

Analysis of Inclusive Economic Growth in Districts/Cities in East Java 2015-2019 (ADB and UNDP Approach)

Ramadhani Nadiah^{1,*} Rahmawati Farida²

¹ Economic Development, Universitas Negeri Malang

² Economic Development, Universitas Negeri Malang

*Corresponding author. Email: <u>farida.rahmawati.fe@um.ac.id</u>

ABSTRACT

Inclusive economic growth is economic growth aimed at the entire society regardless of social status or other differences in society. East Java is one of the provinces that have the vision to improve the welfare of society evenly without exception with a general strategy of development that is pro-people, growth that can also be felt by the poor, and growth that is pro-gender. With this vision, East Java aims to encourage the growth of inclusive economic growth. The purpose of this study is to provide an overview of how the ideal state of an inclusive economy is in the province of East Java. In research to determine the state of inclusive economic growth, There are two methods formulated by the two world institutions selected in this study, the first is the ADB method and the second is the UNDP method. The ADB method was chosen because it is a method specifically intended to measure inclusive growth in developing countries, especially the Asian region, and the indicators have been adjusted to conditions and problems in developing countries, while the UNDP method was chosen as a comparison to determine the state of an inclusive economy if economic growth variables are not included in the calculations. The results of this study indicate that according to the ADB approach, all districts and cities in East Java are at a satisfactory level, whereas according to the UNDP approach, some districts are at high level and all cities and some districts are at the middle level.

Keywords: inclusive growth, Asian Development Bank, United Nations Development Programme.

1. INTRODUCTION

Every country/region has a goal to achieve prosperity for its people. economic welfare is when every individual needs in society can be properly fulfilled. To achieve this goal, the government has created various policies to achieve development. However, so far the direction of national development policies has focused more on achieving high economic growth to increase the production capacity of the Indonesian economy and also increase people's income. (BPS DIY, 2016).

Economic growth is an indicator of economic development in a country/region. However, high economic growth is still not a measure of the success of regional development in the goal of achieving community welfare if it is not balanced with improvements in other fields. Other indicators still need to be met, especially the welfare of the people in the area. Community welfare can be improved by reducing poverty and reducing gaps/inequalities that exist in society. Inequality or inequality that occurs in society is not only about income or wealth owned, but also inequality of opportunities for access to education, health, etc. (Yanti-Sitorus & Marsinta-Arsani, 2018). There is no guarantee about the same benefits that are felt by all people in the presence of high economic growth. Based on this, several international institutions such as the Asian Development Bank (ADB) and the United Nation Development Program (UNDP) have created a formula for calculating economic growth that emphasizes equality and equality of opportunity for all levels of society. This formula is called inclusive economic growth.

The calculation of inclusive economic growth is not only carried out to look at conditions nationally but also regionally at the province and cities/district level to find out how open the opportunities for the access needed by the community can be reached by all levels of society. One of the provinces that has the ideals and goals of increasing equity and economic growth and the welfare of the people of East Java by realizing easy access. This is stated in the East Java Provincial Long-Term Development Plan 2005-2025. In the compiled stages, 2015 - 2019 is the third stage or the consolidation stage of the development strategy implemented in the province of East Java. Whereas in the East Java RPJMD 2014-2019.

The purpose of this study is to present an analysis of the inclusive economic growth of districts/cities in the province of East Java in 2015-2019 through the methods created by the Asian Bank Development (ADB) and the United Nation Development Program (UNDP).

According to Prastyantoko, et al. (2012) inclusive economic development is the development that is intended for all people, regardless of background and differences. Inclusive economic growth is growth that not only creates new economic opportunities but also ensures that all people can have the same opportunities (Ali and Son, 2017). According to Chakrabarty (2009), the approach of inclusive economic growth must be inherent, sustainable, and can reduce the gap between rich and poor. According to BPS (2016), inclusive growth is a growth process that ensures equal access to economic opportunities for all social segments regardless of the circumstances of each individual.

According to Wulan Retno Hapsari (2019), Economic growth can be said to be inclusive if it can improve the function of social opportunities which depends on two factors, namely the average opportunity available to the community and how these opportunities are shared with the community. Klasen (2010) emphasizes the importance of recognizing growth which can be categorized as inclusive growth through two possibilities. The first is the process, economic growth involves public participation so that it can be classified as inclusive. The second is the outcome, namely the extent to which the results of the growth can benefit the majority of people, the second possibility is similar to the pro-poor growth concept.

McKinley (2012) states that inclusive growth works when people gain access to services that improve their ability to seize economic opportunities so that they are ready to be employed. These services include health, education, clean water, and hygiene. Increased human resource development will increase their ability to be actively involved in creating growth and increasing people's income so that it can accelerate the rate of economic growth. The characteristics of inclusive economic growth according to McKinley (2012) are:

- 1. can be felt by the whole population
- 2. equal / higher growth for the poor
- 3. are inclusive in all sectors

4. inclusive means that the tendency of population equality is decreasing

5. inequality and poverty have eroded over time

6. the diminishing direct role of government

Economic development is a multidimensional process that involves major changes in social structures, institutionalized mental attitudes, and national institutions including accelerating economic growth, reducing inequality, and eradicating absolute poverty.

One indicator that can be used to view economic development is the existence of economic growth. Economic growth is an increase in per capita output continuously over a long period. Economic growth is a process or a picture of the economy from time to time, this capability is also an indicator of a country's ability to provide goods and services to its population. The capability of this state grows along with technological advances, institutional adjustments, and ideologies that are needed (Kuznets, 1995).

Based on the Neo-Classical economic growth theory by Sollow-Swan, economic growth depends on the availability of production factors, namely population, labor, and capital accumulation, and also depends on technological advances. This theory views the assumptions that underlie classical economic theory, namely that the economy is at the level of full utilization and full employment. In this theory, it means that the economy will continue to develop depending on the increase in population, capital accumulation, and existing technological advances (Lincolin Arsyad, 2010).

The classical economic growth theory by Sollow-Swan caused several criticisms so that the endogenous theory proposed by Paul Michael Romer emerged. This theory has many similarities with the neoclassical theory, but this theory has a broader perspective, technology, science, and also the quality of human resources is important part of this theory because of the existence of technology, science, and quality human resources. then the economy will not experience the law of diminishing returns as in the neo-classical theory but will continue to increase.

The concept of inclusion originates from the concept of pro-poor growth or only focuses on people living in poverty. The concept of pro-poverty was introduced by Kakwani and Pernia (2000) which was later developed into a non-income element (Ranieri and Ramos, 2013). The concept of inclusive economic growth has a broader concept, namely development that can be felt by all elements of society. However, these two concepts are interrelated because, in reality, economic growth is often only enjoyed by the rich. For this reason, the concept of inclusive economic growth is also often associated with improving people's living standards and reducing poverty.

Economic growth will show that a country has increased its capacity in managing the country, but this has not been able to solve various problems that exist within a country, especially the main problems, namely poverty, and inequality.

Ramos et al. (2013: 36-7) states that in most cases, the performance of the country's inclusiveness index can not only be explained by GDP growth. The absence of a relationship between economic growth and inclusiveness is evidence that normal growth alone has not been able to reduce poverty and inequality.

High economic growth does not guarantee that all people will get the same benefits. To obtain a measure that can explain an economic growth with various social problems in it, several international institutions such as the Asian Development Bank (ADB), the World Economic Forum (WEF), and the United Nation Development Program (UNDP) created a set of variables and formulas for measuring growth. alternative economy by emphasizing equal access to economic opportunities for all levels of society. This measure is known as inclusive economic growth.

2. METHODS

The UNDP method was chosen because there are quite large differences, namely whether there are aspects of economic growth that are taken into account. Economic growth is expected to improve people's welfare through a trickle-down effect, but according to research by Ramos et al. (2013), economic growth does not have a significant effect on the inclusive economy of a region. Meanwhile, in the ADB method, there is variable social protection security as a measure of social protection for the grassroots level.

2.1. Asian Development Bank

McKinley (2010) lists the aspects considered and the indicators used in calculating inclusive economics. However, the data available at the cities/district level is not as complete as the data at the national level, so it is necessary to modify indicators without reducing the essence of the existing variables by the research of Yanti-Sitorus & Marsinta-Arsani in 2018.

Table 1. Indicators for calculating the Asian Development Bank's inclusive economy

No	Variable	Indicator
1.	Economic	Growth of real GDP per capita
	growth	
		Share of industrial, service, and
		agricultural sectors
2.	Productive	Share of the industrial workforce
	workforce	
		Share of self-employed and unpaid
		family labor
3.	Access to	Percentage of households with
	economic	access to electricity
	infrastructure	
		Percentage of cell phone users
4.	poverty	Percentage of poor people
5.	Inequality	Gini coefficient
6.	Gender	Female Literacy Rate
	inequality	
		The ratio of girls to boys in junior
		high school (replaced by HDI of
		girls)
7.	Health and	Under-five mortality rate (replaced
	nutrition	by the percentage of children under
		five who have been immunized
		against measles)
		Death rate under 40 years (replaced
		by Life Expectancy)
		Percentage of children under five
8.	education	APM SD
		APM SMP
9.	Access to	Percentage of households with
	water and	access to improved water
	sanitation	
		Percentage of households with
		proper sanitation
10.	Social	Social protection security (specified
	protection	as the percentage of households
		receiving Raskin)



Data from the indicators above will be analyzed using the data normalization method to produce a composite index with weights (Terry McKinley).

normalization for indicators that have a positive effect:

$$Zij = 10 \left(\frac{Xijk - Xij(min)}{Xij(max) - Xij(min)} \right)$$
(1)

normalization for indicators that have a negative effect:

$$Zij = -10\left(\frac{Xijk - Xij(min)}{Xij(max) - Xij(min)}\right) + 10$$
(2)

For aspects that have more than one indicator, the value used is to find the average value.

the next step is to multiply that value by the weighted weight obtained from McKinley, 2010, and Ali Zhuang from ADB.

Table 2. Weights of inclusive economic calculation variables

No.	Aspects weighed	Weight	
1.	Economic growth	0.25	
2.	Productive employment	0.15	
3.	Economic infrastructure	0.1	
4.	Poverty	0.1	
5.	Inequality	0.1	
6.	Gender equality	0.05	
7.	Health and nutrition	0.05	
8.	Education	0.05	
9.	Access to water and sanitation	0.05	
10.	Social protection	0.1	

The results of these calculations will be scored based on their achievements. namely: (> 4) unsatisfactory; (4 -7) satisfying; (8 - 10) very satisfying.

2.2. United Nations Development Programme

As quoted from Ramos, et al. (2013), there are three variables used in the measurement of inclusive economic growth by UNDP. These variables are poverty with an indicator of the percentage of poor people, inequality with the Gini ratio indicator, employment with an inverse indicator of the ratio of employment to population however, due to limited data available at the regional level, the inverse indicator of the ratio of the ratio of employment to population is replaced by a rate open unemployment (Yanti-Sitorus & Marsinta-Arsani, 2018).

The data has different units so that it must be normalized by the formula:

$$Zi = \left(\frac{Xi - Xi(min)}{Xi(max) - Xi(min)}\right)$$
(3)

After the data has been normalized, the inclusive index value will be calculated using a simple average formula:

$$I = \frac{1}{2}(Zi \ poverty + Zi \ inequality + Zi \ labor)$$
(4)

The value of this inclusive index will be in the range of 0 - 1. The smaller the index value, the more inclusive the growth in the city/district will be.

Ramos, et al (2013) classifies the range of inclusive index levels as follows: 0 - 0.2 very high; 0.2 - 0.4 high; 0.4 - 0.6 medium; 0.6 - 0.8 low; 0.8 - 1 is bad.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. ADB Approach



Figure 1. The ADB approach to district/city inclusive economy index in East Java in 2015 and 2019

Based on the results of this study, which can be seen in the graph above, the inclusive index for cities/districts in East Java in 2015 and 2019 did not change quite drastically, all levels of the inclusion index remain at the satisfactory stage, nothing has decreased at the level of unsatisfactory and nothing has risen to a very satisfying level. It can even be seen in the graph that many cities and districts in East Java experienced a decline in the index from 2015 to 2019. The inclusiveness index of districts/cities in East Java has changed variously every year, all cities have decreased and increased. However, several areas need to be watched out for because of a continuous decline until 2019,

In the variable of economic growth every year the majority of cities/districts experience a decrease in index value, such as in 2016 only 6 districts experienced an increase, in 2017 only 7 districts/cities, in 2018 7



districts/cities and in 2019 9 districts/cities, the rest has decreased.

On the variable of productive labor, the highest and lowest values, namely Sidoarjo and Madura districts, have different patterns. The increase in the score value of the share of industrial labor and the decrease in the shared score of self-employed and paid family workers is assumed to be the number of the working-age population that is increasing and the absorption of labor is increasing but the amount of absorption is still not able to keep up with a large number of workers so that workers who cannot work in the industrial sector choose to be selfemployed or become family workers. an increase in the score of the share of industrial labor is followed by a decrease in the shared score of self-employed family workers, unpaid family workers,

The economic infrastructure variable is developing quite rapidly compared to other variables. It can be seen from the lowest index value on this variable that experienced a high increase, from 0.59 to 0.8 which initially showed that technology was developing rapidly and became a necessity for the community at large.

In the poverty variable, it is known that districts/cities in East Java can overcome the increase in poverty rates that occur in one year, as evidenced by the absence of consecutive increases, and each year fewer districts/cities experience an increase in poverty levels.

Inequality in districts/cities in East Java fluctuates, each year there are districts/cities that continue to experience increases, decrease, and some are constant. The majority of districts/cities show concurrent results between economic growth and the Gini coefficient. When economic growth increases, the Gini coefficient also increases. When economic growth slows down, the Gini coefficient slows down too. This shows that there is still a widening inequality in society when economic growth is increasing.

The movement of the index value on this gender variable occurs fluctuate, the majority of cities experience an increase and decrease every year, except for Pacitan district, Trenggalek district, Bondowoso district, Sidoarjo district, Lamongan district, Bangkalan district, Blitar city, and Batu city which have succeeded in increasing the variable index value. gender every year. Meanwhile, the index value is still low in the districts on the island of Madura.

Based on the results of this study, in 2019 the value of the districts/cities health variable index in East Java had the lowest value in Sampang district with a value of 0.35. While the highest value is 0.42 owned by Ponorogo district, Tulungagung district, Blitar district, and Blitar city. The districts in Madura island except Sumenep have

the smallest index value when compared to other districts/cities, the index value is only between 0.32-0.35.

The value of the education variable index every year does not change (increase or decrease) which is quite drastic, the highest decline was in Lumajang district in 2016. The value of the education variable index value can be said to be quite stable and high with the lowest value in 2019 being 0.41 and the highest 0.47. This shows that people's access to education during the 9 years of compulsory education, starting from Elementary School to Junior High School, is quite high.

The majority of districts and cities in East Java all have high index values, namely above 0.40. However, some districts still have an index value below 0.40. The district with the lowest index value is Bondowoso district which in 2019 had an index value of 0.34, this is caused by the percentage of people with access to proper sanitation of no more than 45%. Another district that has a low index value is Pacitan district which has an index value in 2019 of 0.36, in contrast to Bondowoso district, which has very low public access to proper sanitation, Pacitan district has 2 problems, both for access to clean water and to proper sanitation.

The social security variable can change drastically every year, with the highest year being in 2016 and the lowest year being 2019, 2019 there was a change in government policy through the Ministry of Social Affairs which previously assisted directly to the community in the form of rice, this year transferred to the Non-Cash Food Assistance program or delivered in the form of money amounting to Rp. 110,000. This was carried out because the distribution in the form of rice directly was deemed not on target.

3.2. UNDP Approach

If the ADB calculation has an index range of 1-10 and the higher the index, the better the value is, in contrast to the UNDP interpretation, which has a range of 0.1-1, and if the index value is closer to 0 then the area is more inclusive or better.

	Bad	Low	Intermediate	High	Very high
2015	-	5	25	8	-
2016	-	2	26	10	-
2017	-	-	24	14	-
2018	-	-	21	17	-
2019	-	-	16	22	-

Table 3. Number of districts/cities by the level of inclusiveness

In general, the inclusiveness index value in the cities/regencies of East Java has decreased or is getting better, every year there is always an increase in the level from low, to medium and even to high. In 2015, there were still 5 cities/regencies at the low level, 25 cities/regencies at the middle level, and 8 districts at the high level.

In 2016, two cities/districts, namely Sidoarjo and Madiun districts, were still at the low level, 26 cities/districts at the middle level, and ten districts at the high level. The three cities that were at the previous low level, namely the city of Kediri, the city of Surabaya, and the city of Batu have moved up to the middle level. Then Pamekasan Regency, Situbondo regency, and Bangkalan Regency this year rose to a high level. Meanwhile, one district, namely Trenggalek, which was initially at a high level, this year fell to the middle level due to rising inequality and unemployment.

In 2017, there are no cities/regencies that exist at a low level. At the middle level, there are 24 cities/regencies and at the high level, there are 14 districts. In 2018, 5 districts rose at a high level, namely Ponorogo Regency, Malang Regency, Madiun Regency, Ngawi Regency, and Lamongan Regency. However, 2 districts fell at the middle level, namely Kediri and Bondowoso districts, this reduction in inclusiveness was due to an increase in the inequality rate (Gini ratio) and also an increase in the unemployment rate.

In 2019, 2 districts, namely Kediri and Bondowoso districts, which have experienced a decrease in the level of inclusiveness to the middle level this year, have returned to high levels. In addition, 3 other districts have risen to high levels, namely Trenggalek, Jember, and Magetan. Viewed as a whole, the regions that are at a



Figure 2. The districts/cities inclusive economy index of the UNDP approach in East Java in 2015 and 2019

high level in 2019 are all districts, while all cities are still at the middle level.

Seen in the graph above regarding the development of the inclusion index for cities/districts in East Java in 2015 and 2019, shows that almost all cities/districts experienced a decrease in the index (in this case it means becoming more inclusive), except for the city of Blitar which experienced an increase in the index value. And there are also several cities that experience very few and almost invisible index changes, namely Banyuwangi Regency, Madiun Regency, and Sumenep Regency, of these three districts Banyuwangi, is still at the middle level.

Based on the area of residence, ADB and UNDP calculations show that calculations using the ADB method are more volatile or that there are increases and decreases each year. Whereas UNDP, the average inclusiveness index value tends to increase, it does not experience a decrease, it's just that the city in 2019 has the same value or remains the previous year.

In the district economic growth variable has a higher average index compared to cities, this is due to the share of agriculture which is more in the district than in cities, and the share of industry in several districts that can compete with cities such as Sidoarjo Regency which is a district with the highest number of industries in East Java.

The average index value of the productive labor force variable in cities is higher when compared to districts. This shows that industry in cities is more able to absorb labor, although districts such as Sidoarjo have a very large number of industries with high labor absorption, in other districts, there are still many people who have not been able to work in industry and choose to work on their own and become an unpaid family worker.

The economic infrastructure variable shows that cities have a higher index value, households with access to electricity in several districts are still not maximal or not 100%, while the majority of cities are 100% and for information technology, namely mobile phones, more city people use it. The average poverty variable index shows that cities are higher than districts, this indicates that poverty in cities is lower than in districts.

The inequality index between cities and districts is relatively the same or what is the highest value, namely 1 (inequality weights 10%).

Gender equality between districts and cities shows that cities have a higher index, which means that women or gender equality between men and women are seen as better in cities.

The average health index in cities is higher than in districts, but the difference is not that great. Health in East Java can be said to be quite evenly distributed but still tends to have a fixed value so that it still needs to be improved.

The district and city education index scores are the same, except that in 2015 the city had a higher value than decreases and has a fixed value until 2019. Because this education indicator refers to the 9-year compulsory education program reviewed from the APM SD and SMP, it can be It is seen that the 9-year compulsory education program has been implemented evenly in both districts and cities.

The value of the city's basic infrastructure index was again higher than that of districts, this is because several districts had the lowest index of basic infrastructure variables such as Pacitan and Bondowoso districts. Meanwhile, the average city has a high index with a percentage of the population with access to proper water and sanitation that is above 90%.

The social security variable shows that the district index is much higher than that of cities. This is in line with the higher percentage of poor people in the district so that the amount of social protection insurance issued by the government is also higher in districts compared to cities.

The poverty variable in UNDP shows that districts have a higher index than cities, this indicates that the poverty rate in districts is higher than in cities. Same as the results for the ADB approach.

With a smaller range under the UNDP approach, inequality in cities has a higher value, which means that the inequality rate in cities is greater than that in districts. However, in the last year, inequality in cities has decreased while in districts it has increased.

Cities have a higher labor force index value when compared to districts, this shows that cities have more open unemployment rates when compared to districts.

4. CONCLUSION

Through the calculation of the inclusive index for cities/districts in East Java in 2015 and 2019 did not experience a drastic change, all levels of the inclusion index remained at a satisfactory stage, none fell to an unsatisfactory level and none rose in a very satisfying level. Many cities and regencies in East Java experienced a decrease in the index from 2015 to 2019. The inclusion index of districts/cities in East Java has changed variously every year, all cities have decreased and increased.

Based on the UNDP calculation method, in 2015 there were still cities and districts that were at a low level but had gradually moved up to the middle level, as well as several districts that were at the intermediate level have been able to move up to the high level. In 2017, there were no more cities and regencies that were low-level. In

2018, the number of cities and regencies at the middle level is still more than at the high level. However, in 2019, there were more districts at the high level than at the middle level.

Calculations using the ADB and UNDP methods show a difference, namely in the ADB method, the inclusiveness index has decreased several times, while in the UNDP method the majority has an increase in inclusiveness to an increase in level. This shows that the 3 main problems in welfare, namely poverty, inequality, and unemployment have gradually improved every year, while several indicators in the ADB method have fluctuated increases and decreases, such as the social security variable which has an indicator of the percentage of households receiving Raskin, the indicator. this can change quite drastically depending on the government policy or the programs being implemented.

Districts and cities also have several differences in index scores, districts have index values for economic growth, social security, inequality (through the UNDP approach), and employment (through the UNDP approach) which shows that districts have higher real income per capita and share of 3 main sectors in the district. Compared to cities, the distribution of social security programs is more, lower inequality and also lower unemployment when compared to cities. However, the index value of productive labor, economic infrastructure, poverty, gender equality, and basic infrastructure is higher in cities, this shows that cities can absorb more labor in industry, more adequate economic and basic infrastructure, lower relative poverty, and higher gender equality. Meanwhile, the education and health index scores tended to be the same in both districts and cities.

Based on this research, East Java which has the vision to make the province of East Java an inclusive area in the 2014-2019 RPJMD has been quite successful because in the ADB method all cities and districts are at a satisfactory level and according to UNDP calculations there are no more districts. and cities that are at a low level.

AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS

Rahmawati, Farida	: Responsible for su data collection, processing, and data	pervising data analysis
Ramadhani, Nadiah	: Develop instruments, Doing data processing, and data analysis	research research Research



ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thank you to all related parties who supported the publication of this article

REFERENCES

- [1] Amalina Sholihah, Dyah Hapsari (Staff of the Ministry of Trade and Master Student of Economics Study Program, FI, Hutagaol, MP (PFI Staff, & Asmara, A. (PFI Staff (2013). Inclusive Growth: Phenomenes Of Inclusive Growth In West And East Part Of Indonesia. Economic and Development Policy, 2, 85–122. Https://doi.org/http://103.10.105.65/index.php/jekp /article/view/19947
- [2] Aslam, A., Naveed, A., & Shabbir, G. (2020). Is it an institution, digital or social inclusion that matters for inclusive growth? A panel data analysis. Quality & Quantity, 0123456789. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-020-01008-3
- [3] Badrudin, R., Kusuma, MW, & Wardani, RY (2018). The inclusive economic development model in Sulawesi island. Economic Journal of Emerging Markets, 10 (2), 128–136. https://doi.org/10.20885/ejem.vol10.iss2.art2
- Bakker, M., & Messerli, HR (2017). Inclusive growth versus pro-poor growth: Implications for tourism development. Tourism and Hospitality Research, 17 (4), 384–391. https://doi.org/10.1177/1467358416638919
- [5] Regional Statistics Center (BAPPEDA DIY) and Yogyakarta Provincial Statistics Agency. (2016). Analysis of Inclusive Economic Growth in the Special Region of Yogyakarta 2011-2015. Final Report of BAPPEDA DIY, III.
- [6] BPS. (2016). BPS catalog. Semarang Regency in Figures 2016.
- [7] Cahyadi, NMAK, Sasongko, S., & Saputra, PMA (2018). Inclusive growth and leading sector in Bali. Economic Journal of Emerging Markets, 10 (1), 99–110. https://doi.org/10.20885/ejem.vol10.iss1.art11
- [8] Fourie, F. (2014). How inclusive is economic growth in South Africa? September 2014, 1–5.
- [9] Hapsari, WR (PS Agency (2019). Inclusive Economic Growth Analysis Of District / City In Central Java Province. Sukowati Research and Development Journal, 3 (10), 106–116. Https://doi.org/10.32630/sukowati.v3i1.121
- [10] Khan, A., Khan, G., Safdar, S., & Munir, S. (2016).
 Measurement and Determinants of Inclusive Growth: A Case Study of Pakistan (1990- Author

(s): Azra Khan, Gulzar Khan, Sadia Safdar, Sehar Munir and Zubaria Andleeb Source: The Pakistan Development Review, Winter 2016, Vol. 55, No. 4, Papers.55 (4).

- [11] Majidah, YP, Ananda, CF, & Santoso, DB (2019). Analysis of the Government Role for Inclusive Growth of East Java Province, Indonesia. Russian Journal of Agricultural and Socio-Economic Sciences, 94 (10), 158–165. https://doi.org/10.18551/rjoas.2019-10.21
- [12] McKinley, T. (2010). Inclusive growth criteria and indicators: an inclusive growth index for diagnosis of country progress. Asian Development Bank Working Paper, 14, 1–34. http://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&btnG=Se arch&q=intitle:Inclusive+Growth+Criteria+and+In dicators+:+An+Inclusive+Growth+Index+for+Dia gnose+of+Country+Progress#0
- [13] Mitra, A., & Das, D. (2018). Inclusive Growth: Economics as if People Mattered. Global Business Review, 19 (3), 756–770. https://doi.org/10.1177/0972150917713840 (Eds.), Proceedings of the Computer Aided Verification, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2008, pp. 135–148. DOI: <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-70545-</u> <u>1 14</u>
- [14] Montmasson-Clair, G., & Das-Nair, R. (2019). South Africa's renewable energy experience: In SR and IV Jonathan Klaaren (Ed.), Competition Law and Economic Regulation in Southern Afric (pp. 189–214). Wits University Press.
- [15] Nawab, S., & Naqvi, H. (2016). Pakistan Institute of Development Economics, Islamabad The Idea of Inclusive Growth and Development Policy Author (s): Syed Nawab Haider Naqvi Source: The Pakistan Development Review, Vol. 51, No. 1 (Spring 2012), pp. 1-21 Published by: Pakist. 51 (1), 1–21.
- [16] Nizam, R., Karim, ZA, Rahman, AA, & Sarmidi, T. (2020). Financial inclusiveness and economic growth: new evidence using a threshold regression analysis. Economic Research-Ekonomska Istrazivanja, 33 (1), 1465–1484. https://doi.org/10.1080/1331677X.2020.1748508
- [17] Pratama, R. (2015). Economic Growth, Pro-Poor Growth and Inclusive Growth from Social Expenditures Perspective: Evidence From 33 Provinces in Indonesia on 2006-2012. August.
- [18] Pukuh, N., & Fadlun Widyasthika, H. (2017). When Growth is Inclusive in Indonesia? Journal of Development Planning: The Indonesian Journal of Development Planning, 1 (3), 195–209. https://doi.org/10.36574/jpp.v1i3.19



- [19] Saad-Filho, a. (2010). Growth, poverty, and inequality: From Washington Consensus to inclusive growth. Working Papers, 60 (100). http://www.un.org/esa/desa/papers/2010/wp100_20 10.pdf [4] Bakker, M., & Messerli, HR (2017). Inclusive growth versus pro-poor growth: Implications for tourism development. Tourism and Hospitality Research, 17 (4), 384–391. https://doi.org/10.1177/1467358416638919
- [20] Sabir, S. (2019). Fiscal policy, institutions, and inclusive growth: evidence from the developing Asian countries. International Journal of Social Economics, 46 (6), 822–837. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSE-08-2018-0419
- [21] Siwage Dharma Negara. (2013). Building an Inclusive and Sustainable Indonesian Economy. Indonesian Society, 39 (1), 247–262. http://jmi.ipsk.lipi.go.id/index.php/jmiipsk/article/v iewFile/319/190
- [22] UNDP. (2017). Strategy for Inclusive and Sustainable Growth. 1–147.
- [23] Vera Yanti Sitorus, A., & Marsinta Arsani, A. (2018). A Comparative Study of Inter-Provincial Inclusive Economic Growth in Indonesia 2010-2015 with Approach Methods of ADB, WEF, and UNDP. Journal of Development Planning: The Indonesian Journal of Development Planning, 2 (1), 64–77. https://doi.org/10.36574/jpp.v2i1.32
- [24] Winanda, R., Santoso, DB, & Ekawaty, M. (2020). Analysis Of Leading Industrial Sector In Accelerating Inclusive Economic Growth In Lampung Province. 144 (Afbe 2019), 325–328. https://doi.org/10.2991/aebmr.k.200606.056
- [25] Zheng, J., & Shen, C. (2019). Domestic demandbased economic globalization and inclusive growth. China Political Economy, 2 (1), 136–156. https://doi.org/10.1108/cpe-04-2019-0003