a double burden, namely, on themselves and their families. (Suyanto, 2013)

Therefore, poverty alleviation efforts must be carried out comprehensively, covering various aspects of people's lives, and implemented in an integrated manner (Nasir, et al 2008). According to the World Bank (2008), one of the causes of poverty is due to lack of income and assets, levels of health and education acceptable and employment. (Budiantari & Rustarinuri, 2013) Uncertain economic conditions that result in disruption of family economic stability. Furthermore, the link between expenditure and poverty is also in expenditure, (Abane et al., 2021) as well as personal expenditure for other than primary needs such as information services, this also has an impact on income which is the financial burden of a working poor. .

Bapenas issued a view from data collection related to poverty in Indonesia,

namely, conditions in society that are unable to meet primary (basic) needs in the form of food, clean water, education and other basic human needs. In addition to income inequality, this is also limited to access to social services and other public goods (Mardeka, 2022). As is the case with Aceh Province, which has 23 regencies/cities where people get income per capita which tends to be low.

Furthermore, for the South West region which consists of 8 (eight) regencies/cities,

namely West Aceh Regency, Aceh Jaya Regency, Nagan Raya Regency, Simeulue Regency, Southwest Aceh Regency, South Aceh Regency, Aceh Singkil Regency and Subulussalam City, where the poverty rate was 21.48% in 2010 and decreased 10 (ten) years later to 17.15%. This data can be seen in the following table.

Table 1. Poverty in Indonesia, Aceh Province and South West Region (Barsela) Aceh 2010 and 2020

Years	Poverty in Indonesia (%)	Poverty in Aceh Province (%)	Poverty in Barsela (%)
2010	13,33	19,95	21,48
2020	10,19	15,32	17,15

Sources: BPS Aceh Province, 2020 (March 2021)

According to data from the Central Statistics Agency (BPS) of Aceh Province, the percentage of the number of poor people in Indonesia has continued to decline in the last 10 years, namely 13.33% in 2010 and continues to decline to 5.41% in 2020. Likewise in Aceh Province. The poverty rate in the western tip of Sumatra province has also decreased from year to year. The percentage of poverty in 2010 was 19.95% and continued to decline in 2020 to 15.32%.

On the other hand, the total number of people working in Aceh Province in 2010 was

1,776,000 people. While the number of workers or residents who work in 2020 is 2,220,000 people. This means that the number of workers continues to experience a drastic increase in the next 10 (ten) years.

Furthermore, in the Barsela region, the number of working people is 370,000 people and in the next 10 (ten) years it will reach 462,000 people. Data on the total number of workers in Aceh Province and the Barsela region in 2010 and 2020 can be seen in the following table.

Year	Number of Workers Total Aceh Province (persons)	Employment Opportunity Rate for Barsela Region (%)
2010	370.000	462.000

2020	1.776.000	2.220.000

Sources: BPS Aceh Province, 2020 (March 2021)

The data above illustrates that there has been an increase in the number of people working in the last 10 years, both in Aceh Province and in the Barsela region.   Based on the results of data collection from BPS data (Susenas 2010 and 2020), it was found that the poverty line in the Barsela region was Rp. 280,829/capita/month and in Aceh Province was Rp. 292,131/capita/month. Meanwhile, in the next 10 (ten) years, precisely in 2020, the poverty line in the Barsela region will increase to Rp. 405,262/capita/month and in Aceh Province Rp. 486,935/capita/month.

Overall poverty rates have decreased in all regions over the past 10 years, however, when viewed from the perspective of poverty levels in the Barsela region, it is higher than the average for the province of Aceh. Determinants with socio-economic impact on the dynamics of poverty. The composition of the number of household members, and the relevance of employment to education and employment status have implications for income and household poverty (Schofield et al., 2012); (Drescher & Janzen, 2021)

This indicates that there are many poor people in the Barsela area. The phenomenon of working poor above of course raises the question that there are things that are the determining factors why the welfare/income of workers is still classified as poor. These determinants may come from internal, namely the socio-demographic conditions of the workers themselves as well as external factors. Graham, (2020) there is a relationship between working poor and poverty as it relates to gender and geographic location to affect income poverty. The world's multidimensional poor tend to live in rural areas even though they do not have to work in agriculture, mostly dominated by young people (Robles Aguilar & Sumner, 2020; Moatsos & Lazopoulos, 2021) The phenomenon of working poor is interesting

to study in that direction by looking at the comparison over a period of ten years.

The problem in this research is how is the relationship and the magnitude of the influence of gender, age, education, number of family members, work location, employment sector on the income of poor workers in South West Aceh?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Income is a direct remuneration which is often interpreted as salary/wages that are accumulated with income (take home pay) for the activities carried out. This income is widely used by many researchers and economists in looking at the level of household welfare, when income is used to meet needs in the form of primary or complementary. We may wonder why a consumer or a household spends its income on a number of goods, this is due to scarcity as a result of specialization or the inability to provide all needs by itself, in other cases such as subsistence households. . Even traditional agricultural and food workers who tend to be considered subsistence require production opportunity costs to support their productivity (Todaro, 2011). In the poverty study indicators, in addition to income, expenditure is also used as an indicator to see the condition of household inequality. This expenditure is the total expenditure spent by households.

Households as providers of the labor force that produce productivity in their respective fields. Workers get wages, producers get profits and the government gets taxes from both. As for these workers, not all of them get income that is evenly distributed and well distributed, some are high and some are low, this of course affects the welfare and patterns of household spending, consumption, saving, and investment. The working poor are people

whose personal income is below a certain threshold Struengmann (2002).

Such as the output generated and the acquisition of added value, so it has a significant impact on the wages and income of the working poor. This is in line with what was stated, Fok (2021) The resulting production can significantly affect the income of workers to sustainability. The existence of support for the incomes of the working poor makes a little impetus for the achievement of incomes for the working poor in various sectors and urban areas and especially in the rural sector which tends to have better added value from low production.

Priyono (2002); Moatsos & Lazopoulos, (2021) In addition to work status, the location where a person works is also something that affects a person's condition in his level of welfare. For example, households living in locations where access to capital is difficult to support their productivity will tend to be difficult and complicated.

The working poor is a part of the population that is difficult to define, not only because of the limitations on specific data but also because the concept combines two levels of analysis, namely the employment status of individuals and the wages they earn from workers (individual level) and in a broader sense how income poverty rates in the household context.

According to the ILO (2015), working poverty is a situation faced by individuals who, even though they already have a paid job, do not have sufficient income to lift themselves and their families out of poverty. The working poor is defined as someone who works in a household whose members live below the poverty line.

The working poor is a part of the population that is difficult to define, not only because of the limitations on specific data but also because the concept combines two levels of analysis, namely the employment status of individuals and the wages they earn from workers (individual level) and in a broader

sense how income poverty rates in the household context.

In some studies, the definition of working poor has been widened to include all household members living in poor households that have at least one worker (Caritas, 1998 in Struengmann, 2002). Working poor is also defined as someone who is already working but lives in a household that is at the poverty line. This definition is widely used by developed countries. Mukhyi, (2002) looked at the factors that influence the determination of salary. The results of his research, amounting to 87.1 percent of salary changes can be explained by independent variables (gender, marital status, education level, type of work, work experience, pause (pause in work), expertise, and performance (productivity). of nine variables, which significantly affect the tenure and level of education.The existence of an attachment to the role of household members has an influence on poverty, this is as in the study of Lubungu & Birner, (2021) The existence of the role of family members in helping the household can reduce the gap in the financial burden poor families, working poor women too, have a significant role and relationship with the income of poor families (Budiantari & Rustarinuri, 2013).The relationship between working hours, education, age of workers is an important thing to be used as an indicator of workers' income. young people and working poor children tend to get difficult and discriminatory from a bad environment (Suyanto, 2013)

Research by Garza-Rodriguez (2002) examines the probability determinants of poverty in México. The data used in this study are from the 1996 National Survey of Household Income and Expenditure. Using a logistic regression model it is found that the variables that are positively correlated with the probability of being poor are: household size, living in a rural area, working in a rural occupation and becoming domestic workers. The variables that are negatively correlated with the probability of being poor are: the education level of the head of the household,

the age of the head of the household and his employment status. The employment sector is no less important indicator in this issue of worker poverty, (Fatimah, 2015). On another occasion, income is related to poverty, when income inequality can significantly affect the quality of education and exacerbate income inequality (Sethi et al., 2021). The number of dependents such as the number of household members working poor tends to have a major impact on welfare, if not offset by an increase in income. Family members with involvement such as parenting patterns that result in productivity have a relationship with the income of the workers themselves (Wahyudin, 2014).

The hypotheses to be tested in this study are: socio-demographic variables of poor workers, namely: gender, area of residence, marital status, age , education level, business field, employment sector, and number of hours worked, affect the income of the working poor in the South West Region of Aceh.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study analyzes the income of the working poor in the south west region of Aceh. includes socio-demographic variables, namely gender, area of residence, marital status, age, education level, business field, employment sector, and number of hours worked. Siman et al. (2020) examines household problems from the expenditure side for household consumption by using a socio-economic variable approach in the form of number of hours worked, number of family members, and income.

The data used is primary data with 80 observations starting from the districts of Aceh Jaya, West Aceh, Naan Raya, South Aceh, Simeulue, Subulusalam, and Singkil. And supported by secondary data sourced from the Central Statistics Agency of Aceh Province and several BPS in the West-South District. To make it easier to know the relationship between variables and their effect on the modeling income we use MCA (Multiple Classification Analysis)

MCA explains the effect of the variables on the grand mean of the variables studied. The urgency of using MCA is to see the effect and as a predictor of the variable itself and the effect of other variables. So that it will facilitate the pure influence of each variable and the influence

of other variables. MCA is a further analysis of the ANOVA table, so the model used is an additive linear model which is shown by the following equation:

$$Y = X^{bar} + X1^{JK} + X2^{WILT} + X3^{STKW} + X4^{U} + X5^{DIK} + X6^{LU} + X7^{SP} + X8^{JKER} + et$$

Where are the variables and labels used in the model;

Y = Income of Poor Workers,
JK = Gender,
WILT = Area of Residence,
STKW = Marital Status,
U = Age,
DIK = Education Level,
LU = Business Field,
SP = Employment Sector,
JKER = Number of Working Hours,
e = Error term

The independent variable (X) used for the dependent variable (Y) is the income of poor workers in the South West region of Aceh;

Variabel	Kategori
X1_Gender	Male
	Female

X2_ Residential Area	urban
	rural
X3_ Marital Status	single
	Married/ever married
X4_Ages	<= 30
	31-40
	41-60
	61+
X5_Education	<= Junior High School
	Senior High School
	> Senior High School
X6_ Business field	Agriculture
	Non Agriculture
X7_ Employment Sector	Formal
	Informal
X8_ Number of Working Hours	< 35
	>= 35

The table also produces the values of Eta and Beta which are correlation coefficients. Eta (η) is the value of the relationship between an independent variable and the dependent variable before other independent variables are taken into account. While Beta (β) is the eta value after being freed from the influence of other predictors and attribute variables (control variables). The independent variable which has the greatest Beta value shows the greatest influence on the income of the working poor.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Based on the results of testing the income of the working poor in the South-West region of Aceh

1. Classification and Significance Analysis (Anova)

Based on the calculation results, there are differences between variables, such as gender, age, and number of hours worked that have a strong enough significance to the income of poor workers in the South West region of Aceh at the level of appropriateness/accuracy α= 10 percent. However, simultaneously (overall) all the variables used in this study showed a significant relationship to income at a significance of 0.005 percent.

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
				Experimental Method			
Poor Worker's Income	Main Effects	(Combined)	13772658843191	11	1252059894836	2.801	0.005
		X1_Jenis kelamin	**3758255872550**	**1**	**3758255872550**	**8.409**	**0.005**
		X2_Wilayah Tempat Tinggal	**1499109183364**	**1**	**1499109183364**	**3.354**	**0.071**
		X3_Satus Kawin	156838678065	1	156838678065	0.351	0.556
		X4_Umur	**3931429167166**	**3**	**1310476389055**	**2.932**	**0.040**
		X5_Pendidikan	94526586488	1	94526586488	0.211	0.647
		X6_Lapangan Usaha	377626213713	1	377626213713	0.845	0.361
		X7_Sektor Pekerjaan	164782933190	2	82391466595	0.184	0.832
		X8_Jumlah Jam Kerja	361355661938	1	361355661938	0.809	0.372
	Model		**13772658843191**	**11**	**1252059894836**	**2.801**	**0.005**
	Residual		30391829906809	68	446938675100		
	Total		44164488750000	79	559044161392		

The increase in the working poor can be caused by male workers with an increase of Rp 20,066.8, while this is inversely proportional to the female working poor; the working poor in urban areas have higher incomes than the working poor in rural areas, amounting to Rp 128,528,339; for unmarried poor workers, income is higher than for married or divorced poor workers, which is Rp . 215,756,062; working poor aged 31-40 years and 61 years old have higher income, compared to working poor aged 41-61 years; at the level of education the working poor who finished high school or a higher level had different incomes from the working poor who only finished education below, which was Rp. 177,280,903 this was caused by the large number of jobs indicating a higher level of education; while the working poor who work in the non-agricultural sector have higher incomes than the agricultural sector, amounting to Rp 50,227,602 and this also has the same relationship in the formal and non-formal sectors which have a difference of Rp 18,047,445, meanwhile for the working poor with more working hours have a higher income of Rp. 104210,023. From the description above, the working poor are male, living in urban areas, with married status, who have an age of 31-40 years and higher education and work in the non-agricultural formal sector and coupled with a high number of working hours tend to have a higher income

2. Effect of Independent Variables on Income (factor summary)

	Eta	Beta Adjusted for Factors

Pendapatan Pekerja miskin (Sekarang)	X1_Jenis kelamin	0.354	0.322
	X2_Wilayah Tempat Tinggal	0.124	0.100
	X3_Satus Kawin	0.071	0.067
	X4_Umur	0.361	0.303
	X5_Pendidikan	0.073	0.069
	X6_Lapangan Usaha	0.060	0.097
	X7_Sektor Pekerjaan	0.022	0.049
	X8_Jumlah Jam Kerja	0.316	0.208

In the influence of the above variables, gender has a considerable influence compared to other independent variables on the income of the working poor. Such as the acquisition of a value of 35.4 percent, with the assumption that it is still influenced by other factors. If these other factors are waived or omitted, then the effect of gender on income is as shown in the beta value of 32.2 percent. The high influence of gender is caused by the availability of more business opportunities for men, both in the formal and non-formal sectors, in rural areas or even in urban areas, in the South West region. This also has a relationship such as the area where the working poor live, such as the beta value of the area where they live 10 percent affects the income of the working poor. The working poor in urban areas have a greater opportunity to increase their income than the working poor in rural areas. This is also supported by the fact that young people tend to migrate to other areas such as urban areas to find work, in other cases some return to villages or stay in urban areas until old age. The availability of business fields in urban

3.   Characteristics According to Respondents

Variabel	Kategori	Count	Column N %
X1_Jenis Kelamin	Laki-Laki	47	58.75%
	Perempuan	33	41.25%
X2_Wilayah Tempat Tinggal	Perkotaan	20	25.00%
	Perdesaan	60	75.00%
X3_Satus Kawin	Belum Kawin	4	5.00%
	Kawin/Pernah Kawin	76	95.00%
X4_Umur	<= 30	3	3.75%
	31-40	22	27.50%
	41-60	50	62.50%
	61+	5	6.25%
X5_Pendidikan	<= Smp	54	67.50%
	Sma	24	30.00%
	> Sma	2	2.50%
X6_Lapangan Usaha	Pertanian	26	32.50%
	Non Pertanian	54	67.50%
X7_Sektor Pekerjaan	Formal	16	20.00%
	Informal	64	80.00%
X8_Jumlah Jam Kerja	< 35	25	31.25%
	>= 35	55	68.75%

Total		80	100.00%

If it is observed from the characteristics of the respondents in this study, in terms of gender, there are more male working poor than female working poor, namely 47 men or 58.75 percent and 33 women or 41.25 percent of the total research sites in Aceh. Southwest has male working poor compared to other districts, and female working poor are more common among respondents in South Aceh. In terms of age, the working poor are 53 years old, more than those below. In terms of marital status, more working poor are married than unmarried and divorced, namely 62 married, 4 unmarried, 14 divorced alive/dead from the total sample taken. At the education level alone, the working poor's background is dominated by high school, while the working poor who have the latest education in junior high school/equivalent, elementary school/equivalent, and did not finish elementary school/equivalent have the same score.

*Characteristics of respondents from MCA Calculations

Variabel	object	Umur	Jam Kerja	Jumlah Art	Pendapatan Kini	Pengeluaran Kini	Pendapatan Lalu	Pengeluaran Lalu	Jam Kerja/ Minggu
		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
X1_Jenis Kelamin	Laki-Laki	43.79	8.24	4.11	1491063.83	1386510.64	1623111.11	1246222.22	49.47
	Perempuan	48.91	7.11	3.88	956060.61	1271515.15	955454.55	942878.79	42.64
X2_Wilayah Tempat Tinggal	Perkotaan	46.05	8.93	4.45	1430000.00	1702500.00	1228947.37	1176315.79	53.55
	Perdesaan	45.85	7.39	3.87	1217166.67	1217933.33	1376610.17	1099067.80	44.35
X3_Satus Kawin	Belum Kawin	36.00	6.75	4.50	1500000.00	1862500.00	1025000.00	1050000.00	40.50
	Kawin/Pernah Kawin	46.42	7.83	3.99	1258289.47	1311526.32	1357702.70	1121554.05	46.97
X4_Umur	<= 30	28.00	8.67	3.33	933333.33	1133333.33	800000.00	800000.00	52.00
	31-40	35.68	8.18	3.91	1695454.55	1731818.18	1552727.27	1342272.73	49.09
	41-60	49.38	7.62	4.14	1100600.00	1187520.00	1303061.22	1039081.63	45.72
	61+	66.80	7.00	3.60	1300000.00	1250000.00	1040000.00	1087500.00	42.00
X5_Pendidikan	<= Smp	47.87	8.14	4.11	1291666.67	1200481.48	1440961.54	1079711.54	48.83
	Sma	41.38	7.04	3.71	1203333.33	1552083.33	1143333.33	1181250.00	42.25

	> Sma	47.00	6.75	5.00	1500000.00	2525000.00	1100000.00	1350000.00	40.50
X6_Lapangan Usaha	Pertanian	45.54	8.58	3.58	1205769.23	1132692.31	1189200.00	873200.00	51.46
	Non Pertanian	46.07	7.39	4.22	1301481.48	1438444.44	1412075.47	1233301.89	44.33
X7_Sektor Pekerjaan	Formal	40.06	7.38	3.75	1237500.00	1350000.00	1173333.33	1066666.67	44.25
	Informal	47.36	7.88	4.08	1278593.75	1336343.75	1380476.19	1130079.37	47.25
X8_Jumlah Jam Kerja	< 35	49.52	5.08	3.64	922000.00	1184400.00	1048800.00	969400.00	30.48
	>= 35	44.25	9.00	4.18	1428727.27	1409381.82	1478301.89	1187924.53	54.00
Total		**45.90**	**7.78**	**4.01**	**1270375.00**	**1339075.00**	**1340641.03**	**1117884.62**	**46.65**

Respondents by occupation sector, here we divide into 3 types of business fields which refer to their respective classifications, namely Primary, Secondary (Manufacturing), and Tertiary (services). If we look at the working poor by business field, the number of working poor is dominated by the tertiary sector (service sector) by 35 people and the poor working in the primary sector such as plantations, agriculture, and others who enter the primary sector by 30 people and in the secondary sector (processing/manufacturing) only 15 people.

The average working hours per day poor workers spend up to 9-10 hours per day with a percentage of 9.50 percent. If viewed from the number of household members or the number of dependents of the working poor, the level of the number of working poor household members in one house reaches 5 people and the lowest is 3 people. Current income, current expenses, past income, and past expenses of male workers tend to be greater or more than female workers, i.e. Male workers' current salary is Rp. 1,491,064 with current expenses of Rp. 1,386,511 while salary or income the previous male amounted to Rp 1,623,111 with an expenditure level of Rp 1,246,222. Meanwhile, past and present salaries or incomes of poor women workers were Rp. 956,061 and 955,455 for current and past expenses of Rp. 1,271,515 and 942,879, respectively.

Conclusion

Based on the results and discussion above, it can be concluded that gender has a strong influence on the income of the working poor, besides that age and area of residence also influence. Apart from that, variables such as marital status, education level, business field, employment sector, and number of hours worked, have a significant effect and have an impact on the income of the working poor simultaneously. This can be seen from the acquisition of the beta value and the level of significance. The place of residence/area occupied by the working poor has an important role, from our findings it is possible that the working poor come from the village due to low access to capital resources, to inhabit urban areas working in the informal sector such as services, this is done by workers, especially aged young and male. The high rate of poverty in rural areas exacerbates the poor working there, especially those in the agricultural sector. The need to reformulate regional poverty reduction policies, especially rural areas as providers of production resources. Skills are not necessarily about formal education, lately technological disruption has accelerated the use

of technology and the economy. The need for providing technology literacy for poor workers in order to obtain information and gain added value for the output they produce. Providing relevant training and access to capital according to the comparative advantages of each area where the workers occupy.

Acknowledgment

References

1. Badan Pusat Statistik. 2019. Analisis Kemiskinan, Ketenagakerjaan dan Distribusi Pendapatan. Jakarta: Badan Pusat Statistik.

2. _____. 2010. Aceh Dalam Angka 2010. Banda Aceh: Bappeda dan BPS Provinsi Aceh.

3. _____. 2019. Aceh Dalam Angka 2019. Banda Aceh: Bappeda dan BPS Provinsi Aceh.

4. _____. 2010. Keadaan Angkatan Kerja Provinsi Aceh Agustus 2010. Banda Aceh: BPS Provinsi Aceh.

5. _____. 2019. Keadaan Angkatan Kerja Provinsi Aceh Agustus 2019. Banda Aceh: BPS Provinsi Aceh.

6. _____. 2019. Indikator Tenaga Kerja Provinsi Aceh Agustus 2019. Banda Aceh: BPS Provinsi Aceh.

7. _____. 2019. Indikator Kesejahteraan Masyarakat Provinsi Aceh 2019. Banda Aceh: Bappeda dan BPS Provinsi Aceh.

8. _____. 2010. Survei Sosial Ekonomi Nasional Tahun 2010. Banda Aceh: Bappeda dan BPS Provinsi Aceh.

9. _____. 2020. Survei Sosial Ekonomi Nasional Tahun 2020. Banda Aceh: Bappeda dan BPS Provinsi Aceh.

10. Budiantari, N. N. S., & Rustariyuni, S. D. (2013). Pengaruh Faktor Sosial Demografi terhadap Curahan Jam Kerja Pekerja Perempuan pada Keluarga Miskin di Desa Pemecutan Kaja Kecamatan Denpasar Utara. E-Jurnal Ekonomi Pembangunan Universitas Udayana, 2(11).

11. Fatimah, F. (2015). Reforma Agraria dalam Konteks Peningkatan Akses Kaum Tani Miskin terhadap Penguasaan Tanah di Indonesia. Jurnal Hukum Samudra Keadilan, 10(2), 191–203.

12. Fields, Gary S, et.all. 2003. Household Income Dynamics: A Four-Country Story. The Journal of Development Studies, Vol.40, No.2, December 2003.

13. Garza, Jorge dan Rodriguez. 2002. The Determinants of Poverty in Mexico. MPRA Paper No. 65993, August 2015, Universidad de Monterrey.http://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/65993 diakses tanggal 28 April 2016 Jam 14.35 WIB.

14. ILO. 2015. Tren Ketenagakerjaan dan Sosial di Indonesia 2014 - 2015: Memperkuat Daya Saing dan Produktivitas Melalui Pekerjaan Layak. Jakarta: ILO.

15. Muhammad, Said, ; Zulham, T., ; Sapha, Diana, ; Fitriyani, ; Saputra, Jumadil. 2019. Investigating the Public Spending and Economical Growth on the Poverty Reduction in Indonesia. Industrial Engineering & Management Systems Journal, Vol.18, No.3 Sept 2019, pp.495 – 500.

16. Mardeka (9 Februari 2022). Bappenas: Tenaga Kerja Muda Rawan Sekali

Menjadi   Miskin.
https://www.merdeka.com/khas/bappe
nas-tenaga-kerja-muda-rawan-sekali-
menjadi-miskin-wawancara-
khusus.html.

17. Priyono, Edy. 2002. Mengapa Angka
    Pengangguran Rendah di Masa Krisis?:
    Menguak Peranan Sektor Informal
    Sebagai Buffer Perekonomian. Jurnal
    Ekonomi dan Kewirausahaan Vol 1,
    No. 2, Juli 2002.

18. Strengmann Kuhn, Wolfgang. 2002.
    Working Poor in Europe: A Partial
    Basic Income for Worker?. University
    of Frankfurt, Germany.

19. Suyanto, B. (2013). Perlindungan
    Sosial Bagi Anak-anak Miskin di
    Perkotaan. In Child Poverty and Social
    Protection Conference. SMERU
    Research Institute.

20. Todaro, M.P. (2011). Pembangunan
    Ekonomi Edisi 11 Jidil 2. Erlangga:
    Jakarta

21. World Bank. 2006. Era Baru dalam
    Pengentasan Kemiskinan di Indonesia:
    Ikhtisar. Jakarta: World Bank.

22. Wahyudin, U. (2012). Pelatihan
    Kewirausahaan Berlatar Ekokultural
    untuk Pemberdayaan Masyarakat
    Miskin Pedesaan. Mimbar: Jurnal
    Sosial Dan Pembangunan, 28(1).

23. Wahyuddin, A. (2014). Pola Asuh
    Orang Tua Nelayan dalam
    Membimbing Anak di Desa Campurejo
    Kecamatan Panceng Kabupaten
    Gresik. Paradigma: Jurnal Online
    Mahasiswa S1 Sosiologi UNESA, 2(1).

24. Zulham, T., ; Saftarita, Chenny, ;
    Basyiran, Teuku Bahran, ; Ilhamudin,
    Tasdik. 2019. Why Does the Poor
    Worker Keep Living Poorly in Aceh,
    Indonesia? Opcion Journal, Especial
    No.19, pp.1422 – 1451.