

# ANALYSIS OF FACTORS AFFECTING POVERTY PERSPECTIVE PROBLEMS 2015-2022 PERIOD (CASE STUDY: ACEH SINGKIL DISTRICT)

Alimuddin Pohan<sup>1</sup>, Liza Nurlaila<sup>2</sup>, Elvita Lubis<sup>3</sup>, Fauzi Arif Lubis<sup>4</sup>, Nurul Inayah<sup>5</sup>

Universitas Islam Negeri Sumatera Utara Medan

Korespondensi Penulis:

[alipohan940@gmail.com](mailto:alipohan940@gmail.com)

## Abstract

This research aims to determine the effect of education on poverty from a masalah perspective for the 2015-2022 period (Case Study: Aceh Singkil Regency). To determine the effect of unemployment on poverty from a masalah perspective for the 2015-2022 period (Case Study: Aceh Singkil Regency). To find out the effect of inflation on poverty from a masalah perspective for the period 2015-2022 (Case Study: Aceh Singkil Regency). To find out the effect of the Human Development Index on poverty from a masalah perspective for the period 2015-2022 (Case Study: Aceh Singkil Regency). , Inflation and Investment simultaneously influence poverty from the masalah perspective for the 2015-2022 period (Case Study: Aceh Singkil Regency). This research uses a quantitative approach with time series data. Data taken from 2015-2022 which can be accessed on the website [www.bps.go.id](http://www.bps.go.id). The data analysis technique used was a multiple regression technique which was processed using SPSS 26. The results of the research were that it was found that education had no effect on masalah perspective poverty for the 2015-2022 period (Case Study: Aceh Singkil Regency) with the calculated t value of the Education variable being -8.596 . Meanwhile, the t table value is 2.042. Unemployment influences poverty from the masalah perspective for the 2015-2022 period (Case Study: Aceh Singkil Regency) with the calculated t value for the Unemployment variable being 5.471. Inflation influences poverty from the masalah perspective for the 2015-2022 period (Case Study: District Aceh Singkil) with a calculated t value for the Inflation variable of 2.545, while the t table value is 2.042. Meanwhile, HDI has no effect on masalah perspective poverty for the 2015-2022 period (Case Study: Aceh Singkil Regency) with the calculated t value of the Inflation variable being 0.897, while the t table value is 2.042. Furthermore, education, unemployment, inflation and HDI simultaneously influence poverty from the masalah perspective for the 2015-2022 period (Case Study: Aceh Singkil Regency).

**Keywords: Education, Unemployment, Inflation, HDI and Poverty**

## INTRODUCTION

Indonesia, with its diversity, is a country that has abundant natural resources. If these natural resources are managed well, they should bring prosperity to all the people of Indonesia. Good governance (*good corporate governance*) will result in the achievement of the government's strategic goals which of course lead to the creation of Indonesia's prosperity. Low poverty rates, high per capita income (GDP), increasing investment, stable prices of basic commodities, high wages, low crime rates are some of the variables that determine the welfare of a country.

Poverty is one of the main variables to measure the welfare of a country. Low or high poverty rates are a reflection of the government's ability to manage the country. The smaller the number or percentage of poor people shows that the government has good state governance and vice versa. A small number of poor people generally indicates the prosperity of a country. Islam is very concerned with the discussion of poverty.

Indonesia will experience a decrease in the percentage of poverty in 2022. Based on data from the Central Statistics Agency (BPS), the number of poor people in Indonesia in March 2022 is 26.16 million people. Whereas poverty level Indonesia in the same month was 9.54 percent. When compared with similar research released by BPS in September 2021, the number of poor people and the poverty ratio in March had decreased. For your information, the number of poor people as of September last year was 26.5 million people with a poverty rate of 9.71 percent.

Aceh Province, which implements Islamic law with its Qanun Law and has large OTSUS (Special Autonomy) funds, is the poorest province on the island of Sumatra. Based on data from the Ministry of Finance and APBA documents as a whole over a period of 15 years, the province of Aceh has received Special Autonomy Funds (DOKA) from the central government amounting to IDR 95.93 trillion. ImpactThe Aceh special autonomy funds from 2008 to 2022, which were distributed by the central government to the Aceh government, have not yet been fully felt on the Aceh economy, plus the poverty level is still significant every year. The main objective of the Aceh Special Autonomy fund is aimed at encouraging the economy to create a prosperous Acehese society. One way to see the failure or success of utilizing the realization of the Aceh Special Autonomy Fund since it was budgeted in 2008 is through a welfare perspective (ajnn, 2022).

The pandemic which has an impact on increasing the number of poor people in Aceh Province is a calculation of the total number of poor people in each district in this Province. Aceh Singkil Regency occupies the district with the highest number of poor people compared to 22 other districts. This is a big problem considering the large natural resource potential that this district has. This can be seen in the table below:

**Table 1.2. Percentage of Poor Population by Regency/City in Aceh Province**

Regency/City	Percentage of Poor Population (P0) According to Regency/City (Percent)	
	2021	2022
ACEH	15.33	14.64
Simeulue	18.98	18.37
<b>Aceh Singkil</b>	<b>20.36</b>	<b>19.18</b>
South Aceh	13.18	12.43
Southeast Aceh	13.41	12.83
East Aceh	14.45	13.91
Central Aceh	15.26	14.50
West Aceh	18.81	17.93
Aceh Besar	14.05	13.38
Pidie	19.59	18.79
Bireuen	13.25	12.51
North Aceh	17.43	16.86
Southwest Aceh	16.34	15.44
Gayo Lues	19.64	18.87
Aceh Tamiang	13.34	12.61
Nagan Raya	18.23	17.38
Aceh Jaya	13.23	12.51
Bener Meriah Regency	19.16	18.39
Pidie Jaya	19.55	18.45
Banda Aceh City	7.61	7.13
Sabang City	15.32	14.66

Langsa City	10.96	10.62
Lhokseumawe City	11.16	10.84
Subulussalam City	17.65	16.94

From Table 1.2 above, it can be seen that Aceh Singkil Regency is the district with the highest percentage of poverty rates in 2021 and 2022. Even though Aceh Singkil Regency has a variety of abundant natural resources.

The variables Education, Unemployment, Inflation and HDI are the variables used to see their influence on poverty in this district. Poverty is closely related to education, because education can provide the ability to develop through one's own skills, therefore the lower the level of education, the higher the level of poverty. The higher the level of education, the lower the poverty level. This is in line with the results of research by Elda Wahyu Azizah, Sudarti and Hendra Kusuma entitled "The Influence of Education, Per Capita Income and Population on Poverty in East Java Province", The results of this research show that education has a negative and significant effect on district and city poverty in East Java Province. With a probability value of  $0.0000 < \alpha = 0.10$  and  $t\text{-count} -15.35144 < t\text{-table } 2.02439$ . (Azizah et al., 2018).

The facts on the ground are that Aceh province has a low quality of education. This has become a big problem in recent years. Based on the results of the Computer-Based Written Examination (UTBK) for the 2020, 2021 and 2023 State University Entrance Joint Selection (SBMPTN), Aceh's score and average student score is around 446.7, this point is still below the national average, in fact still under Papua Province.

Unemployment is the second independent variable used in this research. The bad influence of unemployment on poverty according to (Sukirno, 2004) is People's income decreases because they do not have a job, which ultimately reduces the level of prosperity that a person has achieved. According to the results of Yerlina Yacoub's research entitled "The Influence of Unemployment Levels on Regency/City Poverty Levels in West Kalimantan Province". It was found that the unemployment rate had a significant effect on the poverty level of districts/cities in West Kalimantan Province. Empirical data shows a pattern of relationship that is not always in the same direction between the unemployment rate and the poverty rate. (Jacoub, 2012).

Based on data from the Central Statistics Agency (BPS), the unemployment rate in Aceh Province is around 5.97 percent, while the national average open unemployment rate (TPT) at the same time is 5.83 percent. Looking at the national TPT, this figure is already worrying. One of the reasons why the unemployment rate in Aceh is high is because there is a mismatch between labor (supply) and demand (demand) from companies. The small number of companies investing by opening businesses in Aceh is also a factor causing the high unemployment rate in Aceh. The low investment climate certainly results in low unemployment absorption in this province.

Based on the background above, the author is interested in carrying out research entitled: **“Title: Analysis of Factors Affecting Poverty from Maslahah Perspective for the 2015-2022 Period (Case Study: Aceh Singkil Regency).**

## **METHOD**

The type of research used by researchers is descriptive research. Descriptive research is a type of research that aims to present a complete picture of a social situation or is intended to explore and clarify a phenomenon or social reality, by describing a number of variables relating to the problem and unit being studied among the phenomena being tested.

This research was carried out by accessing the site provided by the Central Statistics Agency at <https://bps.go.id> from 2015-2022. This research was conducted over a period of 2 months, namely August to September 2023. The data used is time series data. This is annual report data published by the Central Statistics Agency regarding Poverty, Education, Unemployment, Inflation, Human Development Index in Aceh Province.

The population in this study is all data related to Poverty, Education, Unemployment, Human Development Index and Inflation in Aceh Province. The sample in this research is quarterly time series data obtained from <https://bps.go.id> for 7 years from 2015-2022.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

Aceh Singkil Regency was formed in 1999, namely with the issuance of Law no. 14 of 1999 dated April 27 1999. The administrative area of the Aceh Singkil Regional Government with the capital Singkil is divided into 11 sub-districts which oversee 120 villages (including

transmigration settlements). This district consists of two regions, namely the mainland and the islands. The islands that are part of Aceh Singkil are Banyak Islands.

The population of Aceh Singkil Regency is 130,787 people, consisting of 66,163 men and 64,624 women with an area of 1,857.88 km<sup>2</sup>. The geographical location of Aceh Singkil Regency is in the position 2002'-2027'30" North Latitude and 97004'-97045'00" East Longitude.

Aceh Singkil Regency has administrative boundaries which include the north bordering Subulussalam City, the south bordering the Indonesian Ocean, the east bordering North Sumatra Province and the west bordering Trumon District, South Aceh Regency. Simpang Kanan has the largest area, namely 289.96 km<sup>2</sup> or 15.61 percent of the district area. Suro District is the district that has the highest altitude, namely 74 meters.

### Normality test

The normality test is a statistical test used to test whether the observed data has a normal distribution or not. In this study, researchers used the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. The method is to look at the value of Asymp.sig. (2-tailed) of the table *One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test Unstandardized Residual* the value must be  $> 0.05$  and use graphic analysis methods, either by looking at the graph using a histogram or by looking at it *Normal Probability Plot*. Chart *normal p-plot* will form a straight diagonal line, then the plotting data will be compared with the diagonal line. If the distribution is normal, the line that describes the actual data will follow the diagonal line. As seen in table 4.2 below:

**One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test**

		Unstandardized Residual
N		32
Normal Parameters <sup>a,b</sup>	Mean	.0000000
	Std. Deviation	.05114768
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.277
	Positive	.277
	Negative	-.139

Test Statistic	.277
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.505

**Table 4.2 Normality Test**

Source: SPSS 26 secondary data output processed, 2023

From the results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, it is known that the significance or probability value of 0.505 is greater than 0.05, so it can be stated that all data is normally distributed.

### **Multicollinearity Test**

The multicollinearity test aims to test whether a research regression model finds a correlation between independent variables. According to Ghozali (2011), testing for multicollinearity is carried out by paying attention to the size of the tolerance value and the size of the VIF.

The results of the multicollinearity test in this study are as follows:

**Table 4.3 Scatterplot Test Results**

Model	Colinearity Statistics	
	Tolerance	VIF
(Constant)		
RLS (Average Years of Schooling)	.146	6.839
PNG (Unemployment)	.611	1.635
INF (Inflation)	.336	2.974
HDI (Human Development Index)	.142	7.049

a. Dependent Variable: JPM (Number of Poor Population)

Source: SPSS 26 secondary data output processed, 2023

Based on table 4.3, it can be seen that the VIF value for the variable (RLS) Average Years of Schooling, PNG (Unemployment), INF (Inflation) and HDI (Human Development Index) has a VIF value of  $<10$  and a tolerance value of  $> 0.1$  so that this regression model It was stated that there were no symptoms of multicollinearity.

### **Heteroscedasticity Test**

The heteroscedasticity test aims to test for differences in variance from residual values from one observation period to another. A good regression model is homoscedastic or does not have symptoms of heteroscedasticity.

### **Figure 4.2 Scatterplot Test Results**





Based on the provisions above, it can be concluded that there is no heteroscedasticity problem. So, from the three classical assumption tests, it is certain that you have met the requirements to proceed to multiple linear regression analysis.

To test heteroscedasticity it can also be seen from the Glejser test,

**Table 4.4 Hasil Uji Geysner**

**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Say.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.908	3.021		1.294	.206
	RLS	.000	.001	-.241	-.383	.705
	PNG	-.004	.010	-.324	-.440	.663
	INF	3.798E-005	.000	.937	1.527	.138
	IPM	.005	.015	.016	.340	.737

a. Dependent Variable: Abs\_RES

Based on the provisions above, it can be concluded that there is no heteroscedasticity problem. This can be seen in the output table “**Coefficients**” with variabel **Abs\_RES** acts as a dependent variable. Based on the output above, the value is known **significance (Sig.)** for variables **RLS (X<sub>1</sub>)** is **0,705**. Meanwhile, values **significance (Sig.)** for variables **PNG (X<sub>2</sub>)** is 0.663. Then the

significance value (Sig.) for the INF variable ( $X_3$ ) is 0.138. Next, the significance value (Sig.) for the HDI variable ( $X_4$ ) is 0.737.

### Autocorrelation Test

One of the analytical methods for detecting whether there is autocorrelation is by testing the Durbin Washington value (DW test). The results of the autocorrelation test are as follows:

**Table 4.5 Autocorrelation Test Results**

<b>Durbin-Watson</b>
<b>0,671</b>

Source: SPSS 26 secondary data output processed, 2023

Table 4.5 above shows that the Durbin Watson value for this research is 0.671, so it can be concluded that this research is free from autocorrelation interference.

### Coefficient of Determination (R Square)

Coefficient of Determination (*R Square*) aims to measure the percentage influence of the independent or independent variable on the dependent or dependent variable in percentage units in a research regression model. The results of the coefficient of determination test in this research are as follows:

**Table 4.6 Coefficient of Determination Test Results**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.943 <sup>a</sup>	.890	.873	.08211

a. Predictors: (Constant), IPM, PNG, INF, RLS
b. Dependent Variable: JPM

Source: SPSS 26 secondary data output processed, 2023

Based on tableoutput SPSS “*Model Summary*” above, the value of the coefficient of determination/*R Square* is 0.890 or equal to 89%. This number means that the RLS variable ( $X_1$ ), PNG ( $X_2$ ), INF ( $X_3$ ) and HDI ( $X_4$ ) simultaneously (together) have an effect on the JPM variable ( $Y$ ) by 89%. Meanwhile, the remainder ( $100\% - 89\% = 11\%$ ) is influenced by other variables outside this regression equation or variables that were not studied.

### Uji T

The T test basically aims to find out how much influence each independent variable has on the dependent variable in a study. When carrying out a partial T test, decision making can be done by looking at the Sig value. This research uses a significance value of 5% or 0.05 with the following criteria:

If *Pvalue* (Say)  $> H_0$  accepted. This means that there is no significant influence of the independent variable on stock prices

If *Pvalue* (Say)  $\leq H_0$  rejected. This means that there is a significant influence of the independent variable on stock prices. The t test results in this research are as follows:

**Table 4.7. t Test Results**

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	S a y .
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	8.396	1.066		7.877	.000
RLS	-2.913	.339	-1.438	-8.596	.000
PNG	.658	.120	.447	5.471	.000
INF	.122	.048	.281	2.545	.017
IPM	.082	.092	.152	.897	.377

**Uji F**

The F test is used to determine the effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable in a study simultaneously or together. In the F test, this research will use a significance value of 5% or 0.05 with the following criteria:

If  $Pvalue (Sig) > \alpha$  then  $H_0$  is accepted. This means that there is no significant influence of the independent variable on JPM

If  $Pvalue (Sig) \leq \alpha$  then  $H_0$  is rejected. This means that there is a significant influence of the independent variable on JPM

The results of the F test in this research are as follows:

**Table 4.8 F Test Results**  
ANOVA<sup>a</sup>

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	1.467	4	.367	54.381	.000 <sup>b</sup>
Residual	.182	27	.007		
Total	1.649	31			

a. Dependent Variable: JPM

b. Predictors: (Constant), IPM, PNG, INF, RLS

$H_0$  : RLS, PNG, INF and IPM simultaneously have no effect on JPM

$H_1$  : RLS, PNG, INF and IPM simultaneously have a significant effect on JPM prices

Based on tableoutput SPSS “Anova” above, it is known that the significance value (Sig) is  $0.000 < 0.05$ , so it can be concluded that the hypothesis is accepted or in other words RLS ( $X_1$ ), PNG ( $X_2$ ), INF ( $X_3$ ) IPM ( $X_4$ ) simultaneously has a significant effect on JPM (Y). Orif F count is greater than F table ( $F \text{ count} > F \text{ table}$ ) then simultaneously the independent variable has a significant influence on the dependent variable. In this research, it can be seen that the calculated f has a value of 54.381 while the f table value is 2.71. F count is 54.381. So it can be concluded that simultaneously the independent variable RLS ( $X_1$ ), PNG ( $X_2$ ), INF ( $X_3$ ) IPM ( $X_4$ ) is influential on JPM (Y).

## Multiple Regression Test

Multiple linear regression analysis aims to find the influence of two or more independent variables/independent variables (X) on the dependent variable/dependent variable (Y). The results of multiple linear regression calculations using the SPSS program in this research are as follows:

**Table 4.9 Multiple Linear Regression Test Results**

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	8.396	1.066		7.877	.000
RLS	-2.913	.339	-1.438	-8.596	.000
PNG	.658	.120	.447	5.471	.000
INF	.122	.048	.281	2.545	.017
IPM	.082	.092	.152	.897	.377

a. Dependent Variable: JPM

Source: SPSS 26 secondary data output processed, 2023

In the table “*Coefficients*” above can be explained about the multiple regression equation in this research. The regression equation formula in this research is as follows:

$$Y = a + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + b_3X_3 + b_4X_4 + e$$

$$Y = 8,396 + (-2,931) X_1 + 0,658 X_2 + 0,122 X_3 + 0,082 X_4$$

## CONCLUSION

1. Education has no effect on poverty from the problem perspective for the 2015-2022 period. This is proven by the calculated t value of the Education variable which is -8.596. Meanwhile, the t table value is 2.042. So it is found that t count < from t table, it can be concluded that  $H_1$  accepted and  $H_0$  rejected, meaning it doesn't exist influence between Education ( $X_1$ ) to Poverty (Y).
2. Unemployment influences poverty from a problem perspective for the 2015-2022 period. This is proven by the calculated t value of the Unemployment variable which is 5.471. Meanwhile, the t table value is 2.042. So it is found that t is calculated from the t table, it can be concluded that  $H_2$  accepted and  $H_0$  rejected, meaning there is a significant influence between Unemployment ( $X_2$ ) to Poverty (Y).
3. Inflation influences poverty from a problem perspective for the 2015-2022 period. This is proven by comparing t count and t table. It is known that the calculated t value of the Inflation variable is 2.545, while the t table value is 2.042. So it is found that t is calculated from the t table, it can be concluded that  $H_3$  accepted and  $H_0$  rejected, meaning it exists significant influence between Inflation ( $X_3$ ) to Poverty (Y).
4. HDI has no effect on poverty from the problem perspective for the 2015-2022 period. This is proven by comparing the calculated t value of the Inflation variable which is 0.897, while the t table value is 2.042. So it is found that t is calculated from the t table, it can be concluded that  $H_4$  rejected and  $H_0$  accepted, meaning it doesn't exist significant influence between HDI ( $X_4$ ) to Poverty (Y).
5. Education, Unemployment, Inflation and HDI simultaneously influence poverty from a masalah perspective for the 2015-2022 period. This is proven by calculated f has a value of 54,381 while the f table value is 2.71 F count 54,381

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Agunggunanto, E. Y. (2012). Analysis of Poverty and Income of Fishing Family Cases in Wedung District, Demak Regency, Central Java, Indonesia. *Journal of Development Economic Dynamics*, 1(1), 50. <https://doi.org/10.14710/jdep.1.1.50-58>
- Azizah, E. W., Sudarti, S., & Kusuma, H. (2018). The Influence of Education, Per Capita Income and Population on Poverty in East Java Province. *Journal of Economic Sciences*, 2(1), 167–180.
- Creswell, J. w. 2007. *Research Design, Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. UK: SAGE Publication Inc.



- Please, A.S. (2021). The Influence of Income, Number of Family Members and Education on Consumption Patterns of Poor Households in Sungai Kanan District, South Labuhanbatu Regency, North Sumatra Province, *thesis* FEBI, UIN-SU Medan.
- Harahap, I. (2018). *Development Economics: A Transdisciplinary Approach*. Medan: Perdana Publishing
- Harahap, I. (2018). *Contemporary Muamalah Fiqh*. Medan, FEBI, UIN-SU Press.
- Jhingan, M. L. 2002. Economic Development and Planning, Jakarta: Pt. Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Kuncoro, M. 2000. Development Economics: Theory, Problems and Policies Yogyakarta: UPP AMPYKPN.
- Lubis, F. A. (2018). Poor According to the View of the Qur'an. *TANSIQ: Journal of Islamic Management and Business*, 1(2).
- Maulana, A., & Suryaningrum, N. 2023. The Effect of Poverty on Indonesian Child Labor: Micro Data Analysis. *Journal of Development Economic Dynamics*, 5(3), 258–269. <https://doi.org/10.14710/jdep.5.3.258-269>
- Murjani, A. 2019. Short-Run and Long-Run Impact of Inflation, Unemployment, and Economic Growth Towards Poverty in Indonesia: Ardl Approach. *Jurnal Dinamika Ekonomi Pembangunan*, 2 (1), 15. <https://doi.org/10.14710/jdep.2.1.15-29>
- Mustika, C., Haryadi, H., Junaidi, J., & Zamzami, Z. (2022). The Relationship Between Absolute Poverty Income Inequality in Rural and Urban Areas in Indonesia: The Granger Causality Approach. *Journal of Development Economics*, 11(2), 107–118. <https://doi.org/10.23960/jep.v11i2.541>
- Nasution, W. R., Nawawi, Z. M., & Inayah, N. (2022). Analysis of the Use of Palm Oil Sticks in Increasing Community Income and Welfare from an Islamic Economic Perspective. *ULIL ALBAB: Multidisciplinary Scientific Journal*, 1(8), 2651-2658.
- Rahmi, T.I.F. (2019). *Training Book: Sharia Banking I*. Medan: FEBI UIN-SU.
- Rejekiingsih, T. W. (2012). Participation of the Poor in the Poverty Alleviation Activity Program in Semarang City in 2010. *Journal of Development Economic Dynamics*, 1(1), 9. <https://doi.org/10.14710/jdep.1.1.9-17>
- Primadianti, N., & Sugiyanto, C. (2020). Regional Inequality, Pro-Poor Economic Growth, and Poverty in West Nusa Tenggara. *Journal of Development Economic Dynamics*, 3(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.14710/jdep.3.1.1-20>
- Qadrnanda, L. (2017). Analysis of the Effect of Education on Economic Growth and the Gini Ratio on the Open Unemployment Rate in the Special Region of Yogyakarta in 2010-2015. Thesis, 1–34.
- Q'rene V. F. Supit, Josep B. Kalangi, Steeva Y. L. Tumangkeng (2023). The Influence of Economic Growth, Human Development Index (Ipm), and Unemployment on Poverty in Minahasa Regency. *Periodical Journal of Scientific Efficiency*. 23 (10)
- Rachmadi, M. F. (2019). *Journal of Development Economic Dynamics (JDEP)*. JDEP (Journal of Development Economic Dynamics), 2(2), 172–177.
- Siregar, M. H., Ramadayanti, D., Lubis, F. A., & Ardiansyah, M. (2021). Education, Religion, Social Building Religious Moderation Through Islamic Studies Among the Young Generation in Bandar Khalipah Village, Dusun IX Tembung. *Jurma: Journal of Creative Student Programs*, 5(2), 194-202.
- Sugiarti, S. (2012). The Influence Between Education Level and Unemployment Level on Population Poverty in Indonesia. <http://repository.fe.unj.ac.id/id/eprint/2463>
- Sukirno, Sadono. 2014. Development Economics, Jakarta: Erlangga.

- Suripto, Lalu Subayil (2020). The Influence of Education Level, Unemployment, Economic Growth and Human Development Index on Poverty in D.I.Yogyakarta Period 2010-2017. *Scientific Journal of Development Economics*. 1 (2)
- Susanto, E., Rochaida, E., & Ulfah, Y. (2018). The effect of inflation and education on unemployment and poverty. *Innovation*, 13(1), 19. <https://doi.org/10.29264/jinv.v13i1.2435>.
- Tri Wahyuni, R. N., & Damayanti, A. (2014). Factors Causing Poverty in Papua Province: Spatial Heterogeneity Analysis. *Indonesian Journal of Economics and Development*, 14(2), 128–144. <https://doi.org/10.21002/jepi.v14i2.441>
- Todaro P. Michael. 2020. *Third World Economic Development Volume I*, Jakarta Publisher: Erlangga.
- Todaro P. Michael., & Stephen, S. 2020. *Ninth World Economic Development*. Jakarta Publisher: Erlangga.
- Yacoub, Y. (2012). The Influence of Unemployment Levels on Regency/City Poverty Levels in West Kalimantan Province. 8, 176–185.
- Yafiz, Muhammad and Harahap, Darwis (2018) *Gold Pawn Products in Sharia Banking: Analysis of Economic Issues*. *Human Falah: Journal of Islamic Economics and Business*, 5 (1). pp. 117-144. ISSN 2407-7119; 2527-6646
- Yafiz, Muhammad (2015) *Internalization maqâshid al-syarit'sah in economics according to M. Umer Chapra*. *Ahkam Journal of Sharia Science*, 15 (1). pp. 103-110. ISSN 1412-4734

travel.kompas.com

[www.ajnn.net](http://www.ajnn.net)

[www.bps.go.id](http://www.bps.go.id)