The Affect of Economic Growth toward Poverty in JABODETABEK

Bambang Hermanto[1], Heru Subiyantoro[2], Karno[3], Oyong Lisa[4]

[1,2,3]Universitas Borobudur, Indonesia

[4]Universitas Gajayana, Indonesia

ABSTRACT: The problem of poverty in JABODETABEK when measured by the percentage of poverty has decreased but tends to be slow in 2014-2018 and this problem is a challenge for the government because the poverty rate is still high in JABODETABEK, even though this region has high industrial activity in Java and is a location factor that affects close to the centre of government. This happens because economic growth is the most dominant anti-poverty instrument. This study uses panel data regression analysis technique with the data used is secondary data obtained from the Central Statistics Agency. The results obtained indicate that economic growth has a positive and significant effect on poverty. Suggestions for reducing poverty levels are that local governments need to encourage an increase in the rate of economic growth in the areas of Jakarta, Bogor, Depok, Tangerang and Bekasi.

KEYWORDS: Poverty, Economic Growth, Affect/Impact

I. INTRODUCTION

Poverty is a phenomenon that happened almost in all develop countries. Poverty came up as the cause of society inability so that they can live in a commonsense life. This condition caused the low productivity and income as the result of the decrease of human resource quality. Poverty problem is one of the main problems in economic development. Basically, economic development has purpose to increase the public welfare, income and the economic growth in all sector of development, optimal equitable development, workforce expansion and improvement of peoples' standard living. To reach the overall development, it needs the increase of economic development and the overall income distribution. Indonesian Government realize that national development is one of effort to reach fair and prosperous society. A line with this purpose, there are a lot of development activity that directed to area's development with increasing level of poverty yearly.

Area's development is done integrated and sustainably in accordance with the priority and necessity of each area based on the roots and targets of national development which have been set through short- and long-term development. Therefore, one of the succeed national development main indicator is the decreasing amount of poverty. The effectivity in the decreasing number of poverties is the main growth in choosing the development strategy. This means that one of the main characters in choosing emphasis sector and mainstay sector of national development is effectivity in the decreasing number of poverty (Purnama, 2017).

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Poverty Theory

Poverty according to the World Bank is a situation where a person or a group that doesn't have a choice or opportunity to improve their standard of living in order to have a healthy and better life based on the life standard, having a self-esteem and be appreciated by others. Whereas, based on the Badan Pusat Statistic (Central Bureau of Statistic), poverty is a situation where a person unable to fulfill their basic needs such as clothing, shelter, food, education and health which are considered as needs and have a certain standard count on the expense. Poverty is a social problem that keeps arise in a social life. Poverty problem is in a very long term just same as human age itself. And the main element problem related to many kinds of things and human life characters. In other word, poverty is a global or world life problem, means that poverty has become world concern. This problem happened in all countries. Even though, the impact of poverty varies. (Nurwanti, 2008)

The Affect of Economic Growth toward Poverty in JABODETABEK

Poverty seen as inability from the economy side to fulfill the basic needs of food and non-food that measured by the expenses (Central Bureau of Statistic). Poverty is a problem faced by all of countries. Economic growth as one of the indicators in handling the poverty problem where the economic growth is a concept of the economic development (Atalay, 2015)

Poverty showed an individual, group or society collective condition. Poverty can be caused by many factors. It is hard to find that poverty only caused by single factor. One or poor family can be caused by several factors which related one to another. For example, a disability, low education, no capital or skill to manage, unavailability of job opportunities, get laid off, no social security (pension, health, death), or live in rural area with limited infrastructure and natural resources (Aneta, 2010)

There are a lot of factors which caused poverty, both permanent and develop poverty. Geographical location and natural carrying capacity can be considered as permanent factors. Whereas social, culture which related to knowledge and skills, customs, political situation and ruler's policy considered as develop factors. According to the economist, there are indicators which trapped people in poverty (Todaro M.P., 1995). Thus, indicators related to the development in the field of social, economy, such as service of health, nutrition, teaching, housing area, consumption, transportation and service, agriculture, industry and trade

B. Economic Growth Theory

Economic growth is a long term of capacity rise from the country to provide any kind of economic goods for the residents. Capacity rise determined by the improvement or the adjustment of technology, institutional and ideology toward various demands of the existing situation. Each of those following three main components of this definition is mainly important to be known first. They are 1) continuity output rise is manifestation of economic growth. Whereas providing ability of any kinds of goods showing the economy maturity in a country. 2) technology development is a part condition basic progress of the economic growth continuity, as a condition that is needed. However, there are other factors that needed beside the technology progress. 3) in order to create the growth potential that commonly in new technology so that it is necessary to held kinds of institutional, attitude and ideology (Todaro, 1999).

Economic growth is a way to improve the production capacity in order to reach the output increase which measured by using Gross Domestic Product or Gross Regional Domestic Product in an area (Rahardjo, 2013).

Prof. Simon Kuznet defined economic growth as long-term improvement in a country to provide more kind of economic goods to the residents. This ability growth as the improvement of the technology and the adjustment needed of institutional and ideology (Jhingan, 2012).

Sadono Sukirno stated that economic growth means that the production fiscal development of goods and services applied in a country. For example, the increase and number of industrial goods productions, infrastructure development, school number increased, the increased of services production and capital goods production. As an illustration of the economic growth reached by a country, the real national level of income growth reached, is the standard used (Sukirno, 2011)

Economic growth is a process of output rise per capita in a long term. The stressing is on three aspects. They are, process, per capita output and long term. Economic growth is a process, not an economic illustration in a time. In this case, looking at the dynamic aspect of an economy. It is how an economy develop or change from time to time. The stressing is on the changing or the development (Boediono, 1999).

Economic growth is a process of output rise per capita in long term. The output growth percentage must be higher than population increase percentage and a trend in long term that the growth will continue (Abdurrahman, 2016).

In conclusion, economic growth is an increase of real national income or gross domestic product in long term which caused goods and services produced in society increasing and the society prosperity increasing as well

C. Previous Study

Table 1. Matriculation of Previous Study about Economic Growth toward Poverty

No.	Researcher and Title	Result of the Study	Similarities	Difference
1	Safuridar, Pengaruh Pertumbuhan Ekonomi Terhadap Kemiskinan di Kabupaten Aceh Timur (2017)	Economic growth affects negatively and significantly toward poverty in East Aceh District.	Economic growth affects toward the poverty	Economic growth affects negatively and significantly toward poverty in East Aceh District.
2	Nadia Ika Purnama. ANALISIS PENGARUH PERTUMBUHAN EKONOMI	Economic growth affects negatively and significantly toward level of poverty in	Economic growth affected	Economic growth affects negatively and significantly

	TERHADAP TINGKAT KEMISKINAN DI SUMATERA UTARA (2017)	North Sumatra Province.	toward poverty	toward level of poverty in North Sumatra Province.
3	Ambok Pangiuk. PENGARUH PERTUMBUHAN EKONOMI TERHADAP PENURUNAN KEMISKINAN DI PROVINSI JAMBI TAHUN 2009-2013 (2018)	Economic growth doesn't affect significantly toward poverty.	Economic growth affects toward poverty.	Economic growth doesn't affect significantly toward poverty.
4	Margo Tando Binti ANALISA PENGARUH PERTUMBUHAN EKONOMI TERHADAP PENURUNAN TINGKAT KEMISKINAN DI KALIMANTAN TENGAH (2016)	Level of Economic Growth for the last 6 years, regressed to the decreasing of poverty level in Central Borneo showed that there was a negative correlation.	Economic growth affects toward poverty.	The decreasing of poverty level in Central Borneo showed there was a negative correlation.
5	Ahmad Soleh PERTUMBUHAN EKONOMI DAN KEMISKINAN DI INDONESIA (2014)	The high of economic growth in a region doesn't guarantee the prosperity of the surrounded society, as the phenomenon happened in West Papua Province that showed the economic growth doesn't go along with the poor residents.	Economic growth affects toward poverty.	The high of economic growth of a region doesn't guarantee the prosperity.

Source: *processed data*

D. Framework

Trickle-down effect theory explained that progress made by a group of people will lead down so that create a job opportunity and many kinds of economic opportunity that in the end will grow kinds of conditions in order to create distribution of the economic growth results equally. This theory implied that economic growth will be followed with vertical line from the rich people to poor people automatically. The benefit of economic growth will be perceived by the rich people and then on the next step, the poor people will start to get the benefit when rich people start to spend the outcome of the economic growth they earn. Therefore, the impact of the economic growth toward the decreasing number of poverties, was indirect effect by the vertical line of the rich people to the poor people. This means that poverty will get less in a very small scale when the poor people just get a little benefit of the total benefit caused by the economic growth. This condition will give an opportunity to an increasing of poverty as the result of the increase of income inequality which was caused by the economic growth favours the rich than the poor (Soleh, 2014)

Economic growth is the most dominant instrument to an anti-poverty. Rapid decreasing of poverty happened in Pakistan, was caused by the high growth commodity producer sectors and less of inequality in the urban. This was found through the count using pro-poor growth index in sectoral level. Based on the count, it was found that there were an anti-poverty and poverty sector. However, overall pro-poor growth index showed that overall, of sectoral growth has a negative impact toward poverty (Zaman, Ahmad, Awan, Ali & Naseem, 2014). Clarified by Kuznets in Suselo (2008), development process will be followed with an inequality increasing substantially so that poor people will get a small part of the economic growth. Research done by Knowles showed that there was a negative and significant correlation between economic growth and poverty. The poverty standard shown by per capita income and income-inequality.

Picture 1. Framework

Source: *processed data*

The Affect of Economic Growth toward Poverty in JABODETABEK

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A. Time and Place of Study

The study started in January 2020 until finish. It was started by the process of deciding the title of the study, proposal preparation, research area permit, deciding an analysis unit, collecting the data and facts in the field to processing and data analysis, place or research object done in JABODETABEK area (Jakarta, Bogor, Depok, Tangerang and Bekasi). There are Central Bureau of Statistics, National Development Planning Agency, Ministry of Cooperatives, Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprises, and Ministry of Manpower

B. Population and Research Sample

Population is all possible score in total, the result of counting or measurement of both quantitative and qualitative about certain characteristics of all complete and clear group member to study its nature. Sample is part of the population with certain situation and characteristics to be studied. All research variable data that correlate with poverty and economic growth in JABODETABEK area are the sample used in this study.

Non probability sampling used as the sampling technique. According to Sugiyono (2010), non-probability sampling is sampling technique with same opportunity to each element or population to be chosen as the sample. The sampling technique are systematic sampling, quota, accidental, purposive, fed up, snowball. Sampling non probability technique used in taking the sample in this study was samping purposive technique. Purposive sampling is a sampling technique with certain consideration. Choosing a group of subjects in purposive sampling based on the specific characteristics which considered has strong correlation with the population characteristic known previously. In other word, sample unit contacted, customized to the specific criteria to be applied based on the purpose of the study of research problem

Whereas sample used in this study was time series data for 8 (eight) years by using each year's data from each area of JABODETABEK so that the data sample in this study total of 40 (forty)

C. Definition and Variable Measurement

Research variable Operationalization is an explanation of each variable used in the research toward indicators that make it up. Research variable operational can be seen on the following table:

Table 2. Definition and Variable Measurement

Variable	Conceptual Definition	Operational Defintion	Data Source	Measurement Scale
Economic Growth (X_1)	District Gross Regional Domestic Product Growth based on the applicable price, in the form of percentage (%)	Economic growth percentage, year period of 2011 - 2018	Central Bureau of Statistics Jabodetabek Area	Ratio
Poverty (Y)	People who work, (15 to 64 yearsold) search and haven't got the job	Percentage of people who live under the line of poverty in Jabodetabek area, year period of 2011-2018	Central Bureau of Statistics Jabodetabek Area	Ratio

D. Data Analysis Technique

Panel Data Regression is the combination between cross section data and time series data, where the same cross section unit measured by different time. In other word, panel data is data from several same individual observed in certain period, is regression used panel data. Panel data regression model, K as sector unit, T as time unit and P as the independent variable as follow:

$$Y_{it} = \alpha_{it} + \sum_{j=1}^{p} \beta_j X_{jt} + \varepsilon_{it}$$

Where:

i : sector unit, i = 1,2,3,...., K

t : time unit, t = 1,2,3,..., T

j : independent variable, j = 1,2,3,..., P

The Affect of Economic Growth toward Poverty in JABODETABEK

Yit : dependent variable for sector unit I and time unit t

Xjt : independent variable j for sector unit I time unit ke t

αit : intercept coefficient

βj : slope coefficient

εit : error

$E(\varepsilon_{it}{}^2)$: σ^2

$E(\varepsilon_{it}, \varepsilon_{ks}) = 0$ for $i \neq h$ and /or $t \neq s$

There were three approaches in panel data model calculation 9 (Falah et al, 2016:611), They are:

A. Fixed Effect Model Method (FEM)

FEM assumed that among sector unit and among time unit gave different effect toward model. The different effect shown in the intercept's coefficient score, so that FEM will have different intercepts for each area. FEM will be estimated using variable technique of *Dummy Variables* (LDSV). *Dummy Variables* formula as follow:

$$Y_{it} = \alpha_i + \sum_{j=1}^{p} \beta_j X_{jit} + \varepsilon_{it}$$

Model Selection Method

To decide the proper method in the study, model fit test was done through several steps, such as:

Hypothesis test

Hypothesis test done to test whether regression coefficient obtained, has a significancy score. Nachrowi dan Hardius Usman (2006, h, 16) stated what meant as significant (real different) is a regression coefficient score statistically not equal to zero. If slope coefficient equal to zero, means that not enough evidence to stated that dependent variable affects independent variable. Hypothesis test consists of simultaneous testing and own individual/partial

a. Statistic Test F (Simultaneous Significant Test)

Testing for sub-structure simultaneously using simultaneous significant test (overall significance) through statistic uji. Moreover, Nachrowi dan Firdaus Usman (2006, h. 88) stated that F test intended to do regression coefficient hypothesis test (slope) simultaneously. Whereas, Ghozali (2009, h. 88) stated that simultaneous significant test (F statistic test), basically showed whether all independent variable or dependent variable included as the model has effect simultaneously. And Riduan dan Engkos Achmad Kuncoro (2011, h. 117) said that to test simultaneously, then used anova table and statistic hypothesis formulated as follow:

$H_0 = \beta_{x1y} = \beta_{x2y} = \dots \beta_{xky} = 0$; there is no effect simultaneously

$H_1 = \beta_{x1y} = \beta_{x2y} = \dots \beta_{xky} \neq 0$; there is effect simultaneously

To test the hypothesis using F statistic. The criteria F statistic test with alpha level (α) = 0,05, if the score of $F_{count} > F_{table}$ means that zero hypothesis (H_0) accepted and alternative hypothesis (H_a) rejected (Ghozali, 2009, h. 88).

Riduan and Engkos Achmad Kuncoro (2011, h. 117) stated that significancy test rule manually using F table with the following formula:

$F = (n-k-1) R^2 / K(1-R^2)$

Description :

n : number of sample

k : number of exogenous variable

R^2: R Square

And for the significancy test rule as follow:

1) If the probability score 0,05 is less or same with sig probability score or (005 ≤ sig), then H_0 accepted and H_a rejected, means that not significant.

2) If the probability score 0,05 more or same with sig probability score or (005 ≥ sig), then H_0 rejected and H_a accepted, means that significant

b. t-statistic test (Partial/individual Significancy test)

testing for each sub structure is done individually. Partial by using t statistic significancy test. Nachrowi dan Hardius Usman (2006, h. 18) stated that after doing overall the regression coefficient test, then the next step is counting the regression coefficient individually, by using a t test. Ghozali (2009, h. 88) stated that individual parameter significant test (t-statistic test) basically showed how far the impact of one independent variable individually in explaining

The Affect of Economic Growth toward Poverty in JABODETABEK

dependent variable varieties. Riduan dan Engkos Achmad Kuncoro (2011, h. 117) stated that counting coefficient individually and research hypothesis will be tested, and formulated to be statistic hypothesis as follow:

$H_0 = \beta_{y\,xi} = 0$; there is no partially impact

$H_1 = \beta_y\,xi \neq 0$; there is partially impact

Where: I = 1;2;3;4

Then, to do hypothesis test by using t statistic. The criteria of t statistic test with alpha level (α) = 0,05, if the score of $F_{count} > F_{table}$, then zero hypothesis (H_0) accepted and alternative hypothesis (H_a) rejected (Ghozali (2009, h. 88) and Kusnadi (2005, h.13) in Riduan and Engkos Achmad Kuncoro (2011, h.117)) as follow:

$$t = \frac{Pk}{Sepk} ; (dk - k - 1)$$

Description: Sep_k statistic gained from the computerized result of SPSS for the regression analysis.

Next, to know the significancy by comparing between probability score 0,05 with sig probability score based on the decision making as below:

1) If probability score 0,05 less or same with sig probability score or (005 ≤ sig), then H_0 accepted and H_a rejected, means not significant.

2) If probability score 0,05 more or same with sig probability score or (005 ≥ sig), then H_0 rejected and H_a accepted, means significant.

c. Determination Coefficient Analysis/Goodness or fit(R^2)

Determination Coefficient (R^2) used to measure the model ability in explaining the independent variable. Determination coefficient score ranged from zero until one. This means that if R2 = 0 showed there is no impact of the independent variable toward the dependent variable, if R^2 is getting bigger approaching 1, it showed that the more stronger the impact of independent variable toward dependent variable and vice versa, if R^2 close to 0 then the smaller impact of independent variable toward dependent variable

IV. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The impact felt by the amount of jobless or unabsorbed labor is the amount of society who cannot fulfil their daily needs based on the standard of Central Bureau Statistic regulation and it caused the high of poverty. The data of poverty in Jabodetabek is shown on table 3.

Table 3. Data of Poverty in Jabodetabek (in %)

Year	Jakarta			Bogor			Depok			Tangerang			Bekasi		
	Kems	Difference	%	Kems	Difference	%	Kems	Difference	%	Kems	Difference	%	Kems	Difference	%
2014	4,09			7,74			47,83			2,6			1.184,825		
2015	3.93	-0,16	-3,91%	7,6	-0,14	-1,81%	48,54	0,71	1,48%	3,2	0,6	23,08%	1.189,778	4,953	0,42%
2016	3.75	-0,18	-4,58%	7,29	-0,31	-4,08%	50,56	2,02	4,16%	3,7	0,5	15,63%	118,490	-1071,29	-90,04%
2017	3.77	0,02	0,53%	7,11	-0,18	-2,47%	52,34	1,78	3,52%	4,9	1,2	32,43%	1.182,041	1063,55	897,59%
2018	3,57	-0,2	-5,31%	5,93	-1,18	-16,60%	49,39	-2,95	-5,64%	4,8	-0,1	-2,04%	1.174,404	-7,637	-0,65%

Source: Processed data

In Jakarta area, the percentage of poverty score in 2015 was -3,91%, and decreasing in 2016 to -4,58% and in 2017 increasing so that it got better to 0,53% and decreasing again in 2018 to -5,31%. Based on the research (Kurniawati, 2018), Gross Regional Domestic Product (GRDP) has a positive impact toward poverty in DKI Jakarta Area. In every GRDP increase, will increase the poverty in DKI Jakarta Area. This is caused by worker in DKI Jakarta are not only came from DKI Jakarta but also surrounded area such as Depok, Tangerang, Bekasi dan Bogor. As the result of the increasing of product and services' production, the workers who are not only came from DKI Jakarta but others will get additional fee or income which means this affect the workers' welfare. Because of the number of workers came from out of DKI Jakarta pretty high so that it doesn't really affect to the decrease of poverty in DKI Jakarta

The Affect of Economic Growth toward Poverty in JABODETABEK

Around Bogor area, the percentage of poverty score in 2015 was -1,81%, and decreasing in 2016 became -4,08% and in 2017 got better, even though the result still negative by -2,47. There was a drastic decrease of -16,60% by the year 2018. Based on research done by Lestari, Nulhaqim & Irfan (2019), important elements to handle poverty are Communication of the Partnership Development Working Group in handling poverty in Bogor, Compromise of the Partnership Development Working Group in handling poverty in Bogor, Cooperation of the Partnership Development Working Group in handling poverty in Bogor, Coordination of the Partnership Development Working Group in handling poverty in Bogor, and Consumption Partnership Development Working Group in handling poverty in Bogor. Those 5 (five) important elements are related and affected each other in reaching the purpose of Partnership Development Working Group as human service organization in handling poverty in Bogor City. In this case, the progress of poverty in Bogor keeps decreasing

Around Depok area, the percentage poverty score in 2015 was 1,48%, and increasing in 2016 became 4,16%, in 2017, the poverty decreased to 3,52% and decreased again in 2018 to -5,64%. Trend in Depok area got better reviewed to 2018. It can be seen that in 2018, the poverty decreased. In 2018, Depok area got better showed from the decreasing poverty. The complexity and great of resident education's level Depok area's people, determine the level of poverty. Depok local Government gave support in the form of training toward the citizen so that Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises di Depok not only can develop well but also produce verified cooperative yearly. It is necessary for a region to handle poverty independently, followed by the develop of creativity and innovation which is supported by the local Government. Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises has an important role in poverty eradication in order to leveling the level of people's economy. Depok local Government keeps supporting the Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises empowerment as one of the solutions in increasing the economic growth and decreasing the poverty. Even though the level of poverty in Depok area is on the low level, which means that hard to be pressed, but the local Government keeps trying to decrease the number of region poverty (Inayah, 2019)

Around Tangerang area, the percentage poverty score in 2015 was 23,08% and decreasing in 2016 to 15,63% and increasing in 2017 to 32,43%. However, a year after in 2018, the poverty score was decreasing to -2,04%. This decreasing can be said that the level of poverty in Tangerang has decreased enough, as for one of the poverty benchmarks, based on the spending expense monthly. Every year, the number of expense changes based on the people's economical income condition in general (CNN Banten, 2019)

Around Bekasi area, the percentage poverty score in 2015 was 33,33%, it was pretty high compared to other areas in JABODETABEK. In 2016 and 2017 decreasing but still in a positive score which was 10,42% and 4,65%. A year after in 2018, decreasing to a negative score -2,22%. According to Saptono (2013), one of effort done to relieve the poverty was by evaluating the community economic empowerment process by doing city self PNPM which was done in Kelurahan Perwira Kecamatan Bekasi Utara Kota Bekasi targeted to study the implementation of community economic empowerment process program which related to the community participation, community capacity building, and the degree of community empowerment

Relatively reach areas which has high economic growth level compared to other areas. The high level of economic growth will affect to the level of public welfare. There was a different after the regional autonomy, when the Indonesian government system was centralized, there were areas in Java Island with a high economic growth. It was not only because of industrial event centralized in Java Island but also location factor which was close to the central Government has a great impact to the high of economical event. These caused Java Island has a quite high level of economic growth so the impact of the developing of economic event creates a higher level of public welfare. As the regional autonomy system progresses, the level of economic growth and development is no longer centered on Java Island but areas out of Java Island also increased in economic growth and development. An economic growth can be seen from the high number of total output and also from the Gross Regional Domestic Product (GRDP) per capita of each region (Mahardiki & Santoso, 2013)

As an unfavorable economy situation, economic slowdown affects to the life of the country and people who live in. The decreasing of economy to minus and causing the economy

Table 4. Data of Economy Development in Jabodetabek

Year	Jakarta			Bogor			Depok			Tangerang			Bekasi		
	PE	Difference	%	PE	Difference	%	PE	Difference	%	PE	Difference	%	PE	Difference	%
2014	5.95			6.01			7.28			4.2			5.61		
2015	5.88	-0.07	-1.18%	6.14	0.13	2.16%	6.64	-0.64	-8.79%	3.6	-0.6	-14.29%	5.56	-0.05	-0.89%
2016	5.85	-0.03	-0.51%	6.73	0.59	9.61%	7.28	0.64	9.64%	6.8	3.2	88.89%	6.09	0.53	9.53%
2017	6.22	0.37	6.32%	6.12	-0.61	-9.06%	7.92	0.64	8.79%	7.8	1	14.71%	5.73	-0.36	-5.91%
2018	6.17	-0.05	-0.80%	6.14	0.02	0.33%	8.44	0.52	6.57%	8.2	0.4	5.13%	5.86	0.13	2.27%

Source: processed data

The Affect of Economic Growth toward Poverty in JABODETABEK

Area recession as one of the symptoms experienced by economy slowdown. The impact of the recession economy caused the unstable dollar exchange rate which directly hit and made dollar exchange rate affect to weakening rupiah. It will also hit export import sector in Indonesia. In terms of interest rate, dollar instability will raise the interest rate because of Bank Indonesia will withdraw rupiah. And as the result of inflation getting higher so Bank Syariah will be less competitive. Last, the combination of high dollar exchange rate and the raise of interest rate will affect to two things.

There will be a lot of investors in thus sector will cancel their investment. And the other is the stock investment. There will be a lot of people leave the share business of the capital market, (Al-Zikrillah, 2020)

Based on table 4, it can be known that the economy development percentage in Jakarta area decreasing, started from 2015 as -1,18%, as time goes, economy situation in 2016 and 2017 got better, so that in 2017 economy development percentage became positive to 6,22%. But the economy development percentage decreasing in 2018 as -0,8%. Economy development condition in Jakarta area by 2018 was lower from the previous projection and slowing down from the growth achievement of the previous year. Slowing global economic growth happened in not only in develop countries but also developing countries. The slowing down affects the decreasing of world trade volume and in the end reduce global commodity prices. The growth of Indonesian economy stays strong in the middle of the slowing world economic performance. Thus, economic growth was supported by good domestic demand in the middle of decreasing export performance. Persistent domestic demand was affected by the stability of household consumption which also supported by controlled inflation and good level of consumer trustworthy. Not to speak of the household nonprofit consumption growing up supported by the positive impact of the election administration in 2018. Domestic demand is also supported by the high investment, especially building investment. Supply side performance confirmed the economic growth is still maintained. Based on the business field, especially the economic growth in 2019, supported by business field performance services in tertiary sector, especially communication and information sector, financial and insurance services and other service sectors (Bank Indonesia, 2020)

Around Bogor area, the percentage score of economy development in 2014-2016 was better, so that economy development percentage in 2016 became 9.61% but by 2017 was decreasing to -9,06 and got better or economy development increasing in 2018 by 0,33%. Economy development condition in Bogor area can be said that it has grown better, Bogor area also can be developed to be international tourism destination by considering the strategic location is a potential to develop the growth, economy development and services, national industrial center, trade, transportation, communication and tourism. Another additional scope for the international tourism is the proximity between Jakarta and Bogor as one of the main gates for international tourist. This is one of the opportunities to develop international tourist visits but it was still a small number compared to the local tourist. In fact, Bogor is one of famous tourism destination in national, regional and local scale (Mulyana, 2012)

Depok area, the percentage score of the economy development in 2015 was decreasing to -8,79% but in the next year, Depok economic growth got better with percentage of 9,64%. Even though, the economy development was decreasing but Depok area still have a positive percentage in 2018 by 6,57%. Economy development condition in Depok area can said good enough with a quite huge rate of economy development compared to other areas in around Jabodetabek. According to Kadarisman, Gunawan, & Ismiyati (2016), this condition was supported by the increase of mobility through provision of road infrastructure. Thus supports the economy development in Depok and it also affected by the competitive of the environment, efficient procurement of transportation services. Affordable public transportation served by the informal sector can fulfill the transportation needs for people in Depok, especially for who have low income. However, such services can ruin the environment and create traffic jam which is caused by the unwell regulation. Above condition was a portray that there is a "trade-off" should be faced by Depok local Government in taking land transportation policy

Tangerang area, the percentage score of economy development was decreasing in 2015 to -14,29%. However, in the next year got so much better significantly with the percentage of 88, 89%. Even though in 2018, economy development percentage was decreasing but the percentage score in Tangerang was still positive to 5, 13%. Nevertheless, the average economy development in Tangerang was the lowest compared to other areas. However, the old downtown area in Tangerang area has potential that can be the central of economy in Tangerang city. They are "Pasar Lama" (Old Market) in Gang Cilame and Gang Bhakti, and also trade and service in along Jalan Ki Samaun Corridor (Prasetyo, Fatimah, & Padawangi, 2017)

Bekasi area, the percentage score of economy development in 2015 was -0,89%. In 2017, the economy development percentage score was decreasing to -5,19%. However, the economy development percentage score in Bekasi was positive in 2016 by 9,53%. And by the year of 2018, the economy development percentage kept in the positive score by 2,27%. Economy development in Bekasi area depended on the economy dynamics in the region. Meanwhile, regional economy in general was supported by the small and medium event. Whereas, for small and medium enterprises category is main in both national and regional economy. Small and Medium Enterprises is a powerful business in the middle of economic crisis. Nowadays, there are about 98% majority

The Affect of Economic Growth toward Poverty in JABODETABEK

of economic actors are Small and Medium Enterprises that keep going significantly and become business sector which able to support the national economy stability (Sentosa, 2018)

Seen from the economy development in Jabodetabek areas tended to be decreasing by the year of 2015-2018. Although, not all areas got the same decreasing in the economy development in every year. For example, in Jakarta area in 2015. By the year of 2016 and 2018, the decreasing phenomenon of economy development was caused by the impact of global economy. Jakarta area as the capital city, whereas the high inflation could affect the economy development. In Bogor area, the decreasing of economy development happened in 2017. This was caused by problems happened in demanding sector. There was decreasing in public demand toward certain commodity. For Depok area, there was decreasing of economy development happened in 2015. This was caused by trade off happened in the society. Moreover, economy sector such as environment, procurement of transportation services tended to grow slowly. The same thing happened in Tangerang area, there was also deceleration in economy development, economy condition and the growth regional shopping of Tangerang was also low in 2015. Furthermore, capital problems for the cooperate and Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises by the year was also decreasing. Economy development was decreasing in Bekasi area in 2015 and 2018. This was caused by stagnation in economy sector by the year of 2014 until 2017 which also caused to economy development in 2018 so that the budget allocation tended to be used for the infrastructure, as the result, economy development was decreasing

Data and panel model test used in this study. The analysis model in this study used Common Effect, Fixed Effect, from those both research model, next decided which one the proper data used in this study. According to econometrician in Nachrowi dan Hardius Usman (2006, p. 318), stated that: 1). If amount of time of the panel data owned (T) is more than amount of individual (N), it is suggested to use Fixed effect model; 2) If amount of time of the panel data owned (T) less than amount of individual (N), taken randomly, then fixed effect model is more suitable. In this study, when each individual was not taken randomly, then using Fix Effect is more suitable

Fixed Effect Regression:

Dependent Variable: LNKEMIS?
Method: Pooled Least Squares
Date: 11/12/20   Time: 10:04
Sample: 2011 2018
Included observations: 8
Cross-sections included: 5
Total pool (balanced) observations: 40

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	14.25920	0.419920	33.95697	0.0000
PE?	0.183648	0.066863	2.746627	0.0096
Fixed Effects (Cross)				
_JA--C	2.067591			
_BO--C	0.468408			
_DE--C	1.878720			
_TA--C	-0.815647			
_BE--C	-3.599071			

Effects Specification

Cross-section fixed (dummy variables)

R-squared	0.973288	Mean dependent var	15.40025
Adjusted R-squared	0.969359	S.D. dependent var	2.211123
S.E. of regression	0.387046	Akaike info criterion	1.076932

The Affect of Economic Growth toward Poverty in JABODETABEK

Sum squared resid	5.093345	Schwarz criterion	1.330264
Log likelihood	-15.53865	Hannan-Quinn criter.	1.168529
F-statistic	247.7635	Durbin-Watson stat	1.335948
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000		

Based on the data processed using Eviews, it got Fixed Effect equation model as below:

LNKEMIS = 14.25920 + 0.183648 PE

Equation above can be explained as follow:

1) The number of constant scores 14.25920 showed that if economic growth variable has no change, then the poverty score 14.25920.

2) Economic growth variable regression coefficient (X_1) as 0.183648 means that every 1 unit increase in economic growth variable, then it will increase the poverty (Y) to 0.183648 unit

Poverty factor can affect the achievement of the rate of economic growth. According to Todaro, the widen poverty creates a condition that make the poor have no access to credit allowance, unable to pay their children education, lack of physical and monetary investment opportunities, which caused less per capita growth. The increase of the poor's income will support the increase of demand of the local household needs so that it will stimulate the local production more, increase job opportunities, and growth local investment that will create a faster economic growth condition. Moreover, low income and bad life standard of the poor seen from the nutritious health, and low education can decrease the productivity and slow down the economic growth (Jonaidi, 2012)

Table 1. The Economic Growth Potential Impact toward Poverty in Jabodetabek

Area	Intercept	Constanta	Potential
Jakarta	2.06052414462	+ 14.2404429465	3,32284229
Bogor	0.466772052901	+ 14.2404429465	4,210271
Depok	1.86856297267	+ 14.2404429465	4,3878
Tangerang	-0.809940234932	+ 14.2404429465	4,442172
Bekasi	-3.58591893526	+ 14.2404429465	4,354995

Source: *Processed data*

Based on the fixed effect analysis, the poverty potential of each area in Jabodetabek increasing, the biggest is in Tangerang with 4,442172, followed by Depok with 4,3878 and Bogor with 4,210271, Bekasi with 4,354995 and the least poverty increasing is in with 3,32284229 so, it has potential to be researched

Buchanan stated that the main logic of growth and poverty concept that should be focused on the efficiency of service provision to the society so that the prosperity benefit equal to the cost spent by the public. There were kinds of strategy, policy and alleviation poverty program planned by the local government, in the end, will be depended on the availability and mechanism of budget used owned by the area. In this case, the poverty decreasing potential in Jabodetabek area is difficult to be reached, if there is no effort to do poverty countermeasures well when it is not supported by the budget policy which showed from the poor partiality (pro-poor budget). An approach to measure the correlation between fiscal policy as steps to decrease poverty is really needed (Rusdarti & Sebayang, 2013)

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the purpose of the study, it can be concluded that Economic Growth affected positively and significantly toward poverty in Jakarta, Bogor, Depok, Tangerang dan Bekasi area.

In order to decrease the poverty level, local government needs to support the increase of economic growth in Jakarta, Bogor, Depok, Tangerang dan Bekasi area.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The Affect of Economic Growth toward Poverty in JABODETABEK

REFERENCES

1) Afifah, A. 2018. Tak Lakukan RAT, Dinas Usulkan Non Aktifkan Ratusan Koperasi. Retrieved from Dakta.com: http://dakta.com/news/14445/tak-lakukan-rat-dinas-usulkan-non-aktifkan- ratusan-koperasi

2) Alghofari, F. 2010. Analisis Tingkat Pengangguran di Indonesia Tahun 1980-2007. Jurnal Pengangguran

3) Ariwibowo, P., & Insana, D. R. 2018. Kontribusi Usaha Mikro Kecil dan Menengah Terhadap Tingkat Pertumbuhan Pendapatan Daerah Provinsi DKI Jakarta. Jurnal Organisasi dan Manajemen.

4) Aulia, T. Z., & Hamdani. 2020. Implementasi SAK-ETAP Sebagai Upaya Meningkatkan Kualitas Laporan Keuangan dan Pengaruhnya Terhadap Tingkat Kesehatan Koperasi di Kota Tangerang. Competitive Jurnal Akuntansi dan Keuangan.

5) Bappeda Kota Depok. 2016. Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Daerah Kota Depok Tahun 2016-2021. Depok: Bappeda Kota Depok.

6) Darman. 2013. Pengaruh Pertumbuhan Ekonomi Terhadap Tingkat Pengangguran: Analisis Hukum OKUN. The Winners: Economic, Business, Management, and Information System Journal.

7) Dinas Koperasi, Usaha Kecil dan Menengah serta Perdagangan. 2018. Laporan Kinerja Pembangunan Koperasi dan UMKM di Provinsi DKI Jakarta. Jakarta: Depkop.

8) Ditjen PP. 2008. Lembaran Daerah Kota Bekasi. Bekasi : Ditjen PP.

9) DPR . 2018. Koperasi dalam Sistem Perekonomian Indonesia. Jakarta: Yayasan Pustaka Obor Indonesia.

10) Effendi, R., et al. 2018. Konsep Koperasi Bung Hatta Dalam Perspektif Ekonomi Syariah. Jurnal Al- Hikmah.

11) Fitra, T. L., & Rasyid, A. 2016. Peran Kopontren terhadap Perekonomian Masyarakat sekitar Pondok Pesantren. Jurnal Iqtisaduna.

12) Gunawan, H., et al. 2020. Strategi Pelayanan Perizinan untuk Meningkatkan Investasi di Kabupaten Bogor. Jurnal Manajemen Agribisnis

13) Hapsari, P. P., et al. 2014. Pengaruh Pertumbuhan Usaha Kecil Menengah (UKM) terhadap Pertumbuhan Ekonomi Daerah (Studi di Pemerintah Kota Batu). Wacana.

14) Jonaidi, A. 2012. Analisis Pertumbuhan Ekonomi dan Kemiskinan di Indonesia. Jurnal Kajian Ekonomi.

15) Kementerian Koperasi dan Usaha Kecil dan Menengah RI. 2015. Membangun Koperasi dan UMKM sebagai Ketahanan Ekonomi Nasional.

16) Merdekawati, E., & Rosyanti, N. 2019. Faktor-faktor yang Mempengaruhi Keberhasilan UMKM (a Case Study in UMKM in Bogor City). JIAFE (Jurnal Ilmiah Akuntansi Fakultas Ekonomi).

17) Prambudi, B. 2018. Peran Investasi terhadap Pertumbuhan Ekonomi di Kabupaten Jepara, Tahun 2012-2016. Jurnal EKOBIS; Ekonomi, Bisnis dan Manajemen.

18) Prasaja, M. H. 2013. Pengaruh Investasi Asing, Jumlah Penduduk dan Inflasi terhadap Pengangguran Terdidik di Jawa Tengah Periode Tahun 1980-2011. Economics Development Analysis Journal.

19) Prastowo, S. L. 2020. Analisis Kompetensi Pelaku Usaha, Peran dan Kebijakan Pemerintah terhadap Kinerja UKM di Kota Tangerang dengan Kreativitas Strategi

20) Pratiwi, A. G., & Muta'ali, L. 2018. Perkembangan Ekonomi Wilayah dan Peran Sektor Tersier di Kawasan Jakarta, Bogor, Depok, Tangerang, dan Bekasi (Jabodetabek). Jurnal Bumi Indonesia.

21) Pratiwi, N. M., AR, M., & Azizah, D. F. 2015. Pengaruh Inflasi, Tingkat Suku Bunga SBI, dan Nilai Tukar terhadap Penanaman Modal Asing dan Pertumbuhan Ekonomi di Indonesia (Tahun 2004 sampai dengan Tahun 2013). Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis (JAB).

22) Qomariyah, I. 2013. Pengaruh Tingkat Inflasi dan Pertumbuhan Ekonomi terhadap Tingkat Pengangguran di Jawa Timur. Jurnal Pendidikan Ekonomi (JUPE).

23) Rahmi. 2015. Analisis Pengaruh Perkembangan Usaha Kecil Menengah Sektor Perdagangan terhadap Pertumbuhan Ekonomi di Kota Makassar. POLINAS 1.

24) Regional Kontan.co.id. (2017, July 6). 400 koperasi di Bogor dinyatakan tidak sehat. Retrieved from regional. kontan.co.id:https://regional.kontan.co.id/news/400-koperasi-di-bogor dinyatakan-tidak- sehat

25) Rifa'i, A. 2010. Peran UMKM

26) Sitepu, C. F., & Hasyim. 2018. Perkembangan Ekonomi Koperasi Indonesia. Niagawan.

27) Suhartono, I. 2011. Strategi Pengembangan Koperasi Berorientasi Bisnis. Jurnal Ilmiah Among Makarti.

28) Utami, R. P. 2019. Analisis Faktor – Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Penanaman

29) Modal Asing di Provinsi DKI Jakarta Tahun 2000 – 2017. Dspace UII