International Journal of Society Reviews (INJOSER) e-ISSN: 3030-802X
Vol. 2 No. 10, August 2025, pages: 1784~1803

THE INFLUENCE OF MINIMUM WAGE AND POPULATION SIZE ON INCOME DISTRIBUTION DISPARITY AND COMMUNITY WELFARE IN REGENCIES/CITIES OF BALI PROVINCE

Ni Kadek Lia Ratna Dewi[1], Ni Nyoman Reni Suasih[2]
[1] Faculty of Economics and Business, Udayana University; e-mail : liadewi077@student.unud.ac.id
[2] Faculty of Economics and Business, Udayana University
* Correspondinging Author: Ni Kadek Lia Ratna Dewi

Abstract: Bali Province, as one of the provinces in Indonesia, experiences income distribution disparity across its regencies and cities. Uneven income distribution negatively affects the overall welfare of the population in the province. This study aims to: (1) Analyze the influence of minimum wage and population size on income distribution disparity; (2) Analyze the influence of minimum wage, population size, and income distribution disparity on community welfare; and (3) Analyze the indirect influence of minimum wage and population size on community welfare through income distribution disparity. The data used are secondary data obtained from the Bali Provincial Statistics Agency (BPS), with a total of 135 observation points. The analytical method employed is path analysis. The results of the study show that: (1) Minimum wage and population size have no significant effect on income distribution disparity; (2) Minimum wage, population size, and income distribution disparity have a positive and significant effect on community welfare; (3) Minimum wage and population size do not have an indirect effect on community welfare through income distribution disparity.

Keywords: minimum wage, population size, income distribution disparity, community welfare

INTRODUCTION

One of the main issues frequently faced by developing countries, including Indonesia, is economic inequality. This inequality is reflected in the disparity in income distribution between high-income and low-income groups (Wahyuni & Andriyani, 2022). In many cases, the economy is dominated by a small group of capital owners, with the upper-income groups increasingly benefiting from economic growth. This condition contributes to the persistence of poverty and the widening of socio-economic disparities (Muthia, 2019).

Following the 1997–1998 economic crisis, income inequality in Indonesia tended to increase. Compared to the previous decade, Indonesia experienced the fastest growth in inequality among Southeast Asian countries. In 1990, the wealthiest 20% of households consumed 38.9% of total national expenditure. By 2014, this figure had worsened, with the top 20% consuming nearly half of total national expenditure (47.4%). More concerning was the declining consumption

share of the bottom 20% economic group, which fell from 9.4% in 1990 to just 7.2% in 2014 (Kuntoro et al., 2020).

Economic development is often pursued through strategies such as maximizing gross regional domestic product (GRDP) growth each year. However, this strategy can lead to unintended consequences if not accompanied by efforts to ensure equitable income distribution, resulting in growing disparities. According to Kuznets' theory, income distribution tends to become more equitable in the later stages of economic development, while in the early stages, it is typically more unequal. Therefore, strategies are needed to ensure that economic growth is accompanied by income equity, thereby preventing widening disparities (Kurniawan and Huda, 2024).

The issue of inequality has received global attention. In 2015, world leaders formally adopted the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) as a global development agenda. These goals consist of 17 objectives and 169 targets, guided by the principle of "Leave No One Behind." Goal 10 specifically aims to reduce inequality. In this context, Indonesia has committed to reducing regional disparities by progressively increasing and maintaining income growth for the bottom 40% of the population at a rate above the national average.

Income distribution disparity in Indonesia is measured using the Gini Ratio, which is based on the Lorenz curve—a graphical representation of income or wealth distribution. The closer the curve is to the diagonal line (representing perfect equality), the lower the Gini Ratio. Conversely, the farther the curve deviates from the diagonal, the higher the Gini Ratio (Rini et al., 2022). As of March 2024, Indonesia's Gini Ratio was 0.379, a decrease of 0.009 points from March 2023 (0.388) and a decrease of 0.002 points from September 2022 (0.381) (BPS Indonesia, 2024). However, this reduction remains relatively small.

Income distribution disparity also occurs in various regions of Indonesia, including Bali Province. Comprising eight regencies and one municipality, Bali's regions have diverse characteristics that affect the pattern of economic development. These differences in growth capacity lead to disparities in both economic development and per capita income. Rapid tourism development in southern Bali has contributed to increased income levels in this region, whereas the northern part of Bali has benefited much less from economic growth (Fawaid, 2021).

Denpasar City recorded a relatively high Gini Ratio of 0.3420 points in 2023, although this figure decreased compared to 0.3680 points in 2022. In contrast, the regency with the lowest Gini Ratio was Bangli Regency in 2019, with a score of 0.2744 points. This disparity may be attributed to the gap between urban and rural populations. Urban residents tend to have more diverse types of employment compared to those in rural areas, resulting in greater variation in income. Consequently, the Gini Ratio in urban areas tends to be higher than in rural areas (Juniati et al., 2022).

The rapid development of tourism in the southern region of Bali, particularly in Denpasar City and Tabanan Regency, has led to a relatively high level of disparity

over the past five years. This indicates that the trickle-down effect theory has not been optimally realized, even in these relatively developed areas. The high level of economic activity in southern Bali has not yet had a significant positive impact on the northern regions of the island, such as Karangasem and Jembrana, which continue to exhibit fluctuating and relatively high Gini Ratios. Therefore, the challenge of achieving equitable income distribution extends beyond southern Bali and also encompasses the northern regions.

Unequal income distribution directly impacts community welfare, which is a key goal of economic development (Febrian and Yusnida, 2020). Community welfare reflects the government's success in developing the economy and is also a central objective of the SDGs (Sultan et al., 2023). Therefore, development should aim not only for high and sustainable economic activity but also for equitable income distribution. If left unaddressed, rising disparities can lead to complex social and economic problems, including low levels of community welfare (Ningtiyas and Nuraini Dwiputri, 2021).

Welfare cannot be measured by economic growth alone but also by how equitably the benefits of development are shared across society. According to welfare social theory, equitable income distribution enhances social welfare (Midgley, 1999). Disparities in income distribution can limit vulnerable groups' access to essential services such as education, healthcare, and decent work, thereby reducing their quality of life (Friedlander, 1980). Community welfare is considered high when income inequality is low (Prawesti Ningrum et al., 2024).

The Human Development Index (HDI), introduced by the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) in 1990, is a key indicator for measuring community welfare and the population's access to income, healthcare, and education (Budiarti, 2019). It comprises three basic dimensions: health, education, and a decent standard of living. HDI is also used to rank the development level of regions or countries (Ismail et al., 2021).

Income distribution disparity can also be influenced by the minimum wage set by the government. This is particularly relevant in Bali Province, where minimum wages vary significantly across regencies and municipalities (Wibawa and Purbadharmaja, 2019). In 2024, Badung Regency had the highest minimum wage in Bali at IDR 3,318,628.06, while the lowest—IDR 2,813,672.00—was set as the provincial minimum wage (UMP) for five regencies: Jembrana, Klungkung, Bangli, Karangasem, and Buleleng (BPS Bali Province, 2025). These wage differences inevitably affect community welfare across Bali's regions.

Minimum wage policy is intended to ensure that workers receive fair compensation that meets their basic living needs (Suryani and Woyanti, 2021). Minimum wage plays a critical role in shaping economic disparity, particularly between urban and rural areas. Low minimum wages can exacerbate income inequality in certain regions. Therefore, increasing minimum wages is viewed as a strategic measure to reduce income disparity (Julihanza and Khoirudin, 2023).

According to Bali Governor's Decree No. 939/03-M/HK/2024, the Provincial Minimum Wage (UMP) for 2025 is set at IDR 2,996,561.00 per month, effective from January 1, 2025. This represents a 6% increase from the 2024 UMP of IDR 2,816,672.00 (Bali Provincial Office of Manpower and Energy and Mineral Resources, 2024). This increase offers new hope for workers to earn a more decent income aligned with the cost of living.

Raising the minimum wage is one effort by the government to improve earnings for low-wage workers and reduce income gaps between high- and low-income groups (Yuzani et al., 2024). According to labor market theory, higher minimum wages can reduce income inequality by narrowing the earnings gap between low-wage workers and the wealthy (Putri and Anggraini, 2024). However, the effectiveness of minimum wage policy varies across regions depending on economic structure and employer compliance (Sari and Pujiyono, 2013).

Population size can also affect income disparity. Malthusian theory suggests that population growth increases income inequality due to lower living standards and per capita income, which leads to higher poverty rates (Taresh et al., 2021). However, the "large market" theory proposed by Krugman (1991) argues that larger populations create broader markets and promote large-scale production and employment opportunities, thereby reducing income disparity by distributing resources and income among more people.

The demographic dividend theory posits that when the proportion of the working-age population exceeds the non-productive population, a region or country can experience accelerated economic growth. The productive population is aged 15–64 years, while the non-productive group includes those under 15. According to Todaro (2011), the demographic bonus can be observed through the dependency ratio—if it falls below 50%, it indicates a lighter burden on the working population.

The National Population and Family Planning Board (BKKBN) and UNFPA note that total population growth can increase the productive workforce if demographic transition does not stagnate. From a development economics perspective, productive individuals constitute human capital that can drive inclusive economic growth. In line with Becker's (1993) human capital theory, both the quantity and quality of human resources significantly influence economic output and community welfare. When the productive population has access to education, training, and decent job opportunities, it can enhance income levels and reduce income distribution disparities.

Based on the foregoing, appropriate wage policies and demographic growth are crucial factors influencing income and ultimately community welfare. This research aims to analyze the effect of minimum wage and population size on income distribution disparity and community welfare across regencies and cities in Bali Province. This issue is essential for understanding the economic dynamics of Bali's regions and for formulating more effective policies to achieve inclusive and sustainable economic growth, with the ultimate goal of reducing income disparities in the future. Hence, this study is titled: "The Influence of Minimum Wage and

Population Size on Income Distribution Disparity and Community Welfare in Regencies/Cities of Bali Province."

METHOD

This study employs a quantitative associative approach aimed at analyzing the influence of the minimum wage and population size on community welfare, with income distribution disparity serving as an intervening variable. The research was conducted across nine regencies/cities in the Province of Bali, namely Jembrana, Tabanan, Badung, Gianyar, Klungkung, Bangli, Buleleng, Karangasem, and Denpasar City. The selection of these locations is based on the presence of development disparities and uneven growth in the Human Development Index (HDI) across regions in Bali Province (Sugiyono, 2013).

The variables used in this study consist of minimum wage (X1) and population size (X2) as independent variables, income distribution disparity (Y1) as the intervening variable, and community welfare (Y2) as the dependent variable. The data used are secondary panel data, which combine time series data from 2010–2024 and cross-sectional data from the nine regencies/cities, totaling 135 observations. The data were obtained from the Central Bureau of Statistics (BPS) of Bali Province, including data on the minimum wage (UMK), population size, Gini Ratio, and HDI, and were supported by a literature review from relevant books and journals (Amruddin, 2022).

Data analysis was conducted using two methods: descriptive statistical analysis to describe the characteristics of the data, and path analysis to examine both direct and indirect relationships among the variables. The structural model was analyzed using SPSS software and complemented by the Sobel test to assess the mediating effect of income distribution disparity. This technique aims to determine the extent to which the minimum wage and population size influence community welfare, both directly and indirectly through income distribution disparity (Kuncoro in Duryadi, 2021; Sugiyono, 2017).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Descriptive Statistical Test Results

Table 1. Results of Descriptive Statistical Tests of Research Variables

		Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Minimum wage	135	829500,00	3318628,00	1985812,593	689392,9205
Total population	135	171,10	947,10	408,1609	206,80030
Income Distribution Disparity	135	0,22	0,42	0,3256	0,03611
Public welfare	135	60,58	8522	73,1193	5,82123

Source: SPSS Data Processing Results (Appendix 2)

Based on Table 1, it can be explained that the number of observation points is 135. First, variable (X1), namely the minimum wage by district/city in Bali Province in 2010-2024, shows the highest value of IDR 3,318,628.00 which occurred in Badung

Regency in 2024, while the lowest value was IDR 829,500.00 which occurred in Bangli Regency in 2010. The standard deviation value is IDR 689,329.92 with an average value of IDR 1,985,812.59. Based on this, it can be concluded that the average value is higher than the standard deviation, indicating that the minimum wage by district/city in Bali Province during 2010-2024 can be said to be relatively even.

Variable (X2), namely the population level by district/city in Bali Province during 2010-2024, showed the highest value of 947.10 thousand people in Denpasar City in 2019, while the lowest value was 171.10 thousand people in Klungkung Regency in 2010. The standard deviation value is 206.80 thousand people with an average value of 468.16 thousand people. Based on these data, it can be concluded that the average value is greater than the standard deviation value, so this shows that the population by district/city in Bali Province in 2010-2024 is relatively even.

Variable (Y1), namely the disparity of income distribution by district/city in Bali Province during 2010-2024, showed the highest value of 0.42 points in Denpasar City in 2010, while the lowest value was 0.22 points in Bangli Regency in 2010. The standard deviation value is 0.03611 points with an average value of 0.3256 points. Based on these data, it can be concluded that the average value is smaller than the standard deviation value. This shows that the disparity of income distribution by district/city in Bali Province in 2010-2024 still shows a high level of distribution, so it cannot be said to be evenly distributed.

Variable (Y2), namely community welfare by district/city in Bali Province during 2010-2024, showed the highest value of 85.22 points in Denpasar City in 2024, while the lowest value was 60.58 points in Karangasem Regency in 2010. The standard deviation value is 5.82123 points with an average value of 73.1193 points. Based on these data, it can be concluded that the average value is greater than the standard deviation value, so this shows that community welfare by district/city in Bali Province in 2010-2024 is relatively evenly distributed.

Path Analysis Test Results

a) Calculation of path coefficients in determining structural model equations

Table 2. Results of Path Analysis Test of Equation I

Variables	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t count	Sig. t-test
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	0.335	0.011		30,509	0,000
Minimum wage	-6,712E-9	0,000	-0.128	-1,460	0.152
Total population	7,284E-6	0,000	0.042	0.475	0.639

Source: SPSS Data Processing Results

Based on Table 2, equation I can be made, namely as follows.

$Y1 = 0.335 - 0.000000006712X1 + 0.000007284X2$

The regression coefficient value of the minimum wage variable (X1) is negative with a significance value of the t-test of more than 0.05. While the regression coefficient value of the population variable (X2) is positive with a significance value of the t-test of more than 0.05. This shows that the minimum wage (X1) has a negative and insignificant effect on the disparity of income distribution (Y1) while the population (X2) has a positive and insignificant effect on the disparity of income distribution (Y1).

Table 3. Path Analysis Test Results for Equation 2

Variables	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t count	Sig. t-test
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	48,166	3,112		15,479	0,000
Minimum wage	3.692E-6	0,000	0.437	7,988	0,000
Total population	0.016	0.002	0.570	10,486	0,000
Income Distribution Disparity	31,063	8,680	8,680	3,578	0,000

Source: SPSS Data Processing Results

Based on Table 3, equation II can be made, namely as follows.

Y2 = 48.166 + 0.000003692X1 + 0.016X2 + 31.063Y1

The regression coefficient value of the minimum wage variable (X1), population (X2), and income distribution disparity (Y1) is positive with a t-test significance value of less than 0.05. This shows that the minimum wage (X1), population (X2), and income distribution disparity (Y1) have a positive and significant effect on community welfare (Y1) according to districts/cities in Bali Province.

b) Coefficient of Determination (Adjusted R2)

Table 4. Table of Determination Coefficient Results (Adjusted R2)

	Equality	R2	Adjusted R2
1	$Y_1 = 0{,}335 - 0{,}000000006712X_1 + 0{,}000007284X_2$	0,016	0,001
2	$Y_2 = 48{,}166 + 0{,}000003692X_1 + 0{,}016X_2 + 31{,}063Y_1$	0,626	0,618

Source: SPSS Data Processing Results

Table 4 shows in equation I, the magnitude of the influence of the independent variable on the dependent variable is indicated by a determination value of 0.001. This means that only 0.1 percent of the variation in income distribution disparity (Y1) of districts/cities in Bali Province is influenced by minimum wages (X1) and population (X2), 99.9 percent is influenced by other factors outside the model. Furthermore, in equation II, the magnitude of the influence of the independent variable on the dependent variable is indicated by a

determination value of 0.618. This means that 61.8 percent of the variation in community welfare (Y2) according to districts/cities in Bali Province is influenced by variations in the minimum wage variable (X1), population (X2), and income distribution disparity (Y1), the remaining 38.2 percent is influenced by other factors not included in the model.

Based on Table 4, the calculation of the standard error of estimate is as follows.

$$\boldsymbol{e_i = \sqrt{(1 - R^2}}$$

$$\boldsymbol{e_1 = \sqrt{(1 - (Ri^2)}} = \boldsymbol{\sqrt{1 - 0,016}} = 0,992$$

$$\boldsymbol{e_2 = \sqrt{(1 - (Ri^2)}} = \boldsymbol{\sqrt{1 - 0,626}} = 0,611$$

Furthermore, based on the calculation of the standard error of estimate above, the total data diversity can be calculated, namely as follows.

$$\boldsymbol{R_m^2 = 1 - P_{e1}^2\, P_{e2}^2 \ldots P_{ep}^2}$$

$$\boldsymbol{R_m^2 = 1 - {e_1}^2\, {e_2}^2} = \boldsymbol{1 - (0,992)^2\ (0,611)^2} = 0,633$$

Direct Hypothesis Testing Results

Table 5. Hypothesis Testing of Equation I

Independent Variables	t count	Sig. t-test	Information
Minimum wage	1,460	0.147	Not Significant
Total population	0.475	0.635	Not Significant

Source: SPSS Data Processing Results

Next, a test of the II equation structure was carried out using the t-test which aims to determine the influence of minimum wages (X1), population (X2), and disparity in income distribution (Y1) on public welfare directly towards public welfare (Y1) in districts/cities in Bali Province, as shown in Table 6, namely as follows.

Table 6. Hypothesis Testing of Equation II

Independent Variables	t count	Sig. test	t-Information
Minimum wage	,988	0,000	Significant
Total population	0.486	0,000	Significant
Income Distribution Disparity	,578	0,000	Significant

Source: SPSS Data Processing Results

Based on Table 5 and Table 6, the values in the data processing results can be interpreted using the t-test, namely as follows.

a) The effect of minimum wages (X1) on income distribution disparities (Y1) in districts/cities in Bali Province

Based on the results obtained in Table 5, the test results show that the t-value (-1.460) < t-table (1.984) and the significance value is 0.147 > 0.050, so Ho

is not rejected and H1 is not accepted. This means that the minimum wage variable has a negative but insignificant effect on the disparity of income distribution in districts/cities in Bali Province.

b) The influence of population (X2) on the disparity in income distribution (Y1) of districts/cities in Bali Province

Based on the results obtained in Table 5, the test results show that the t-count value (0.475) < t-table (1.984) and the significance value is 0.635 > 0.050, so H0 is not rejected and H1 is not accepted. This means that the population variable has a positive but insignificant effect on the disparity of income distribution in districts/cities in Bali Province.

c) The influence of minimum wages (X1) on community welfare (Y2) in districts/cities in Bali Province

Based on the results obtained in Table 6, the test results show that the t-count value (7.988) > t-table (1.984) and the significance value is 0.000 < 0.050, so H0 is rejected and H1 is accepted. This means that the minimum wage variable has a positive and significant effect on the welfare of the district/city community in Bali Province.

d) The influence of population (X2) on community welfare (Y2) in districts/cities in Bali Province

Based on the results obtained in Table 6, the test results show that the t-count value (10.486) > t-table (1.984) and the significance value is 0.000 < 0.050, so H0 is rejected and H1 is accepted. This means that the population variable has a positive and significant effect on the welfare of the district/city community in Bali Province.

e) The influence of income distribution disparities (Y1) on community welfare (Y2) in districts/cities in Bali Province

Based on the results obtained on Table 6, the test results show that the t-value (3.578) > t-table (1.984) and the significance value is 0.000 < 0.050 but the direction of the coefficient shows a positive relationship, so H0 is not rejected and H1 is not accepted. This means that the income distribution disparity variable has a positive but significant effect on the welfare of the district/city community in Bali Province.

Sobel Test Results

a) The indirect effect of minimum wages (X1) on social welfare (Y2) through disparities in income distribution (Y1).

The calculation of the Sobel test or indirect influence between minimum wages (X1) on community welfare (Y2) through disparities in income distribution (Y1) in districts/cities in Bali Province can be calculated as follows.

$$\mathbf{S_{\beta_1\beta_5}} = \sqrt{\boldsymbol{\beta 5^2 S_{\beta 1^2}} + \boldsymbol{\beta 1^2 S_{\beta 5^2}}}$$

However, based on the regression results, the Sβ1 value of 0.000 is a rounded result so it is necessary to calculate the actual Sβ1 value, which is as follows.

$$\mathbf{S_{\beta 1}} = \frac{\boldsymbol{B}}{\boldsymbol{t}} = \frac{\mathbf{-6{,}712}\boldsymbol{E^{-9}}}{\mathbf{-1{,}460}} \approx 4{,}599 \times 10^{-9}$$

$$\mathbf{S_{\beta_1\beta_5}} = \sqrt{(\mathbf{0,193})^2(\mathbf{4,599} \times \mathbf{10^{-9}})^2 + (\mathbf{-0,128})^2(\mathbf{8,680})^2} = 1{,}111$$

Next, the Z value is calculated to test the significance of the indirect influence of the minimum wage on community welfare through income distribution disparities, as follows.

$$\mathbf{Z} = \frac{\boldsymbol{\beta_1\beta_5}}{\mathbf{S_{\beta 1}\beta_5}}$$

$$\mathbf{Z} = \frac{\mathbf{-0{,}128}\ .\ \mathbf{0{,}193}}{\mathbf{1{,}111}} = -0{,}022$$

Since Zcount is -0.022 < 1.96, then H0 is not rejected and H1 is not accepted. This means that the disparity in income distribution (Y1) is not an intervening variable between minimum wages (X1) and community welfare (Y2) of districts/cities in Bali Province.

b) The indirect effect of population size (X2) on social welfare (Y2) through disparities in income distribution (Y1)

The calculation of the Sobel test or indirect influence between the number of residents (X2) on community welfare (Y2) through the disparity in income distribution (Y1) of districts/cities in Bali Province can be calculated as follows.

$$\mathbf{S_{\beta_2\beta_5}} = \sqrt{\boldsymbol{\beta 5^2 S_{\beta 2^2}} + \boldsymbol{\beta 2^2 S_{\beta 5^2}}}$$

However, based on the regression results, the Sβ2 value of 0.000 is most likely a rounding result, so it is necessary to calculate the actual Sβ1 value, which is as follows.

$$\mathbf{S_{\beta 2}} = \frac{\boldsymbol{B}}{\boldsymbol{t}} = \frac{\mathbf{7{,}284}\boldsymbol{E^{-6}}}{\mathbf{0{,}475}} = 1{,}533 \times 10^{-5}$$

$$\mathbf{S_{\beta_2\beta_5}} = \sqrt{(\mathbf{0,193})^2(\mathbf{1,533} \times \mathbf{10^{-5}})^2 + ((\mathbf{0,042})^2(\mathbf{8,680})^2} = 0{,}365$$

Next, the Z value is calculated to test the significance of the indirect influence of the minimum wage on community welfare through income distribution disparities, as follows.

$$\mathbf{Z} = \frac{\boldsymbol{\beta_2\beta_5}}{\mathbf{S_{\beta 2}\beta_5}}$$

$$\mathbf{Z} = \frac{\mathbf{0{,}042}\ .\mathbf{0{,}193}}{\mathbf{0{,}365}} = 0{,}0222$$

Since Zcount is 0.0222 < 1.96, then H0 is not rejected and H1 is not accepted. This means that the disparity in income distribution (Y1) is not an intervening variable between the population (X2) and the welfare of the community (Y2) of districts/cities in Bali Province.

Table 7. Results of Calculation of Direct, Indirect, and Total Influence of Minimum Wage Variables, Population, Income Distribution Disparity, and Community Welfare in Regency/City in Bali Province

Influence Variable Relationship	Direct	Not Direct Through Y1	Total
X1 →Y1	0.128		0.128
X2 →Y1	0.042		0.042
X1 →Y2	0.437	(-0.128 × 0.192 = -0.0246)	0.412
X2 →Y2	0.571	(0.042 × 0.192 = 0.0081)	0.578
Y1 →Y2	0.193		0.193

Source: SPSS Data Processing Results

Discussion of Research Results

The Influence of Minimum Wages and Population on Income Distribution Disparities

Based on the results of path analysis in equation I, the minimum wage variable shows a regression coefficient value of -0.000000006712 with a significance value of 0.147> 0.05. While the population variable shows a regression coefficient value of 0.000007284 with a significance value of 0.635> 0.05. This indicates that the minimum wage and population do not have a significant effect on the disparity in income distribution in Regency/City in Bali Province. This means that the disparity in income distribution in Bali Province is not only influenced by the amount of the minimum wage or population, but also other structural factors such as differences in local economic structure, the contribution of the informal sector, and access to formal education and employment.

The results of this study are in line with researchKanbur and Zhuang (2013)which states that the influence of wage policy on income distribution disparities is highly dependent on the institutional structure and distribution of access to formal employment. If most of the population works in the informal sector, an increase in the minimum wage is not effective enough in increasing the income of the lowest economic class. According toUbaidillah and Sugiyanto (2024), the minimum wage policy does not have a significant impact on distribution disparities in Indonesia. This is because the implementation of the wage policy cannot touch the informal worker group that dominates the labor market.

The workforce structure in Bali Province is dominated by the informal and tourism sectors, especially in Badung, Gianyar, and Denpasar Regencies. Based on dataBPS Bali Province (2024), more than 33 percent of workers are in the categories of production workers, operators, and manual workers. Meanwhile, the contribution of the informal sector is still high, especially in the MSME group, daily

workers, and the craft sector. This causes the minimum wage policy to be less effective in impacting the informal worker group because in general it is not bound by the formal wage system regulated by government regulations.

The population variable also does not have a significant effect on the disparity in income distribution in districts/cities in Bali Province. This is in line with the results of research conducted byArfian (2022)which shows that population does not have a significant effect on income distribution disparity. Demographic factors such as population are not sufficient as a single indicator variable for disparity. Structural variables such as poverty, economic access, and investment are much more dominant in explaining income distribution disparity.(Refkhi Al Aqilah et al., 2024).

The distribution of population between regencies/cities in Bali Province does not always correlate with the distribution of income. Denpasar City and Badung Regency have a high population but also have a high distribution disparity value. This is because most of the income is concentrated in the upper class community who have access to the formal sector and tourism services. The population in Bali Province has increased every year, but this increase does not cause disparities in income distribution between regions. The population is only a demographic background, the disparity in income distribution is more influenced by the level of education and the distribution of formal employment.

The Influence of Minimum Wages, Population, and Income Distribution Disparities on Community Welfare

Based on the results of equation II, it shows that the minimum wage coefficient is 0.000003692 with a significance of 0.000, then the population is 0.016 with a significance of 0.000, and the disparity in income distribution has a coefficient value of 31.063 with a significance of 0.000. These results indicate that the variables of minimum wage, population, and disparity in income distribution have a positive and significant effect on the welfare of the people of districts/cities in Bali Province. This finding provides an empirical basis that the policy of increasing minimum wages and managing productive population, as well as managing adaptive income disparities, can be an effective development strategy to encourage welfare at the regional level.

The results of the study show that increasing the minimum wage can improve people's welfare even though the increase is relatively small. In line with research by Bossler et al. (2024)which shows that an increase in the minimum wage can significantly increase workers' income without triggering a decrease in employment. This proves that the minimum wage is not only a social protection, but also an instrument for building public welfare. FurthermoreThe Last Supper (2020)explains that the minimum wage has a positive impact on people's welfare by increasing purchasing power and household consumption.

Around 49.32 percent of the workforce in Bali Province works in the formal sector, especially in areas with a service economy structure such as Denpasar City, Badung Regency, and Gianyar. Formal workers are a group that is directly affected

by the minimum wage policy. An increase in the minimum wage will lead to an increase in purchasing power that can encourage household consumption, local economic turnover, and an increase in welfare indicators such as per capita expenditure and access to basic needs. In addition, the increase in purchasing power creates a multiplier effect on MSMEs and local creative economy actors who are highly dependent on domestic demand.

Furthermore, the population has a positive and significant influence on community welfare.Fitriyani et al. (2024)shows that population growth supported by improving the quality of human resources can provide a positive contribution to improving regional welfare, through the mechanism of increasing household consumption, growth of micro-enterprises, and the provision of a more diverse workforce. The results of this study are in line with research conducted byAl Aqilah et al. (2024)In a panel study on Sumatra Island, it was stated that population growth has a positive effect on community welfare, especially if supported by strengthening the productive economic sector.

Denpasar City and Badung Regency have a high population showing a positive correlation to high community welfare, reflected in the HDI value and higher per capita expenditure compared to other regencies/cities in Bali Province. This indicates that the population, especially the productive age population, contributes to increasing household consumption, job growth, and strengthening local economic activity. Denpasar City with a population dominated by the productive age group encourages the growth of the informal and informal sectors and new economic innovations such as start-ups, digital MSMEs, and the creative economy which can be a catalyst for the growth of community welfare.

The results of the study show that disparity in income distribution is positively correlated with social welfare. This finding is in line with the viewThe Kunzets (1955)which suggests a pattern of relationship between economic growth and income distribution disparity that forms an inverted U-curve. Income distribution disparity tends to increase in the early stages of economic growth along with the transition from the agricultural sector to the industrial and service sectors. This is due to the concentration of economic benefits in certain groups that adapt more quickly to the new economic structure that gives rise to capital accumulation and industrialization.

Classical economists such as Keynes, Kaldor, Stiglitz, and Lewis emphasize that high-income groups have a higher marginal propensity to save (MPS) than low-income groups.(Keyness, 1936; Stiglitz, 1969;Lewis, 1954). High-income groups tend to save a larger portion of their income. According toKaldor (1957), disparities drive growth through the savings effect because elite groups contribute a large proportion of national investment to create jobs, increase national income, and strengthen community capacity.

Research conducted byBourguignon (2004), states that in developing countries, income distribution disparities can run parallel to the increase in aggregate welfare until it reaches saturation point. Disparities can have a positive

impact on welfare growth if driven by expansive sectors that are able to absorb labor and create new economic activities. Therefore, districts/cities in Bali Province reflect areas with higher economic and income concentrations that can contribute to the welfare of the wider community through increasing GRDP per capita, infrastructure, and access to public services.

Although there is still a disparity in income distribution, Badung Regency, Denpasar City, and Gianyar as contributors to the majority of GRDP in Bali Province can create an indirect distribution effect on the welfare of the community at large. The growth of the tourism sector in Badung Regency and Denpasar City can encourage the opening of employment opportunities, demand for raw materials, and supporting services from hinterland areas such as Karangasem, Bangli, and Jembrana Regencies. Communities outside the economic center can also feel the benefits of economic growth even though the distribution of income is still unequal.

Kuznets' theory and the views of classical economists are relevant to be applied in Bali Province, especially in explaining how income distribution disparities are positively correlated to community welfare. The southern part of Bali has experienced much faster economic growth compared to other regions which can encourage increased welfare. High-income groups tend to invest in strategic sectors such as tourism, property, and services that will open up new jobs and expand economic opportunities from regional centers.

In addition, areas with high income levels also have greater fiscal capacity that can enable better infrastructure, education, and health development. If public facilities and access are expanded, the welfare effect increases in aggregate even for groups of people who are below the average income line. The disparity that occurs is not the stagnation of underdeveloped areas, but rather the acceleration of developed areas that create regional growth drivers. Therefore, the disparity in income distribution, in the current growth stage in Bali Province, still contributes positively to community welfare.

The Influence of Minimum Wages and Population on Community Welfare through Income Distribution Disparities

The indirect effect of minimum wage and population variables on community welfare through income distribution disparity is calculated using the Sobel test. The results of the study indicate that both Z values are smaller than the critical Z value of 1.96 at a significance level of 0.05. This means that there is no significant indirect effect of minimum wage and population variables on community welfare through income distribution disparity in districts/cities in Bali Province. This indicates that income distribution disparity does not play a role as a significant intervening variable in the relationship between minimum wage and population on community welfare.

Fields (2001)explains that the income distribution path towards welfare is highly dependent on the role of institutions and distribution systems. If the disparity in income distribution is not managed through income redistribution, then the disparity will not contribute positively to the welfare of society indirectly.

ResearchRizal and Mustapita (2024)stated that the minimum wage has a direct and significant impact on the welfare of society, while the contribution of income distribution disparity as an intervening variable has proven to be insignificant. In line with the research resultsRusman et al. (2024)shows that minimum wages have a significant effect on social welfare through the economic growth channel and the purchasing channel, but not through income distribution disparity as a mediator.

The disparity in income distribution that occurs in districts/cities in Bali Province has not been strong enough to play an intervening role in improving people's welfare. This is because Bali's economic structure is very centralized in several districts/cities such as Denpasar City and Badung Regency, so that access to development benefits is still uneven. In addition, more than 50 percent of the workforce in Bali Province works in the informal sector, which causes the minimum wage policy to have a direct impact on people's welfare without going through an income distribution mechanism. Most informal workers are directly affected by the minimum wage policy because they are not in a formal work structure protected by employment regulations.

Meanwhile, the influence of population in Bali Province has a stronger direct influence on people's welfare. This is because the increase in population, especially in areas with economic concentrations such as Denpasar City, Badung Regency, and Gianyar, is able to encourage household consumption growth, increased economic activity, and expansion of the informal sector and MSMEs. The influence of population is greater through increased consumption and the provision of jobs and not through disparities in income distribution. In addition, the income redistribution mechanism has not been running optimally so that the increase in population does not significantly affect the disparity in income distribution, but directly contributes to people's welfare such as per capita expenditure, consumption, and access to public services.

CONCLUSION

The results of the study, based on the previous discussion, can be concluded as follows:

1. The minimum wage has a negative but not significant effect, and population size has a positive but not significant effect on income distribution disparity in the regencies/cities of Bali Province.
2. The minimum wage, population size, and income distribution disparity have a positive and significant effect on community welfare in the regencies/cities of Bali Province.
3. The minimum wage and population size do not have an indirect effect on community welfare in the regencies/cities of Bali Province through income distribution disparity.

REFERENCES

Al Aqilah, M. R., Muchtar, M., & Robinson Sihombing, P. (2024). Analisis Determinan Ketimpangan Pendapatan Di Pulau Sumatera. Journal of Law, Administration, and Social Science, 4(1), 13–24. https://doi.org/10.54957/jolas.v4i1.684

Amruddin, dkk. (2022). Metodologi Penelitian Kuantitatif. Pradima Pustaka.

Arfian. (2022). Pengaruh Jumlah Penduduk, Pendidikan, dan Kemiskinan Terhadap Ketimpangan Pendapatan di Kabupaten/Kota Provinsi Sulawesi Tenggara. Jurnal Progres Ekonomi Pembangunan (JPEP), 7(2), 234–244.

Becker, G. S. (1993). Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis, with Special Reference to Education. University of Chicago Press.

Bossler, M., Chittka, L., & Schank, T. (2024). A 22 Percent Increase in the German Minimum Wage: Nothing Crazy! [IZA Institute of Labor Economics]. www.iza.org

Bourguignon, F. (2004). The Poverty-Growth-Inequality Triangle. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/5127146

BPS Provinsi Bali. (2024a). Indilator Pasar Tenaga Kerja Indonesia Agustus 2024.

BPS Provinsi Bali. (2024b). Penduduk, Laju Pertumbuhan Penduduk, Distribusi Persentase Penduduk Kepadatan Penduduk, Rasio Jenis Kelamin Penduduk Menurut Kabupaten/Kota di Provinsi Bali, 2024.

BPS Provinsi Bali. (2024c). Tingkat Ketimpangan Pengeluaran Penduduk Indonesia Maret 2024.

BPS Provinsi Bali. (2025a). Distribusi Pendapatan Provinsi Bali Menurut Kelompok Pendapatan dan Kabupaten/Kota (Persen), 2024.

BPS Provinsi Bali. (2025b). Penduduk Usia 15 Tahun ke Atas yang Bekerja Menurut Jenis Pekerjaan/Jabatan dalam Pekerjaan Utama di Provinsi Bali (Orang), 2024.

BPS Provinsi Bali. (2025c). Pengeluaran Perkapita Disesuaikan Provinsi Bali Menurut Kabupaten/Kota (Ribu Rupiah/Orang/Tahun), 2024.

BPS Provinsi Bali. (2025d). Perkembangan Gini Ratio Menurut Kabupaten/Kota di Provinsi Bali Tahun 2020-2024.

BPS Provinsi Bali. (2025e). Perkembangan IPM Menurut Kabupaten/Kota di Provinsi Bali Tahun 2020-2024.

BPS Provinsi Bali. (2025f). Pertumbuhan Ekonomi Bali Triwulan I-2025.

BPS Provinsi Bali. (2025g). Proyeksi Penduduk Provinsi Bali Menurut Kelompok Umur (Ribu Jiwa), 2025.

BPS Provinsi Bali. (2025h). Upah Minimum Kabupaten/Kota di Provinsi Bali (Rupiah), 2025.

Budiarti, N. (2019). Pengaruh Kesejahteraan Masyarakat Melalui Analisa Indeks Pembangunan Manusia Kab/Kota Provinsi Jawa Timur. Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Perbanas.

Buku Bali Membangun . (2020).

Duryadi. (2021). Metode Penelitian Ilmiah.

Ehrenberg, R. G., & Smith, R. S. (2021). Modern labor economics: Theory and public policy (13, Ed.). Routledge.

Fawaid, M. G. (2021). Analisis Ketimpangan Daerah Utara dan Selatan Provinsi Bali Tahun 2011-2018. Universitas Jember.

Febrian, R. E., & Yusnida. (2020). Kajian Kesejahteraan di Provinsi Bengkulu: Sebuah Temuan dari Analisis Jalur. Convergence: The Journal of Economic Development, 2(1), 16–35.

Fields, G. (2001). Distribution and Development.
Firdausy, K. A. nuzul, Hanim, A., & Komariyah, S. (2023). Analisis Pengaruh Pertumbuhan Ekonomi dan Pertumbuhan Penduduk terhadap Ketimpangan Pendapatan dan Kemiskinan Provinsi Jawa Timur. Jurnal Ekuilibrium, 7(1), 35. https://doi.org/10.19184/jek.v7i1.33216
Fitriyani, I., Syafruddin, Asmini, & Kadewi Sumbawati, N. (2024). Analisis Pengaruh Jumlah Penduduk, Upah Minimum, dan Pertumbuhan Ekonomi Terhadap Ketimpangan Distribusi Pendapatan di Kabupaten Sumbawa. Jurnal Media Informatika (JUMIN), 5(2), 182.
Friedlander, W. A. (t.t.). Introduction to Social Welfare (5 ed.). Englewood Cliffs, N.J. : Prentice-Hall, [1980].
Garnero, A., Kampelmann, R., & Rycx, F. (2015). Minimum Wage Systems and Earnings Inequalities: Does Institutional Diversity Matter? European Journal of Industrial Relations, 2(21), 50–57.
Ghozali, I. (2018). Aplikasi analisis multivariate dengan program IBM SPSS 25. Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.
Grünberger, K., Narazani, E., Filauro, S., & Kiss, A. (2022). Social and fiscal impacts of statutory minimum wages in EU countries: a microsimulation analysis with EUROMOD. ZA Journal of Labor Policy, 12(1).
Hadad, M. D. (2000). Perekonomian Indonesia: Masalah dan prospek (2, Ed.). Pusat Pengembangan Ekonomi.
Hicks, J. R. (1946). Value and Capital: An Inquiry Into Some Fundamental Principles of Economic Theory (2 ed.). Oxford University Press.
International Labour Organisation (ILO). (2021). Global Wage Report 2020-21: Wages and Minimum Wages in The Time of COVID-19.
Ismail, I. F., Walewangko, E. N., & Sumual, J. I. (2021). Analisis Pengaruh Pertumbuhan Ekonomi, Pengeluaran Pemerintah Sektor Pendidikan dan Kesehatan terhadap Indeks Pembangunan Manusia di Kota Manado. Jurnal Berkala Ilmiah Efisien, 21(03), 103–114.
Julihanza, A., & Khoirudin, R. (2023). Determininan Ketimpangan Pendapatan di Seluruh Provinsi di Sumatera. Journal of Macroeconomics and Social Development, 1(2), 1–12. https://economics.pubmedia.id/index.php/jmsd
Juniati, W., Abdullah, M. L., & Wibowo, M. G. (2022). Determinants of Income Inequality Villages and Cities in Indonesia. Journal of Developing Economies, 7(2), 266–279. https://doi.org/10.20473/jde.v7i2.33980
Kaldor, N. (1957). A Model of Economic Growth. The Economic Journal, 67(268), 591–624.
Kanbur, R., & Zhuang, J. (2013). Urbanization and inequality in Asia. Asian Development Review, 30, 131–30147. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2260109
Keyness, J. M. (1936). The General Theory of Employment Interest and Money. Macmillan.
Kline, R. B. (2015). Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling (4 ed.). The Guilford Press.
Krugman, P. (1991). Increasing Returns and Economic Geography. Journal of Political Economy, 99, 483–499.

Kuntoro, E., Anggraeni, L., & Widyastutik. (2020). Pengaruh Keterbukaan Ekonomi dan Transformasi Struktural Terhadap Ketimpangan Pendapatan di Indonesia. Proceeding SENDIU, 545–552.

Kunzets, S. (1955). Economic Growth and Income Inequality. The American Economic Review, XLV, 2–28.

Kurniawan, A., & Sulistyaningrum, E. (2017). Analisis upah minimum terhadap ketimpangan pendapatan antarwilayah di Indonesia. Jurnal Ekonomi dan Pembangunan Indonesia, 18(2), 137–152.

Kurniawan, R., & Huda, S. (2024). Analisis Pertumbuhan Ekonomi dan Ketimpangan Distribusi Pendapatan Provinsi Bali. Jurnal Dinamika Ekonomi Pembangunan, 3(2), 91–99. https://doi.org/10.33005/jdep.v3i2.115

Lewis, W. A. (1954). Economic Development with Unlimited Supplies of Labour. The Manchester School, 2(22), 139–191.

Midgley, J. (1999). Social Development: The Developmental Perspective in Social Welfare. SAGE Publications Ltd.

Mudana, I. W. E., & Purbadharmaja. (2024). Pengaruh Upah Minimum dan Pertumbuhan Ekonomi terhadap Ketimpangan Distribusi Pendapatan dan Kesejahteraan Masyarakat Kabupaten/Kota di Provinsi Bali. Jurnal Review Pendidikan dan Pengajaran, 7(3), 9601–9612.

Mulia, R. A., & Saputra, N. (2020). Analisis Faktor-Faktor yang Mempengaruhi Kesejahteraan Masyarakat Kota Padang. JurnalEl-Riyasah, 10(1), 67–87.

Muthia, A. (2019). Analisis Pro-poor Growth Melalui Identifikasi Pengaruh Pertumbuhan Ekonomi terhadap Ketimpangan Pendapatan dan Kemiskinan di Indonesia Tahun 2010-2015. Indonesian Journal of Applied Statistics, 2(2), 67–79.

Ningtiyas, N., & Nuraini Dwiputri, I. (2021). Analisis disparitas pendapatan di Indonesia Tahun 2015-2019: Analisis Regresi Data Panel. Jurnal Ekonomi, Bisnis dan Pendidikan, 1(7), 670–685. https://doi.org/10.17977/um066v1i72021p670-685

Noegroho, Y. S., & Soelistianingsih, L. (2007). Analisis Disparitas Pendapatan Kabupaten/Kota di Provinsi Jawa Tengah dan Faktor-Faktor yang Mempengaruhi Pertumbuhan Ekonomi Regional. 2, 1–30.

Noviana, S. N. (2020). Pengaruh Upah Minimum Regional dan Rasio Infrastruktur Terhadap Kesenjangan Distribusi Pendapatan di Indonesia. Jurnal Akuntansi AKTIVA, 1(2), 116–135.

Nurnaningsih, L., Riyanto, W. H., & Susilowati, D. (2019). Pengaruh Jumlah Penduduk, Tingkat Kemiskinan dan Jumlah Pengangguran Terhadap Indeks Pembangunan Manusia Kabupaten/Kota Provinsi Nusa Tenggara Barat. Jurnal Ilmu Ekonomi (JIE), 3(4), 505–516.

Piketty, T. (2014). Capital in the twenty-first century. Harvard University Press.

Pradnyawati, I. G. A. A., & Budhi, M. K. S. (2023). Analisis Pengaruh Komponen IPM dan Kesempatan Kerja Terhadap Tingkat Kemiskinan di Kabupaten/Kota Provinsi Bali Periode 2010-2019. e-Jurnal Ekonomi Pembangunan Universitas Udayana, 10(9), 3528–3555. https://doi.org/https://ojs.unud.ac.id/index.php/eep/article/view/69672

Prawesti Ningrum, E., Endah Nursyamsi, S., & Siregar, N. (2024). Faktor Terkait Kesenjangan Ekonomi dan Kesejahteraan. Jurnal Riset Akuntansi dan Keuangan, 7(2), 116–126. http://ejurnal.unim.ac.id/index.php/prive

Putri, A. S., & Anggraini, S. (2024). Pengaruh Pertumbuhan Ekonomi, Upah Minimum, dan Tingkat Pengangguran Terhadap Ketimpangan Pendapatan di Kota Tanjungpinang. Jurnal Manajerial dan Bisnis Tanjungpinang, 2, 100–109.

Refkhi Al Aqilah, M., Muchtar, M., & Robinson Sihombing, P. (2024). Analisis Determinan Ketimpangan Pendapatan di Pulau Sumatera. Journal of Law, Administration, and Social Science, 4(1), 13–24.

Rini, G. A. M. C., Suciptawati, N. L. P., & Utari, I. A. P. A. (2022). IDENTIFIKASI FAKTOR YANG MEMENGARUHI GINI RATIO DI INDONESIA. E-Jurnal Matematika, 11(3), 160–166. https://doi.org/10.24843/mtk.2022.v11.i03.p376

Rizal, M., & Mustapita, A. F. (2024). Effect of Minimum Wages on Labor, Welfare and Economic Growth: Evidence from East Java province. Optimum: Jurnal Ekonomi dan Pembangunan, 14(1), 10–19. https://doi.org/10.12928/optimum.v14i1.8139

Rusman, H., Agnesia Sihombing, D., Assery, S., Osman, I., & Lamboy Sinaga, V. (2024). Analysis of The Relationship Between Minimum Wage Policy, Distribution of Job Availability, Household Spending Behavior and Welfare Level in Indonesia. Journal Of Social Science Research, 4(4), 10787–10794.

Said, M. (2000). Pengantar Ilmu Kependudukan. PT RajaGrafindo Persada.

Sanjaya, I. G. A. (2020). Pengaruh Upah Minimum dan Investasi terhadap Ketimpangan Distribusi Pendapatan dan Kesejahteraan Masyarakat Kabupaten/Kota di Provinsi Bali. E-Journal Ekonomi Pembangunan Universitas Udayana, 10(12), 4705–4737.

Sari, N. R., & Pujiyono, A. (2013). Analisis Pertumbuhan Ekonomi dan Ketimpangan Pendapatan Antar Provinsi di Indonesia Tahun 2004-2010. Diponegoro Journal of Economics, 2(3), 1.

Sastrohadiwiryo, B. S. (2005). Manajemen tenaga kerja Indonesia: Pendekatan administrasi dan operasional. Bumi Aksara.

Sen, A. (1999). Development as Freedom. Oxford University Press.

Setyawan, R. (2019). Identifikasi Pengaruh Pertumbuhan Ekonomi, Pengeluaran Pemerintah, Jumlah Penduduk dan Tingkat Pengangguran Terhadap Disparitas Pendapatan di Provinsi Jawa Timur. Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa FEB, 7(2).

Simanjuntak, P. J. (2001). Pengantar ekonomi sumber daya manusia (3, Ed.). Lembaga Penerbit FE UI.

Sitthiyot, T. (2016). On Income Inequality and Population Size. Thammasat Review of Economic and Social Policy, 2(2), 24–48.

Stiglitz, J. E. (1969). Distribution of Income and Wealth Among Individuals. Econometrica, 3(37), 382–397.

Sugiyono. (2013). Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R & D.

Sugiyono. (2017). Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif.

Sukirno, S. (2006). Ekonomi pembangunan: Proses, masalah, dan dasar kebijakan (3, Ed.). Kencana Prenada Media Group.

Sultan, Rahayu, H. C., & Purwiyanta. (2023). Analisis Pengaruh Kesejahteraan Masyarakat Terhadap Pertumbuhan Ekonomi di Indonesia. Jurnal Informatika Ekonomi Bisnis, 5(1), 75–83. https://doi.org/10.37034/infeb.v5i1.198

Suryani, K. G., & Woyanti, N. (2021). The Effect of Economic Growth, HDI, District/City Minimum Wage and Unemployment on Inequity of Income Distribution in Province of D.I Yogyakarta (2010-2018). Media Ekonomi dan Manajemen, 36(2), 170. https://doi.org/10.24856/mem.v36i2.1990

Syafitri, W. (2013). Dampak upah minimum terhadap ketimpangan pendapatan dan kesempatan kerja di Indonesia. Jurnal Ekonomi Pembangunan, 14(2), 212–228.
Tambunan, T. T. H. (2001). Perekonomian Indonesia: Teori dan Temuan Empiris (2 ed.). Ghalia Indonesia.
Taresh, A. A., Sari, D. W., & Purwono, R. (2021). Analysis of The Relationship Between Income Inequality and Social Variables: Evidence from Indonesia. Economic & Sociology, 14(1), 103–119. https://doi.org/10.14254/2071-789X.2021/14-1/7
Todaro, M. P. (2003). Economic Development (8 ed.). Addison-Wesley.
Todaro, M. P., & Smith, S. C. (2004). Economic development (8, Ed.). Addison-Wesley.
Todaro, M. P., & Smith, S. C. (2020). Economic development (13, Ed.). Pearson Education.
Ubaidillah, H. N., & Sugiyanto, C. (2024). Analisis Kebijakan Upah Minimum sebagai Instrumen Anti-Kemiskinan dan Redistribusi Pendapatan di Indonesia. Universitas Gadjah Mada.
Wahyuni, S., & Andriyani, D. (2022). Pengaruh Inflasi, Jumlah Penduduk dan Pertumbuhan Ekonomi terhadap Ketimpangan Pendapatan di Provinsi Aceh. Jurnal Ekonomi Regional Unimal, 5(1), 39–47.
Wati, A. N. C., & Yasa, I. N. M. (2024). Determinan Disparitas Distribusi Pendapatan dan Kesejahteraan Masyarakat Kabupaten/Kota di Provinsi Bali. Journal of Social Science Research, 4(4), 7239–7254.
Wibawa, I. P. E., & Purbadharmaja, I. B. P. (2019). Pengaruh Upah Minimum dan Investasi terhadap Kesempatan Kerja dan Konsumsi di Kabupaten/Kota Provinsi Bali. e-Jurnal Ekonomi Pembangunan Universitas Udayana, 10(9), 3826–3854.
Wild, J. J., Subramanyam, K. R., & Halsey, R. F. (2003). Financial Statement Analysis (8 ed.). McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
Yuzani, D. A., Deswina, L. F., Ifonne.H, M., & Suryadi. (2024). Pengaruh Faktor Sosial Ekonomi terhadap Tingkat Kriminalitas: Analisis di Kota Tanjungpinang. Jurnal Ilmu Hukum, 1(4), 165–173. https://doi.org/10.62017/syariah
Zamharir, Z. (2016). Dampak kenaikan upah minimum terhadap indeks pembangunan manusia di Indonesia. Jurnal Ekonomi dan Studi Pembangunan, 17(1), 45–58.