

# Local Labor Market Conditions And The Jobless Poor: Indonesian Social Policy Employment Strategy

Mansyur Radjab<sup>1</sup>, Musran Munizu<sup>2</sup>, Abdul Razak Munir<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Sociology, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Hasanuddin University, Indonesia,*  
[radjabmansyur@gmail.com](mailto:radjabmansyur@gmail.com)

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Business, Faculty of Economics and Business, Hasanuddin University, Indonesia,*  
[m3.feunhas@gmail.com](mailto:m3.feunhas@gmail.com)

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Business, Faculty of Economics and Business, Hasanuddin University, Indonesia,*  
[arazak@fe.unhas.ac.id](mailto:arazak@fe.unhas.ac.id)

## Abstract

The purpose of this research is to identify the root causes of unemployment in Pangkep Regency and to propose solutions to help the unemployed find work. The goal and goal of this activity is to compile a document that can determine what causes unemployment and produce recommendations that can become a solution in research on the provision of jobs for the unemployed in Pangkep Regency. (1) urban area = 50 people, (2) mountainous/inland area = 25 people, and (3) island/coastal area = 25 people were included in the study area and number of samples. This study employs a purposive sampling technique, which involves selecting a sample based on specific objectives and characteristics. Furthermore, the Focus Group Discussion (FGD) method is used in this study to confirm the findings of the field survey, rank the causal and solution factors, and formulate strategies for providing employment opportunities for the unemployed. The findings indicate that there are eight strategies that can be implemented to help the unemployed in the Pangkep Islands, namely: (1) increasing the synergy of stakeholders in developing workforce capacity (training, technical guidance, etc.), and (2) increasing the quantity and quality of assistance. (3) increasing the quantity and quality of entrepreneurship programs, developing Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises (MSME) and Cooperatives, (4) optimizing the role of Job Training Centers (JTC) in the regions, (5) increasing the government's role as a facilitator for providing employment opportunities through the establishment of Job Center institutions in the regions, (6) increasing the quantity and quality of pre-employment training programs for graduates of General High Schools (GMS) and Vocational High Schools (VHS), (7) reforming the education sector, particularly vocational education (VHS), such as curriculum development that is linked and matched with market employment needs, and (8) encouraging the growth of investment in the region, both Foreign Investment (FI) and Domestic Investment (DI), through one-stop licensing systems.

**Keywords:** Unemployment; Profession; Labor.

## Introduction

Indonesia is one of the countries with a high level of income distribution inequality. The majority of Indonesia's income inequality problems are caused by a lack of income to meet basic needs. Economic development is one of the efforts that have been tried to reduce the level of inequality in a region.

However, inequality cannot be eliminated; it can only be reduced at a certain level of the social system so that the growth process is harmonious [1].

The ever-increasing population leads to an increase in the number of workers, which, in turn, leads to an increase in the number of job openings [2]. Unemployment does not necessarily arise when the quantity of work possibilities equals or

exceeds the labor force. The reason for this is that there is not always a match between the amount of education possessed by the community and the education required by job providers. Because of this imbalance, portion of the existing workforce is unable to fill available job openings. Because there is no meeting place between job searchers and available positions, the number of jobless remains high [3]. As a result, a huge workforce is predicted to promote economic activity, which will improve people's wellbeing [4].

The economic ramifications of the COVID-19 epidemic, as well as the measures being taken to alleviate them, have far-reaching implications for employees and their families. More over 40% of individuals claimed that the outbreak and the public response caused them or someone in their family to lose their job, hours, or pay. As a result, the adults most likely to suffer economic losses as a result of the epidemic come from lower-income households (below 250 percent of the federal poverty level). People currently were in difficult economic circumstances before to the crisis, and the majority of them are unlikely to return to work soon [5].

Unemployment rates vary greatly depending on income, as well as between jobs and industries [6]. Job loss may result in a worse overall judgment of social integration and subjective well-being. The estimates of the short- and medium-term impacts on life satisfaction were stronger: job loss resulted with a 0.55 SD fall in life satisfaction, compared to a 0.34 SD decrease in social integration. Furthermore, job loss may be associated with significant mental health issues. Unemployment decreases mental health by 0.31 standard deviation. Furthermore, the deprivation index, which measures poverty, climbed significantly by 0.60 SD, while contentment with living conditions declined by 0.54 SD. Periods of inactivity have an impact on the psychological demands generally addressed by job interactions [7]. Like a result, persistently high unemployment, as we are seeing today, is a serious public health issue. The link between unemployment and psychological distress (PD) among young individuals (20–35 years) as a result of the coronavirus pandemic. We dug further into the characteristics that predict PD protection (trust, mastery, optimism) or risk (financial stress, loneliness) [9].

Unemployment among the people is a result of political will, policy, and public practice, not of disparities in ambitions [10]. People who are not in the job force, like the unemployed, have low salaries [11]. The loss of job and the resulting decrease in means of support and survival has

substantially raised the amount of existential fear that traumatizes people, communities, and our general feeling of security in the modern world [12]. Families with unemployed children and parents have reported extremely high levels of anguish, with long-term implications for the child's well-being and development [13].

Human resources (HR) play a significant role in accomplishing development goals in the execution of national development. In line with this, one of the aspects of human resource development is the development of manpower, which is aimed at improving the quality and participation in development as well as protecting their rights and interests in accordance with human dignity [14]. Workplace stakeholders must be made aware of employee requirements in order to give workplace assistance [15].

The most significant economic aims of developed and emerging countries are to reduce unemployment and achieve high rates of economic growth. Economic growth and employment are two highly essential macroeconomic factors in terms of a country's economic performance and are crucial aspects of the economic strategies of many countries, particularly industrialized countries. The Gross National Product (GNP) or its per capita value is one of the markers of a country's welfare [16]. Controlling the situation by creating job openings for the jobless can help to lower the number of unemployed persons. The likelihood of increased crime can be reduced by lowering the number of jobless people [17]. Furthermore, rising unemployment will reduce economic activity, causing people's salaries to fall. As a result, the community's tax burden will be reduced. If tax income falls, finances for government economic activities fall as well, causing development activities to fall further [18].

Article 27 paragraph 2 of the Republic of Indonesia's 1945 Constitution declares that "every citizen has the right to work and a fair life for mankind." This has ramifications for the state's commitment to assist its citizens in finding good jobs. This is followed by granting the central government, province governments, and district/municipal governments extensive powers in the personnel sector, including planning, implementing, and managing manpower. Furthermore, Regional Government Law No. 23 of 2014 specifies that manpower concerns are necessary and unrelated to fundamental services. Thus, personnel implementation concerns are fairly important matters that are not only the duty of the Central Government, but also of the

Provincial Government, and thus become the authority of the Regency/City Government.

The publication of a country's monthly (quarterly) unemployment rate is one of the most important regular economic events for market players [19]. Vacancies, in particular, continued to rise, and neither the recall rate for the temporarily jobless nor the job search rate for individuals who had been permanently laid off decreased significantly [20]. The availability of job opportunities in the era of regional autonomy aims to accelerate the realization of community welfare by improving services, empowerment, and community participation, as well as increasing regional competitiveness by taking into account democratic, just, and equitable principles, as well as regional characteristics. Manpower is a component of human resources, which is a key aspect in achieving effective economic growth. Labor has two functions in development: as a subject or player in the development process, and as an item that must be created [21].

The workforce is defined as the population of working age. According to Law No. 13 of 2003, Chapter I, Article 1 paragraph 2, the workforce is defined as everybody who can perform labor to generate products or services for their personal needs as well as the requirements of the community [22]. The government is in charge of expanding work possibilities both inside and outside of the employment relationship. As a result, all government programs, both federal and regional, in each industry are aimed at increasing work possibilities and lowering unemployment.

Unemployment occurs when a person is between the ages of 15 and 65 and does not work. Unemployment is often created when the labor force or number of job searchers is not equal to the number of jobs available.

Unemployment is a national issue that must be addressed by the federal government, local governments, and the community (stakeholders). As a result, the reaction must be carried out collaboratively by all key stakeholders and integrated across sectors of society, by attempting to enhance job prospects both within and outside the workplace. Unemployment benefits are intended to give workers with insurance in the event that they lose their job. Furthermore, job searchers anticipating higher benefit cuts should ramp up their search efforts as soon as possible [23]. With this in mind, employees may be able to locate jobs faster if they are paid to explore more generally. However, little attention has been paid to approaches to deploy low- cost techniques that immediately enhance the scope of locating jobless

employees. Similarly, there is still little evidence of the consequences of a larger job search on the labor market [24]. However, little attention has been paid to the impact of cash transfer programs on labor-market outcomes, either directly or in conjunction with other interventions [25]. The local area has choice over the sort of employment and training services provided, but is required by law to provide three types of services: core, intense, and training [26]. According to data from the Central Statistics Agency for Pangkep Regency (2019), there are 10,419 jobless persons, or approximately 6.91 percent of the entire population of Pangkep Regency, who are publicly unemployed and dominated by young people. This is particularly intriguing in regard to the Pangkep Regency Government's strategy of identifying the core causes of unemployment in the Pangkep Regency and providing remedies so that the jobless can find work.

**Methods**

The qualitative descriptive technique, which is based on descriptive statistical analysis and qualitatively reported data, is used in this study. In this part, we discuss the literature review process in detail and offer statistics from the selected studies [27]. We used a fresh data collection to create a new set of information about employees who use referrals to shape their current matches [28]. The research was carried out in the Pangkajene and Kepulauan Regencies during a six-month period. In 2018, the target population for open unemployment in Pangkep Regency was 10,419 persons, or approximately 6.91 percent of the entire workforce in Pangkep Regency. The model's frequency, durability, and severity of the unemployment crisis are all quantitatively consistent with historical evidence [29]. Determination of the number of samples using the SLOVIN formula as follows:

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2} = \frac{10.419}{1 + 10.419(0,1)^2} = 99,9$$

**Basic Theory**

Where:

n = Minimum number of samples

N = Total population

e = 90% precision value, e = 10% (0,1)

The minimal sample size for this study is 99.99 persons, which is rounded up to 100 people based on this calculation. Furthermore, the funds are

distributed to each region based on its features, as follows: (1) metropolitan area = 50 people, (2) mountainous/inland area = 25 people, and (3) island/coastal area = 25 people. Purposive sampling is a strategy for defining the sample based on certain aims and attributes. There were 106 respondents who completed the entire questionnaire instrument till the completion of the survey data gathering operations.

The information gleaned from the respondents is survey information about the characteristics of jobless people. Furthermore, the Focus Group Discussion (FGD) technique is used in this study to corroborate the findings of the field survey, rank the cause and solution elements, and formulate plans for creating work chances for the unemployed. Approximately 15 key informants from the government (Local Regional Apparatus Organizations), Members of the Regional People's Representative Council, Universities, the commercial sector, and other stakeholders participated in the FGD activities.

The major data utilized in this study are direct responses of respondents/community using a questionnaire instrument. Furthermore, secondary data is derived from a variety of public sources, namely data from the Central Statistics Agency (CSA), associated Regional Apparatus Organizations (RAO) report data, and other pertinent data. To confirm the field data gathering method, on-site observation and monitoring were also carried out. The data is then derived via in-depth interviews and Focus Group Discussions (FGD) with resource persons/key informants/stakeholders.

This study's data was gathered in four ways: observation, questionnaires, in-depth interviews, and focus groups. Meanwhile, descriptive analysis and Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) analysis were used to analyze the data. Descriptive statistical analysis is used to describe the study region, respondent characteristics, and research variables in narrative, percentage (percent), average value (mean), and picture/graph form.

The AHP analysis is used to establish strategies for offering work chances to the jobless. This study begins by identifying the core causes of

unemployment, then assesses remedies, and concludes with the development of strategies, policies, programs, and action plans [30]. AHP analysis is a decision-making technique that is backed by a basic mathematical method and may be used to tackle problems such as policy formulation or priority setting [31] [32]. AHP is utilized in this study to find the priority variables that become the basis of the problem/cause and the solution to unemployment.

The AHP model bases decision making on three main principles: (1) Hierarchical arrangement; (2) The preparation of the problem hierarchy is a step toward clarifying and detailing complex and complex problems. The decision-making hierarchy is created using the perspectives of parties with expertise and knowledge in the relevant field. (2) Setting priorities; The weight or contribution of the criterion aspects to the decision-making objectives can be considered as their priority. (3) logical consistency; The consistency of the respondents' replies in defining the priority of the elements is the fundamental factor that will determine the validity of the data and the consequences of decision making.

The AHP approach is distinguished by its ability to describe a complicated or unframed scenario into a hierarchical shape and assign weights by comparing in pairs. Finally, execute a synthesis to identify which variables have precedence as a consequence of the analysis, since this AHP technique employs an analytical approach to complicated issues via decomposition and synthesis that is arranged in a hierarchy. As a result of its application, the AHP approach offers various advantages, including: (1) Capable of discussing complicated and unstructured topics in a fair manner. (2) Integrating intuition, reasoning, feeling, and sensing in decision-making analysis; (3) Be able to synthesis the ideas of diverse responders' points of view; (4) Consider the consistency and assessment done in comparing the variables to verify the judgment; (5) The elements' ease of measurement (6) Allows for forward planning (forecasting) or backward planning (outlining the future to be accomplished at present moment) (backward).

**Table 1. Pairwise Comparison Scale Table**

No	Definition	Information
1	Equally important	Both elements have the same effect
3	Moderate is more important	Experience and judgment slightly favor oneelement over its partner

5	More important	Experience and judgment strongly favor oneelement over its partner
7	Very more important	One element is preferred and practically has amarked dominance over its partner
9	Absolute more important	
2,4,6,8	The values between two adjacent consideration values	
Opposite	ajj 1 a ji	

**Results and Discussion**

**Data and Descriptive Statistics**

Pangkajene and Islands Regency is located on the West Coast of South Sulawesi, about 100 km north of Makassar City. Geographically, it is located at coordinates 4°40' South Latitude - 8°00' South Latitude and 110° East Longitude - 119°48'67" East Longitude. The area of Pangkajene and Islands Regency is 1112.9 km<sup>2</sup>, divided into 13 sub-districts, namely: (1) Liukang Tangaya District covering an area of 120 km<sup>2</sup>, (2) Liukang Kalmas District covering an area of 91.50 km<sup>2</sup>, (3) Tupabbiring District covering an area of 54.44 km<sup>2</sup>, (4) North Tupabbiring District covering an area of 85.56 km<sup>2</sup>, (5) Pangkajene District covering an area of 47, 39 km<sup>2</sup>, (6) Minasatene District covering an area of 76.48 km<sup>2</sup>, (7) Balocci District covering an area of 143.48 km<sup>2</sup>, (8) Tondong Tallasa District covering an area of 111.20 km<sup>2</sup>, (9) Bunggoro District covering an area of 90.12 km<sup>2</sup>, (10 ) Labakkang District covering an area of 98.46 km<sup>2</sup>, (11) Ma'rang District covering an area of 75.22 km<sup>2</sup>, (12) Bungoro Segeri District 78.28 km<sup>2</sup>, and (13) Mandalle District covering an area of 40.16 km<sup>2</sup>.

According to demographic projections for 2019, the population of Pangkajene and Islands Regency is 332,674 people, with 161,118 male inhabitants and 171,556 female residents. The population of Pangkajene and the Archipelago increased by 0.87 percent compared to the predicted population in

2017, with the male population increasing by 0.94 percent and the female population increasing by 0.80 percent. Meanwhile, in 2018, the male population to female population ratio was 93.92. In 2019, the population density in Pangkajene and Islands Regency was 299 people per km<sup>2</sup>, with an average of 4 persons per family. The population density in the 13 sub-districts is quite diverse, with the highest density in Pangkajene sub-district (965 people/km<sup>2</sup>) and the lowest in Tondong Tallasa sub-district (77 people/km<sup>2</sup>). Meanwhile, the number of households increased by 0.87 percent in comparison to 2017.

The working-age population is separated into two groups: laborers and non-laborers. The labor force is defined as the population of working age who is economically engaged and may be classified as employed or jobless. Working covers both now working and temporarily not working, whereas unemployment is further classified as ever working and never working. Those who are not in the labor force are then split into three categories: school, household care, and other activities. As of 2019, the total employment in Pangkajene and Islands Regency was 150,852. 6.91 percent of this total are unemployed. Furthermore, there are 86,711 persons who are not in the work force, with specifics of 20,533 schools, 59,454 caring for the home, and 6,724 others. The Open Unemployment Rate (OUR) in Pangkajene and the Archipelago was 6.91 percent in 2018, with the Labor Force Participation Rate (LFPR) at 63.50 percent.

**Table 2. Employment Conditions in Pangkep Regency in 2019.**

<b>Labor Force (LF)</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Proportion (%)</b>
Working	86.072	54.361	140.433	59,11
Unemployed/job seekers	7.080	3.339	10.419	4,39
<b>Total</b>	<b>93.152</b>	<b>57.700</b>	<b>150.852</b>	<b>63,50</b>
<b>Not Labor Force (NLF)</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Proportion (%)</b>
School	8.751	11.782	20.533	8,64
Taking care of household	6.799	52.655	59.454	25,03
Other	3.893	2.831	6.724	2,83
<b>Total</b>	<b>19.443</b>	<b>67.268</b>	<b>86.711</b>	<b>36,50</b>
<b>Total (LF+NLF)</b>	<b>112.595</b>	<b>124.968</b>	<b>237.563</b>	<b>100,00</b>
<b>Labor Force Participation Rate (LFPR) (%)</b>	<b>82,73</b>	<b>46,17</b>	<b>63,50</b>	

<b>Open Unemployment Rate (OUR) (%)</b>	<b>7,60</b>	<b>5,79</b>	<b>6,91</b>	
---	-------------	-------------	-------------	--

Source: Sakernas 2020 data (processed)

According to the main occupations division, 33.33 percent of the population work in the Agriculture, Forestry, Hunting, and Fisheries sector, while 12.99 percent work in the Manufacturing Industry sector, and 20.67 percent work in the wholesale, retail, restaurant, and food sector. 17.11 percent work in community services, and 15.89 percent work in other industries. Then, based on the amount of hours worked in the previous week, the majority of the workers in Pangkajene and the Islands worked 35 hours or more.

According to the results of the August 2020 National Labor Force Survey (NLFS), the working-age population of Pangkajene and Islands Regency, also known as Pangkep Regency, is 237,563. Pangkep Regency's share of the working-age population is just 3.75 percent of the working-age population in South Sulawesi Province as a whole. When divided by gender, the female working-age population outnumbers the male population by 5.21 percent, or 12,373 persons. When divided by location, the working-age population in rural regions is 46.12 percent more than the working-age population in urban areas.

Based on the main activities carried out a week ago, the composition of the working age population in Pangkep Regency in 2019 was work, which reached 59.11 percent, followed by household activities, which reached 25.03 percent, and those who attended school and were unemployed, respectively. by 8.64 percent and 4.39 percent, respectively, and the working-age population engaged in other activities has the smallest percentage, 2.83 percent.

Equipping the workforce with the skills required for present and future occupations is a strategic concern that must be considered for a country's national growth and development possibilities. Finally, the welfare of any society is determined by how many people work and how productive those who rely on their talents are, because skills are the foundation of respectable labor. The labor force indicator seeks to assess how many people in a given region have the potential to work. The proportion of the working-age population in Pangkep Regency who is in the labor force (63.50 percent) is greater than that of those who are not (36.50 percent). The greater the proportion of the workforce in Pangkep Regency, the greater the number of individuals with the capacity to work there.

This is reflected in the NLFS (2020) data, which show a growth in the workforce from 139,333 to 150,852 individuals, with the increase corresponding to the increase in the number of employees in Pangkep Regency. The number of working individuals in 2018 was 140,433, an increase of 10,919 persons over the previous year's figure of 129,514 people. The expansion in the workforce in Pangkep Regency is based on the phenomena of a considerable drop in the non-labor force population, particularly those whose primary activity is home care and other activities. This is made feasible by the movement of people who are not in the labor force but are planning to establish a business, seeking for employment, or have been accepted but have not yet begun. The following table shows the number of working people in Pangkep Regency organized by age group.

**Table 3. Working Population by Age Group in Pangkep Regency in 2019**

No	Age Group (Years)	Male	Female	Total	Proportion (%)
1	15-19	4.150	1.822	5.972	4,25
2	20-24	10.056	7.231	17.287	12,31
3	25-29	10.464	7.883	18.347	13,06
4	30-34	10.095	5.059	15.154	10,79
5	35-39	10.924	7.582	18.506	13,18
6	40-44	10.509	7.087	17.596	12,53
7	45-49	9.515	5.059	14.574	10,38
8	50-54	7.505	4.680	12.185	8,68
9	55-59	5.649	2.644	8.293	5,91
10	60+	7.205	5.314	12.519	8,91
	Total	86.072	54.361	140.433	100,00

Source: Data processed (2020)

According to the statistics in the table above, the working population in Pangkep Regency is dominated by those aged 20 to 49, with a percentage rate of 72.25 percent. The figure below shows the proportion of the entire working population by age group. Furthermore, the proportion of the working population by age group in Pangkep Regency reveals that the 15-19 year age group has the lowest percentage, 4.25 percent, while the 55-59 year age group has the highest percentage, 5.91 percent. The elder the working group, the weaker their ability/skills/skills (decreased productivity). However, the percentage of the workforce in the oldest age group (60+ years) is larger than that of the preceding age group, at 8.91 percent.

### **Open Unemployment Rate (OUR)**

The open unemployment rate is a figure that represents the number of persons of working age who are seeking for work, starting a company, believing it is hard to find work, or who have a job but have not begun working and are frequently utilized for work [33]. The Open Unemployment Rate (OUR) statistic is used by the government to measure the success of employment sector performance. OUR is a ratio of the number of jobless (including working-age people searching for work, starting a business, feeling desperate for work, and already having a job but not starting work) to the overall workforce. The larger proportion of OUR indicates that there are an increasing number of employees who are not absorbed in the region's job market. By having thorough information about OUR, it is believed that initiatives to relieve unemployment in the Pangkep Regency region, such as the provision of suitable job possibilities, may be adequately planned in order to improve community welfare. Unemployment is a very difficult problem since it is affected and impacted by a number of elements that interact with one another in a complicated pattern. According to the International Labor Organization (ILO), open unemployment refers to those who are seeking for work, starting a new business, not looking for work out of despair, or who have been approved for work but have not begun it.

According to the findings of the 2019 National Labor Force Survey (NLFS), the number of unemployed individuals in Pangkep Regency is 10,419, ranking third behind Makassar City and Gowa Regency. When compared to 2018, this figure grew to 9,819 persons. However, the value in percentage terms fell from 7.05 percent in 2018 to 6.91 percent in 2019. The overall OUR of Pangkep Regency in 2019 was 6.91 percent, which

means that there were 6 to 7 available positions for per 100 workers in Pangkep Regency. In 2019, the overall OUR number declined by 0.14 percent compared to 2018. (7.05 percent). This is substantial improvement because open unemployment has decreased in the Pangkep Regency. However, Pangkep Regency's OUR statistic is higher than South Sulawesi Province's OUR, which is 5.34 percent; in 2018, Pangkep Regency's OUR is third highest after Makassar City and Palopo City.

The decrease in OUR in 2019 occurred exclusively in the female workforce, whereas it climbed in the male workforce. Male OUR is higher than female OUR, at 7.60 percent versus 5.79 percent. When evaluated by location, the work force in metropolitan regions has a higher tendency

to become publicly jobless. When we look at the district or city area, the open unemployment rate for both men and women is greater in urban regions than in districts.

### **Unemployment Education Level**

In developing nations, persons with high education (high school and above) are more likely to be unemployed; in developed countries, those with little education are more likely to be unemployed. The lower the unemployment rate, the greater a person's education level. One of the numerous factors that may be used to measure the quality of unemployment education is information on the degree of unemployment education.

In this day and age, the function of education is not always directly proportionate to the world of work, particularly if the direction and model of education do not lead to job orientation. Such circumstances frequently result in the problem of educated unemployment. There is a statistically significant association between education level and labor market status, with individuals with only elementary education having a greater share of jobless [34]. As a result, while evaluating one's labor market success, it is critical to assess the substance and quality of educational investments, such as college majors and college quality [35]. As a result, skill development programs may be launched so that young people can find job soon after finishing their studies [36].

Education level is one of the elements that determine a region's poverty level; in order to minimize poverty, an area's people must have a high level of education. As a result, enhancing education involves not only free education for the impoverished, but also strong infrastructure access to be able to travel to school promptly. Many

school-age children are still absent from school in mountain and rural regions due to a lack of suitable infrastructure to transport them to the nearest school from their homes. As a result, the government must invest in infrastructure, particularly in rural regions that remain undeveloped [37].

According to the NLFS (2019) data, the majority of the jobless in Pangkep Regency are high school graduates/equivalent to 60.89 percent. When comparing kinds, vocational high school graduates have a higher unemployment rate than ordinary high school graduates, which is 33.80 percent. Such situations arise because vocational high school graduates have specialized skills and prefer to seek out/choose occupations that are related to the disciplines in which they are active. In truth, vocational high school graduates seldom or never aspire to establish and develop jobs; those who are jobless are better off unemployed than starting their own firms. In practice, it is supposed to inculcate entrepreneurial knowledge and self-efficacy motivation, which has ramifications for entrepreneurship interest, particularly among vocational high school graduates.

### Results Of Description Analysis

**Table 4. Respondent Profiles by District**

No	Subdistrict	Frequency (person)	Percentage (%)
1	Labakkang	8	7,55
2	Pangkajene	8	7,55
3	Bungoro	8	7,55
4	Mandale	10	9,43
5	Segeri	9	8,49
6	Ma'rang	10	9,43
7	Minasatene	14	13,21
8	Balocci	11	10,38
9	Liukang Tupabbiring	28	26,42
<b>Total</b>		<b>106</b>	<b>100,00</b>

### Description of Respondents by Age Group

According to the descriptive analysis results, respondents were split into six (six) age groups:

### Description of Respondents by District

This study was done in a variety of sub-districts in Pangkep Regency that represented three (three) regional features, including urban/lowland, rural/highland, and islands/coastal regions. The urban areas are represented by the sub-districts of Labakkang, Pangkajene, Bungoro, Mandale, Segeri, and Ma'rang. Meanwhile, the sub-districts of Minasa'tene and Ballocci reflect the highland/rural regions. Meanwhile, the Liukang Tupabbiring sub-district represents the islands/coastal areas. The following table provides a description of the respondent's profile depending on the origin of the sub-district. According to the data in the table, there were 106 participants who participated in this study. There were 25 responders (23.59 percent) from mountainous/highland areas encompassing the Minasa'tene and Ballocci sub-districts. Then there were 28 responders (26.42 percent) from the archipelagic zone, which included the Liukang Tupabbiring sub-district. Meanwhile, 53 persons (50%) arrived from urban/lowland regions, which included five sub-districts: Labakkang, Pangkajene, Bungoro, Mandale, and Ma'rang.

(1) 17-20 years, (2) 21-30 years, (3) 31-40 years, (4) 41-50 years, (5) 51-60 years, and (6) 61 years and more. The following table contains a detailed description of the respondent's profile by age group.

**Table 5. Respondent Profiles by Age Group**

No	Age (Years)	Frequency (person)	Percentage (%)
1	17-20	13	12,26
2	21-30	17	16,04
3	31-40	24	22,64
4	42-50	20	18,87
5	51-60	16	15,09
6	61+	16	15,09
<b>Total</b>		<b>106</b>	<b>100,00</b>

Source: Data processed, 2020

According to the data in the table, there were 106 participants who participated in this study. The age groups 31-40 years and 41-50 years had the most replies, with 24 people (22.64 percent) and 20 persons, respectively (18.87 percent). Then, as many as 17 persons from the age bracket 21-30 years old responded (16.04 percent). While the rest are respondents aged 51-60 years (15.09 percent), 61 years and above (15.09 percent), and the

smallest are respondents aged 17-20 years (12.26 percent).

### Description of Respondents by Gender

The descriptive analysis revealed that respondents were classified into two (two) classes based on gender: (1) Male and (2) Female. The following table contains a detailed description of the respondent's profile by gender.

**Table 6. Respondent Profile Table by Gender**

No	Gender	Frequency (person)	Percentage (%)
1	Man	46	43,40
2	Woman	60	56,60
<b>Total</b>		<b>106</b>	<b>100,00</b>

Source: Data processed, 2020

According to the data in the table, there were 106 participants who participated in this study. The female group dominated the respondents in this survey, accounting for 60 persons (56.6 percent), with the male group accounting for 46 people (43.4 percent) of the total number of respondents.

### Description of Respondents Based on

### Marital Status

The descriptive analysis revealed that respondents were classified into three (three) groups based on marital status: (1) Married, (2) Unmarried, and (3) Divorced. The following table contains a detailed description of the respondent's profile depending on marital status.

**Table 6. Respondents Profile Based on Marital Status**

No	Marital Status	Frequency (person)	Percentage (%)
1	Marry	73	68,87
2	Not married	25	23,58
3	Divorced	8	7,55
<b>Total</b>		<b>106</b>	<b>100,00</b>

Source: Data processed, 2020

According to the data in the table, there were 106 participants who participated in this study. The married group dominated the respondents in this survey, accounting for 73 individuals (68.87 percent), with the unmarried group accounting for 25 people (23.58 percent) and the divorced group accounting for 8 people (7.55 percent) of the total number of respondents.

### Description of Respondents Based on

### Position in the Household

According to the descriptive analysis results, respondents are classified into six (six) categories depending on their position in the household: (1) Head of the Household, (2) Wife, (3) Children, (4) Parents, (5) In-laws, and (6) Nephew. The following table contains a detailed description of the respondent's profile depending on position in the household.

**Table 7. Respondents Profile Based on Position in the Household**

No	Position in the Household	Frequency (person)	Percentage (%)
1	Head of household	38	35,85
2	Wife	40	37,74
3	Child	21	19,81
4	Parent	2	1,89
5	Parents in law	2	1,89
6	Nephew	3	2,83
<b>Total</b>		<b>106</b>	<b>100,00</b>

Source: Data processed, 2020

According to the data in the table, there were 106 participants who participated in this study. Respondents in this study were dominated by the wife group, which accounted for 40 people (37.74 percent), and the Head of the Household, who accounted for 38 people (35.85 percent), with the children group accounting for 21 people (19.81 percent), the nephew group accounting for 3 people (2.83 percent), and the parents and in-laws accounting for 2 people (1.89 percent).

### Description of Respondents Based on Religion

The descriptive analysis revealed that respondents were classified into two (two) categories based on religion, namely (1) Islam and (2) other religions (Protestant, Catholic, Hindu, and Buddhist). The following table contains a detailed summary of the respondent's religious profile.

**Table 8. Respondents Profile Based on Religion**

No	Religion	Frequency (person)	(%)
1	Islam	106	100
2	Other religions	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>100,00</b>

Source: Data processed, 2020

According to the data in the table, there were 106 participants who participated in this study. Respondents in this survey were overwhelmingly Muslim, accounting for as many as 106 persons (100 percent), and none of the respondents practiced a faith other than Islam.

### Description of Respondents by Ethnicity/Ethnicity

The descriptive analysis revealed that respondents were divided into three (three) groups based on ethnicity: (1) Makassarese, (2) Bugis, and (3) other ethnic groups (Mandar, Toraja, Javanese, etc.). The following table contains a detailed description of the respondent's ethnicity profile.

**Table 9. Respondent Profiles by Ethnicity/Ethnicity**

No	Ethnic group	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Makassar	32	30,19
2	Bugis	74	69,81
	<b>Total</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>100,00</b>

Source: Data processed, 2020

According to the data in the table, 106 participants participated in this study. The Bugis ethnic group had as many as 74 persons (69.81 percent) of the respondents in this survey, while the Makassar tribe had as many as 32 people (30.19 percent). Other ethnic groupings, on the other hand, do not exist.

### Description of Respondents Based on Education Level

The descriptive analysis revealed that respondents were divided into six (six) groups based on their last education, namely: (1) never attended school, (2) did not finish elementary school, (3) elementary school/equivalent, (4) junior high school/equivalent, (5) high school / equivalent, and (6) Bachelor / S1. The following table contains a detailed description of the respondent's profile depending on their degree of schooling.

**Table 10. Respondents Profile Based on Education Level**

No	Last education	Frequency (person)	Percentage (%)
1	Never school	4	3,77
2	Not completed in primary school	7	6,60
3	Elementary School/Equivalent	38	35,85
4	Junior High School/Equivalent	15	14,15
5	High School/Equivalent	34	32,08

6	Bachelor degree	8	7,55
	<b>Total</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>100,00</b>

Source: Data processed, 2020

According to the data in the table, there were 106 participants who participated in this study. Respondents in this survey were dominated by those who graduated from elementary school/equivalent, with as many as 38 individuals (35.85 percent), followed by those who graduated from high school/equivalent, with as many as 34 people (32.08 percent). The remainder include individuals who have completed junior high school/equivalent (14.15 percent), a bachelor's degree (7.55 percent), did not complete elementary school (6.60 percent), or have never attended

Table 11. Respondents Profile Based on Income Level

No	Average Income/Month	Frequency (person)	Percentage (%)
1	<1 million rupiah	70	66,04
2	1-2 million rupiah	29	27,36
3	2-3 million rupiah	7	6,60
	<b>Total</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>100,00</b>

Source: Data processed, 2020

According to the table above, 106 participants participated in this study. Respondents in this survey were dominated by groups with an average monthly income of less than 1 million rupiah, which was 70 persons (66.04 percent), and was followed by a group of 29 people (27.36 percent) who earned between 1-2 million rupiahs. The remainder are responders with an average monthly income of 2-3 million rupiah.

**Table 12. Respondents Profile Based on Main Activities**

No	Main Sector/Occupation	Frequency (person)	Percentage (%)
1	Doesn't work	68	64,15
2	Farmer	12	11,32
3	Fisherman	20	18,87
4	Self-employed	6	5,66
	<b>Total</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>100,00</b>

Source: Data processed, 2020

According to the table above, 106 participants participated in this study. This study's respondents were dominated by the jobless, who constituted 68 individuals (64.15 percent), followed by fishermen (20 people (18.87 percent), and farmers (12 people) (11.32 percent). Furthermore, based on the descriptive analysis results, it can be shown that the lowest group of respondents, as many as 6 persons or 5.66 percent of the total respondents, have the major occupation/activity as self-

school (3.77 percent).

### Description of Respondents Based on Income Level

The descriptive analysis revealed that respondents were split into three (three) categories depending on their income level: (1) less than one million rupiah, (2) 1-2 million rupiah, and (3) 2 - 3 million rupiah. The following table contains a detailed description of the respondent's profile depending on their level of income.

### Description of Respondents Based on Main Activities

The descriptive analysis revealed that respondents were split into four (four) categories based on their major activities, namely: (1) not working, (2) farmers, (3) fishermen, and (4) entrepreneurs. The following table contains a detailed summary of the respondent's profile based on the primary activities.

employed.

### Description of Respondents Based on Government Aid Recipients

The descriptive analysis revealed that respondents were split into two (two) groups depending on their receipt of government support, namely: (1) never and (2) never. The following table contains a detailed description of the respondent's profile based on government aid beneficiaries.

**Table 13. Respondents Profile Based on Government Aid Recipients**

No	Government Aid Recipients	Frequency (person)	Percentage (%)
1	Yes	56	52,83

2	Never	50	47,17
	<b>Total</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>100,00</b>

Source: Data processed, 2020

According to the table above, 106 participants participated in this study. Respondents in this survey were dominated by organizations that had received government aid, both central and local governments such as PKH, and social assistance, with 56 persons (52.83%), while the rest were groups that had never received support, with 50 people (47,17 percent).

### Description of Respondents' Responses to Household Economic Conditions

According to the findings of descriptive analysis, respondents' replies based on household economic situations are classified into five (five) groups: (1) considerably better, (2) better, (3) fairly excellent, (4) declining, and (5) worse. The following table contains a detailed summary of respondents' replies depending on household economic situations.

**Table 14. Respondents' Responses to Household Economic Conditions**

No	Household Economic Condition	Frequency (person)	Percentage (%)
1	Much better	2	1,89
2	Better	26	24,53
3	Pretty good	64	60,38
4	Decrease	14	13,21
5	Worse	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>100,00</b>

Source: Data processed, 2020

According to the statistics in the table above, there were 106 participants who participated in this study. As many as 64 people (60.38 percent) claimed their household's economic situation was fairly excellent, 26 people were better (24.53 percent), and 2 people were lot better (1.89 percent). Meanwhile, 14 individuals (13.21 percent) of all respondents stated their economic situation has worsened. These findings show that respondents' economic situations are generally

"good enough."

### Description of Respondents' Expectations of Local Government

The descriptive analysis findings reflect a number of respondents' expectations of local governments in their efforts to offer jobs for the jobless. The distribution of respondents' expectations is shown in the table below.

**Table 15. Respondents' Expectations of Local Government**

No	Respondent's Expectations	Frequency (person)	Percentage (%)
1	Assistance (businesscapital, production equipment, etc.)	26	24,53
2	Job skills training	22	20,75
3	Provide job opportunities	15	14,15
4	Business assistance	25	23,58
5	Job information	10	9,43
6	Involvement of all parties (government, private etc.)	8	7,55
	<b>Total</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>100,00</b>

Source: Data processed 2020

According to the statistics in the table above, there were 106 participants who participated in this study. Respondents' expectations of local

governments in terms of efforts to provide job opportunities were dominated by the provision of assistance (business capital, production equipment,

fishing/cultivating equipment, etc.) by as many as 26 people (24.53 percent), followed by business assistance by as many as 25 people (23.58 percent), and job skills training by as many as 22 people (20,75 percent). The rest of the total respondents are involved in providing employment (14.15 percent), employment information (9.43 percent), and engagement of all parties/stakeholders (7.55 percent).

**Analysis of Priority Factors Causes and Solutions of Unemployment**

Based on the findings of the identification and

focus groups, the following factors were identified as causes of unemployment: (1) low level of education, (2) education level that was not in line with the available work fields, (3) insufficient workforce skills/skills, (4) lack of available job opportunities, (5) work force is picky about work, (6) inappropriate salary/wage, (7) unequal employment & recruitment information, and (8) lack of attention from local government. The following table summarizes the findings of the comprehensive identification of the elements producing unemployment.

**Table 16. Factors Causing Unemployment**

No	Description	Code
1	Low level of education	FP-1
2	The level of education does not match the available job fields	FP-2
3	Inadequate workforce skills	FP-3
4	Lack of available job opportunities	FP-4
5	Work force picky job	FP-5
6	Inappropriate salary/wages	FP-6
7	Information about uneven employment and recruitment	FP-7
8	Lack of attention from local government in preparing the workforce	FP-8

Source: Data processed, 2020

Furthermore, the reasons driving unemployment are rated based on stakeholder opinions. The results of data processing using the expert choice software to compute significance and rank weights are shown in table 4.17. According to the findings of the AHP study shown in the table, the causes producing unemployment are as follows, in order of their ranks and weights; (1) The workforce is selective about their jobs (0.1902); (2) Inadequate

workforce skills/abilities (0.1611); (3) A lack of education (0.1484); (4) A scarcity of work possibilities (0.1232); (5) The degree of education does not correspond to the accessible job areas (0.1194); (6) Inadequate salary/wages (0.1022); (7) Local government's failure to pay attention to worker preparation (0.0912); (8) Information on job possibilities and uneven hiring (0.0643)

**Table 17. Results of Analysis of Priority Factors Causes of Unemployment**

No	Description	Code	Weights	Rank
1	Low level of education	FP-1	0,1484	3
2	The level of education does not match the available job fields	FP-2	0,1194	5
3	Inadequate workforce skills	FP-3	0,1611	2
4	Lack of available job opportunities	FP-4	0,1232	4
5	Work force picky job	FP-5	0,1902	1
6	Inappropriate salary/wages	FP-6	0,1022	6
7	Information about uneven employment & recruitment	FP-7	0,0643	8
8	Lack of attention from local government	FP-8	0,0912	7

	in preparing the workforce			
	Consistency Index (CI)			0,0012

Source: Data processed, 2020

The identification and FGD results produced 8 (eight) solution factors to overcome/reduce unemployment, namely: (1) Improving the education sector (vocational, curriculum) and other aspects, (2) Pre-employment training program, (3) Encouraging investment growth (DI & FI), (4) Entrepreneurship & MSME Development Program, and (5) Community empowerment assistance (agricultural & non-agricultural sector), (6) Stakeholder collaboration in workforce

capacity building (training, technical assistance, and so on), (7) optimizing the operation of job training centers (BLK), and (8) establishing Job Center institutions in the regions. The following table summarizes the findings from the identification of total unemployment solution factors.

**Table 18. Unemployment Solution Factors**

No	Description	Code
1	Improving the education sector (vocational, curriculum) and other aspects	FS-1
2	Pre-employment training program	FS-2
3	Encouraging investment growth (DI & FI)	FS-3
4	Entrepreneurship and MSME development program	FS-4
5	Community empowerment assistance (agricultural & non-agricultural sector)	FS-5
6	Stakeholder synergy in workforce capacity development (training, technical guidance, etc.)	FS-6
7	JTC function optimization	FS-7
8	Establishment of job center institutions in the regions	FS-8

Source: Data processed, 2020

The aspects of the unemployment solution are then ranked based on stakeholder feedback. The results of data processing using the expert choice software to compute significance and rank weights are shown in table 4.19. According to the findings of the AHP analysis shown in the table, the unemployment solution components are as follows, in order of their ranks and weights; (1) Stakeholder collaboration in workforce capacity development (training, technical assistance, and so on) (0.1824); (2) Assistance with community

empowerment (agricultural and non-agricultural sectors) (0.1608); (3) Program for Entrepreneurship and MSME Development (0.1544); (4) Improving the functionality of JTC (Job Training Center) (0.1466); (5) Establishment of regional Job Center institutions (0.1072); (6) Program of pre-employment training (0.0956); (7) Improving education (vocational, curricular, and other factors) (0.0812); (8) Encouragement of investment growth (DI & FI) (0.0718).

**Table 19. Results of Analysis of Priority Factors for Unemployment Solutions**

No	Description	Code	Weights	Rank
1	Low level of education	FS-1	0,0812	7
2	The level of education does not match the available job fields	FS-2	0,0956	6
3	Inadequate workforce skills	FS-3	0,0718	8
4	Lack of available job opportunities	FS-4	0,1544	3
5	Work force picky job	FS-5	0,1608	2
6	Inappropriate salary/wages	FS-6	0,1824	1

7	Information about uneven employment & recruitment	FS-7	0,1466	4
8	Lack of attention from local government in preparing the workforce	FS-8	0,1072	5
	Consistency Index (CI)			0,0011

Source: Data processed, 2020

### Job Provision Strategies for the Unless

Based on the findings of the study of priority solutions for unemployment given in the preceding section, a variety of methods for creating jobs for the jobless in Pangkajene and Islands (Pangkep) Regencies can be developed in the following order; (1) Increase stakeholder collaboration in workforce capacity development (training, technical guidance, etc.); (2) Expand the scope and quality of community empowerment aid (agricultural & non- agricultural sectors); (3) Expanding the number and quality of entrepreneurial programs, as well as the development of Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprises (MSME) and Cooperatives; (4) Improving the regional function of Job Training Centers (JTC); (5) Expanding the government's involvement as a facilitator of job prospects through the construction of Job Center institutions in the regions; (6) Expand the number and quality of pre-employment training programs available to high school and vocational high school graduates; (7) Improving the education system, particularly vocational education, by designing a curriculum that is linked and matched to labor market demands; (8) Promoting regional investment growth, including FI and DI, through one-stop licensing that makes it easy for business actors/investors.

### Conclusion

Based on the findings of the research reported in the preceding section, the following conclusions can be drawn: The jobless made up the majority of respondents in this research, accounting for 68 individuals (64.15 percent), followed by fishermen (20 people (18.87 percent), and farmers (12 people) (11.32 percent). Furthermore, the respondents in this study were dominated by groups who had received government support, both central and local governments, such as the Family Hope Program and other social aid, namely 56 persons (52.83 percent), while the rest were groups that had never received assistance (47.17 percent). Furthermore, 64 individuals (60.38 percent) claimed that their household's economic situation was fairly excellent, 26 people were better (24.53 percent), and 2 people were considerably better (1.89 percent). Respondents' expectations of local governments in terms of

efforts to provide job opportunities were dominated by the provision of assistance (business capital, production equipment, fishing/cultivating equipment, etc.) by as many as 26 people (24.53 percent), followed by business assistance by as many as 25 people (23.58 percent), and job skills training by as many as 22 people (20,75 percent). The rest of the total respondents are involved in providing employment (14.15 percent), employment information (9.43 percent), and engagement of all parties/stakeholders (7.55 percent). According to their ranking, the following are the solution variables for creating jobs for the unemployed: (1) Stakeholder collaboration in developing workforce capacity (training, technical assistance, and so on), (2) Community empowerment assistance (agricultural and non-agricultural sectors), (3) Entrepreneurship Program & Development of Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprises, (4) Optimizing the function of Job Training Centers (JTC), (5) Establishment of Job Center institutions in the regions, (6) Pre-employment training programs, (7) Reforming the education sector (vocational education), and (8) Encouraging investment growth (FI & DI).

### References

- [1] Febriyani, A., & Anis, A. (2021). Pengaruh Pertumbuhan Ekonomi, Investasi dan Indeks Pembangunan Manusia Terhadap Ketimpangan Distribusi Pendapatan di Indonesia. *Jurnal Kajian Ekonomi Dan Pembangunan*, 3(4). <https://doi.org/10.24036/jkep.v3i4.12375>
- [2] Aswanto, & Ahmadl. (2022). Pengaruh Jumlah Penduduk dan UMR terhadap Jumlah Pengangguran di Provinsi Riau 2010-2020. *IKRA-ITH EKONOMIKA*, 5(2), 87–95.
- [3] Subhan, M. (2018). Pengangguran dan Tawaran Solutif dalam Perspektif Islam. *Jurnal Ekonomi Syariah*, 3(2), 153–164. <https://doi.org/10.30736/jesa.v3i2.44>
- [4] Rakhmawati, A., & Boedirochminarni, A. (2018). Analisis Tingkat Penyerapan Tenaga Kerja Sektor Industri di Kabupaten Gresik. *Jurnal Ilmu Ekonomi*, 2(1), 74–82.
- [5] Acs, G., & Karpman, M. (2020). Employment, Income, and Unemployment

- Insurance during the COVID-19 Pandemic. Urban Institute, 1–11
- [6] Ganong, P., Noel, P. J., & Vavra, J. S. (2020). US Unemployment Insurance Replacement Rates During The Pandemic. *Journal of Public Economics*, 191. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2020.104273>
- [7] Pohlan, L. (2019). Organization Unemployment and Social Exclusion. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 164, 273–299. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2019.06.006>
- [8] Achdut, N., & Refaeli, T. (2020). Unemployment and Psychological Distress among Young People during the COVID-19 Pandemic: Psychological Resources and Risk Factors.
- [9] *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(19), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17197163>
- [10] Couloute, L., & Kopf, D. (2018). Out of Prison & Out of Work: Unemployment among formerly incarcerated people. *Prison Policy Initiative*, 1–14.
- [11] Gangopadhyaya, A., & Garrett, B. (2020). Unemployment, Health Insurance, and the COVID-19 Recession. Available at SSRN, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3568489>
- [12] Blustein, D. L. (2020). Work and Unemployment in the Time of COVID-19: The Existential Experience of Loss and Fear. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022167820934229>
- [13] Parolin, Z. (2020). Comment Unemployment and child health during COVID-19 in the USA. *The Lancet Public Health*, 5(10), e521–e522. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667\(20\)30207-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667(20)30207-3)
- [14] Sutjiatmi, S., & Puspita, N. (2019). Strategi Dinas Perindustrian dan Tenaga Kerja dalam Menangani Pengangguran di Kabupaten Tegal. *Indonesian Governance Journal (Kajian Politik-Pemerintahan)*, 2(April), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.24905/pgj.v2i1.1250>
- [15] Brouwers, E. P. M. (2020). Social Stigma is an Underestimated Contributing Factor to Unemployment in People with Mental Illness or Mental Health Issues: Position Paper and Future Directions. *Brouwers BMC Psychology*, 8(36), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-020-00399-0>
- [16] Soyulu, Ö. B., Çakmak, İ., & Okur, F. (2018). Economic growth and unemployment issue: Panel data analysis in Eastern European Countries. *Journal of International Studies*, 11(1), 93–107. <https://doi.org/10.14254/2071-8330.2018/11-1/7>
- [17] Fitria, I., Hanifa, N., Soemarsono, A. R., & Nugraheni, K. (2021). Konstruksi Model Pengaruh Pertumbuhan Pengangguran Terhadap Dinamika Angka Kriminalitas Melalui Pemberian Kontrol Optimal. *SPECTA Journal of Technology*, 5(1), 58–67. <https://doi.org/10.35718/specta.v5i1.285>
- [18] Isnati, B., & Yusrini, B. A. (2019). Peran Ekonomi Kreatif Sektor Kerajinan Untuk Mengurangi Tingkat Pengangguran di Desa Taman Sari Kecamatan Gunungsari Kabupaten Lombok Barat. *SOCIETY (Jurnal Jurusan Tadris IPS)*, 10(2), 154–162. <https://doi.org/10.20414/society.v10i2.1787>
- [19] Chakraborty, T., Kumar, A., & Munmun, C. (2020). Unemployment Rate Forecasting: A Hybrid Approach. *Computational Economics*, 0123456789. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10614-020-10040-2>
- [20] Gallant, J., Notowidigdo, M. J., Kroft, K., & Lange, F. (2020). Temporary Unemployment and Labor Market Dynamics During The Covid-19 Recession. In *National Bureau of Economic Research*.
- [21] Desanti, G., & Ariusni. (2021). Pengaruh Umur, Jenis Kelamin, Jam Kerja, Status Pekerjaan dan Pendidikan Terhadap Pendapatan Tenaga Kerja di Kota Padang. *Jurnal Kajian Ekonomi Dan Pembangunan*, 3(4). <https://doi.org/10.24036/jkep.v3i4.12377>
- [22] Syahrial. (2020). Dampak Covid-19 Terhadap Tenaga Kerja di Indonesia. *Jurnal Ners*, 4(2), 21–29.
- [23] Marinescu, I., & Skandalis, D. (2021). Unemployment Insurance and Job Search Behavior. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 136(2), 887–931. <https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjaa037>
- [24] Vethaak, H., & Klaauw, B. van der. (2021). Empirical Evaluation of Broader Job Search Requirements for Unemployed Workers-Work in progress. 1–44.
- [25] Baird, S., McKenzie, D., & Özler, B. (2018). The effects of cash transfers on adult labor market outcomes. *Journal of Development*

- and Migration, 8(22), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40176-018-0131-9>.
- [26] McConnell, S., & Burkander, P. (2021). The Effects of Employment Counseling on Labor Market Outcomes for Adults and Dislocated Workers: Evidence from a Nationally Abstract. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 0(0), 1–39. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pam.22305>.
- [27] Lima, Y., Barbosa, C. E., & Souza, J. M. De. (2021). Understanding Technological Unemployment: A Review of Causes, Consequences, and Solutions. *Societies*, 11(2), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.3390/soc11020050>.
- [28] Lester, B., Rivers, D. A., & Topa, G. (2021). The Heterogeneous Impact of Referrals on Labor Market Outcomes. *FRB of Philadelphia Working Paper*, 21–34. <https://doi.org/10.21799/frbp.wp.2021.34>.
- [29] Petrosky-nadeau, N., & Zhang, L. (2020). Unemployment crises. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, xxx. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmoneco.2020.01.009>.
- [30] David, F. R. (2004). *Manajemen Strategis: Konsep dan Kasus*. Indeks Gramedia Grup.
- [31] Mulyono, M. (2002). *Teori Pengambilan Keputusan*. Lembaga Penerbit FE-UI.
- [32] Saaty, T. L. (1994). How to Make a Decision: The Analytic Hierarchy Process. *Inform Journal on Applied Analytics*, 24(6). <https://doi.org/10.1287/inte.24.6.19>.
- [33] Wahyuni, S. (2021). Pengaruh Pengangguran Terbuka Terdidik Universitas Terhadap Garis Kemiskinan di Provinsi Aceh. *Jurnal Ekonomika Universitas Almuslim Bireuen Aceh*, 15(1), 9–14. <https://doi.org/10.51179/eko.v15i1.537>.
- [34] Norström, F., Waenerlund, A., Lindholm, L., Nygren, R., Sahlén, K., & Brydsten, A. (2019). Does unemployment contribute to poorer health-related quality of life among Swedish adults? *BMC Public Health*, 19(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-019-6825-y>.
- [35] Choi, J., & Bae, H. (2020). Changes in Early Labor Market Outcomes among Young College Graduates in South Korea. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 688(1), 115–136. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716220906779>.
- [36] Kassem, M., Ali, A., & Andi, M. (2019). Unemployment Rate, Population Density and Crime Rate in Punjab (Pakistan): An Empirical Analysis Mohamad. *Bulletin of Business and Economics*, 8(2), 92–104.
- [37] Putra, I. K. A. A., & Arka, S. (2016). Analisis Pengaruh Tingkat Pengangguran Terbuka, Kesempatan Kerja, dan Tingkat Pendidikan Terhadap Tingkat Kemiskinan Pada Kabupaten/Kota Di Provinsi Bali. *E-Jurnaliekonomi Pembangunan Universitas Udayana*, 7(3), 416–444.