

$\delta_1\gamma_5$ = The effect of the primary sector on income inequality through employment and per capita income

$\delta_2\gamma_5$ = The effect of the secondary sector on income inequality through employment and per capita income

$\delta_3\gamma_5$ = The effect of the tertiary sector on income inequality through employment and per capita income

c. Total effects

$\gamma_1 + \alpha_1\gamma_4 + \delta_1\gamma_5 = \sigma_1$ = The total effect of the primary sector on employment on per capita income on income inequality

$\gamma_2 + \alpha_2\gamma_4 + \delta_2\gamma_5 = \sigma_2$ = The total effect of the secondary sector on employment on per capita income on income inequality

$\gamma_3 + \alpha_3\gamma_4 + \delta_3\gamma_5 = \sigma_3$ = The total effect of the tertiary sector on employment on per capita income on income inequality

IV. Result and Discussion

Table 1 Direct Effects

Variable	Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P	Label
Y1 <--- ΔX1	,173	,032	5,321	***	par_2
Y1 <--- ΔX3	,020	,015	1,359	,174	par_3
Y1 <--- ΔX2	,045	,025	1,800	,072	par_4
Y2 <--- ΔX1	-,012	,005	-2,297	,022	par_10
Y2 <--- ΔX2	,002	,004	,606	,545	par_11
Y2 <--- ΔX3	,000	,002	,125	,900	par_12
Y2 <--- e2	2,000				
Y3 <--- ΔX1	,001	,001	2,084	,037	par_1
Y3 <--- Y2	,028	,012	2,350	,019	par_6
Y3 <--- ΔX2	-,001	,000	-2,222	,026	par_7
Y3 <--- ΔX3	,000	,000	-,156	,876	par_8
Y3 <--- Y1	-,001	,002	-,439	,660	par_9
Y3 <--- e3	3,000				

Source: Amos (processed data), 2020

Based on the existing table, it illustrates the results of statistical analysis of the effect of the primary, secondary and tertiary sectors on employment. Also the effects of the primary sector, secondary sector, tertiary sector on per capita income and the effects of employment and per capita income on income inequality in districts in South Sulawesi Province.

The results of the analysis show that the primary sector variables have a significant effect on employment, the primary sector variables have a significant effect on per capita income, the primary, secondary sector variables and per capita income have a significant

effect on income inequality. Meanwhile the secondary and tertiary sectors do not have a significant effect on employment and per capita income, tertiary sector variables and employment do not have a significant effect on income inequality.

The estimation results of the primary sector on employment are 0.173 with a probability value of 0.000 at the 5% significance level. This means that the primary sector has a significant effect on employment. Every increase in the primary sector for 1 year will increase employment by 0.173 percent.

As for the estimation results of the secondary sector on employment of 0.045 with a probability value of 0.072 at the 5% significance level. This means that the secondary sector has no effect on employment. Every increase in the secondary sector for 1 year will not increase employment by 0.072 percent.

The estimation results of the tertiary sector on employment are 0.020 with a probability value of 0.174 at the 5% significance level. This means that the tertiary sector has no effect on employment. Every increase in the tertiary sector for 1 year will not increase employment by 0.020 percent.

The estimation results of the primary sector on per capita income are -0.012 with a probability value of 0.022 at a significance level of 5%, this means that the primary sector has a significant effect on per capita income. Every increase in the primary sector for 1 year, there will be a decrease in per capita income by 0.012 percent.

As for the estimation results of the secondary sector on per capita income of 0.002 with a probability value of 0.545 at the 5% significance level, this means that the secondary sector has no effect on per capita income. Every increase in the secondary sector for 1 year will not increase per capita income by 0.002 percent.

As for the estimation results of the tertiary sector on per capita income of 0,000 with a probability value of 0.90 at the 5% significance level, this means that the tertiary sector has no effect on per capita income. Every increase in the tertiary sector for 1 year will not increase the income per capita by 0,000 percent.

The estimation results of the primary sector for income inequality are 0.001 with a probability value of 0.037 at a significance level of 5%, this means that the primary sector has a significant effect on income inequality. Every increase in the primary sector for 1 year will increase income inequality by 0.001 percent.

The estimation result of the secondary sector on income inequality is -0.001 with a probability value of 0.026 at a significance level of 5%, this means that the secondary sector has a significant effect on income inequality. Every increase in the secondary sector for 1 year will increase the Gini ratio by 0.019 percent.

The estimation results of the tertiary sector on income inequality are 0,000 with a probability value of 0.876 at a significance level of 5%, this means that the tertiary sector has no effect on income inequality. Any increase in the tertiary sector for 1 year will not increase income inequality by 0,000 percent.

The estimation result of employment on income inequality is -0.001 with a probability value of 0.660 at the 5% significance level, this means that employment has no effect on income inequality. For every increase in employment for 1 year there will be no decrease in the Gini ratio of 0.001 percent.

The estimated results of per capita income on income inequality are 0.028 with a probability value of 0.019 at a significance level of 5%, this means that per capita income has a significant effect on income inequality. Every increase in per capita income for 1 year will increase income inequality by 0.028 percent.

Table 2 Indirect Effects

Variable relationship	Estimation	Probability	remarks
$\Delta X1 \rightarrow Y3$ through Y1 and Y2	-0,002	0.000	significant
$\Delta X2 \rightarrow Y3$ through Y1 and Y2	-0,001	0.000	significant
$\Delta X3 \rightarrow Y3$ through Y1 and Y2	-0,008	0.001	significant

Source: Amos (processed data)

Table 5.4 shows the results of the statistical analysis of the indirect effect between the primary, secondary and tertiary sectors on income inequality through employment and per capita income. The results show that the indirect effect of the primary sector on income inequality is -0.002 with a probability value of 0.000 at a significance level of 5%, so this indicates that the primary sector has a significant effect on income inequality through employment and per capita income. Every 1 year increase in the primary sector will reduce the gap rate by 0.002 percent.

The indirect effect of the secondary sector on income inequality is -0.001 with a probability value of 0.000 at a significance level of 5%, so this indicates that the secondary sector has a significant effect on income inequality through employment and per capita income. Every 1 year increase in the primary sector will reduce the gap rate by 0.001 percent.

The indirect effect of the tertiary sector on income inequality is -0.008 with a probability value of 0.001 at a significance level of 5%, this indicates that the tertiary sector has a significant effect on income inequality through employment and per capita income. Every 1 year increase in the primary sector will reduce the gap rate by 0.008 percent.

Discussion

Direct effects

Effect of Structural Transformation on employment

The effect of the primary sector on GRDP is 0.173 with a probability value of 0.000 at a significance level of 5%, this means that the primary sector has a significant effect on employment. Every increase in the primary sector for 1 year will not increase employment by 0.173 percent.

As for the estimation results of the secondary sector on employment of 0.045 with a probability value of 0.072 at the 5% significance level, this means that the secondary sector has no effect on employment. Every increase in the secondary sector for 1 year will not increase employment by 0.072 percent.

The estimation results of the tertiary sector on employment are 0.020 with a probability value of 0.174 at the 5% significance level, this means that the tertiary sector has no effect on employment. Every increase in the tertiary sector for 1 year will not increase employment by 0.020 percent.

The primary sector has a significant effect on employment, meaning that the increase in the primary sector will increase employment in districts in South Sulawesi Province. This result is in accordance with the initial hypothesis which states that the primary sector has a significant and positive direct effect on employment. Meanwhile, the secondary and tertiary sectors are not in accordance with the results of the initial hypothesis.

The results of statistical analysis for the primary sector have shown consistency with the theory of Fei and Ranis (1964) developing a dual economy model. The dual economy Fei-Ranis (FR) model explains how increased productivity in the agricultural sector helps improve the performance of the industrial sector. This model is a development of the Lewis growth model which assumes an unlimited supply of labor. The FR model divides the stages of transformation based on marginal productivity (PM) and wages which are considered constant and exogenous fixed.

The transfer of workers from the agricultural sector to the industrial sector provides benefits for both sectors. At this stage the surplus labor transferred has a perfectly elastic supply curve. This happens because there is an abundance of labor resulting in the marginal

product of cooperation labor with or close to zero. At this stage labor productivity increases, and the industrial sector can grow because it is supported by additional labor from the agricultural sector.

The secondary and tertiary sectors do not have a significant effect on employment in the Regency / City of South Sulawesi, because although the secondary and tertiary sectors have the highest contribution to the GRDP of South Sulawesi Province, the growth rate of the secondary and tertiary sectors is still lower than the growth rate of the primary sector. . An increase in GRDP in the secondary and tertiary sectors cannot be followed by employment. This happens because companies in the secondary and tertiary fields on a large scale use technology and require a workforce with high qualifications and productivity.

The Effect of Structural Transformation on Per capita Income

The estimation results of the primary sector on per capita income are -0.012 with a probability value of 0.022 at a significance level of 5%, this means that the primary sector has a significant effect on per capita income. Every increase in the primary sector for 1 year, there will be a decrease in per capita income by 0.012 percent.

As for the estimation results of the secondary sector on per capita income of 0.002 with a probability value of 0.545 at the 5% significance level, this means that the secondary sector has no effect on per capita income. Every increase in the secondary sector for 1 year will not increase per capita income by 0.002 percent.

As for the estimation results of the tertiary sector on per capita income of 0,000 with a probability value of 0.90 at the 5% significance level, this means that the tertiary sector has no effect on per capita income. Every increase in the tertiary sector for 1 year will not increase the income per capita by 0,000 percent.

The primary sector has a significant effect on per capita income, meaning that the increase in the primary sector will decrease the income per capita in the regencies in South Sulawesi Province. This result is not in accordance with the initial hypothesis which states that the primary sector has a significant and positive direct effect on per capita income. Meanwhile, the secondary and tertiary sectors are not in accordance with the results of the initial hypothesis.

The results of statistical analysis regarding the increase in the primary sector will make a decrease in the income of a region, which will be argued by Hill (1996), which describes the structural transformations that occur in developing countries which have a very fast movement, this is indicated by the contribution of the agricultural sector to income per capita GRDP has decreased to less than half of it. (Amir and Nazara, 2005)

Economic development in the regions is a process that should be carried out in collaboration with the community and policy makers to manage resources and form a partnership pattern between local governments and the private sector to expand employment which will ultimately encourage economic growth. The potential of natural resources is abundant in South Sulawesi Province which can be used as indicators of economic performance and as a measure of a region's prosperity.

According to Nikoloski (2009) there are two long-term effects on changes in the structure of the economy towards the secondary and tertiary sectors. The initial impact is that these changes can accelerate economic growth leading to an increase in GDP per capita. Meanwhile, the second effect predicts that change will lead to an increase in inequality. As a result, at the start of development, income and income inequality will be positively correlated. As the development process continues, the transfer of labor from the agricultural sector to the industrial sector will reduce income inequality. What happened in South Sulawesi Province was that a shift in the economic structure was not followed by a proportional shift in labor across sectors from the primary sector to the secondary and tertiary sectors. This also confirmed why the secondary and tertiary sectors had no significant effect on per capita income.

The Effect of Structural Transformation on Income Inequality

The estimation results of the primary sector on income inequality are 0.001 with a probability value of 0.037 at a significance level of 5%, this means that the primary sector has a significant effect on income inequality. Every increase in the primary sector for 1 year will increase income inequality by 0.001 percent.

The estimation result of the secondary sector on income inequality is -0.001 with a probability value of 0.026 at a significance level of 5%, this means that the secondary sector has a significant effect on income inequality. Every increase in the secondary sector for 1 year will increase income inequality by 0.019 percent.

The estimation results of the tertiary sector on income inequality are 0,000 with a probability value of 0.876 at a significance level of 5%, this means that the tertiary sector has no significant effect on income inequality. Any increase in the tertiary sector for 1 year will not increase income inequality by 0,000 percent.

The significant and positive effect of the primary sector on income inequality means that the increase in the primary sector will increase income inequality in districts in South

Sulawesi Province. This result is not in accordance with the initial hypothesis which states that the primary sector has a significant and positive direct effect on income inequality.

The significant and negative effect of the secondary sector on income inequality means that the increase in the secondary sector will increase income inequality in districts in South Sulawesi Province. This result is in accordance with the initial hypothesis which states that the primary sector has a significant and negative direct effect on income inequality, while the tertiary is not in accordance with the results of the initial hypothesis.

The statistical results that have been carried out are in accordance with what has been stated by Dastidar (2012) that the development of the secondary and tertiary sectors which is faster than the primary sector in developing countries has an effect on exacerbating income inequality. This occurs because the slowdown in the agricultural sector (primary sector) has reduced the absorption of labor, even though it is in this sector that most of the population works. The final impact of structural transformation in developing countries is an increase in the percentage of the poor and widening income inequality.

Changes in the economic structure will affect the distribution of income, that is, it can reduce, increase, or even do not affect the inequality of income distribution at all. Changes in the economic structure will reduce the level of inequality if followed by a transfer of labor from the sectors that are left behind to the targeted sectors.

Meanwhile, for the tertiary sector it is insignificant, the inability of workers to shift to the modern sector will not have a significant effect on improving income distribution, because there is no transfer of workers from the primary and secondary sectors to the tertiary sector. This will actually widen the income gap between the rich and the poor. The results of this study are in line with the opinion of Todaro and Smith (2006) that a fast rate of economic growth does not in itself improve the distribution of income for the entire population. Rapid growth has a negative impact on the marginalized, because they are unable to adapt and will be marginalized as a result of structural changes to modern growth. Other thinkers such as Baudrillard (2011) stated that the ideology of growth only produces two things, namely prosperity and poverty. Prosperous for the beneficiary and the poor for the marginalized.

Effect of Employment on Income Inequality

The estimation result of employment on income inequality is -0.001 with a probability value of 0.660 at the 5% significance level, this means that employment has no effect on income inequality. Every increase in employment for 1 year there will be no decrease in income inequality by 0.001 percent.

Employment has no effect on income inequality in districts in South Sulawesi Province. This result is not in accordance with the results of the initial hypothesis. This is in line with research conducted by Fitriani (2017) which states that the number of job seekers has no effect on income inequality.

This result is in accordance with what was done by Adipuryanti & Sudibia (2015), which states that employment has no effect on income inequality. Likewise with research conducted by Rahma (2018) which states that employment has increased by 1 percent, so it will not increase income inequality.

The non-impact of employment on income inequality is caused by an increase in employment in the agricultural sector followed by an increase in the industrial sector. Seen from the type of business, laborers or employees are the types of business that are mostly practiced by workers as seen from the proportion which continues to increase quite significantly but not accompanied by a decrease in income inequality.

The results of the research that have been carried out are inversely proportional to the theory put forward by Karl Marx, where at the beginning of development there will be an increase in demand for labor. This increase in demand for labor was followed by an increase in the level of wages which then had an effect on the increase in risk of capital to labor so that in the end there was a decline in demand for labor again. Thus, the problem of unemployment and income gap arises.

The Effect of Per capita Income on Income Inequality

The results of the estimated income per capita on income inequality are 0.028 with a probability value of 0.019 at the 5% significance level, this means that per capita income has a significant positive effect on income inequality. Every increase in per capita income for 1 year will increase income inequality by 0.028 percent.

Income per capita has a significant effect on income inequality, meaning that an increase in income per capita will increase income inequality in districts in South Sulawesi Province. This result is not in accordance with the initial hypothesis which states that per capita income has a significant and negative direct effect on income inequality.

According to the theory put forward by Barro (2000) explains that Kuznets' theory is built from the basic idea of a change in the economic structure from agriculture to industry. This model assumes that the economy was initially dominated by the agricultural sector, which was characterized by a low per capita income accompanied by an even distribution of

income. Meanwhile, the industrial sector started on a small scale with a fairly high per capita income but was followed by high income inequality.

Economic development resulted in a shift in population employment from agriculture to industry. Workers who migrate from agriculture to industry will get an increase in per capita income, which in turn will increase inequality. This theory simply states that at the start of economic development, the relationship between per capita income and inequality will be positive.

Indirect effect

Primary Sector Indirect Effect on Income Inequality

The indirect effect of the primary sector on income inequality is -0.002 with a probability value of 0.000 at a significance level of 5%, this indicates that the primary sector has a significant effect on income inequality through employment and per capita income. Every 1 year increase in the primary sector will reduce the gap rate by 0.002 percent.

The results obtained are in accordance with the initial hypothesis which states that the primary sector has a negative effect on income inequality through employment and per capita income. This is in accordance with the results of research conducted by Budiharsono (1996) which states that the transition to the economic structure that is expected to occur in a country or region is that the shift in demand patterns will change the structure of production towards an increase in industrial and service production on the basis of a strong agricultural sector. Thus, the growth of the industrial and service sectors is related to the agricultural sector. Like the industry being developed is an agriculture-based industry. It is also hoped that changes in the production structure will change the structure of employment.

Labor shifting from the agricultural sector can be absorbed by the (formal) industrial and service sectors. So that population movement is a provider of cheap labor and not a source of unemployment, a source of inequality and a source of urban crime problems. With the increase in employment from the agricultural sector by the industrial and service sectors and the increase in wages, the structural transformation will increase income and improve the level of income distribution between groups, between sectors and between regions.

Secondary Sector Indirect Effect on Income Inequality

The indirect effect of the secondary sector on income inequality is -0.001 with a probability value of 0.000 at a significance level of 5%, so this indicates that the secondary sector has a significant effect on income inequality through employment and per capita income. Every 1 year increase in the primary sector will reduce the gap rate by 0.001 percent.

The results obtained are in accordance with the initial hypothesis which states that the secondary sector has a negative effect on income inequality through employment and per capita income. The theory of development by Arthur Lewis basically discusses the development process that occurs between urban and rural areas which takes into account the process of population movement. This theory also discusses investment patterns that occur in the modern sector as well as the wage fixing system that applies in the modern sector which in turn will correlate with the current urbanization.

Along with the development of development in a country, the role of the primary sector will get smaller and smaller (both the proportion of national production and the workforce working in that sector), then the role of the industrial sector will be shifted. With the increasingly rapid role of the secondary sector in the economic structure, national production will also increase because the secondary sector can trigger economic growth faster than the primary sector. Judging from the large level of national production, it is expected that it will increase income, where this increase in income is expected to further reduce the level of existing income inequality.

The Indirect Effect of the Tertiary Sector on Income Inequality

The indirect effect of the tertiary sector on income inequality is -0.008 with a probability value of 0.001 at a significance level of 5%, this indicates that the tertiary sector has a significant effect on income inequality through employment and per capita income. Every 1 year increase in the primary sector will reduce the gap rate by 0.008 percent.

The results obtained are in accordance with the hypothesis and are significant for income inequality through employment and per capita income. This has been expressed by Faustino and Vali (2011) which state that there is one theory that is opposite to the neo-classical theory in explaining the effect of the service sector on inequality, namely the dependency theory. This theory reveals that the economic dependence of developing countries on the economies of developed countries has a dangerous impact on the socio-economies of developing countries, especially in the long run. This dependence occurs through dependence on international trade. Proponents of this theory argue that international trade in developing countries hinders economic growth and results in income inequality.

In developed countries, the development of the service sector and the decreasing share of the industrial and agricultural sectors has succeeded in reducing income inequality. This is because developed countries already have a different phase from developing countries. With the existence of a high level of public education and a fairly rapid level of technology use, it is natural for people in developed countries to work in the service sector.

Industries in developed countries also have capital-intensive characteristics, which are dominated by machines and high technology that require highly educated workers to operate them, so the quality of labor demanded in the industrial sector tends to be higher.

Conclusion

Based on the research that has been conducted, it is concluded that the results of data testing indicate that the direct shift in the economic structure from the primary to secondary sectors has a significant effect in reducing the level of inequality. Income inequality will decrease with the transition to the industrial sector. While indirectly through employment and income per shift, its structure towards the tertiary sector of the agricultural sector and the industrial sector have a significant effect in reducing levels of inequality. Thus, it can be said that a shift in the economic structure will improve income distribution.

Suggestions from researchers that are expected policymakers to policy development and sectoral development for the regional economy. It should prioritize primary and secondary sectors to boost the economy in the regency/cities of South Sulawesi, with regard to those sectors may also encourage the movement of the tertiary sector for the construction of South Sulawesi. It is also expected to look for sources of new economic growth spread throughout the regency/cities of South Sulawesi to encourage the contribution of economic growth in South Sulawesi which has been heavily dependent on the city of Makassar.

References

- [1] Abrams, Jay B. 2010. *Quantitative Business Valuation: A Mathematical Approach for Today's Professional: Second Edition*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- [2] Adelman C. Morrison T. 1973. *Economic Growth and Social Equity in Developing Countries*. Oxford: Stanford University Press.
- [3] Adelman, I. R. M. A. 1961. *Theories of Economic Growth and Development, Stanford*.
- [4] 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 Jurnal Kependudukan dan Pengembangan Sumber Daya Manusia*, 11(1), 20-28.
- [5] Ahluwalia MS. 1976. *Inequality, Poverty and Development*. *Journal of Development Economics* 3 (No. 4 1976).
- [6] Agussalim, 2009. *Mereduksi Kemiskinan; Sebuah Proposal Baru untuk Indonesia*. Nala Cipta Lentera dan PSKMP UNHAS; Makassar.
- [7] Alesina, A., & Rodrik, D. 1994. *Distributive politics and economic growth*. *The quarterly journal of economics*, 109(2), 465-490.
- [8] Amir, H., & Nazara, S. 2005. Analisis Perubahan Struktur Ekonomi (Economic Landscape) dan Kebijakan Strategi Pembangunan Jawa Timur Tahun 1994 dan 2000: Analisis Input-Output. *Jurnal Ekonomi dan Pembangunan Indonesia*, 5(2), 37-55.
- [9] Armstrong, J. Scott. 2001. *Principles of Forecasting: A Handbook for Researcher and Practitioners*. Springer Science & Business Media, Inc.

- [10] Arsyad, 2010. Ekonomi Pembangunan Edisi Kelima. Yogyakarta: UPP STIM YKPN
- [11] Badan Pusat Statistik. 2016 Indikator Kesejahteraan Rakyat Provinsi Sulawesi Selatan 2016 . Sulawesi Selatan.
- [12] _____ . Provinsi Sulawesi Selatan Dalam Angka Tahun; Berbagai Edisi . Sulawesi Selatan.
- [13] Barro, R. J. 2000. Inequality and Growth in a Panel of Countries. *Journal of economic growth*, 5(1), 5-32.
- [14] Baudrillard JP. 2011. Masyarakat Konsumsi. Bantul. Penerbit: Kreasi Wacana
- [15] Benjamin D, Brandt L, Giles J, Wang S. 2005. Income Inequality During China's Economic Transition. Working Paper. Canada: Social Sciences and Humanities Research.
- [16] Bryant, C., & White, L. G. 1982. Managing Development in The Third World. Boulder, Colorado
- [17] Budiharsono, S. 1996. Transformasi Struktural dan Pertumbuhan Ekonomi Antardaerah, 1987-1995. Disertasi. Program Studi Ilmu-ilmu Perencanaan Pembangunan Wilayah dan Pedesaan. IPB. Bogor
- [18] Caselli dan Wilbur. 2001. The U.S. Structural Transformation and Regional Convergence: A Reinterpretation. *Journal of economiy*. Vol 109. No. 3
- [19] Checchi, D. and García-Peñalosa, C., 2008. Labour market institutions and income inequality. *Economic Policy*, 23(56), pp.602-649.
- [20] Chenery HB, Syrquin M. 1975. Pattern of Development 1950-1970. Word Bank Working Paper. Washington DC: World Bank
- [21] Chongvilaivan, Aekapol. 2013. Individual Income Inequality and its Drivers in Indonesia: A Theil Decomposition Reassessment. ISEAS Working Paper. (2).
- [22] Clark, C. 1951. Urban population densities. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series A (General)*, 114(4), 490-496.
- [23] Dastidar AG. 2012. Income Distribution and Structural Transformation: Empirical evidence from developed and developing countries. *Seoul Journal of Economics*, Vol. 25, No.1
- [24] Fabiomarta W. 2004. Transformasi Struktural Perekonomian Indonesia dan Faktor yang Mempengaruhinya [tesis]. Bogor: Institut Pertanian Bogor.
- [25] Faustino, H. C., & Vali, C. 2011. The effects of globalisation on OECD income inequality: a static and dynamic analysis. *DE working papers; n°12/2011/DE*.
- [26] Fitriani, L. L. 2017. *Pengaruh Jumlah Pencari Kerja Terhadap Kesenjangan Pendapatan Antar Daerah Di Provinsi Banten Tahun 2011-2015* (Doctoral dissertation, Uin Sultan Maulana Hasanudin Banten).
- [27] Glaeser EL. 2006. Inequality. Di dalam Barry R Weingast BR, Wittman DA, editor. *The Oxford Handbook of Political Economy*. New York: Oxford University Press Inc.
- [28] Gollin, D., Parente, S. L., & Rogerson, R. 2002. Structural transformation and cross-country income differences. *Manuscript, University of Illinois*.
- [29] Gujarati, Damodar, Dawn C. Porter. 2010. *Dasar-dasar Ekonomterika*. Terj. Eugenia. Mardanugraha, dkk. Jakarta.
- [30] Hasan, Muhammad. 2018. Pembangunan Ekonomi dan Pemberdayaan Masyarakat: *Strategi Pembangunan Manusia dalam Perspektif Ekonomi Lokal*. Pustaka Taman Ilmu
- [31] Hill. 1966. Transformasi Ekonomi Indonesia: Sebuah Studi Kritis dan Komprehensif. Yogyakarta: PAU (Studi Ekonomi) UGM bekerja sama dengan PT Tiara Wacana
- [32] Jhingan M.L. 2012. Ekonomi Pembangunan dan Perencanaan. Jakarta Raja Grafindo Perkasa.
- [33] Imam Ghozali dan Fuad. 2008. Structural Equation Modeling. Semarang: Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.
- [34] Kuncoro, Murdrajat. 2006. Ekonomi Pembangunan. Penerbit Salemba Empat, Jakarta.
- [35] Kuznetz S. 1955. Economic Growth and Income Inequality. *American Economic Review*

- [36] Kurniawan, B. 2011. Transformasi Struktural Perekonomian Indonesia dalam Kerangka Model Input Output Tahun 1971-2008. Tesis. Program Studi Ilmu Ekonomi. IPB. Bogor.
- [37] Leibbrandt, M., Woolard, I., McEwen, H. and Koep, C., 2010. Employment and inequality outcomes in South Africa. University of Cape Town: Southern Africa Labour and Development Research Unit.
- [38] Lewis WA. 1954. Economic Development with Limited Supply of Labor. New York: Manchester School
- [39] McKay, Andy et al. 2003. "Inequality in middle income countries: Key conceptual issues", Overseas Development Institute occasional paper: December
- [40] Nikoloski, Z. 2009. Economic and political determinants of income inequality. *London (GB): University College London.*
- [41] Nurkse, R. 1952. Some International Aspects Of The Problem Of Economic Development. *The American Economic Review*, 42(2), 571-583
- [42] Olobatuyi, Moses E. 2006. A User's Guide to Path Analysis. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America Inc.
- [43] Otsuka, K. dan Readon, T. 1998. Lesson from Industrialization in East Asia: Are They Applicable to Africa? Paper presented at an IFRI/World Bank– sponsored Workshop on Strategies for Stimulating Growth of the Rural Nonfarm Economy in Developing Countries. Warrenton-VA. USA.
- [44] Panizza, Ugo. 2002. "Income inequality and Economic Growth: Evidence from the American Data". *Journal of Economic Growth* 2002, Volume7, No. 1, March
- [45] Pardo-Beltrán, E. 2002. Effects of income distribution on growth. Department of Economies, New School for Social Research, New York.
- [46] Perotti, R., 1992. Income distribution, politics, and growth. *The American Economic Review*, 82(2), pp.311-316.
- [47] R, Satya Chakravarty dan Palash Sarkar. 2020. New Perspectives on The Gini and Bonferroni Indices of Inequality. *Ecineq Society for the Study of Economic Inequality*, 2020-538.
- [48] Rahma, E. A. 2018. Analisis Faktor-Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Ketimpangan Pendapatan Antar Provinsi Di Pulau Jawa Tahun 2010-2016.
- [49] Ravallion, M. 2001. "Growth, inequality and poverty: looking beyond averages", *World Development*, 29 (11), pp. 1803-1815.
- [50] Shankar dan Anwar. 2003. Bridging the Economic Divide Within Countries: A Scorecard on the Performance of Regional Policies in Reducing Regional Income Disparities. *World development* Vo. 3. No. 8. Elsevier.
- [51] Sukirno S. 2006. Ekonomi Pembangunan: Proses, Masalah, dan Dasar Kebijakan. Edisi kedua. Jakarta: Kencana
- [52] Susanti, Hera, Ihsan M, Widyanti. 1995. Indikator-indikato Makro Ekonomi. Jakarta: Lembaga Penerbit LPEM Fakultas Ekonomi Universitas Indonesia
- [53] Stevens, Paul. 2003. "Resource Impact: Curse or Blessing? A literature survey", University of Dundee, Centre for Energy, Petroleum, and Mineral Law and Policy.
- [54] Stokes, Houston H. 1997. Specifying and Diagnostically Testing Econometric Models: Second Edition. Greenwood Publishing Group, Inc.
- [55] Sugiyono. 2007. Metodologi Penelitian Bisnis. PT. Gramedia, Jakarta
- [56] Syrquin, M, 1988, Patterns of Structural Change, Handbook of Development Economics, Elsevier Science Publishers B.V
- [57] Szirmai A, Wim N , Nobuya H 2012. Structural Change, Poverty Reduction And Industrial policy In The Brics. Viena. United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)
- [58] Tambunan T. 2001. Perekonomian Indonesia Teori dan Temuan Empiris. Jakarta: Ghalia Indonesia
- [59] Thomas, Vinod., et al. 2000. The Quality of Growth. New York. Oxford University Press
- [60] Todaro, M. P & Staphen C Smith. 2006. Pembangunan Ekonomi di Dunia Ketiga. Edisi Kesembilan. Jakarta: Erlangga

- [⁶¹] Verbeek, Marno. 2008. *A Guide to Modern Econometrics: Third Edition*. Chicester: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- [⁶²] White, H. and E. Anderson. 2001. "Growth versus distribution: does the pattern of growth matter?" *Development Policy Review*, 16(3), pp. 267-289.
- [⁶³] Zikro. 2006. *Analisis Transformasi Struktur ekonomi dan Distribusi di Provinsi Lampung [Tesis]*. Jakarta: Universitas Indonesia.tober:1-2.

© GSJ