

Investment, Labor, Local Own-Source Revenue, Economic Inequality and Economic Growth: Study on Regency/Cities of Bali, Indonesia

Anak Agung Sagung Dian Sawitri¹, Made Kembar Sri Budhi²

¹Faculty of Economics and Business, Udayana University, Bali, Indonesia

²Faculty of Economics and Business, Udayana University, Bali, Indonesia

ABSTRACT: Economic inequality is a phenomenon that a country cannot avoid, but it can be suppressed by increasing investment, labor, and local revenue, all of which are expected to help reduce inequality and achieve quality economic growth in a region. In reality, uneven distribution has resulted in economic inequality in various regions. The purpose of this study is to examine the impact of investment, labor, and local own-source revenue on economic growth in Bali, Indonesia using economic inequality as a mediating variable. The study was carried out in 9 districts / cities in Bali Province and Bali Province as a comparison between 2011 and 2018. This study had 80 observations by combining time series data for eight years and cross section data from as many as 9 districts / cities and the Province of Bali. Non-participant observation was used to collect data, which was then processed using path analysis techniques. This study's findings show that investment and labor have no effect on economic inequality. Original local income has the potential to reduce economic inequity. The findings also show that investment, labor, and local revenue can all help to boost economic growth. Meanwhile, economic inequality is incapable of mediating the impact of investment, labor, and local revenue on economic growth.

KEYWORDS : *Investment, Labor, Own-Source Revenue, Economic Inequality, and Economic Growth*

I. INTRODUCTION

Economic growth is an important indicator for analyzing a country's national development and determining the extent to which economic activity will generate additional income for the community over a given time period (Kusumawati, 2018). Economic growth can be achieved as a result of the government's efforts to improve the welfare of its people. The greater the level of economic growth, the greater the level of community welfare (Amri, 2017). High economic growth and sustainability are the top priorities for a country's government in order to maintain the country's sustainability and resilience.

The Gross Regional Domestic Product (GRDP) is a metric used by Indonesia to assess the economic development of a region (GRDP). Even though GRDP is a good measuring tool, it cannot accurately reflect the welfare of the population because it does not reflect the economic welfare felt by everyone in a country. High per capita income will reflect better economic welfare than GRDP accompanied by a more even distribution of income, but the income distribution is uneven.

A country's economic growth will have a multiplier effect on all aspects of life, including the environment and the socio-cultural community. Regional inequality will be reflected in economic growth, both directly and indirectly (Adipuryanti and Sudibia, 2015). The success of a region in improving the well-being of its people has an impact on the quality of economic growth achieved. The rate of economic growth in a region indicates the level of welfare of its people.

Economic development is the state's effort to improve the well-being of its citizens in all of its regions. Various changes in the rate of economic growth, income inequality reduction, and poverty alleviation can be generated over time as a result of this development. The development is carried out with an emphasis on economic growth efforts by utilizing all of its potential, both natural and human resources (Hairani and Syahputri, 2017).

Regional development is an essential component of national development, and it is carried out on the principles of regional autonomy and the regulation of national resources, which provide opportunities for enhancing democracy and regional performance in order to improve people's welfare (Latif and Yoyok, 2014). One of the capital sources used to finance regional development is Local Own-Source Revenue. Local Own-Source Revenue, which is one of the regional revenue sources, is linked to economic growth (Barimbing and Karmini, 2015).

Indonesia, an archipelago with 34 provinces, is not immune to the development imbalance. Differences in each region's characteristics, such as geographical location, natural resources, human resource quality, and infrastructure, cause each region to have different growth capabilities in managing their respective regions. This disparity in growth ability is accompanied by disparities in economic development patterns, which result in income disparities between regions (Endrawati et al., 2017). Inequality that occurs in an area is not something that can be eliminated, but can only be reduced to a level acceptable to a particular social system so that harmony in the system is maintained in the process of its growth.

In response to this phenomenon, the Indonesian government implemented a policy, namely a policy of regional autonomy and fiscal decentralization. Because not all development policies established by the central government could be implemented in all regions of Indonesia, the policy was enforced. Areas with carrying capacity and that meet the criteria for this national policy will easily absorb development opportunities. This is in contrast to regions that do not meet the criteria of national policies, which will see a slowdown in development. With the existence of regional autonomy and fiscal decentralization policies, it is expected that the optimization of development will occur in accordance with the potentials and problems of the region, so as to minimize the occurrence of inequality in a given area.

In the implementation of regional autonomy as an embodiment of the principle of decentralization, regions are given the right to obtain financial resources and the certainty of financing availability in accordance with governmental affairs, such as the right to receive profit sharing from national resources in the regions, the authority to collect and use regional taxes and levies, and the authority to collect and use regional taxes and levies (Raydan Lili, 2016). Other economic policies have been launched by the government to encourage deregulation and support investment in key sectors in order to create job opportunities (Suartha and Murjana, 2017), and are expected to increase people's prosperity and welfare (Zulkarnain and Muhammad, 2020). Every country is constantly attempting to create an environment that will encourage investment in order to obtain development financing. The advancement of a region's development will also have an impact on labor absorption and the increase in a region's Local Own-Source Revenue.

Regional autonomy policies and fiscal policies are also being implemented in the Province of Bali, which is expected to be able to manage resources in the region optimally and minimize economic imbalances between its regions in the future. Bali is one of the most well-known tourist destinations in Indonesia and around the world, so it is one of the targets for investors to consider. The flow of capital from these investors can directly increase regional development and, as a result, the Balinese people's economy. The investment dynamics influence both high and low levels of development and economic growth (Taufik et al, 2015). But in reality, the investment intake that occurs in the regencies / cities of Bali Province is only centered on areas that have tourism and industrial sectors, such as Badung Regency and Denpasar City.

Labor, in addition to investment, is thought to influence the level of inequality and economic growth in Bali Province. It will have an impact on increasing employment through equitable economic development. A large workforce that is balanced with the amount of output produced can help a region's economic growth. The increase in the number of workers will have an effect on the productivity of the community's goods and services (Sukirno, 2008: 430). Todaro (2000: 112) argues that, the growth of the labor force is traditionally considered as one of the positive factors that spur economic growth, a large number of workers means that it will increase the level of production.

In reality, the imbalance between labor demand and supply in Bali Province has driven many villagers to migrate to cities in search of work. This causes economic inequality because migration-related economic activity is concentrated only in urban areas, resulting in disparities in economic growth between rural and urban areas in Bali Province.

Local Own-Source Revenue is another factor that influences inequality and economic growth in Bali Province. Local Own-Source Revenue is a source of revenue for local governments in obtaining development funds and meeting regional expenditures related to economic growth generated by the APBD. Regions with a high level of Local Own-Source Revenue are more likely to experience positive economic growth. In reality, this high level of Local Own-Source Revenue can be found only in a few areas of Bali Province, such as the Sarbagita area (Denpasar-Badung-Gianyar-Tabanan).

The amount of the Bali Provincial Government's APBD in 2018 is 18.24 trillion rupiah, with a total expenditure (expenditure) of 18.93 trillion rupiah, according to data on the realization of the Bali Provincial Government's APBD (BPS, 2019). The use of Local Own-Source Revenue is restricted to routine and development expenditures (Lubis, 2007). Routine expenditures derived from Local Own-Source Revenue are used for personnel costs, goods and services for operations, official travel, maintenance, and other purposes. Development expenditures derived from Local Own-Source Revenue are used to finance development projects in an effort to advance regional development, with the goal of affecting quality economic growth if regional development is advanced. To achieve quality economic growth, development spending must account for a larger proportion of total spending than routine spending, allowing the APBD's impact on the economy to be felt.

Development in the Province of Bali which is taking place continuously has improved the economy of its people. The achievement of development results that are greatly felt by the community is the development aggregate of the nine regencies / cities in Bali Province which of course cannot be separated from the joint efforts of the government and the community.

The Gini Ratio of Bali Province has fluctuated, tending to decrease between 2011 and 2018. Bali Province had the highest Gini ratio of 0.43 in 2012 and the lowest Gini ratio of 0.37 in 2016. During the period 2011-2018, Bangli and Gianyar Regencies had the lowest Gini ratio, which was 0.27 in 2011 and 2017. In 2012, Denpasar City had the highest Gini ratio rate of 0.43. Klungkung Regency has the highest Gini ratio level of 0.39 in 2018, while Gianyar and Bangli Regencies have the lowest Gini ratio level of 0.31. The difference in the level of the Gini ratio indicates that the level of community welfare in the Regency / City of Bali Province is still uneven.

Badung Regency in Bali, Indonesia, has the highest GRDP value of 35,275.42 billion rupiah, while Bangli Regency has the lowest GRDP value of 4350.14 billion rupiah. The significant difference in the value of GRDP between Badung and Bangli Regencies is due to differences in their geographical location, natural resources, human resource quality, and infrastructure, resulting in differences in their ability to grow in managing their respective regions. Badung Regency has the most tourist destinations in Bali Province and is also the largest source of APBD in Bali Province, so it is often referred to as the richest district in Bali Province. Badung Regency, which has the highest Gross Domestic Product (GDP) value in Bali Province, is supported by a source of Local Own-Source Revenue, which is primarily derived from hotel and restaurant tax levies. The fact that Bangli Regency has a PDRB value of 4,350.14 billion rupiah in Bali Province indicates that the added value of the goods and services produced is still low. The amount of GRDP value becomes a benchmark when examining economic activities such as regional income, industrial activities, and other economic activities. Disparities between regions will result from differences in income distribution visible in the value of GRDP in each district and city within a region.

II. HYPOTHESES FORMULATION

The research conceptual framework is a relationship between concepts from the problem to be studied. The goal of this study is to examine the impact of investment, labor, Local Own-Source Revenue, and economic inequality on economic growth in Bali Province's regencies and cities. Economic growth as measured by PDRB ADHK 2010 according to regencies / cities in Bali Province is the dependent variable in this study. In this study, the independent variables are investment, labor, and Local Own-Source Revenue in the Regency / City of Bali Province. The mediating variable (intervening) used in this study is economic inequality as measured by the Gini ratio of districts / cities in Bali Province.

Economic growth is an important indicator in assessing the performance of an economy, especially for analyzing the results of economic development that has been implemented by a country or a region. According to Jhingan (2004: 229), according to the Harrod-Domar growth theory, it is stated that investment has a key role in economic growth, namely creating income and increasing the production capacity of the economy by increasing investment. An increase in investment can affect economic growth. If investment increases, economic growth will also increase. Vice versa. This is in line with research by Adipuryanti & Sudibia (2015) which states that investment has a positive and significant effect on economic growth. In Kartikasari's research (2017), it is stated that investment can be interpreted as spending to buy capital goods and production needs to increase the capability of a company so that it affects the productivity of goods and services which automatically contributes to economic growth, so that through investment factors it can have a significant positive effect on growth. the economy.

In fact, high investment is only spread in several areas in an area, causing economic inequality. Capital inflows or investment are also seen as a way to generate economic growth and development, without incurring debt for the recipient country, but as a supporter of development and economic growth (Grad-Rusu, Elena, 2019). This research is also in line with Koomson and Abekah (2018) that there are still many regions that have not received equal investment intake. Apart from the problem of uneven social infrastructure that hinders growth in a region. The economy of a region is likely to perform better, if more investment is channeled into labor-intensive activities, because it has a reductive effect on unemployment.

According to Siregar (2019) in his research, through investment, it can increase the demand side which also affects the presence of labor. Therefore, investment can increase the income of the population. The increase in population income illustrates an increase in demand for goods and services, which in turn encourages economic growth. This labor absorption is also in line with Mulyadi's research (Soekapdjo, et al. 2020) which states that, with the advancement of development, it can affect the absorption of labor in the region which automatically increases growth. economy and the welfare of the people.

Yu Zheng (2015) in his research also argues that the progress of development in a region also affects labor mobility. High labor mobility increases the labor supply and strengthens the comparative advantage in labor-intensive production, and vice versa. Low labor mobility will have the opposite effect. However, this high employment growth cannot guarantee that the job opportunities created will play a role in shaping the value of GRDP, in terms of output (Effendi et. Al, 2019).

Indonesia, which has a large population of occupations, tends to experience excess labor, where the majority of Indonesia's population is in rural areas and is absorbed in the agricultural sector. Excess labor in one sector will contribute to the growth of output and labor supply in other sectors. The absorption of excess labor in the industrial sector (modern sector) by the informal sector will cause a gradual increase in the wage rate in rural areas and this will reduce the disparity in income between rural and urban areas, so that the excess supply of workers does not cause problems with economic growth (Erni, 2017). Syrquin and Chenery (1989) suggest that the main source of economic growth is the movement of labor with low productivity from the rural sector to urban areas. The mobility of the workforce often creates income inequality.

The imbalance between the demand and supply of labor will cause a high level of unemployment. In Indonesia, job opportunities are still a problem in economic development. The prolonged high rate of unemployment will cause economic development problems which will have an impact on the welfare of the community. Industrial development is one of the goals to improve the welfare of the people. The development of the industrial sector can support the problem of poverty alleviation and lowering the unemployment rate. In the process, the industrial sector has provided the Indonesian population with opportunities to find jobs and also contributes to Gross Domestic Product (Ningsih & Bagus Indrajaya, 2015). The industrial sector has not been spared from investments so that it can increase economic growth.

Bali, which is a province that is also in demand by various groups in terms of work, both from the non-Balinese and the Balinese themselves. The difference in job offers offered by the provinces in Bali is what causes the mobility of the population to Bali. Population mobility is carried out to meet economic or social needs. The level of population mobility will affect development strategies that also affect economic growth and ultimately increase the welfare of the population (Nandiswari and Surya Dewi, 2016).

Local Own-Source Revenue is a source of regional revenue that is used to support the economic growth of a region. Local Own-Source Revenue which is used as a source of APBD can increase economic growth and reduce the level of development inequality. This is supported empirically in the research of Nurhuda et al. (2013), which suggests that high Local Own-Source Revenue has a positive effect on economic growth and has a negative effect on development inequality between regions in districts / cities of East Java Province.

According to Pujiati (2008), an increase in Local Own-Source Revenue will cause positive externalities and will increase economic growth. But in reality, there are differences in research results with existing theories. This difference is caused by the lack of available infrastructure and public infrastructure that supports the economy, in addition to that high local taxes and levies that enter Local Own-Source Revenue can burden business actors so that economic activity slows down and is not maximized which causes economic growth to decline (Suwandika, 2015). Based on Mohamad Khusaini's research in his research entitled "Increasing the Fiscal Capacity and Human Development of East Java: What Should a Regional Government Do?" states that, local revenue has an influence on the performance of the regional economy. Regions that experience an increase in local revenue will certainly have high economic growth.

Economic inequality refers to the standard of living relative to society, because inequality between regions is caused by differences in the initial gift factors. This difference makes the level of development different in each region, causing a gap or gap in welfare in the region (Kuncoro, 2006: 87). Bali is a province with 8 districts and 1 city not free from the existence of inequality. Differences in geographic location and resources are the cause of the existence of inequality between regions which also affects the level of economic growth, where the more there is economic inequality between regions, the level of economic growth in that region is less qualified or in other words, the higher the Gini ratio level of an area, then the rate of economic growth is decreasing. This is in line with Amri's research (2017) which presents empirical evidence of a negative effect of economic inequality on economic growth. This is also supported by Ali's research (2014) in Pakistan which suggests that income inequality has a negative impact on economic growth. Based on the theoretical basis and the results of previous research, the hypotheses proposed in this study are:

H₁: Investment, Labor and Local Own-Source Revenue have a negative effect on Economic Inequality in the districts / cities of Bali Province

H₂: Investment, Labor and Local Own-Source Revenue have a positive effect on Economic Growth in the districts/cities of Bali Province

H₃: Economic Inequality has a negative effect on Economic Growth in the regencies / cities of Bali Province

H₄: Economic inequality mediates the effect of investment, labor and Local Own-Source Revenue on economic growth in the regencies / cities of Bali Province

III. RESEARCH METHOD

The research was conducted in the Province of Bali, Indonesia in 9 districts / cities and the Province of Bali as a comparison. This is because Bali Province is one of the provinces whose economic development is supported by the tourism sector and has the potential to obtain capital inflows and to absorb more labor than other provinces. It is hoped that this will accelerate the rate of economic growth through infrastructure development due to capital inflows that can absorb labor and increase Local Own-Source Revenue in districts / cities of Bali Province so as to reduce the level of economic inequality in Bali Province.

Investment (X1) is the amount of investment originating from outside and within the country that was invested in the regencies / cities of Bali Province for the period 2011-2018 in billions of rupiah. Labor (X2) is the number of people who work in the regencies / cities of Bali Province for the period 2011-2018 in thousands of people. Original Regional Revenue (X3) is the amount of revenue received by a region in the regency / city of Bali Province for the period 2011-2018 in million rupiah. Economic Inequality (Y1) is the level of economic inequality seen through the Gini ratio value according to regencies / cities in Bali Province in 2011-2018 in points. Economic Growth (Y2) is the level of economic growth seen through GRDP according to regencies / cities in Bali Province ADHK 2010 2011-2018 in billion rupiah.

The observation points in this study are in Bali Province, in this case Jembrana Regency, Tabanan Regency, Badung Regency, Gianyar Regency, Klungkung Regency, Bangli Regency, Karangasem Regency, Buleleng Regency, Denpasar City, and Bali Province (in the time span 2011-2018. The cross section data used are 9 regencies / cities in Bali Province and Bali Province, while the time series data used are every year from 2011-2018 (8 years). Thus, the size of the sample size is $10 \times 8 = 80$ observations.

The Statistical Product and Service Solutions (SPSS) Program Version 26.0 is used as a statistical tool for analyzing calculated data. This study uses path analysis techniques by examining the direct and indirect effects of each variable.

IV. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The variable description is a description of each variable in this study, namely investment (X1), labor (X2), local own-source revenue (X3), economic inequality (Y1) and economic growth (Y2). Investment has a strategic role in encouraging economic growth through investment that increases production capacity and increases national income (Todaro: 2000; 137-138). The accuracy of the distribution of these investments also supports the creation of quality economic growth. The unequal distribution of investment will cause economic inequality in various regions, which will affect the quality of economic growth (Danawati et al., 2016). Based on data collected from the Central Statistics Agency, Table 1. shows the realization of investment originating from within the country and abroad owned by the respective regencies and cities in Bali Province.

Table 1. Investment Realization by regency / city in Bali Province, 2011-2018 (billion Rupiah)

Regencies/Cities	Foreign and Domestic Investment Realization in Bali Province (Billion Rupiah)							
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Jembrana	250.82	105.49	81.66	223.57	191.80	7,065.81	276.07	4,409.44
Tabanan	1,166.90	788.76	142.12	744.36	445.41	5,298.55	189.99	141.79
Badung	3,173.82	7,180.81	6,147.50	2,618.14	6,329.40	624.89	5,910.93	603.99
Gianyar	1,161.03	330.94	1,230.40	542.27	1,217.14	810.56	186.98	398.94
Klungkung	179.34	55.34	28.89	71.60	147.98	559.97	2,980.98	65.96
Bangli	28.15	31.62	21.39	24.41	30.78	15.65	26.45	82.59
Karangasem	635.54	124.70	186.98	138.55	169.95	1,086.10	393.87	5,337.15
Buleleng	2,168.48	464.40	262.21	3,359.93	1,611.31	419.65	1,126.41	2,453.69
Denpasar	2,937.36	3,003.10	3,028.22	1,200.44	15,728.80	166.43	6,366.39	5,138.57
Bali Province	11,701.45	12,085.13	11,428.09	8,923.27	25,872.56	16,047.62	17,458.10	18,632.13

Table 1. shows that the investment value in each district / city in Bali Province fluctuates. Over a period of 8 years, the highest investment in Bali Province was obtained in 2015 amounting to 25,872.56 billion rupiah, whereas in the previous year, namely 2014 Bali Province had the lowest investment during the 2011-2018 period of 8,923.27 billion rupiah. The high level of investment realization in 2015 was driven by two factors, namely the increasing interest of investors in each regency / city in Bali Province as an investment destination and the discipline of investors in reporting the progress of their investment. A district / city in Bali Province that gets a higher investment distribution than other districts / cities will have the potential to cause economic inequality. Denpasar City received the largest distribution in the form of investment compared to other districts, amounting to 15,728.8 billion rupiah in 2015, while Bangli Regency received the lowest investment distribution of 15.65 billion rupiah in 2016.

Labor is one of the factors that spur economic growth in a region. High labor absorption can indicate high growth as well, however, the high absorption of labor which only occurs in a certain area will cause various economic problems such as economic inequality. High and even labor absorption in various regions will better

describe the quality economic growth in that region. Based on data collected from the Central Bureau of Statistics, Table 2. shows the number of people working in each regency and city in Bali Province.

Table 2. Working Population by Regency / City in Bali Province 2011-2018 (thousand people)

Regencies/Cities	Working Population by Regency / City in Bali Province (Thousand People)							
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Jembrana	146.87	152.07	135.61	142.09	142.43	138.16	162.66	161.02
Tabanan	244.04	261.38	262.04	262.01	264.11	261.11	246.75	271.84
Badung	302.82	319.93	325.01	322.91	338.82	325.22	343.23	357.45
Gianyar	258.00	266.75	262.41	265.79	283.78	269.55	300.37	306.44
Klungkung	92.77	96.53	99.42	100.8	104.13	99.53	103.97	106.03
Bangli	139.20	141.78	140.12	143.86	135.71	139.98	142.56	146.61
Karangasem	232.24	238.93	242.20	240.45	241.98	239.17	238.74	253.47
Buleleng	332.10	348.51	345.42	333.60	345.33	341.00	358.11	371.37
Denpasar	411.12	426.60	429.84	461.14	468.51	439.45	501.91	516.64
Bali Province	2,159.16	2,252.48	2,242.08	2,272.63	2324.81	2,250.24	2,398.31	2,490.87

Based on Table 2, it shows the fluctuation of the population working in each regency / city of Bali Province which tends to increase every year. The highest number of people working in Bali Province occurred in 2018, amounting to 2490.87 thousand people, while the lowest number of people working in Bali Province occurred in 2011 with 2159.16 thousand people. Klungkung Regency has the lowest average number of working population compared to other urban districts, the lowest number belongs to Klungkung Regency of 92.77 thousand people in 2011. Denpasar City is a city that has the highest average number of working population compared to other districts in Bali Province. Denpasar City owned the highest amount of 516.64 thousand people in 2018.

The difference in the absorption of labor in the regencies / cities of Bali Province is influenced by differences in geographical location and the existing resources in that area. Based on Table 2., there are cities that have high labor absorption and on the other hand there are districts that have very low labor absorption. This causes imbalance between regions, because the contribution of the absorption of labor can affect the quality of economic growth in a region.

Local own-source revenue plays a role as a source of revenue and funding for local governments which is a benchmark for implementing regional autonomy. With the increase in local own-source revenue, it is hoped that regions will be more independent in fiscal terms and can reduce economic inequality between regions, so that they can contribute to increasing the economic growth of a given region. Based on data collected from the Central Bureau of Statistics, Table 4.4 shows the number of working people in each district and city in Bali Province.

Table 3. Local Own-Source Revenue by Regency / City in Bali Province 2011-2018 (Million Rupiah)

Regencies/Cities	Local Own-Source Revenue by Regency / City in Bali Province 2011-2018 (Million Rupiah)							
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Jembrana	41.33	46,47	68,49	89,35	98,03	114,53	121,34	126,48
Tabanan	141,05	183,3	255,42	273,43	300,8	318,08	426,63	363,37
Badung	1406,3	1870,19	2279,11	2722,63	3001,46	3563,46	4172,46	4555,71
Gianyar	175,27	261,22	319,61	424,47	45,72	529,86	662,75	770,2
Klungkung	40,74	48,56	67,4	98,84	120,03	134,14	153,21	186,97
Bangli	22,96	40,75	55,99	76,14	87,73	104,83	104,6	122,69
Karangasem	129,56	144,02	168,65	239,43	243,12	318,08	198,57	200,36
Buleleng	109,17	129	160,29	219,68	293,04	282,11	455,19	335,55
Denpasar	424,96	511,33	658,97	698,74	776,21	807,05	1008,71	940,11
Bali Province	1723,81	2042,09	2529,98	2920,42	3041,27	3041,2	3398,47	3718,5

Based on Table 3., it shows the fluctuation of local revenue in each regency and city in Bali Province over a period of 8 years. The province of Bali had the highest local own-source revenue in 2018, amounting to 3718.5 million rupiah. The high local own-source revenue of Bali Province is supported by the contribution of Badung Regency with local own-source revenue of 4,555.71 million rupiah. The amount of local own-source revenue in Badung Regency is driven by the large amount of taxes and fees that come from hotels, restaurants, and various other tourist destinations. Bangli Regency has the lowest local own-source revenue when compared to other districts and cities, which is 122.69 million rupiahin 2018. Based on Table 3., it can be seen that there are still differences in the amount of local own-source revenue in the regencies / cities of Bali Province during 2011-2018. The difference in the amount of local own-source revenue in the Province of Bali has caused imbalances between regions which also have an impact on the quality of economic growth in the region.

Economic inequality is a crucial phenomenon that affects the slowing down of the economic process to be achieved in a region which automatically affects the quality of economic growth. The amount of the income distribution is often stated by the Gini ratio value. The smaller the Gini ratio, the more equitable the distribution of income among residents of an area. Gini ratio is defined as the ratio of a measure of the evenness or inequality of the income distribution of the population of a region. To overcome these problems, government intervention is required in resolving economic inequality and economic growth, so that when a region has received equitable welfare, it will indicate quality economic growth. Based on data collected from the Central Bureau of Statistics, Table 4. shows the Gini ratio level for each district and city in Bali Province.

Table 4. Gini Ratio by Regency / City in Bali Province 2011-2018 (Points)

Regencies/Cities	Gini Ratio by Regency / City in Bali Province 2011-2018 (Points)							
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Jembrana	0.40	0.37	0.37	0.39	0.31	0.36	0.32	0.33
Tabanan	0.37	0.35	0.39	0.40	0.36	0.34	0.31	0.32
Badung	0.34	0.33	0.35	0.34	0.32	0.32	0.32	0.34
Gianyar	0.33	0.34	0.33	0.38	0.33	0.31	0.27	0.31
Klungkung	0.38	0.35	0.36	0.35	0.37	0.36	0.37	0.39
Bangli	0.27	0.31	0.31	0.33	0.38	0.35	0.30	0.31
Karangasem	0.30	0.29	0.33	0.34	0.31	0.29	0.32	0.34
Buleleng	0.34	0.33	0.38	0.39	0.34	0.34	0.31	0.34
Denpasar	0.34	0.43	0.36	0.38	0.36	0.33	0.34	0.34
Bali Province	0.41	0.43	0.40	0.42	0.38	0.37	0.38	0.38

Based on Table 4., it shows that the value of the Gini ratio in each district / city in Bali Province fluctuated in the 2011-2018 period, but tended to be stagnant with 0.38 points in the last 2 years. The lowest Gini ratio value of Bali Province occurred in 2016 at 0.37 points. Gianyar Regency and Bangli Regency are one of the districts in Bali Province that have the lowest Gini ratio value in the 2011-2018 period when compared to other districts and cities, namely 0.27 points in 2011 and 2017. The low Gini ratio value of Gianyar Regency indicates that the inequality between regions in it is not getting wider or narrower, considering that the income of the people tends to be more evenly distributed. Denpasar City is one of the districts in Bali Province which has the highest Gini ratio value when compared to other regencies and cities of 0.43 points in 2012 which indicates that economic inequality between regions in Klungkung Regency is getting wider considering the income between the people tends to be uneven. The difference in the value of the Gini ratio in each regency / city in the Province of Bali indicates that there are still disparities in the regencies / cities of the Province of Bali. This insurmountable imbalance will affect the quality of economic growth that occurs in a given region.

Economic growth is the key to measuring the economic performance of a country by describing the economic conditions that occur in a country on an ongoing basis to get to a condition that is considered to be better for a certain period of time. The economic condition of a region in general can be shown by the Gross Regional Domestic Product (GRDP) figure, which illustrates the gross value added through the production of goods and services by the production unit of a country. The higher the GRDP figure indicates the higher the quality of economic growth in an area. Vice versa. The high quality of a region's economic growth certainly needs to be supported by the distribution of GRDP in that area. Inequality in the GRDP figure of a region will cause inequality between regions. Based on data collected from the Central Bureau of Statistics, Table 5. shows the development of GRDP in each district and city in Bali Province.

Table 5. District / City GRDP in Bali Province ADHK 2010 2011-2018 (billion rupiah)

Regencies/Cities	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Jembrana	5,999.30	6,365.86	6,727.79	7,134.97	7,576.31	8,027.93	8,452.03	8,924.38
Tabanan	9,895.35	10,500.46	11,178.19	11,908	12,644.52	13,420.55	14,141.72	14,949.32
Badung	22,322.70	24,027.65	25,666.53	27,458.06	29,170.24	31,157.37	33,052.05	35,275.42
Gianyar	11,682.13	12,508.66	13,361.40	14,269.42	15,168.55	16,125.28	17,005.12	18,027.09
Klungkung	3,798.86	4,036.36	4,280.45	4,536.35	4,813.39	5,115.61	5,387.61	5,682.94
Bangli	2,916.14	3,097.06	3,281.16	3,472.30	3,686.10	3,916.10	4,124.22	4,350.14
Karangasem	7,116.36	7,538.03	8,002.15	8,482.88	8,991.75	9,524.23	10,006.13	10,550.25
Buleleng	14,497.37	15,480.21	16,587.19	17,741.75	18,818.62	19,950.72	21,023.60	22,201.45
Denpasar	21,763.41	23,397.17	25,026.21	26,778.59	28,422.70	30,273.39	32,105.35	34,166.04
Bali Province	99,991.63	106,951.50	114,103.60	121,787.60	129,126.60	137,296.50	144,933.30	154,072.70

Table 5. shows an increase in the GRDP figure in each regency and city in Bali Province based on constant 2010 prices each year during 2011-2018 which tends to increase. Badung is the district that contributes the largest value of its GRDP in Bali Province each year. The high GRDP figure of Badung Regency in 2018, which is 35,275.42 billion rupiahs supported by the existence of various kinds of world-class tourism objects

that also attract various foreign and domestic investors to invest. Bangli is one of the districts in Bali Province with the lowest GRDP figure, which is 4350.14 billion rupiah. The low GRDP in Bangli Regency is caused by the sectoral potential that comes from the agriculture, forestry and other sectors. The difference in sectoral potential of Badung Regency and Bangli Regency can be seen significantly from the large GRDP figure, so that both foreign and domestic investors prefer Badung Regency to invest.

This research was conducted to analyze the effect of investment, labor, local own-source revenue, and economic inequality on economic growth in each district and city in Bali Province. Equation 1 testing is conducted to see the direct effect of investment, labor and local own-source revenue on economic inequality using the Statistical Product and Service Solutions (SPSS) program version 26, then the results of the regression test are presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Regression Test Results for Equation I

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	0.264	0.027		9.897	0.000
Investment (Ln)	0.005	0.003	0.261	1.618	0.110
Labor (Ln)	0.018	0.008	0.435	2.427	0.018
Own-Source Revenue (Ln)	-0.009	0.004	-0.343	-1.964	0.053

Table 6. shows that investment with a Standardized Coefficients Beta value of 0.261 with sig 0.110 > 0.05 indicates that investment has a positive and insignificant effect on economic inequality. Labor with the Standardize Coefficients Beta value of 0.435 with sig 0.018 < 0.05 indicates that labor has a positive and significant effect on economic inequality. Local own-source revenue with Standardize Coefficients Beta value of -0.343 with sig 0.053 < 0.05 indicates that local own-source revenue has a negative and significant effect on economic inequality.

Equation 2 testing is carried out to see the effect of investment, labor, local own-source revenue, and Economic Inequality on Economic Growth in each district and city in Bali Province directly which is carried out using the Statistical Product and Service Solution (SPSS) program version 26.0, then the test The regression results are presented in Table 7.

Table 7. Regression Test Results for Equation II

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	3.405	0.271		15.676	0.000
Investment (Ln)	0.074	0.016	0.146	4.743	0.000
Labor (Ln)	0.712	0.042	0.592	16.926	0.000
Own-Source Revenue (Ln)	0.231	0.025	0.315	9.362	0.000
Economic Inequality	0.867	0.618	0.030	1.403	0.165

Table 7. shows that investment with Standardized Coefficients Beta value of 0.146 with sig 0.000 < 0.05 indicates that investment has a positive and significant effect on economic growth. Labor with the Standardize Coefficients Beta value of 0.592 with sig 0.000 < 0.05 indicates that labor has a positive and significant effect on economic growth. Local own-source revenue with Standardize Coefficients Beta value of 0.315 with sig 0.000 < 0.05 indicates that local own-source revenue has a positive and significant effect on economic growth. Economic inequality with a Standardize Coefficients Beta value of 0.030 with sig 0.165 > 0.05 indicates that the economic inequality variable has a positive and insignificant effect on economic growth.

Based on Table 6. and Table 7., a summary of the path coefficient and significance of the relationship between variables can be seen and summarized as presented in Table 8.

Table 8. Summary of Path Coefficients and the Significance of the Relationship Between Variables

Regression	Standard Coefficients Beta	P. Value	Information
X1 → Y1	0.261	0.110	Not significant
X2 → Y1	0.435	0.018	Significant
X3 → Y1	-0.343	0.053	Not significant
X1 → Y2	0.146	0.000	Significant
X2 → Y2	0.592	0.000	Significant
X3 → Y2	0.315	0.000	Significant
Y1 → Y2	0.030	0.165	Not significant

Based on the results of the SPSS Ver. 26 obtained a coefficient value of β_1 of 0.261 with a significance value of 0.883. The significance value obtained is 0.110 > 0.005, indicating that investment has a positive and insignificant effect on economic inequality in each district / city in Bali Province in 2011-2018. This means that

investment has no effect on economic inequality. This research is in line with research conducted by Pradnyadewi and Purbadharmaja (2017), Adipuryanti and Sudibia (2015) which state that investment does not have a significant effect on the inequality of income distribution of districts / cities in Bali Province. According to Prastiwi et al (2020), investment does not have a significant effect on the income gap in Java from 2014 to 2018. Based on the previous research, it is assumed that investment has no effect on economic inequality which is in line with the results of this study.

Based on the results shows the value of the β_2 coefficient of 0.435 with a significance value of 0.018. The significance value of $0.018 < 0.05$ indicates that the workforce seen through the number of working people has a positive and significant effect on economic inequality in Bali Province. This means that labor has an influence on economic inequality in the form of an increase in labor which contributes to economic inequality, because labor absorption is only absorbed in a few regions. This research is also in line with research by Danawati et al. (2016) which states that direct employment has a positive and significant effect on inequality in the distribution of income in districts / cities in Bali Province. According to Nurana and Lutfi (2012), labor has a significant and positive effect on the level of regional development inequality in Ciayumajakuning. According to Rosmeli (2015), labor has a significant and positive effect on development inequality in Eastern Indonesia. This is because the number of workers in Eastern Indonesia is low quality, while workers who come from these areas and have good quality human resources prefer to work in Java.

Based on the test results shows the value of the β_3 coefficient of -0.343 with a significance value of 0.053. A significance value of 0.053 indicates that local own-source revenue has a negative and significant effect on economic inequality. This shows that local own-source revenue has an influence on economic inequality in each district / city in Bali Province, which means that an increase in local own-source revenue has an effect on decreasing the level of economic inequality in each district / city in Bali Province in 2014-2018. This is in line with Sholikah's research (2020) which states that the local own-source revenue variable shows a negative and significant effect on economic inequality between districts / cities in the Special Region of Yogyakarta in 2011-2018.

Based on the test results shows the value of the β_4 coefficient of 0.146 with a significance value of 0.000. The significance value of $0.000 < 0.05$ indicates that investment has a positive and significant effect on economic growth in each district / city in Bali Province. This research is in line with research conducted by Dewi and Bendesa (2020) which states that direct investment has a positive and significant effect on economic growth. According to Mudiarcana and Marhaeni (2018) and Sari et al (2019), investment directly affects economic growth in Bali Province. Based on the research of Putra and Sudibia (2019), it is said that investment shows a positive and significant impact on the economic growth of districts / cities in Bali Province. This indicates that the more investment a region receives, it will increase economic growth in that region.

Based on the test results shows the value of the β_5 coefficient of 0.592 with a significance value of 0.000. A significance value of $0.000 < 0.05$ indicates that the influence of labor has a positive and significant influence on economic growth, which means that the increasing number of workers will increase economic growth as well. This is in line with research by Windayana and Darsana (2020) & Wahyudi and Yuliarmi (2021) which show that labor has a positive and significant effect on economic growth in Bali Province. According to Barimbing and Karmini (2015), labor has a partially positive and significant impact on the economic growth of regencies / cities in Bali Province, which shows that the increasing number of workers encourages the increase in levels, thereby increasing economic growth.

Based on the test results shows the value of the coefficient 6 of 0.315 with a significance value of 0.000. The significance value of $0.000 < 0.05$ indicates that local own-source revenue has a positive and significant effect on economic growth. This means that the higher the local own-source revenue a region gets, the higher the economic growth of the area. This research is in accordance with the income of Sukirno (2000) which states that local own-source revenue is considered as capital accumulated which will cause more positive externalities and will accelerate economic growth. This is in line with the research of Suwandika and Mahaendra Yasa (2015) which states that local own-source revenue has a positive and significant effect on economic growth in Bali Province. This is also in line with the research of Utami and Indrajaya (2019) which states that local own-source revenue has a positive effect on economic growth in Bali. Kusumawati and Wiksuana (2018), Barimbing and Karmini (2015) state that local own-source revenue has a positive effect on economic growth.

Based on the test results shows the β_7 coefficient of 0.030 with a significance value of 0.165. The significance value of $0.165 > 0.05$ indicates that economic inequality has a positive and insignificant effect, which means that economic inequality has no significant effect on economic growth. This study states that economic inequality has no effect on economic growth. This is in line with the research of The SMERU Research Institute (2017) which states that there is no significant effect between economic inequality on economic growth. It is assumed that a research period that is too short will obscure the impact of economic inequality on economic growth.

V. CONCLUSION

Investment does not have a negative effect on economic inequality in the regencies / cities of Bali Province. Labor does not have a negative and significant effect on economic inequality in the Regency / City of Bali Province. Local own-source revenue has a negative and significant effect on economic inequality in the districts / cities of Bali Province. Investment, labor, and local own-source revenue have a positive and significant effect on economic growth in the regencies / cities of Bali Province. Economic inequality has no negative effect on economic growth in the regencies / cities of Bali Province. Economic inequality does not mediate the effect of investment, labor, and local own-source revenue on economic growth in the regencies / cities of Bali Province.

This research only discusses regencies and cities in the province of Bali. so that the generalization area is not too broad. Future research can be directed to research other districts or cities. In addition, the proposed mediation variable also cannot mediate the relationship between investment, labor and local revenue on economic growth so that further research can examine other variables that can mediate the relationship of these variables.

REFERENCES

- [1] Adipuryanti, N. L. P. Y., & Sudibia, I. K. (2015). Analisis Pengaruh Jumlah Penduduk Yang Bekerja dan Investasi Terhadap Ketimpangan Distribusi Pendapatan Melalui Pertumbuhan Ekonomi Kabupaten/Kota di Provinsi Bali. *Piramida*, 11(1).
- [2] Ali, S. (2014). Inflation, income inequality and economic growth in Pakistan: A cointegration analysis. *International Journal of Economic Practices and Theories*, 4(1), 33-42.
- [3] Amri, K. (2017). Analisis Pertumbuhan Ekonomi dan Ketimpangan Pendapatan: Data Panel 8 Provinsi di Sumatera. *Jurnal EMT KITA*, 1(1), 1-11.
- [4] Andhiani, K. D., Erfit, E., & Bhakti, A. (2018). Analisis pertumbuhan ekonomi dan ketimpangan pembangunan di Wilayah Sumatera. *e-Jurnal Perspektif Ekonomi dan Pembangunan Daerah*, 7(1), 26-34.
- [5] Apriansyah, H., Syamsurijal, S., & Bahri, F. (2007). *Analisis Hubungan Kausalitas Antara Investasi Pemerintah Dengan Pertumbuhan Ekonomi Kota Palembang* (Doctoral dissertation, Sriwijaya University).
- [6] Badan Pusat Statistik. (2019). Statistik Keuangan Pemerintah Kabupaten/Kota Se-Provinsi Bali 2014-2018. November. BPS Provinsi Bali
- [7] Badan Pusat Statistik. (2020). Pertumbuhan PDRB/Ekonomi Menurut Kabupaten/Kota di Provinsi Bali 2018. BPS Provinsi Bali
- [8] Badan Pusat Statistik. (2020). Gini Rasio Provinsi Bali Menurut Kabupaten/Kota tahun 2015-2018. BPS Provinsi Bali
- [9] Barimbing, Y. R., & Karmini, N. L. (2015). Pengaruh PAD, Tenaga Kerja dan Investasi Terhadap Pertumbuhan Ekonomi di Provinsi Bali. *E-Jurnal EP Unud*, 4(5), 434-450.
- [10] Danawati, S., Bendesa, I. K. G., & Utama, M. S. (2016). Pengaruh pengeluaran pemerintah dan investasi terhadap kesempatan kerja, pertumbuhan ekonomi serta ketimpangan pendapatan kabupaten/kota di Provinsi Bali. *E-Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Bisnis Universitas Udayana*, 7, 2123-2160.
- [11] Dewi, N. K. V. D., & Bendesa, I.K. G. (2020). Analisis Pengaruh Investasi dan Upah Minimum Kabupaten Terhadap Kesempatan Kerja dan Pertumbuhan Ekonomi. *E-Jurnal EP Unud*, 9(3).
- [12] Effendi, I., Yandi, L. S., & Listiana, I. (2019). Effect of infrastructure development in the program of simultaneous movement for village development on economic growth. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science* (2147-4478), 8(6), 25-30.
- [13] Enderwati, U., Saenong, Z., & Rahim, M. (2017). Analisis Ketimpangan Pembangunan Ekonomi Antar Provinsi Di Pulau Jawa. *JPEP (Jurnal Progres Ekonomi Pembangunan)*, 2(1).
- [14] Hairani RS, P., & Syahputri, A. R. (2016). Analisis Ketimpangan Ekonomi dan Pengaruhnya terhadap Tingkat Kriminalitas di Provinsi Sumatera Utara. *Jurnal Ekonomikawan*, 16(1).
- [15] Jhingan, M.L. (2004). *Ekonomi Pembangunan dan Perencanaan*. Jakarta: PT. RajaGrafindo Persada.
- [16] Kartikasari, D. (2017). The Effect of Export, Import and Investment to Economic Growth of Riau Island Indonesia. *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*, 7(4), 663-667.
- [17] Khusaini, M. (2020). Increasing the Fiscal Capacity and Human Development of East Java: What Should a Regional Government Do?. *Review of Integrative Business and Economics Research*, 9(4), 99-113.
- [18] Koomson-Abekah, I., & Nwaba, E. C. (2018). Africa-China investment and growth link. *Journal of Chinese Economic and Foreign Trade Studies*.
- [19] Kuncoro, Mudrajat. (2006). *Ekonomi Pembangunan*. Jakarta: Salemba Empat
- [20] Kusumawati, L., & Wiksuana, I. G. B. (2018). Pengaruh Pendapatan Daerah Terhadap Pertumbuhan Ekonomi Di Wilayah Sarbagita Provinsi Bali. *E-Jurnal Manajemen*, 7(5), 2592-2620.

- [21] Latif, M. K. (2014). Pengaruh Investasi, Tenaga Kerja, dan Pendapatan Asli Daerah Terhadap Pertumbuhan Ekonomi di Kabupaten Kediri. *Jurnal Pendidikan Ekonomi (JUPE)*, 2(3).
- [22] Lubis, Hamsar. (2007). Efisiensi dan efektivitas penggunaan APBD. Diunduh dari Perpustakaan Bappenas. Website: <http://perpustakaan.bappenas.go.id/>
- [23] Nandiswari, D. A. C., & Rustariyuni, S. D. (2016). Analisis Faktor-Faktor Yang Mendorong Alasan Seseorang Untuk Melakukan Commuting (Studi Kasus Di Desa Pandak Gede). *Piramida*, 12(2).
- [24] Ningsih, N. M. C., & Indrajaya, I. G. B. (2015). Pengaruh modal dan tingkat upah terhadap nilai produksi serta penyerapan tenaga kerja pada industri kerajinan perak. *Jurnal Ekonomi Kuantitatif Terapan*, 5(1).
- [25] Nurana, A. C. (2012). Analisis dampak kebijakan otonomi daerah terhadap ketimpangan perkembangan wilayah di kawasan Ciayumajakuning. *Jurnal Bumi Indonesia*, 1(3).
- [26] Nurhuda, R. (2013). Analisis ketimpangan pembangunan (studi di Provinsi Jawa Timur tahun 2005-2011). *Jurnal Administrasi Publik*, 1(4), 110-119.
- [27] Pradnyadewi, D., & Purbadharmaja, I. B. (2017). Pengaruh IPM, biaya infrastruktur, investasi dan pertumbuhan ekonomi terhadap ketimpangan distribusi pendapatan di provinsi bali. *E-Jurnal Ekonomi Pembangunan Universitas Udayana*, 6(2), 255-285.
- [28] Prastiwi, D. H., Laut, L. T., & Destiningsih, R. (2020). Analisis Faktor-Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Ketimpangan Pendapatan Di Pulau Jawa Tahun 2014-2018. *DINAMIC: Directory Journal of Economic*, 2(1), 33-50.
- [29] Endrayani, N. K. E., & Dewi, M. H. U. (2016). Analisis faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi tingkat kemiskinan kabupaten/kota di Provinsi Bali. *E-Jurnal Ekonomi dan Bisnis Universitas Udayana*, 5(1), 63-88.
- [30] Howes, S., & Davies, R. (2014). Survey of recent developments. *Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies*, 50(2), 157-183.
- [31] Rosmeli, R. (2015). Dampak Investasi Dan Tenaga Kerja Terhadap Ketimpangan Pembangunan Kawasan Timur Indonesia. *Jurnal Paradigma Ekonomika*, 10(2).
- [32] Grad-Rusu, E. (2019). Understanding Foreign Direct Investments Spillover Mechanisms in the Romanian Economy. *Res. & Sci. Today*, 18, 156.
- [33] Sholikah, I. A. (2020). *Determinan Ketimpangan Ekonomi Antar Kabupaten/Kota di Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta tahun 2011-2018*. Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta.
- [34] Siregar, B. (2019). Direct and Indirect Effects of Investment on Community Welfare. *Investment Management and Financial Innovations*, 16(3), 206-216.
- [35] Soekapdjo, S., Tribudhi, D. A., Hariyanti, D., & Nugroho, L. (2020). Factors affecting economic growth in central java. *International journal of commerce and finance*, 6(1), 155-165.
- [36] Suartha, N., & Yasa, I. G. W. M. (2017). Pengaruh Pertumbuhan Ekonomi, Migrasi Masuk Terhadap Pertumbuhan Penduduk and Alih Fungsi Bangunan Penduduk Asli Kota Denpasar. *Jurnal Ekonomi Kuantitatif Terapan (JEKT)*, 10(2), 95-107.
- [37] Sukirno, Sadono. (2008). *Mikro Ekonomi: Teori Pengantar*. Jakarta: PT. Raja Grafindo Persada
- [38] Sukirno, Sadono. (2010). *Makro Ekonomi: Teori Pengantar: Edisi Ketiga*. Jakarta: PT. Raja Grafindo Persada
- [39] Suwandika, P. E., & Yasa, I. N. M. (2015). Pengaruh Pendapatan Asli Daerah dan Investasi terhadap Pertumbuhan Ekonomi dan Tingkat Pengangguran di Provinsi Bali. *E-Jurnal Ekonomi Pembangunan Universitas Udayana*, 4(7), 44554.
- [40] Syrquin, M., & Chenery, H. (1989). Three decades of industrialization. *The World Bank Economic Review*, 3(2), 145-181.
- [41] Taufik, M., Rochaida, E., & Fitriadi, F. (2014). Pengaruh Investasi Dan Ekspor Terhadap Pertumbuhan Ekonomi Serta Penyerapan Tenaga Kerja Provinsi Kalimantan Timur. *Jurnal Ekonomi Kuantitatif Terapan*, 7(2).
- [42] Todaro, M.P. (2000). *Pembangunan Ekonomi di Dunia Ketiga* (H.Munandar, Trans. Edisi Ketujuh ed.). Jakarta: Erlangga
- [43] Wahyudi, I P. A. R., & Yuliarini, N. N. (2021). Pengaruh Jumlah Tenaga Kerja Dan Penanaman Modal Dalam Negeri Terhadap Pertumbuhan Ekonomi Dan Tingkat Kemiskinan. *E-Jurnal Ekonomi Pembangunan Universitas Udayana*, 10(3), 1187 - 1218
- [44] Windayana, I. B., & Darsana, I. (2020). Pengaruh Tingkat Pendidikan, Umk, Investasi Terhadap Penyerapan Tenaga Kerja Dan Pertumbuhan Ekonomi, Kabupaten/Kota Di Provinsi Bali. *E-Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Bisnis Universitas Udayana*, 9(1).57-72. doi:10.24843/EEB.2020.v09.i01.p04
- [45] Zheng, Y. (2016). Institutions, labor mobility, and foreign direct investment in China and India. *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 51(2), 147-168.
- [46] Zulkarnain, Z., & Erwan, M. (2020). Dampak Luas Areal Perkebunan Sawit Terhadap Perekonomian Masyarakat di Kabupaten Kutai Timur, Kalimantan Timur. *Jurnal Internasional Penelitian dalam Bisnis dan Ilmu Sosial*, 9(4).