

Research Article

What Determines the Poverty of Paid Workers in Indonesia?

Leni Novianti¹, Raja Masbar², Muhammad Nasir*³¹Master of Economics, Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Syiah Kuala, Indonesia²Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Syiah Kuala, Indonesia**Article History**

Received: 08.01.2020

Accepted: 21.01.2020

Published: 27.01.2020

Journal homepage:<https://www.easpublisher.com/easjebm>**Quick Response Code**

Abstract: This study aims to measure and analyze the influences of individual and household factors on the poverty level of paid workers in Aceh province, Indonesia by using the 2018 National Labor Force Survey (Sakernas) data. Based on the binary logistic regression, gender, education, migration status, and the number of family members has a statistically significant effect on the poverty level of paid workers. To reduce the probability of paid workers becoming poor, the following recommendations are suggested. Government need to create an affordable education for children and young people so that they are not interested too quick to enter the workforce, ensure fulfillment of needs of non-migrant workers without having to leave their place of birth and family to settle job in other places, provide training and skills for paid workers in accordance to the market needs, and re-promote the family planning program nationwide.

Keywords: Worker, poverty line, binary logistic regression

Copyright @ 2020: This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution license which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium for non commercial use (NonCommercial, or CC-BY-NC) provided the original author and source are credited.

INTRODUCTION

The 2015-2030 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) are a continuation of the 2010-2015 Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). SDG is a development program comprises of 17 goals and 169 measurable targets with a period that has been agreed by various countries. SDG is a world development agenda aimed at realizing human welfare. Some of the main goals in the SDGs are victory in any form to provide productive and comprehensive employment opportunities and decent work for all. The purpose of the SDGs is to be the most complicated task for many countries in the world, including Indonesia (Jayanti et al., 2019). According to the Central Statistics Agency (BPS) – Statistics Indonesia (2018), the percentage of poverty in Indonesia over the past few years has been declining and reached 9.66% in September 2018. The government continues to strive to reduce the poverty rate as targeted in the 2015-2019 National Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJMN) by 6-8% by the end of 2019. This confirms the need for each year the government is expected to reduce poverty by one percent per year.

Reducing the poverty rate has also become the target of the Government of Aceh province, Indonesia. In the Aceh Province's Medium Term Development Plan (RPJM) for 2017-2022, the Government of Aceh has a sixth mission of realizing food sovereignty and

security with the goal of reducing poverty rate from 16.43% to 15.43% in 2018 and the eighth mission is to build and develop competitive production centers and creative industries with the aim of reducing open unemployment rate from 7.57% to 6.85% in 2018. The unemployment problem is closely related to population poverty.

Hitherto, labor issues have become a problem that often arises in the political bargaining agenda. Unjust outsourcing, termination of employment, incompatible regional minimum wage, inadequate labor protections, and weak legal protection for migrant workers have been a complex problem contributing to the poverty problem that needs an urgent solution. From some of these problems, the problem of labor welfare has always been a struggle because it concerns the welfare of labor life.

Based on the report of BPS – Statistics Indonesia (2018), the labor force in the province of Aceh in August 2018 reached 36.52% for the primary paid workers and 9.21% for the free workers, 20.73% self-employed, 15.65% for the non-permanent/unpaid workers, 4.21% for assisted by permanent/unpaid worker, and 13.65% for family/unpaid workers. Wages become a major problem in the provincial labor market. Many workers receive low-level wages to fulfill their daily needs, especially for those with large family members. This is the reason why vulnerable workers

with poor status let alone paid workers with non-permanent income.

Previous studies by Cheung and Chou (2016) showed that low-income jobs and the absence of co-workers in the household are the two main mechanisms that cause poverty in employment in Hong Kong. They also found that the risk of poverty in the workplace is different for high and low skilled workers. Priyono (2002) stated that status as a worker does not guarantee that a person will prosper. This phenomenon occurs in conditions where a person works, but the income earned from his work is unable to meet his minimum needs and is still below the poverty line. The phenomenon of poverty of workers being paid above raises the question that there are causes which are the deciding factors why many of the paid workers are struggling in poverty problem or have incomes below the poverty line. Dewi *et al.* (2018), Majid *et al.* (2019), and Nansadiqa *et al.* (2019) documented that economic growth and financial sector development determined the poverty level in Indonesia.

Based on the above background, it is interesting to study the determinants of poverty among paid laborers in Aceh Province, Indonesia. Specifically, it attempts to provide a general picture of the characteristics of poorly paid workers in Aceh, to measure and analyze the effect of individual factors on the poverty of paid workers, and to measure and analyze the effect of household factors on the poverty of paid workers. The findings of this study are hoped to provide some guidelines for policy-makers in designing policy for poverty education.

The rest of this study is structured in the following manner. Section 2 provides the selected literature reviews and followed by the discussion on the research method in Section 3. Section 4 provides the findings and their discussion and ended with the concluding remarks in Section 5.

LITERATURE REVIEW

According to the BPS – Statistics Indonesia (2016), poverty is an economic inability to meet the basic needs of life, both food, and non-food needs, and this is viewed in terms of household expenditure. The situation of not achieving a decent life with an income of USD1.00 per day is the definition of poverty by the World Bank. In 2005, the World Bank re-defined a new international poverty line, which is a per capita income per day of USD1.25. According to the National Planning and Development Agency (BAPPENAS), poverty is a condition of shortage not because of the wishes of the poor but because of conditions that cannot be avoided with the capabilities they have. Todaro (2006) defined absolute poverty as a population that is unable to get enough resources to meet basic needs.

According to Rady *et al.* (2002), the literature on poverty contains several approaches to measuring household welfare. The different selection of variables used to measure poverty can produce different perceptions of poverty. The two variables most commonly used to measure poverty are income and expenditure while the analysis units that are the most studied are individuals and households. Bradshaw (2006) suggested that there are at least five factors that cause poverty: 1) individual; 2) cultural; 3) economic, social, and political structure; 4) regional disparity; and 5) addiction cycle. Laderchi (2000) stated that the measurement of monetary poverty is the right measurement and is most commonly used to identify poverty through under-consumption or income below the poverty line. Meanwhile, Majid (2011), Majid (2014), and Majid (2017) defined poverty from both material and spiritual aspects.

According to Ahmed (2004), measuring the poverty line has several approaches, including direct calorie intake and the cost of basic needs approaches. With the direct calorie intake method, a household is categorized as poor if the energy intake per capita is less than the minimum energy requirement per capita of 2,100 kilocalories per capita per day. This method is used by the BPS – Statistics Indonesia to calculate food poverty lines. Meanwhile, the cost of basic needs method is also used as an approach to measuring poverty or well-being.

According to Foster *et al.* (1984), the measures of absolute poverty using both income-based measurements and the ability to meet basic needs in terms of expenditure, produces three kinds of poverty indicators, namely: (i) Percentage of population living below the predetermined poverty line, or also called the poverty rate or incidence, or head-count index (P0); (ii) Poverty inequality index, or poverty gap index (P1); and (iii) Poverty severity index (P2). The International Labor Organization (2006) defines worker poverty as a situation faced by individuals who already have jobs but do not have enough income to lift themselves and their families out of poverty. Majid (2001) defines poor workers as those who work and live in poor households, while Strengmann-Kuhn (2004) defines poor workers in two categories, namely: workers with a week's work time before the survey of at least one hour of living in poor households and workers with full-time work a week before the survey of living in poor households. Furthermore, Wicks-Lim (2012) defines poor workers as those who live with children in households with income no more than 2.4 times the poverty line.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study uses secondary data in the form of raw data gathered from the National Labor Force

Survey (Sakernas) in August 2018. Sakernas is a survey of labor force information that is carried out twice a year. The reason for using the Sakernas data for this study is because the information on the household income of the workers that are the focus of this research was officially surveyed by Sakernas. From the 2018 Sakernas data, there were 5,248 paid workers in Aceh Province.

The analytical method used in this study is descriptive analysis and inferential analysis. Data processing in this study uses the SPSS program. This descriptive analysis is mainly used to study the description of the characteristics of prosperous workers. Although it is the simplest statistical tool, the results of the descriptive analysis can be invaluable input for decision-makers, depending on the form of analysis used (Agung, 2002). Meanwhile, inferential analysis is used to estimate the effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable. This analysis can explain social, demographic and regional factors that affect workers' welfare.

The inferential analysis method used in this study is a binary logistic regression model. The logistic regression model is used to analyze data if the dependent variable is a qualitative variable on a binary scale/more with one/more explanatory variables on a category scale (Nachrowi and Usman, 2005). This model is also used to measure the probability of a situation occurring by taking into account the factors that influence and comparing the risk of a situation arising from a factor after calculating other factors in the model.

In this study, a binary logistic regression model is used to explore the poverty status of paid workers where the dependent variable is the poverty status. Binary logistic regression analysis is used because the independent variables studied will be made in the form of categorical with the number of categories two. To identify the binary/dichotomous logistic regression model, the dependent variable is expressed in the logit function for $Y = 1$ compared to the logit function $Y = 0$. In this case, the category $Y = 0$ is referred to as the reference category. For the poverty level model, namely: $Y = 0$, if paid workers are not poor. $Y = 1$, if workers are paid poorly.

The logit function or model has the following general form (Nachrowi and Usman, 2002). Category $Y = 0$ each is a reference group (reference group). In general, the form of a binary logistic regression model is written as follows:

$$L_i = \ln \frac{p_i}{1-p_i} = \beta_1 + \beta_2 X_i + u_i \quad (1)$$

In the logit p_i model it is defined following the logistic distribution function. p_i is defined as follows:

$$p_i = \frac{1}{1+e^{-z}}; \text{ dimana } Z_i = \beta_1 + \beta_2 X_i \quad (2)$$

and

$$1 - p_i = \frac{1}{1+e^{zi}} = \frac{e^{-zi}}{1+e^{-zi}} \quad (3)$$

where L_i is the probability of the dependent variable, p_i is the probability of an event occurring, $1-p_i$ is the probability that an event did not occur, β is the estimated regression coefficient, X is the value of the independent variable, e^z is the exponential function (where $e = 2,718 \dots$), and Z is a logistic function.

The following binary logistic equation model is estimated to measure the poverty status of paid workers with poverty line criteria:

$$Z = \ln \frac{p}{1-p} \quad (4)$$

$$\ln \frac{p}{1-p} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 AG0 + \beta_2 AG1 + \beta_3 GD + \beta_4 EDU0 + \beta_5 EDU1 + \beta_6 MS0 + \beta_7 FMS0 + \beta_8 HMS1 + \varepsilon \quad (5)$$

where p is the probability of success (there has been an event wherein paid workers are poor), $1-p$ is the probability of failure (there has been no event where the paid worker is not poor), β_k is the estimated logistic regression coefficient for the k -independent variable, $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, 8$, AG is the paid worker's age, GD is the gender of paid workers, EDU is the paid worker's education, MS is the migration status of paid workers, HMS is the household member size of paid workers.???

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Descriptive statistics of the sample

Table 1 illustrates the descriptive statistics of the paid workers, comprising the social, economic, and demographic characteristics. The poverty status of paid workers is divided into two categories, namely poor and non-poor, determined based on the poverty line. The table showed that 90.03% of the sample of paid workers was non-poor, while 9.97% was poor. When viewed by age group, 47.97% of the sample of this study was workers with age group 15-34 years old, 40.30% was within the age group 35-54 years old, and 11.73% was over 55 years old. The workers by the age groups of 15-34 years old and 35-54 old showed the almost similar number. This balanced composition shows a balanced amount, then a sample of paid workers starting from work at the beginning of a career and workers currently being paid at the peak of a career.

More than two-thirds of the study sample was male. This is reasonable because the responsibility for earning a living is more heavily placed on men. Meanwhile, if viewed from the status of the migration, only one-tenth of the sample of paid workers was migrant labor. When viewed from the level of education, more than half or as much as 58% of the sample of workers are paid with secondary education, namely junior high school or equivalent and high school

or equivalent. Low and higher education have a proportion of the number of samples that are very

contrasting, namely respectively 39.96% and 1.99% of the total study sample.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of Paid Workers

Characteristics	Group	Total	%
Poverty status	Poor	20,255	9.97
	Non-poor	182,842	90.03
	Total	203,097	100
Age group	15-34 years old	97,424	47.97
	35-54 years old	81,857	40.30
	≥ 55 years old	23,816	11.73
	Total	203,097	100
Gender	Male	158,111	77.85
	Female	44,986	22.15
	Total	203,097	100
Migrant status	Migrant	20,104	9.90
	Non-migrant	182,993	90.10
	Total	203,097	100
Education	Lower level	81,155	39.96
	Medium level	117,910	58.06
	High level	4,032	1.99
	Total	203,097	100
Household members size	≤ 4 people	108,725	53.50
	5-6 people	70,472	34.70
	≥ 7 people	23,900	11.80
	Total	203,097	100

Finally, from an individual characteristic of paid workers, this study also looks at the perspective of the household where the paid worker lives. As illustrated in Table 1, the majority of the sample (53.50%) of paid workers living in households with fewer than five members, and only 11.80% of them live in households of seven or more members.

Next, Table 2 reports the characteristics of the paid workers in the province of Aceh, Indonesia. This table provides bivariate descriptive between the individual and household characteristics and poverty of paid workers. This analysis is expected to provide an overview of the individual and household characteristics of the unit of analysis studied so that it will provide insight in analyzing the relationship between these characteristics and the poverty of paid workers.

When viewed according to age group, the proportion of paid workers by the age group 55 years and above who were poor was greater than paid workers by the age group of 15-34 years old and 35-54 years old. This happens because the workers aged 55 years and above have decreased their physical abilities so that the impact on decreasing working productivity.

The proportion of workers paid poor in the 15-34 age group is the lowest among the other age groups.

In terms of gender, the proportion of paid workers by the poor male was smaller than the paid workers by poor women. Specifically, the number of male household head samples was greater than the female household head which was 158,111 of 203,097. Migration is one way to improve welfare so that it is better than before. With regard to the migration status of paid workers, welfare can be seen as a motive or purpose of migration and as a means to migrate. Someone migrating is done at the expense of costs so that migration, in general, tends to be done by individuals who have enough money to make the move. Looking from the perspective of the destination, migrants usually have a higher fighting power because they have strong motivation and goals to be achieved.

Table 2 also provides a comparison of the poverty of paid workers between migrant and non-migrant workers. With the poverty line criteria, the proportion of paid non-migrant workers who were poor were slightly smaller than the paid workers whose status were migrants. This shows that the tendency of poverty is more experienced by migrant workers.

Table 2: Distribution frequency of paid workers

Characteristics	Poverty status	Total
-----------------	----------------	-------

	Non-poor	Poor	Frequency	%
Age group				
15-34 years old	91.03	8.97	97,424	100
35-54 years old	90.67	9.33	81,857	100
≥ 55 years old	83.71	12.29	23,816	100
Total	90.03	9.97	203,097	100
Migration status				
Migrant	89.99	10.01	182,993	100
Non-migrant	90.34	9.66	20,104	100
Total	90.03	9.97	203,097	100
Gender				
Male	93.19	6.81	158,111	100
Female	78.93	21.07	44,986	100
Total	90.03	9.97	203,097	100
Education				
Lower level	87.54	12.46	81,155	100
Medium level	92.04	7.98	117,910	100
High level	81.18	18.82	4,032	100
Total	90.03	9.97	203,097	100
Household members size				
≤ 4 people	90.02	9.98	108,725	100
5-6 people	89.16	10.84	70,472	100
≥ 7 people	92.62	7.38	23,900	100
Total	90.03	9.97	203,097	100

In terms of education level, the paid workers who possessed a higher level of education received a higher level of welfare. The low level of education causes low skills in the workforce, resulting in low wages or incomes. The low level of education results in limited self-development abilities and the limited number of jobs that can be entered. Low levels of education also limit the ability to find and take advantage of opportunities. Table 2 also shows that with the poverty line criteria, the proportion of paid workers with high education who were poor was greater than workers with low and medium education.

Finally, viewing from the family size, the number of household members indicates the potential or economic burden of the household. The existence of household members aged below 15 years old is generally still in school and not yet financially independent. Meanwhile, the existence of household members aged over 64 years old indicates the burden of dependency on the elderly population because when the elderly income is insufficient to support their lives after retirement, some of them rely on younger families, especially on children.

Determinants of poverty of the paid workers

Table 3 presents the results of the estimation of a binary logistic regression model, explaining the effect of individual and household factors on the tendency of paid workers to be poor. Based on the overall significance test, it can be seen that almost all independent variables could be used together to form a model. From the results of estimation, the first test is conducted to find out whether all the independent variables can be used together to form a model. As illustrated in Table 7, the -2 LogLikelihood (51,966,404) was greater than the chi-square value (21,026), showing that all independent variables can be entered into the model.

Based on the findings in Table 3, all independent variables have statistically significant in affecting the dependent variable. By looking at the coefficient (β) and $\text{Exp}(\beta)$ value of each variable, it can be explained the direction of the relationship and the tendency of paid workers to be poor. Variables with positive coefficients mean the tendency of paid workers to be poor with that category would be greater than the reference category. Variables with interval or ratio measurement scales whose coefficients were positive indicate that each increase of one unit of the independent variable would increase the tendency of poorly paid workers.

Table 3: Findings of determinants of the paid workers to be poor

Variable	β	P-Value	Odds-Ratio
----------	---------	---------	------------

Constant	-0.58	0.00	0.56
Age group			
15-34 years old			
35-54 years old	-0.21	0.00	0.81
≥55 years old	-0.49	0.00	0.61
Gender			
Male			
Female	-1.28	0.00	0.28
Migrant status			
Migrant			
Non-migrant	0.55	0.00	1.06
Education			
Lower level			
Medium level	-0.61	0.00	0.54
High level	-0.85	0.00	0.43
Household members size			
≤ 4 people			
5-6 people	0.12	0.00	1.12
≥ 7 people	0.41	0.00	1.51

The age variable has a significant effect on the tendency of paid workers to be poor. Paid workers who were in their peak careers were in the age group of 35-54 years old have a tendency to be poor 0.81 times less than paid workers aged group of 15-34 years old. This finding is in line with our hypotheses which suggest that the younger the workers' age, the greater the tendency for poverty. Paid workers with the aged group of 55 years old and above have a tendency to be poor 0.61 times less than paid workers aged 15-34 years old. This result is in line with Wulandari (2012) which found that a worker at the beginning of his career age is poorer because they have just entered the workforce and are only pursuing a career so that their accumulated wealth is still small. Likewise with the results of research conducted on agricultural households by Sharma and Singh (2015), the level of welfare of agricultural households where the age of the head of the household is getting older, where the older the age of the head of the agricultural household the more experience that has been obtained generally at productive age.

With regard to the gender factor, female paid workers tend to be poor 0.28 times less than male paid workers. This finding is in line with the study by Oginni *et al.* (2013) in Nigeria where a smaller female household head tends to be poor when compared to the male head of household-based on data from the Nigeria Demographic and Health Survey (NDHS) in 2008 with a total household sample of 34,070 households. This is also supported by research of Rajaram (2009) in India using data from the National Family Health Survey (NFHS) in 2005-2006 and a different measure of poverty by looking at housing conditions, wealth index and index a standard of living that better reflects the chronic standard of living found that the tendency of female head of households to be poor was smaller when compared to male head of households. This study did not use a measure of

poverty based on consumption expenditure because it only reflects the temporary income of a person.

As for the migration status of paid workers, the study found a statistically significant effect on the tendency of paid workers to be poor. Paid workers who were non-migrant workers tend to be 1.06 poorer than paid workers who were migrants. This result is in line with research conducted by Arifiyanto (2016) that the migration status of paid workers has a statistically significant effect on the tendency of paid workers to be poor. Paid workers who have migrant status tend to be poor 0.51 less than paid workers who have non-migrant status. This contradicted the results of Cheung and Chou's (2015) research in Hong Kong which stated that migrant workers have a poverty tendency 1.25 times more than non-migrant workers. The results of this study are also contradicted to the study by Zeng *et al.* (2019) in Hangzhou, China that found the migrant workers experience housing problems where almost one third (29.2%) migrant workers spend greater than 30% of their income on renting a house has resulted in many migrant workers returning to their places of origin. The high cost of living in Aceh province has made migrant workers need higher living costs, especially for housing so that it can cause migrant workers to be less prosperous than non-migrant workers.

Furthermore, the level of education has a significant influence on the tendency of paid workers to be poor. Because the reference category was low-educated paid workers, it can be said that workers paid with secondary and higher education have a tendency to be of poor status less than those of low-educated paid workers. The results of this study are in line with the hypothesis that has been formulated that paid workers with less education have a tendency to be poorer. In addition, workers paid with secondary education (junior and senior high school equivalents) have a tendency to

be poor 0.54 times less than paid workers with low education (elementary school and below), whereas paid workers with higher education (tertiary education) have a tendency of being poor 0.43 times smaller than paid educated workers. In general, the higher the level of education a paid worker is, the more prosperous his household is. The same thing was also found in the study by Bokosi (2006) which showed that in 2012 in Malawi, the possibility of poor households with household heads having completed primary education was 11% lower than households with household heads who did not attend school. In China, Zhiyi and Ye (2008) also documented that education investment had the greatest impact on farmers' income growth.

Finally, the size of household members is also found to be statistically significant in influencing the tendency of paid workers to be poor. Workers with a number of household members of 5 or more have a tendency to be poorer than paid workers with a maximum number of household members of 4 people. Households with 5-6 members have a poverty tendency of 1.12 times, while those with 7 or more have a tendency of 1.51 times greater than households with a maximum of 4 people. This is in line with the study of Sekhampu (2013) in Southern Africa and Igbalajobi et al. (2013) in Nigeria who documented an increasing number of family members in line with the increased risk of households for the poor. The poverty experienced by a household usually occurs in situations of insufficient income to meet the living needs of household members. The larger the household members, the greater the cost of living the household has to bear.

CONCLUSION

Based on the above discussion and analysis, the following conclusions can be drawn. Based on the results of descriptive analysis, it showed that paid workers who were poor reached 9.97%, workers with age group of 55 years and above, female, migrant status, highly educated, and have 5-6 household members have a larger tendency to become poor. Based on the inferential analysis, all independent variables (age, gender, migration status, education and number of household members) have a statistically significant effect on the poverty of paid workers. On individual factors, the paid workers with age group 15-34 years old, male, non-migrant and low educated level have the greatest tendency to be poor. Meanwhile, on the household factor, the paid workers who have household members of 7 people or more have the greatest tendency to be poor.

Referring to these empirical findings, to reduce the tendency of paid workers to become poor, the study suggests that the government must create cheap education for children and the young generation of the nation so that they are not interested and enter the workforce too quickly. The government should pay

attention and help non-migrant workers/indigenous people to be able to ensure fulfillment of their basic needs so that non-migrant workers can settle down to work without having to leave their place of birth and family to find work in other areas. The government must enhance the training and skills of workers that can be directly applied in the labor market in accordance with the needs of the job. The government should improve the productivity of young/early career workers with a variety of quality programs and training. Finally, the re-application of the small family program for households through the promotion of family planning campaigns should be prioritized to reducing poverty.

REFERENCES

1. Agung, I. G. N. (2000). *Metode Penelitian Sosial 2: Pengertian dan Pemakaian Praktis*. Jakarta: PT. Raja Grafindo Persada.
2. Agustiyani, R. (2010). *Faktor-faktor yang Mempengaruhi Status Kemiskinan Pekerja di Indonesia (Analisa Data Susenas dan Sakernas 2008)*. Thesis. Program Pascasarjana. Universitas Indonesia. Depok.
3. Ahmed, F. (2004). *Practices of Poverty Measurement and Poverty Profile of Bangladesh*. Manila: Asian Development Bank
4. Badan Pusat Statistik – BPS – Statistics Indonesia. (2018). *Keadaan Angkatan Kerja di Indonesia November 2018*. Jakarta: BPS.
5. Badan Pusat Statistik – BPS – Statistics Indonesia. (2018). *Keadaan Pekerja di Indonesia November 2018*. Jakarta: BPS.
6. Bodea, G., & Herman, E. (2014). Factors behind working poverty in Romania. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 15, 711-720.
7. Bokosi, F. K. (2006). *Household Poverty Dynamics in Malawi* (No. 1222). Germany: University Library of Munich.
8. Bradshaw, T. K. (2007). Theories of poverty and anti-poverty programs in community development. *Community Development*, 38(1), 7-25.
9. Cheung, K. C. K., & Chou, K. L. (2016). Working Poor in Hong Kong. *Social Indicators Research*, 129(1), 317-335.
10. Dewi, S., Majid, M. S. A., & Kassim, S. (2018). Dynamics of financial development, economic growth, and poverty alleviation: The Indonesian experience. *South East European Journal of Economics and Business*, 13(1), 17-30.
11. Foster, J., Greer, J., & Thorbecke, E. (1984). A class of decomposable poverty measures. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, 761-766.
12. Hosmer, D., & Lemeshow, S. (2013). *Applied Logistic Regression (3rd Ed)*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
13. Igbalajobi, O., Fatuase, A. I., & Ajibefun, I. (2013). Determinants of poverty incidence among

- rural farmers in Ondo State, Nigeria. *American Journal of Rural Development*, 1(5), 131-137.
14. International Labor Organization. (2003). *Working out of Poverty*. Geneva: ILO.
 15. International Labor Organization. (2006). *Realizing Decent Work in Asia, Fourteenth Asian Regional Meeting, Busan, Republic of Korea*. Geneva: ILO.
 16. International Labor Organization. (2006). *Statistical Report on The Working Poor in the Caribbean*. Geneva: ILO.
 17. Jayanti, E., Muhammad, S., Nazamuddin, B., Zulham, T., & Majid, M. (2019). Does Quality Of Life Matter For Achieving Sustainable Development Goals In Indonesia?. *Regional Science Inquiry*, 11(3), 119-132.
 18. Laderchi, C. R. (2000). *The Monetary Approach to Poverty: A Survey of Concepts and Methods* (pp. 1-19). Queen Elizabeth House.
 19. Majid, M. S. A. (2011). Mengentaskan kemiskinan dalam perspektif ekonomi syariah. *Jurnal Ekonomi dan Pembangunan*, 6(2), 43-52.
 20. Majid, M. S. A. (2014). Analisis Tingkat Pendidikan Dan Kemiskinan di Aceh. *Jurnal Pencerahan*, 8(1), 15-37.
 21. Majid, M. S. A. (2017). Mengentaskan Kemiskinan Rakyat Aceh Dengan Syariah. *Media Syari'ah*, 15(2), 209-220.
 22. Majid, M. S. A., Dewi, S., & Kassim, S. H. (2019). Does financial development reduce poverty? Empirical evidence from Indonesia. *Journal of the Knowledge Economy*, 10(3), 1019-1036.
 23. Majid, N. (2001). Working Poor in Developing Countries. *International Labour Review*, 140, 271.
 24. Nachrowi, D., & Usman, H. (2005). *Penggunaan Teknik Ekonometri (edisi revisi)*. Jakarta: P.T Raja Grafindo Persada.
 25. Nansadiqa, L., Masbar, R., & Majid, M. S. A. (2019). Does Economic Growth Matter For Poverty Reduction In Indonesia?. *East African Scholars Journal of Economics, Business and Management*, 2(2), 46-52.
 26. Oginni, A., Ahonsi, B., & Ukwuije, F. (2013). Are female-headed households typically poorer than male-headed households in Nigeria?. *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 45, 132-137.
 27. Priyono, E. (2002). Mengapa Angka Pengangguran Rendah di Masa Krisis?: Menguak Peranan Sektor Informal Sebagai Buffer Perekonomian. *Jurnal Ekonomi dan Kewirausahaan*, 1(2), 1-13.
 28. Rady, T., Slotsve, G., Mohabbat, K. (2002). *Poverty in Egypt: 1974-1996*.
 29. Rajaram, R., (2009). *Female-headed households and poverty: evidence from the national family health survey*. In: Third Southeastern International/Development Economics Workshop – Agenda & Papers, Atlanta.
 30. Sekhampu, T. J. (2013). Determinants of poverty in a South African township. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 34(2), 145-153.
 31. Sharma, R., & Singh, G. (2015). Access to modern agricultural technologies and farmer household welfare: Evidence from India. *Millennial Asia*, 6(1), 19-43.
 32. Strengmann-Kuhn, W. (2004). *Working Poor in Europe. Promoting Income Security as a Right*. London: Anthem Press
 33. Todaro, P., & Smith, C. (2006). *Economic development ninth edition*. Pearson Addison-Wesley Education Limited: United Kingdom.
 34. Wicks-Lim, J. (2012, October). The working poor: A booming demographic. In *New labor forum* (Vol. 21, No. 3, pp. 17-25). Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA: SAGE Publications.
 35. World Bank. (2005). Understanding the determinants of poverty. *Poverty Manual, JH Revision*, Chapter 8.
 36. World Bank. (2015). *Poverty*. World Development Report.
 37. Wulandari, S. L. (2012). Status Ekonomi dan Migrasi di Kota Depok: Analisis Data Sensus Penduduk 2010. *Thesis*, Program Pascasarjana. Universitas Indonesia. Depok.
 38. Zeng, H., Yu, X., & Zhang, J. (2019). Urban village demolition, migrant workers' rental costs and housing choices: Evidence from Hangzhou, China. *Cities*, 94, 70-79.
 39. Zhiyi, G. U. O., & Ye, C. H. A. N. G. (2008). The investment of human capital of peasant household and the growth of farmers' income. *Frontiers of Economics in China*, 3(3), 296-311.