

DISSIMILARITY INDEX , LABOR SUPPLY AND LENGTH OF SCHOOLING ON WAGE GAP IN INDONESIA

Yunisvta^{1*}, Muhammad Teguh², Rosmiyati Chodijah³, Imelda⁴

Development Economics, Faculty of Economic, Universitas Sriwijaya^{1,2,3,4} yunisvita@unsri.ac.id^{1*}, mteguh@unsri.ac.id², roossaleh@gmail.com³, imeldazainal@unsri.ac.id⁴

Abstract

Purpose: Analyzing the effect of worker characteristics based on length of schooling, LFPR and dissimilarity in each province on the wage gap in Indonesia 2015-2018.

Research Methodology: The model for estimating the wage gap is a regression equation with panel data, namely the level of wages, length of schooling, Labor Force Participation Rate (LFPR), and the number of male and female workers based on the type of occupation of various provinces in Indonesia in 2015 - 2018. The analytical method used is the OLS (*Ordinary Least Square*) using eviews software.

Results: The wage gap in Indonesia, based on Index D does not significantly affect it and the coefficient is also very small. The most dominant factor affecting the wage gap is the difference in school length.

Limitations: This research does not include other aspects of human capital, namely skills or experience of workers. The wage gap can also be explained more clearly if we look at the economic growth in each province and it will be more comprehensive if all provinces can be analyzed.

Contribution: This research will be very useful to enrich the discrimination of workers in Labor Economics.

Keywords: Wage gap, Dissimilarity index, length of schooling, LFPR

1. INTRODUCTION

Gender-based labor market differences have attracted the attention of researchers, policy makers and international institutions. Wage or income gaps exist between male and female workers in both industrialized countries and the transition from agriculture to industry. In America, the female to male wage ratio was between 79 and 81 percent between 2000-2010; in EU countries the wage gap was between 15 and 17 percent during 1994-2006. The wage gap in Italy and Portugal is only one digit but in Cyprus, Estonia and the United Kingdom it is more than 20 percent (Banerjee, 2014). This finding occurs in all countries including Indonesia, where the wage gap in 2015-2018 shows an increasing trend of around 11 percent (BPS, 2019).

In essence, the labor wage gap according to gender is still a topic of discussion and a problem in every country in the world, one of which is Indonesia. The labor wage gap according to sex is the difference in the average wage that occurs between men and women or a difference that shows that the wages of female workers are lower than that of men. Anker (1998) states that women's wages are lower than men in almost all countries in the world, and this wage difference occurs in all wage patterns, both daily, weekly and monthly and occurs in almost all non-agricultural and manufacturing sectors.

This gender wage gap can also have a negative impact on the domestic product of a country. Based on research in Australia it was found that the average impact of the gender wage gap on gross domestic product per capita was -0.507, which means that each 1 percent increase in the average wage gap leads to a decrease in economic growth of 0.507 percent (Cassels et al. 2009).



There are several characteristic factors that cause differences in wage application between male and female workers. The first factor causing the wage gap is the level of education. According to Jacob (2006), the low wages of female workers compared to male workers are due to differences in human capital, namely education. Education level is one of the factors that influence the quality of human resources and in turn will affect the level of wages received by workers. The higher the level of education a worker has, the higher the wages they receive. For example, a person who has graduated from high school will receive a higher wage than someone who only graduated from elementary school.

Changes in education levels facilitate female's entry into the labor market. The more educated female, the higher the level of participation. In Indonesia, the phenomenon of increasing the level of education of female in 2015-2018 accompanied the increase in men. However, if we look further, it is found that there are differences in the level of education of the male and female population based on the average length of schooling (Table 1). In general, in all provinces, female take 7.35 - 7.72 years of education, which is still shorter than male 8.35 - 8.62 years. This means that the level of education of female in Indonesia is still lower than that of male.

	Average Length of Schooling (years)							
Province		Ma	ale			Fer	nale	
	2015	2016	2017	2018	2015	2016	2017	2018
Aceh	9.16	9.19	9.36	9.49	8.4	8.54	8.62	8.71
North Sumatra	9.42	9.48	9.55	9.61	8.66	8.78	8.96	9.08
West Sumatra	8.63	8.72	8.86	8.87	8.32	8.49	8.6	8.66
Riau	8.8	8.81	9.02	9.12	8.17	8.36	8.49	8.71
Jambi	8.46	8.5	8.59	8.67	7.44	7.63	7.7	7.77
South Sumatra	8.17	8.18	8.3	8.32	7.37	7.48	7.67	7.68
Bengkulu	8.7	8.72	8.76	8.93	7.89	8.01	8.16	8.28
Lampung	7.92	7.93	8.08	8.14	7.19	7.33	7.49	7.5
Bangka Belitung Islands	7.99	8	8.1	8.17	7.14	7.31	7.48	7.51
Riau Islands	9.86	9.87	10	10.01	9.36	9.46	9.57	9.6
Jakarta	11.21	11.34	11.43	11.46	10.2	10.42	10.61	10.63
West Java	8.36	8.37	8.59	8.6	7.35	7.52	7.69	7.71
Central Java	7.59	7.68	7.79	7.86	6.5	6.65	6.78	6.87
DI Yogyakarta	9.64	9.67	9.74	9.87	8.4	8.6	8.73	8.8
East Java	7.75	7.81	7.93	7.96	6.57	6.69	6.78	6.85
Banten	8.86	8.9	9.07	9.18	7.66	7.82	7.98	8.04
Bali	9.18	9.2	9.35	9.5	7.33	7.53	7.75	7.82
West Nusa Tenggara	7.51	7.54	7.63	7.81	6.02	6.13	6.27	6.36
East Nusa Tenggara	7.27	7.32	7.46	7.62	6.61	6.75	6.87	7
West Kalimantan	7.42	7.49	7.59	7.61	6.43	6.44	6.49	6.62
Central Kalimantan	8.43	8.49	8.62	8.7	7.59	7.73	7.91	8
South Kalimantan	8.29	8.38	8.45	8.46	7.23	7.4	7.52	7.53
East Kalimantan	9.57	9.61	9.75	9.86	8.68	8.82	8.93	9.06
North Kalimantan	9.12	9.14	9.27	9.52	8.25	8.43	8.44	8.69
North Sulawesi	8.9	8.93	9.1	9.24	8.86	9	9.19	9.24
Central Sulawesi	8.27	8.38	8.56	8.76	7.66	7.84	8	8.27
South Sulawesi	7.97	8.08	8.31	8.32	7.34	7.46	7.63	7.76
Southeast Sulawesi	8.79	8.83	8.98	9.13	7.7	7.86	7.95	8.26
Gorontalo	6.76	6.82	6.98	7.14	7.34	7.41	7.56	7.76

Table 1: Average Length of Schooling by Gender in Indonesia

503	6th Sriwij Busine	aya H ss Co	Econo onfero	omics ence (, Acc (SEA	ount BC)	ing, a 2020	and
	West Sulawesi	7.33	7.4	7.55	7.66	6.71	6.91	7.0
	Maluku	9.42	9.47	9.63	9.75	8.91	9.08	9.1
	North Maluku	8.91	8.99	9.05	9.15	7.8	8.06	8.1

9.81

6.9

8.41

9.79

6.85

8.35

Source: Sakernas, BPS, 2018

West Papua

Papua

Indonesia

Several recent studies have shown that female's participation in the labor market is increasing. The level of participation in Indonesia shows a fluctuating situation but the trend is increasing (Table 2). In 2018 the LFPR for male was 82.68 percent, increasing slightly to 83.13 in the following year. Meanwhile, the LFPR for female in the same period did not change at 51.88 percent. In general, the LFPR (Labor Force Participation Rate) for male is still much higher than the LFPR for female, where the LFPR for male is higher, around 1.5 times the LFPR for female.

9.89

7.02

8.56

10.09

7.26

8.62

6.71

5.02

7.35

7.08

9.17

8.17

6.9

5.44

7.65

6.8

5.32

7.5

7.28

9.41

8.28

7.01

5.7

7.72

Table 2: LFPR based on Gender in Indonesia

Gender	August 2018	February 2019	August 2019
Male	82.68	83.18	83.13
Female	51.88	55.50	51.89
National	67.26	69.32	67.49

Source: Labor Market Indicators, BPS, 2019

Based on occupation, women workers dominate in types of work (1) Professional, technician and related occupations; (3) Clerical and related occupations; (4) Sales worker and (5) Services worker. Male workers are more dominant in the type of work (2) Managerial and supervisory occupations; (6) Agriculture, forestry, hunting and fishing workers and laborers; (7) Production workers, operation of machinery workers; and (8) others.

Table 5. Tereentage of Workers by Occupa	Table 5. Tereentage of Workers by Occupation and Ochuci in Indonesia					
Occupation	KBJI Code	Male	Female			
Professional, technician and related occupations	1	5.77	10.59			
Managerial and supervisory occupations	2	1.95	0.86			
Clerical and related occupations	3	5.21	7,18			
Sales worker	4	14.53	26.53			
Services worker	5	4.22	9.66			
Agriculture, forestry, hunting and fishing workers and laborers	6	27.96	24.35			
Production workers, operation of machinery workers	7	37.57	20.68			
Others	8	2.79	0.15			

Table 3. Percentage of Workers by Occupation and Gender in Indonesia

Source: Labor Market Indicators, BPS, 2019

The dominance of female in this type of work is 2 times more than that of male workers in this type of work (Table 3). The highest percentage of female workers is in the type of work (4) Sales worker, namely 26.53 percent, while male workers are mostly in the type of work (7) Production workers, operation of machinery workers, namely 37.37 percent.

In earlier empirical studies, discrimination in the labor market was calculated by applying the standard decomposition. Oaxaca (1973) studied the gender wage gap in the US labor market. He found that the wage gap between females and males is quite large. In the same year, Blinder (1973) exploited US



data to explore the gender and race wage gap. He concluded that there is a difference in wages across different genders and races. Both studies focused on the contribution of discrimination to wage differentials in the labor market. Since then, many more empirical studies have applied the Blinder-Oaxaca decomposition analysis to explore various aspects of discrimination. Coelli (2014), the main finding of this investigation is that occupational differences do contribute to the gender wage gap in Australia when occupation is defined at an appropriately disaggregated level. Joonmo Cho & Donghun Cho (2011) finds out that the wage differential between the formal and the informal sector found among female workers does not appear in the group of male workers. Based on this empirical result, their study speculates that the dual labor market structure aggravates the overall gender earning gap, as female workers are penalized more by locating themselves in the informal labor market than are male workers.

The main objective of this research is to find out whether the characteristics of provinces, especially the characteristics of workers based on length of schooling, LFPR and dissimilarity in each province are the causes of the wage gap in Indonesia 2015-2018.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Human capital per worker h usually uses a measure average years of schooling of the population of working age (age at over 15 or under 65 years). This measure is considered the most appropriate because human capital is reflected of the exponential function of mean years of schooling (Savvides, 2009). Moreover, these parameters can be used to see the return of schooling from micro studies. This study was conducted to see the effect of increasing school years to an increase in individual wages.

Muhyiddin (2018) states that differences in wages paid to workers arise because there are differences in *human capital* and differences in types of work. In addition to wages, many companies impose compensation *non-wage* or *fringe benefits* or *benefits in kind*. Wage and non-wage compensation are analyzed in theory *hedonic*. Philosophically, *hedonic* comes from the hedonian concept which hypothesizes that the population pursues utility and rejects disutility. The size of the wages is determined by labor market conditions. The difference in the amount of wages is due to differences in *human capital*, namely workers who have a certain education and as compensation, these workers will get wages that are not the same as workers who have other education.

Human capital per labor h usually uses a measure average years of schooling of the population of working age (age at over 15 or under 65 years). This measure is considered the most appropriate because human capital is reflected of the exponential function of mean years of schooling (Savvides, 2009). Moreover, these parameters can be used to see *the return of schooling* from micro studies. This study was conducted to see the effect of increasing school years to an increase in individual wages.

In addition to wages, many companies impose compensation *non-wage* or *fringe benefits* or *benefits in kind*. Wage and non-wage compensation are analyzed in theory *hedonic*. Philosophically, *hedonic* comes from the hedonian concept which hypothesizes that the population pursues utility and rejects disutility. The size of the wages is determined by labor market conditions. The difference in the amount of wages is due to differences in *human capital*, namely workers who have a certain education and as compensation, these workers will get wages that are not the same as workers who have other education.

The equation Ln (W_0) or log income is a constant function of Ln (W_0) and S is the length of *schooling*. Income can vary according to work experience or age. The *life cycle* wage pattern has an inverted U pattern, so the equation becomes:

$$LnW_0 = \beta_0 + \beta_1 S + \beta_2 A + \beta_3 A^2 + \varepsilon$$
 (1)

Where: $LnW_0 = Log Wage$ $\beta_0 = LnY coefficient$ $\beta_1 = School coefficient$



S = length of schooling (years) $\beta_2 =$ Work Experience Coefficient A = Work Experience

 $\beta_3 =$ Work Experience Coefficient Quadratic

 A^2 = Work Experience Squared

Mincer Model is known as the Mincer *wage equation (mincerian wage equation)*. According to Mincer's model of time in education is used as the main determination to increase income (Mincer, 1958).

Hanushek (2020) and Ahmad (2015) say that the production function of education is closely related to the labor market and as a determinant of workers' wages. The reason is because by following the education process it will increase knowledge, skills and expertise. Likewise, Azhar *et al.* (2018), Megasari and Purnastuti (2016) who concluded that education level has an effect on income, and income has an effect on work experience. The higher the level of education, the greater the return on investment in education received. Toutkoushian & Paulsen (2016) and Psacharopoulus and Patrinos (2004), argue that investment in education behaves with investment and physical capital, where there are positive and considerable financial benefits from education.

Differences in income and / or occupation are due to differences in human capital investment (Becker, 1993). Similarities in human capital will lead to similarities in occupation and income. When differences in occupation and income exist, is it due to different attributes of human capital, for example formal education, age, health, residence, presence of children and age, and marital status. Characteristics such as family attitudes and preferences (household utility), family income, national origin, or primary language are also important factors of human capital (Becker, 1993, Bloomquist, 1990, Kidd and Shannon, 1994).

The analysis of the difference in wage compensation can be explained in two ways; The market for risky jobs and the hedonic wage function. Suppose there are two types of jobs in the job market. Some jobs offer a very safe environment so that the chance of injury on this job is equal to zero. Other jobs offer a permanent risk environment so that the chances of injury in this job are equal to one.

It is assumed that workers have perfect information about the level of risk at each job. In other words, the worker knows whether he is working in a safe or risky job. As workers decide whether to accept job offers from risky companies or from safe companies, a company must also decide whether to provide a risky or safe work environment for its workers. The workers' decisions are indicated by their utilitarian function whereas the firm's choice will depend on the profit function.

Market compensation differentials equalize supply and demand and provide the necessary gratuities to attract the last worker hired by the company at risk. The difference in wage compensation and the number of workers working in risky jobs is determined by the intersection of the market supply and demand curves. The supply curve is ascending while the demand curve is decreasing. If the wage differential exceeds the equilibrium level, more people will work for the firm at risk than are demanded, so the wage compensation gap will fall. Likewise, if the wage differential is below the equilibrium level, too few workers will want to work in jobs at risk relative to demand, and the wage compensation differential will increase.

Now, through the hedonic wage function, it is assumed that workers do not like risk and suppose that there are many types of firms. The odds of injury on the job will be various values between 0 and 1. Different workers have different preferences for risk indicated by



indifference curves. The slope of the indifference curve shows how much wages must be increased to make voluntary workers change jobs more risky. To explain how a company chooses the type of environment it offers for its employment, it is shown with an isoprofit curve. This curve is ascending and concave in scope. Different companies have different isoprofit curves.

The job market marries risk-averse workers with firms that provide a safe environment; Workers who do not think about the risks will run into companies that find it difficult to provide a safe environment. This relationship between wages and job characteristics is called the hedonic wage function. Because workers do not like risk and because it is expensive to provide a safety factor, the hedonic wage function is an upward slope. The slope indicates the increase in wages offered by a slightly more risky job.

The key implications of this theory are summed up easily: As long as everyone in the population agrees on whether a particular job characteristic is "good" or "bad", good job characteristics are associated with low wage rates and bad job characteristics are associated with high wage rates. For example, a job that is physically demanding may be more unpleasant than other jobs, and is therefore expected to pay a higher wage rate.

His theory, however, suggests that markets compensate for wage differences measuring what is needed to make marginal workers accept certain jobs. If marginalized workers happen to like being hired in risky jobs or being told what to do at that job, the market wage differentials will go in an apparently wrong direction (Borjas, 2013).

The wage gap between male and female may arise due to gender differences in the assessment of certain aspects of work. Several empirical studies provide evidence that female prefer to work in certain jobs and firms, because they are associated with lower investment in job-specific training (Becker, 1971), less competitive environment (Niederle and Vesterlund, 2007), depreciation rate of human capital. lower levels (Gorlich and de Grip, 2009, and Polacheck, 1981), and more pleasant and family-friendly working conditions (Bender, Donohue, and Heywood, 2005; Budig and England, 2001). For this desire, the non-cash job characteristics of women seem willing to accept lower wages.

Ismail and Jajri (2012) in their observations in Malaysia found that differences in wages or income received by workers were caused by race, human capital and job characteristics, saying that workers who received training, had higher education, would be able to receive a higher salary. high when compared to workers who do not attend school as well as people who have more work experience for the various sectors of work they do. Likewise, Tanzel and Bircan (2010) show that the employment sector has an influence on the gap in determining the income received. In the case that occurred in Turkey, it shows or explains that someone who works in the public sector will receive much greater rewards in the form of money compared to someone who works in the private or special sector.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research uses secondary data obtained from the 2018 National Labor Force Survey (Sakernas). The data used are the level of wages, length of schooling, Labor Force Participation Rate (LFPR), and the number of men and women workers based on types of occupation of various provinces in Indonesia in 2015 - 2018.

A dissimilarity index was built to measure occupational segregation (Duncan and Duncan, 1955). First, the percentage of all workers in each province where each occupation group is calculated. This index is then half of the absolute total value of the difference between the specific locations of the distribution,

$$ID_{ij} = 0.5 \sum |F_{ij} / F_{j} - M_{ij} / M_{j}| (2)$$



where ID is the Dissimilarity index; F_i is the number of female workers in occupation i, M_i is the number of male workers in occupation i; F_j is the number of female workers in j province; M_j is the number of male workers in the province j.

The absolute value of the sum of the difference between the percentage distribution of males and females in each occupation is halved (because there are two groups of males and females) to produce values that range in the index from 0 (perfect integration) to 1 (perfect segregation). Then the multiple regression equation used in this study is:

$$L_nWG_{it} = \alpha + \beta_1 ID_{it} + \beta_2 LS_{it} + \beta_3 LFPR_{it} + \mu_{it}$$
(3)

where: WG is the difference in income; ID is the Dissimilarity Index; LS is the length of school; LFPR is the level of labor force participation; i is the province; t is the year (2015-2018) and μ is the error rate.

Equation (3) is a general form of the panel data regression equation. The analytical method used is the OLS (*Ordinary Least Square*) using eviews software. The use of panel data has several advantages, among others (Baltagi, 2005); able to control individual heterogeneity; provides more information, is more varied, reduces collinearity between variables, increases degrees of freedom, and is more efficient; Better for decision-making studies; able to identify and measure effects that simply cannot be obtained from *cross section* puredata or puredata *time series*; and can test and build more complex behavioral models.

The existing research model will be estimated using 3 approaches, namely the *Common Effect, Fixed Effect* and the Random Effect approach. To find out whether the wage gap is influenced by dissimilarity, length of schooling and LFPR, a model specification test was conducted.

In order to choose the most appropriate model to use from the three models above, several tests can be carried out, including the Chow test; Breusch-Pagan test or LM test; and the Hausman test. (1) Chow test is a test to determine *Common Effects* or *Fixed effects* model that is most appropriate to use in estimating panel data; (2) LM test used to test whether *Common Effects* or *Random Effects* are most appropriate for estimating panel data; (3) The Hausman test is a statistical test to choose whether themodel *Fixed effects* (FEM) or *Random Effects* (REM)is most appropriate to use in estimating panel data. The difference between the two is the presence or absence of a correlation between the individual effects and the independent variables. The Hausman test aims to find out whether there is a correlation as mentioned above. The null hypothesis is that there is no correlation, REM estimators are consistent and efficient. While the FEM estimator is consistent but inefficient. If there is a correlation, the FEM estimator is consistent and efficient but the REM estimator is inconsistent. In addition to the test method, model selection can also be done by testing standard errors. The model with the smallest standard error value is selected. All tests are carried out using the Eviews program (Richard, 2013).

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The selection of the first best regression model was carried out by using the Fixed Effect method significance test Chow test. The following table is the result of the Chow test:

Table 4: ChowResults						
Effects Test	Statistic	df	Prob.			
Cross-section F	2.015967	(26.78)	0.0095			
Source: processed data						



Chow test which is shown in Table 4 gives the conclusion that the hypothesis choosing the model is *Common Effect* rejected. This conclusion is based on the value of the probability of cross section F smaller than alpha 5 percent (0.0095 < 0.05). Thus, based on the Chow test, the best model used to analyze in this study is themodel*Fixed Effect*.

Second, the significance test of the Fixed Effect method and the Random Effect method. Based on The Hausman test in Table 5 shows that the probability value of *random cross section* is 0.6163, this means that it is greater than 5 percent alpha, so Ho is not rejected and the model chosen is *random effect*.

Table 5: HausmanResults					
Test Summary	Chi- Sq.statistics	Chi-Sq. df	Prob.		
Cross-section random	1.793775	3	0.6163		

Source: processed data

Third, because the Chow and Hausman tests give inconsistent results where Chow and Hausman estimates show differences in the results of selecting the best model, so the best model is determined using the LM test.

Table 6: LM Test Results						
Null(no rand. Effect) Alternative	Cross- section One-sided	Period One-sided	Both			
Breusch-Pagan	1.275788	0.700678	1.976466			
Honda	(0.2587) -1.129508	(0.4026) 0.837065	(0.1598) -0.206788 (0.5810)			
King-Wu	(0.8707) -1.129508 (0.8707)	0.837065	(0.3819) 0.429299 (0.3330)			
GHM			(0.3339) 0.700678 (0.3774)			

Source: processed data

Estimated results from the *Breusch-Pagan test* show that the value *Prob.Cross-section one-sided* greater than the significance level α (0.2587> 0.05) so that H₀ is not rejected, which means that the best model according to the LM test is the Common *Effect Model*.

Based on the Chow, Hausman and LM tests, it can be seen that there are differences in results, the Chow test chooses the *Fixed Effect Model* as the best model while the Hausman test chooses the *Random Effect Model* as the best model. So for the final stage of selecting the best model using the LM test which selects the *Common Effect Model*. Thus the final model selection chooses the *Common Effect Model* as the best model.

The choice of the model must be supported by statistical results, based on statistical model comparisons showing that the *Fixed Effect Model (FEM)* is a model that can be interpreted statistically because almost all variables are partially significant, in contrast to the *Common Effect*



Model (CEM) and Random Effect Model (REM) which statistically cannot be interpreted in the discussion because all variables are declared partially insignificant, so that through consideration of these statistical results in order to be interpreted perfectly both in theory and in effect, the model chosen is the Fixed Effect Model (FEM).

The estimation results of panel data using the model *fixed effect* based on Table 7 can be written as follows:

Ln WG = - 0.000789 * ID - 1.125065 * LS - 0.012293 * LFPR + 14.63319 + [CX = F]

Table 7: Estimatio	n Result of Fix	ed Effect Mo	del	
Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
С	14.63319	0.603029	24.26615	0.0000
ID?	-0.000789	0.011155	-0.070733	0.9438
LS?	-1.125065	0.232033	-4.848728	0.0000
LFPR?	-0.012293	0.004104	-2.995425	0.0037
Fixed Effects (Cross)				
_ACEH - C	0.151367			
_NORTHSUMATERA - C	-0.170948			
_WESTSUMATERA - C	-0.848893			
_RIAU - C	-0.251767			
_JAMBI - C	0.314680			
_SOUTHSUMATERA - C	-0.239398			
_BENGKULU - C	-0.017785			
_LAMPUNG- C	-0.475383			
_BANGKABELITUNGISLANDS - C	0.300465			
_RIAUISLANDS - C	-0.198176			
_JAKARTA - C	0.562013			
_WESTJAVA - C	-0.708122			
_CENTRALJAVA - C	0.475494			
_YOGYAKARTA - C	-0.053245			
_EASTJAVA - C	0.151386			
_BANTEN - C	0.481071			
_BALI - C	0.266304			
_EASTNUSATENGGARA - C	-0.516302			
_WESTKALIMANTAN - C	0.831807			
_NORTHSULAWESI - C	-1.124913			
_SOUTHSULAWESI - C	0.216644			
_GORONTALO - C	-1.509741			
_WESTSULAWESI - C	0.076998			
_MALUKU- C- C	-0.807663			
_NORTHMALUKU - C.	0.228275			
_WESTPAPUAC	2.135759			
_PAPUA - C	0.730073			

Source: processed data

Based on the regression result equation, the average value of the (random error component random error component) is 14.63319. The Dissimilarity Index (ID), the difference in length of schooling (LS) and the difference in LFPR show a negative effect on the income differences between male and female workers (LNWG) in Indonesia. Of the three determinants of gender income differences, Index D does not significantly influence it and the coefficient is also very small. It can be stated that this variable has a very small and insignificant effect on the difference in income statistically.



The ability to explain the gender income gap by these three variables is 48.34 percent. The proportion of variations in income differences that can be explained by these 3 variables is less than 50 percent. More than 50 percent of the determinants that affect differences in income should be explained.

Referring to the regression coefficient value of each independent variable in the estimation result equation, it can be explained that assuming other factors are constant, the dissimilarity index coefficient of -0.000789 means that each increase in the index score by 1 percent will reduce the worker's income gap by 0.000789 percent. If the difference in length of schooling for male and female workers increases by 1 percent, it will also reduce the worker's income gap by 1.125065 percent. Each increase in the difference between men's and women's LFPR by 1 percent will reduce the income gap for workers by 14.63319 percent. So, the factor that most dominantly affects the income gap is the difference in school length. In the case of the length of school coefficient being negative, this is due to the influence of factors that are not statistically observed. When the education level of male workers is higher than the education of female workers it causes the income gap to decrease, this is because there are other important factors that are not observed such as continuous working years and age of workers.

The findings in this study contradict studies which show that occupational segregation is a major contributor to the gender wage gap (Blau and Kahn 2007; England, Hermsen, and Cotter 2000). At the same time, the decline in occupational segregation was the main factor contributing to the increase in real income for women during the last period of the decade. Hsieh et al. (2010) estimate that between 1960 and 2008 about 60 percent of growth in real wages for black women, 40 percent for white women, and 45 percent for black men could be attributed to a decrease in the rate of occupational segregation; during the same time they estimated a 5 percent decrease in real wages for white males as a result of changes in occupational composition by gender. Just as Hori (2000) found, the gender wage gap can be explained by occupational segregation of only 5.1 percent, likewise Sorensen (1990) shows that in the United States 15-30 percent of the gender wage gap can be explained by occupational segregation.

Based on Table 7, it can be calculated the percentage of worker wage gap for each province, as shown in Table 8. The wage gap getting closer to zero means that the wage gap is low and vice versa if the average wage gap is close to 100.So, overall provinces in Indonesia are not experience a significant labor wage gap. West Papua and Papua are provinces with the highest average wage gap, namely 16.77 and 15.36; while Gorontalo and North Sulawesi were provinces with the lowest income differences, namely 13.12 and 13.51. More than half of the provinces in Indonesia (51.85 percent) show that the difference in the income of male and female workers exceeds the difference in the national average (14.63).

14510 0	I mea Lifeet iii		
province	coefficient	wage gap (percentage)	
Aceh	14.784557	0.151367	
North Sumatra	14.462242	-0.170948	
West Sumatra	13.784297	-0.848893	
Riau	14.381423	-0.251767	
Jambi	14.947870	0.31468	
South Sumatra	14.393792	-0.239398	
Bengkulu	14.615405	-0.017785	
Lampung	14.157807	-0.475383	
Bangka Belitung Islands	0.300465	14.933655	
Riau Islands	14.435014	-0.198176	
Jakarta	15.195203	0.562013	
West Java	13.925068	-0.708122	

Table 8: Fixed Effect Model Estimation Results



Central Java	15.108684	0.475494
Yogyakarta	14.579945	-0.053245
East Java	14.784576	0.151386
Banten	15.114261	0.481071
Bali	14.899494	0.266304
East Nusa Tenggara	14.116888	-0.516302
West Kalimantan	15.464997	0.831807
North Sulawesi	- 1.124913	13.508277
South Sulawesi	0.216644	14.849834
Gorontalo	13.123449	-1.509741
West Sulawesi	14.710188	0.076998
Maluku	13.825527	-0.807663
North Maluku	14.861465	0.228275
West Papua	16.768949	2.135759
Papua	15.363263	0.730073
average		14.633190

Source: Data processed

Province	Wage Gap (Rj	Average			
	2015	2016	2017	2018	
Aceh	1,002,464	582,564	712,490	544,204	710,431
North Sumatera	844,372	599,922	585,212	549,069	644,644
West Sumatera	620,180	327,265	591,634	801,449	585,132
Riau	1,032,413	605,644	639,699	599,981	719,434
Jambi	588,780	450,017	669,987	536,224	561,252
South Sumatera	1,496,190	655,792	564,731	604,642	830,339
Bengkulu	914,886	631,520	350,410	856,546	688,341
Lampung	808,998	566,908	567,248	299,731	560,721
Bangka Belitung Islands	1,512,321	796,169	668,827	488,003	866,330
Riau Islands	153,218	1,391,348	873,680	1,098,945	879,298
DKI Jakarta	1,064,557	891,246	915,571	1,007,456	969,708
West Java	1,049,078	533,054	704,700	603,505	722,584
Central Java	926,833	619,514	586,338	732,473	716,290
Yogyakarta	803,330	533,910	489,031	523,958	587,557
East Java	917,228	652,833	587,910	618,126	694,024
Banten	1,489,075	471,750	491,007	574,116	756,487
Bali	1,049,851	747,964	910,302	898,011	901,532
East Nusa Tenggara	616,711	219,894	446,324	388,226	417,789
West Kalimantan	1,069,901	542,567	608,225	711,810	733,126
North Sulawesi	434,966	179,343	415,312	224,640	313,565
South Sulawesi	897,384	613,974	1,089,388	1,167,344	942,023
Gorontalo	1,003,115	357,962	431,212	430,263	555,638
West Sulawesi	799,098	383,069	756,186	1,015,684	738,509
Maluku	724,040	242,576	511,752	287,784	441,538



			(·	- / -	-	
North Maluku	915,912	641,719	573,700	751,673	720,751	
West Papua	332,000	409,228	29,370	778,648	387,312	
Papua	739,971	1,052,037	809,963	874,620	869,148	

Source: Data processed

Observing what is shown in Table 9 in nominal wage gap of workers in line with the data on Table 8. North Sulawesi Province is an area with a low income difference category, as well as a region showing a high category, namely DKI Jakarta, South Sulawesi and Bali.

5. CONCLUSION

The Dissimilarity Index (ID), length of schooling (LS) and LFPR show a negative effect on the income differences between male and female workers (LnWG) in Indonesia. Of the three determinants of gender wage gap, Index D does not significantly influence it and the coefficient is also very small. The most dominant factor affecting wage gap is the difference in length of schooling. In the case of the length of schooling coefficient being negative, this is due to the influence of factors that are not statistically observed.

LIMITATION AND STUDY FORWARD

This research still does not include the factors that determine the wage gap from other aspects of human capital, namely the skills or experience of workers. The wage gap between provinces in Indonesia can also be explained more clearly if we look at the economic growth in each province. Another limitation is that not all provinces can be analyzed due to the unavailability of data for several provinces in the years observed. The division of regions based on islands can also be an alternative for the analyzed area data. Subsequent research can also measure dissimilarity in the form of horizontal and vertical segregation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The research of this article was funded by DIPA of Public Service Agency of Sriwijaya University.

SP DIPA-023.17.2.677515 / 2020, revision 01, on March 16,2020. In accordance with the Rector's Decree Number: 0685 / UN9 / SK.BUK.KP / 2020, on July 15, 2020.

REFERENCES

- Anker, R. 1998. *Gender and Jobs. Sex Segregation and Occupations in the World*. International Labour Office, Geneva.
- Azhar Mukhamad., Suwanto., Machmud Amir. 2018. Determinan Return to Education in Indonesia. *Jurnal Manejerial*, 3(4), 52-69.
- Baltagi, Badi H. 2005. *Econometrics Analysis of Panel Data*. Chichester: John Willey & Sons Publisher.
- Banerjee, Biswait, 2014. Occupational Segregation and Gender Differential in Earning in Macedonia. IZA Journal of European labor Studies. 3(4). 1-27.
- Becker, G. 1971. The Economics of Discrimination. 2nd ed., University of Chicago Press.
- Becker, G. S. 1993. *Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis With Special Reference to Education*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago, 3, 19-29.
- Bender, K., S. Donohue and J. Heywood. 2005. Job Satisfaction and Gender Segregation. Oxford *Economic Papers*, 57, 479-496.



- Blau, Francine D. and Lawrence M. Kahn. 2007. The Gender Pay Gap. *The Economists' Voice*, 4 (4), Article 5.
- Blinder. A. 1973. Wage Discrimination: Reduced Form and Structural Estimates. *Journal Of Human Resource*, 8 (4). 436-455.
- Bloomquist, L.E., 1990. Local Labor Market Characteristics and the Occupational Concentration of Different Sociodemographic Groups. *Rural Sociology*. 55(2). 199-213.
- Borjas, George J. 2013. Labor Economics. Third Edition. Irwin Mc Graw HillPublished.
- BPS, 2019, Indikator Pasar Tenaga Kerja. Jakarta.
- Budig, M., and P. England. 2001. The Wage Penalty for Motherhood. *American Sociological Review*, 66(2), 204–225.
- Cassels, R. Vidyattama, Y. Miranti, R., J McNamara. 2009. *The Impact of Sustained Gender Wage Gap on the Australian Economy*. Nastem, Canbera, Australia.
- Coelli, Michael B. 2014. Occupational Differences and the Australian Gender Wage Gap. The Australian Economic Review. 47 (1). 44-62.
- Duncan, O.D., and B. Duncan. 1955. Residential Distribution and Occupational Stratification. *The American Journal of Sociology*, (60), 493-503.
- England, Paula, Joan M. Hermsen, and David A. Cotter. 2000. The Devaluation of Women's Work: A Comment on Tam. *American Journal of Sociology*, *105* (6), 1741–1751.
- Görlich, Dennis, and Andries de Grip. 2009. Human Capital Depreciation during Hometime. Oxford Economic Papers, 61 (2008), 98–121.
- Hanushek, E. A. 2020. Education In Production Functions. *The Economics of Education*. Academic Press. 161-170.
- Hori, H. 2000. Labor Market Segmentation and The Gender wage Gap. *Japan Labor Revie*, 6 (1). 5-20.
- Hsieh, Chang-Tai, Erik Hurst, Charles I. Jones, Peter J. Klenow. 2010. The Allocation of Talent and U.S. Economic Growth. *NBER Working Paper No. 18693*.
- Ismal, Rahmah dan Jajri, Idris. 2012. Gender Wage Differentials and Discrimination in Malaysian Labour Market. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 9 (5), 719-728.
- Jacob. M. 2006. Changes In The Wage Gap Of Gender In Caste Groups In India Dissertation Submitted to The faculty Of Graduate School Of The University Of Maryland (Unpublished).
- Joonmo Cho & Donghun Cho. 2011. Gender Difference Of The Informal Sector Wage Gap: A Longitudinal Analysis For The Korean Labor Market. *Journal of the Asia Pacific Economy*, *16*, (4), 612-629. DOI: 10.1080/13547860.2011.621363
- Kidd, M.P., and M. Shannon. 1994. An Update and Extension of the Canadian Evidence on Gender Wage Differentials. *Canadian Journal of Economics*, 27 (4), 918-938.
- Megasari, D. N., & Purnastuti, L. 2016. Disparitas Gender dalam Tingkat Pengembalian Investasi Pendidikan di Jawa Barat. Jurnal Economia. 12(1). 23-31.



Mincer. J. 1958. Investment in Human Capital and Personal Income Distribution. *The Journal of Political Economy*. 66(4). 77-87.

Muhyiddin, Nurlina T. 2018. Ekonomi Ketenagakerjaan. Idea Press. Yogyakarta.

- Niederle, M., and L. Vesterlund. 2007. Do Women Shy Away from Competition? Do Men Compete too Much?. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, *12*, 1067–1101.
- Oaxaca, R.L. 1973. Male-Famale Wage Differentials in Urban Labor Markets. International Economic Review. Vol.14(1). Hal: 693-709.
- Psacharopoulos, G., & Patrinos, H. A. 2004. Returns to Investment in Education: A Further Update. *Education Economics*. 12(2). 111–134.
- Polacheck, S. 1981. Occupational Self-Selection: A Human Capital Approach to Sex Differences in Occupational Structure. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, *63*, 60-69.
- Richard S. 2013. *E-Views Illustrated for Version* 8. University of California. IHS Global Inc. Santa Barbara.
- Savvides, Andreas and Thanasis Stengos. 2009. Human Capital And Economic Growth. Stanford University Press. Stanford. California.
- Sorensen E. 1990. The Crowding Hypothesis And Comparable Worth. *Journal Human Resources*. 25, (1). 55–89.
- Tanzel, A. dan Bircan F. 2010. Demand For Education in Turkey: A Tobit Analysis of Private Tuttoring Expenditures. *Economics of Education Review*, 25, 303-313.
- Toutkoushian, R. K., and Paulsen, M. B. 2016. Private And Social Returns To Higher Education. *Economics of Higher Education*. Springer. Dordrecht.

ISBN 978-979-587-937-4



(BOOK OF PROCEEDINGS)

Sriwijaya Economics, Accounting, and Business Conference International Seminar and Conference

EABC 2020

"VUCA 2.0 : HOW TO SURVIVE THE UNSTEADY WORLD?"

November 18th-19th,2020 Faculty of Economics, Universitas Sriwijaya Palembang, Indonesia



COMMITTEE OF SEABC 2020

Director Chancellor Steering Committee	 Prof. Dr. Ir. Anis Saggaf, MSCE (Rector of Sriwijaya University) Prof. Dr. Mohammad Adam, S.E, M.E Prof. Dr. Badia Perizade, M.B.A Prof. H. Syamsurijal AK,Ph.D Prof. Dr. Taufiq, S.E., M.Si Prof. Dr. Hj. Sulastri, M.Kom, M.E Prof. Hj. Nurlina Tarmizi, S.E., M.S., Ph.D Prof. Dr. Berndatte Robiani, M.Sc Prof. Dr. H. Didik Susetyo, M.Si
Chairman Vice Chairman	: Agung Putra Raneo, S.E., M.Si : Dr. Azwardi, S.E., M.Si Dr. Yulia Saftiana, S.E., M.Si, Ak., CA Drs. H. Dian Eka, M.M
Secretary	: Dr. Muhammad Ichsan Hadjri, M.M Patmawati, S.E., M.Si., Ak., CA
Secretariat	
Coordinator	: Isni Andriana, S.E., M.Fin., Ph.D
Members	: Dr. Hasni Yusrianti, S.E., MAAC., Ak
	Dr, Hj. Rela Sari, S.E., M.Si., Ak., CA
	Dr. Suhel, M.Si
	Dr. Shelfi Malinda, S.E., M.M
	Agil Novriansa, S.E., M.Sc., Ak., CA
	Fida Muthia, S.E., M.Sc
	Muhammadd Hidayat, M.Si
	Muhmmad Ichsan Siregar, S.E., M.S., Ak
	Nur Khamisah, S.E., M.Sc
	Sri Andaiyani, S.E., M.S.E
	Ruth Samantha, S.E., M.Si
	Anisa Listva, S.E., M.Si., Ak
	Alghifari Mahdi Igamo, S.E., M.S.E
	Parama Santati, S.E., M.Kom
	H. Mulvadi, S.E., M.Si
	Muhammad Wahyudin, S.E
	Muhammad Ridwan, S.E
	Warindi, S.E
	Rinaldy Saleh, S.E
	Maulana Yusuf, S.Kom
	Sutimah, S.E
	Komta Irawati, S. Pd
	Zaindal Abidin
	Arfan Syukri
	Nuraini, S.E
	Zahratunnisa
	Achmad Trisno Djati
	Renaldi Setiawan
	Ayu Sagita

6th Sriwijaya Economics, Accounting, and Business Conference (SEABC) 2020



	Nabila Salsabella
	Muhammad Haldin Eaihar
	Multaniniaa metaini rajitat
Event Division	
Coordinator	: Dr. Muhklis, S.E., M.Si
Members	: Imelda, S.E., M.S.E
	Dr. Luk Luk Fuadah, S.E., M.BA., Ak., CA
	Marlina Widiyanti, S.E., S.H., MM., Ph.D
	Dr. Imam Asngari, S.E., M.Si
	Dr. Sukanto, S.E., M.Si
	Dr Hi Anna Yulianita S E M Si
	Dr Yuliani S E M M CFP OWP AEPP
	Dr Yunisvita S.E. M.Si
	Dr E Yusnaini S E M Si Ak
	Hi Rina Tiandrakirana DP SE Ak MM
	Dessy Yunira S.F. M.M. M.B.A
	Drs Vuliansvah M Diah M M
	Dr. Ahmad Systiri SFIMSI
	Liliana S.F. M.SI
	Δ sfeni Nurullah S.F. M Δ cc
	Reza Ghasarma S.E. M.M. M.B.A
	Achmad Maulana S.F. M.M.
	M Farban S F M Si
	Achmad Soediro S.E. Ak. M.Com
	Lisnowati S E M Si
	Easting and Addition SE MSi Alt CA ACDA
	retuinant Aumania, S.E., M.SI., AK., C.A., ACFA
	Alya Kallaulallu M. Afif Izzudin
	M. Alli Izzuulli Soni Africagych Dollyc
	Solin Allansyan Paika M. Salim Dahmat Al Num
	M. Salim Kanmat Al Nuru
Publication Division	
Coordinator	: Arista Hakiki, S.E., M.Acc., Ak
Members	: Dr. Kemas Muhammad Husni Thamrin, S.E., M.M
	Abdul Bashir, S.E., M.Si
	Dirta Pratama Atiyatna, S.E., M.Si
	Sri Maryati, S.E., M.Sc
	Ichsan Hamidi, S.H.I., M.Si
	Nyimas Dewi Murnila Saputri, S.E., M.SM
	Lina Dameria Siregar, S.E., M.M
	Hera Febria Mavilinda, S.E., M.Si
	M. Fahmi Husaini

Sponsorship Division

Coordinator	: Welly Nailis, S.E., M.M
Members	: Mukhtaruddin, S.E., M.Si., Ak, CA
	Drs. Burhanuddin, M.Acc. Ak
	Efva Octavia Donata Gozali, S.E., M.Si., Ak, CA



Documentation and Host Division Coordinator : Aryanto, S.E., M.T.I, Ak : Muchtar Indana, S.E Members Arvansah, S.E Murahmat, S.Mn S.A Somadi, S.E Derry Ramad M. Daffa Syahtara **Ommy Nugroho** M. Rizky Britama **Equipment and Logistic Division** Coordinator : Suvitno, S. A.P. : Widodo, ST Members Juhartono Pirmansvah, S.E M. Indra Amrullah, S.E Edi Sudrajat Sunarto Ahmad Eko Saputra Yulianto Rusdi Saputra

Sumarno





Assalammualaikum Wr. Wb

Welcome to the Sriwijaya, Economics, Accounting and Business Conference (SEABC). SEABC is scholarly activity consists of international seminar and conference that is expected to give contribution and identify national economic policy, especially in facing ASEAN economic community. In 2020, SEABC is running its sixth year and taking a theme of "VUCA 2.0 : How to Survive Unsteady World ?".

The Faculty of Economics of Universitas Sriwijaya has organized this important seminar and conference. Many individuals have put that hard work to make this event becomes reality. The papers presented at this conference and included in this proceedings are expected to give contribution to research and technology development (IPTEK).

At last, we would like to thank for all the participants and the presenters that are willing to present their ideas and make this conference possible. We hope this proceedings can be a reference to build our nation and country.

Wassalammualaikum Wr. Wb

Prof. Dr. Mohamad Adam, S.E., M.E. Dean of Faculty of Economics Universitas Sriwijaya



FOREWORD



Assalammualaikum Wr. Wb

I am delighted to welcome you to the 6th Sriwijaya, Economics, Accounting and Business Conference (SEABC). SEABC is scholarly activity consists of international seminar and conference that is expected to give contribution and identify national economic policy, especially in facing ASEAN economic community. In 2020, SEABC is running its sixth year and taking a theme of "VUCA 2.0 : How to Survive Unsteady World ?".

The Economics Faculty of Universitas Sriwijaya have organized this important seminar and conference. This year is special. All of us can't predict this before, the pandemi of Covid – 19. That thing makes all seminar and conference activity do by online. The 6^{th} SEABC conference papers were peer reviewed for technical and editorial content by a dedicated committee of referees. We accept nearly 90 papers for oral presentation from 10 countries. These papers were presented in 2 days, 4 sessions each day.

Finally, I would like to thank for all the presenters that are willing to present their ideas and make this conference possible. We hope this proceeding book can give contributes to research and technology development.

Wassalammualaikum Wr. Wb

Agung Putra Raneo, S.E., M.Si Chairman 6th SEABC Universitas Sriwijaya





TABLE OF CONTENT

Committee of SEABC 2020 Foreword Table of Content	i iv vii
Determinants of Faculty Members Job Satisfaction Allan A. Lalosa, Alirose A. Lalosa	1
Overcoming the Covid-19 Pandemic Crisis in Korea: Major Lessons and Policy Implications Choong Lyol Lee and Jaichung Lee	11
The Influence of Socio-Political on Iraq Accounting System in Iraqi Banks Hasanian Salim, Mohammed Abdullah, and Reem Muhsin	35
Determining The Relationship Between Information Technology and Leadership Style (Case Study: Navy Research Institute of Bandar Anzali in Northern of Iran) Mohammad Taleghani and Ataollah Taleghani	49
Developing Lecturer of Non-Public Universities in Vietnam Tran Viet Anh	59
The Effect of Stress Arousal and Supervisor Support on Burnout in Local Government Internal Auditors Agil Novriansa, Aryanto, and Burhanuddin	73
Financial Literacy and Retirement Planning: A Descriptive Study Fida Muthia, Reza Ghasarma, Sri Andaiyani	81
The Effect of Good Corporate Governance, Intellectual Capital and Financial Performance of Corporate Social Responsibility Sandra Sukma Embuningtiyas and Oktaviani Rita Puspasari	89
Role of Mining as a Basis Sector in South Sumatra Mega Debiyanti, Imelda Imelda, Muhammad Subardin, Muhammad Teguh	99
Price Policy and Farmers' Welfare in Indonesia in The Short and Long Term: Dynamic Models Azwardi, Sukanto, Nazeli Adnan, Arika Kurniawan, Hamira, Genta Ramzuni	115
The Effect of Audit Committee Attributes on Sustainability Reporting of Banks in Indonesia Inten Meutia, Shelly Febriana K, Emylia Yuniarti	125
Earnings Management and Its Determinant (Study of Listed Companies on Indonesia Stock Exchange) Ruth Samantha Hamzah, Efva Octavina Gozali, Nur Khamisah	137
Contagion Effect of Capital Market on Top- 10 European Union Countries With The Most Cases of Covid- 19	145

Mohamad Zulman Hakim, Dicky Taryana



Performance Evaluation of Sriwijaya University Based on Performance Indicators of The Public Services Agency of Education	167
Anton Indra Budiman, Tertiarto Wahyudi, and Rina Tjandrakirana .D.P.	
Online Food Delivery During Pandemic Covid- 9 Jisnawati Aslamia Rosa, Ahmad Maulana	179
Iishawati, Asianna Kosa, Anniat Matiana	
Spiritual Motivation and Religious Performance: A Case Study on Employees of Sharia Business Unit of Regional Development Bank in South Sumatera Muhammad Ichsan Hadjri, Badia Perizade, Zunaidah	189
Social Mapping Indeks Desa Zakat (IDZ) on Zakat Community Development (ZCD) Program for Optimizing Zakat Empowerment Nurida Isnaeni, Ridhwan, Sigit Indrawijaya	197
Does Financial Distress Has An Effects on Audit Report Lag? Nur Khamisah, Anisa Listya, Nyimas Dewi Murnila Saputri	209
Analysis of Solvability and Profitability of State-Owned Enterprises (BUMN) Arround Palembang City Period 2014 - 2018	219
Munanniau Ichsan Shegar, Alginian Manul Igano, H. Abuunan Saggar, Amyau Canyau	
How Competence and Creativity Affect Teacher's Performance? M. Iqbal Nurfauzan, Eeng Ahman, Budi Santoso	231
Analysis of The Effectiveness and Performance of The Regional Government Organizations Budget South Sumatra Province Rahmi Anisa, Lukluk Fuadah, and Sukanto	243
Analysis and Design of Customs E-Audit Joko Santoso, Tubagus Muhamad Yusuf Khudri	255
Analysis of Indonesian Labor Remittance Contribution Abroad on Device Reserves Erlanga Pura, Syaipan Jambak, Mardalena, Ria Apriyanti	271
Change Leadership: Facing The New Normal Due To The 09 Covid Pandemi Posma Sariguna Johnson Kennedy	289
The Effect of Government Internal Control System, Whistleblowing System, and Professional Internal Auditors Skeptisism on The Fraud Prevention of Financial Reporting Ussy, Azwardi, Sa'adah	307
Herding Behaviour Indicators and Investment Decisions: Evidence From Indonesia and Malaysia Arif Widodo Nugroho, Gede Wahyu Diatmika, Ari Warokka, Sumardi	317
Financial Literacy, Financial Behavior and Revenue on Investment Decisions Housewife in Palembang Namirah Rachmalia, Yuliani Yuliani, Reza Ghazarma	331



Effect of Sharia Accounting Knowledge, Religiosity, Social Environment, and Location on Decision of Saving in Sharia Commercial Banks Emylia Yuniarti, Eka Meirawati, Rela Sari, Abu Kosim	343
The Effect of Loan Portfolio Diversification on Bank Stability With Market Concentration Moderation in Bank Buku III and IV Listed on The Indonesia Stock Exchange (BEI) 2013 – 2019 Novin Yustikarini, Dwi Nastiti Danarsari	359
Price Analysis Between Commodity Groups of Inflation in Banten Province in 2008- 2018	371
Deswita Herlina, Amalia Romadhona	
The Role of Financial Development on Monetary Stabilityin Indonesia: An Empirical Study	393
Muhammad Riswan, Aisyah Lian Sari, Rahayu	
Shifting Legitimacy Strategies in Islamic Banking Achmad Soediro, Media Kusumawardani, Fardinant Adhitama, Muhammad Farhan	399
Dissimilarity Index , Labor Supply and Length of Schooling on Wage Gap in Indonesia Yunisvita, Muhammad Teguh, Rosmiyati Chodijah, Imelda	413
The Effect of Accountability, Dislosure, and Reporting on The Use of Village Fund Finances on Community Welfare Dwirini, Abukosim, Meita Rahmawati	427
The Characteristics of Zakat, Infaq, Sadaqah and Wakaf (Ziswaf) Collection on Zakat Institution (Laz) in Palembang City Fera Widyanata, Ahmad Syathiri, Fardinant Adithama	435
Financial Behavior During The Pandemic (Study Case of Housewives in Palembang City)	447
Ratna Juwita, Sri Megawati Elizabeth	
Innovation Capibility on Labor Productivity (A Literature Review) Fauzia Afriyani, Syamsurijal A. Kadir, Nurlina T. Muhyiddin, Rosmiyati Chodijah	459
Fertility Decline: Long and Short Run Effects on Economic Growth and Labor Markets in Southeast Asia Anna Yulianita, Feny Marissa, Siti Rohima, Arika Kurniawan	475
Implementation of Fiscal Policies To The Establishment of A Balanced Budget in The South Sumatra Province Syaputri Ayu Geby Gisela, Susetyo Didik, Sukanto, Ulum Muhammad Bahrul	487
Income Smoothing Analysis: Eckel Index Approach (Empirical Study of Go Public Property, Real Estate and Construction Companies) Patmawati, Meita Rahmawati, Efva Octavina Donata Ghozali	493
Talent Management, Self-Efficacy, and Job Satisfaction: A Case Study of Hotel Employee in Palembang	501

Zunaidah, Didik Susetyo, Muhammad Ichsan Hadjri



Good Corporate Governance, Economic Performance and Sustainability Report Dirvi Surya Abbas, Arry Eksandy	509
How To Improve Application System To Survive in E-Wallets Industry Iisnawati, Welly Nailis, Dessy Yunita	519
The Role of Fintech in Increasing Inclusion Financial in UMKM in South Sumatera Liliana, Ariodillah Hidayat, M. Komri Yusuf, Syirod Saleh	533
Work Overload and Intention To Stay: An Investigation on The Mediation of Workplace Spirituality and Wellbeing At Work Among Millennial Teachers in Indonesia Yuni Listiani, Fanny Martdianty	553
The Effect of Service Quality and Promotion on Customer Satisfaction Online Go- Ride Transportation Services in Palembang City Ahmad Maulana, Nurkardina Novalia, Agung Putra Raneo, Wita Farla WK	563
The Effect of Camel Ratio on Financial Distress in Banking Company in Indonesia Trie Sartika Pratiwi, Muhammad Hidayat, Muhammad Ichsan Siregar	579
Covid-19: The Influence and Government Policy on Indonesian Capital Market By Industry Agung Putra Raneo, Nyimas Dewi Murnila Saputri	585
Concept To Market Sumitro Sarkum, Abd. Rasyid Syamsuri, Supriadi	595
The Effect of Organizational Culture and Job Satisfaction on Turnover Intention" At BNI 46 Jakarta Chandra S Haratua, Gultom Hamidah Lubis, Madha Komala	619
Analysis Of Potential Informal Entrepreneurs Using The Formalization Model (Case Study: Informal Sector Entrepreneurs In Palembang City) Armansyah, Sukamdi, Agus Joko Pitoyo	629
Investment Decision, Funding Decision, Dividend Policy and Firm Value in Indonesian Bank Muhammad Hidayat, Sri Maryati, Trie Sartika Pratiwi	639
Do Islamic Rural Banks Support Regional Economic Growth in Indonesia? Ahmad Syathiri, Umar Hamdan, Fardinant Adhitama	651
Organizational Support and Its Influence on Objective Career Success Wita Farla, Lina Dameria Siregar, Supardi A. Bakri	663
Analysis Influence of Investment Credit and Government Capital Expenditure on Interprovincial Development Inequality in Indonesia Annisa Fitriyah, Bernadette Robiani, Rosmiyati Chodijah	673
Measuring Celebrity Endorser Credibility: The Source Model Approach Dessy Yunita, Welly Nailis, Nofiawaty	687

6th Sriwijaya Economics, Accounting, and Business Conference (SEABC) 2020 ISBN 978-979-587-937-4



Role of The Sharia Industry in Increasing Economic Growth With The Implementation of Ict As A Moderating Variable Berlian Karlina	697
Effect of Islamicity Performance Index on Sharia Profitability (Profit Margin) in Islamic Banking Oktarini, Yusnaini, Achmad Soediro, Ainun Putri	707
Privacy Concerns in Personalized Advertising Effectiveness on Social Media Lia Febria Lina, Adhy Setiyanto	727
Good Corporate Governance, Affective Commitment and Job Satisfaction in Regional Owned Enterprises Agustina Hanafi, Mohamad Adam, Afriyadi Cahyadi, Muhammad Azmi	733
Effect of Individual Characteristics, Job Characteristics, Organizational Characteristics and Organizational Climate on Management Satisfaction Mediated By Work Motivation Emi Wakhyuni, Nashrudin Setiawan	747
Crafting Strategic Maneuverability To Boost Business Performance Hermas Kornelius, Innocentius Bernarto, Anton Wachidin Widjaja	771
Analysis of Green-Washing and Green Consumer Using The Rasch Model Yulia Hamdaini Putri, Aslamia Rosa, Hera Mavilinda	781
The Effect of Job Satisfaction and Employee Engagement on Turnover Intention of Millennials Generation in Palembang Lina Dameria Siregar, Yuliansyah M. Diah, Wita Farla WK	799
Building on The Improvement of Financial Performance of State-Owned Enterprises With The Principle of Transparency Syarif Usman, Sulastri, Marlina Widiyanti, Yuliani	813
Human Capital, Social Capital, Wage and Prosperity: Formal Worker Cases Nurlina T Muhyiddin, Aning Kesuma Putri, Liliana	825
Web-Based Mosque Financial Reporting System in Increasing The Receipt of Mosque Fund (A Case Study of Mosques in Indralaya) Maya Sari Syama Yanti, Dwi Febianti, Debby Koesnadi Poetri, Ainun Putri, Muhammad Kahpi	837
The Use of Customer Accounting Information During Pandemic Era Linda Hetri Suriyanti, Mentari Dwi Aristi, Syalma Yoreza	849
The Effect of Taxation Knowledge, Quality of Fiscus Service and Moral Obligation on Tax Amnesty Participants in Tax Office of Pratama Ilir Barat Palembang Riski, Syamsurijal, Luk Luk Fuadah	857
Study on Several Determinants of Occupational Change in Hotel: A Review in Palembang Sholahuddin Arsyad, Syamsurijal A Kadir, Nurlina T Muhyidin, Bambang B Soebyakto	865



Meta Analysis Study: Employability Skills in Novice Workers For Reducing Unemption Levels Ayu Nur Yaumil Akbar, Budi Santoso, Eeng Ahman	873
Good Governance in Building A New Image in The Directorate General of Immigration-Jakarta Imas Komariyah, Muhammad Ishaq Ismail	885
Applying Lean Warehouse Approach in Warehouse Kd in Leading Automotive Manufacturer in Cikarang, Indonesia Deri Maryadi, Febri wongiawan, Irfan Satriawan	897
Analysis of The Impact of Tourism Destinations Amount, Hotels Amount, Restaurant Amount, Labors Amount on Accommodation Sector Income, Food and Beverage in South Sumatera Province Nia Kurnia, Bernadette Robiani, Rosmiyati Chodijah	911
The Effect of Islamic Social Report on Banking Performance Based on Maqasid Index in Indonesian Sharia Commercial Banks Ainun Putri, Yusnaini, Achmad Soediro, Oktarini	925
The Impact of Tourism Sector, Foreign Investment and Economic Growth on Income Inequality in Sumatera Island Reny Mardellya	939
Deposit Insurance, Market Discipline, and Bank Risk; Implications For Commercial Banks in Asean-5 Reza Ghasarma, Agung Putra Raneo, Dian Eka	953
The Effect of Media Engagement Toward Advertising Acceptance Zakaria Wahab, Islahuddin Daud, Welly Nailis, Mohammad Eko Fitrianto	961
Determinants of Village Fund Management Accountability (Study on Villages in Sragen Regency) Wiwin Juliyanti, Yohanes K. Wibowo	969
The Effect of Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Good Corporate Governance on Employee Performance Pt Bunda Bersama Bojonegara Kabupaten Serang Rt. Erlina Gentari, Tubagus Fikran Maulana Taqiyyullah	981
Perceptions of Usefulness and Behaviors To Keep Using in The Implementation of Regional Management Information System Applications Sri Maryati, Muhammad Ichsan Siregar, Anisa Listya	987
Website Quality As A Factor Affecting Customer Satisfaction and Repurchase Intention: The Webqual 4.0 Approach	993

Hera Febria Mavilinda, Yuni Adinda Putri, Akhmad Nazaruddin



Creative Industry of Water Hyacinth During The Pandemic (Study on Micro and Small Enterprises in Semarang Regency, Central Java)	1015
Berta Bekti Retnawati, Marlon Leong, Bernadeta Irmawati	
Income Distribution Inequality Due To Pandemic Covid-19 Suparmono	1033
Reaction of Share Prices in The Indonesian Capital Market To Event of Lawsuit Against The Result of The Indonesian Predential Election in 2019 Taufik, Marlina Widiyanti, Samadi W Bakar, Suhartini Karim	1045
The Influence of Financial Distress, Idlle Cash and Financial Statement Opinions on The Management of Local Government Silpa Abdul Rohman, Rochmawati Daud, Arista Hakiki	1057
Analysis of Factors That Affect The Yield of Sharia Bonds (Sukuk) in Companies Listed on The Indonesia Stock Exchange Ria Mareta Sari	1079

Analysis of Effect of Professional Zakat and Family Hope Program Funding on 1091 Mustahik Welfare in Ogan Ilir District M Endah Okky Pratama

The Effects of The Income, The Price, and The Location on The Demand For Simple 1097 and Healthy Houses (Rsh) in Palembang City Lina



DISSIMILARITY INDEX , LABOR SUPPLY AND LENGTH OF SCHOOLING ON WAGE GAP IN INDONESIA

Yunisvta^{1*}, Muhammad Teguh², Rosmiyati Chodijah³, Imelda⁴

Development Economics, Faculty of Economic, Universitas Sriwijaya^{1,2,3,4} yunisvita@unsri.ac.id^{1*}, mteguh@unsri.ac.id², roossaleh@gmail.com³, imeldazainal@unsri.ac.id⁴

Abstract

Purpose: Analyzing the effect of worker characteristics based on length of schooling, LFPR and dissimilarity in each province on the wage gap in Indonesia 2015-2018.

Research Methodology: The model for estimating the wage gap is a regression equation with panel data, namely the level of wages, length of schooling, Labor Force Participation Rate (LFPR), and the number of male and female workers based on the type of occupation of various provinces in Indonesia in 2015 - 2018. The analytical method used is the OLS (*Ordinary Least Square*) using eviews software.

Results: The wage gap in Indonesia, based on Index D does not significantly affect it and the coefficient is also very small. The most dominant factor affecting the wage gap is the difference in school length.

Limitations: This research does not include other aspects of human capital, namely skills or experience of workers. The wage gap can also be explained more clearly if we look at the economic growth in each province and it will be more comprehensive if all provinces can be analyzed.

Contribution: This research will be very useful to enrich the discrimination of workers in Labor Economics.

Keywords: Wage gap, Dissimilarity index, length of schooling, LFPR

1. INTRODUCTION

Gender-based labor market differences have attracted the attention of researchers, policy makers and international institutions. Wage or income gaps exist between male and female workers in both industrialized countries and the transition from agriculture to industry. In America, the female to male wage ratio was between 79 and 81 percent between 2000-2010; in EU countries the wage gap was between 15 and 17 percent during 1994-2006. The wage gap in Italy and Portugal is only one digit but in Cyprus, Estonia and the United Kingdom it is more than 20 percent (Banerjee, 2014). This finding occurs in all countries including Indonesia, where the wage gap in 2015-2018 shows an increasing trend of around 11 percent (BPS, 2019).

In essence, the labor wage gap according to gender is still a topic of discussion and a problem in every country in the world, one of which is Indonesia. The labor wage gap according to sex is the difference in the average wage that occurs between men and women or a difference that shows that the wages of female workers are lower than that of men. Anker (1998) states that women's wages are lower than men in almost all countries in the world, and this wage difference occurs in all wage patterns, both daily, weekly and monthly and occurs in almost all non-agricultural and manufacturing sectors.

This gender wage gap can also have a negative impact on the domestic product of a country. Based on research in Australia it was found that the average impact of the gender wage gap on gross domestic product per capita was -0.507, which means that each 1 percent increase in the average wage gap leads to a decrease in economic growth of 0.507 percent (Cassels et al. 2009).



There are several characteristic factors that cause differences in wage application between male and female workers. The first factor causing the wage gap is the level of education. According to Jacob (2006), the low wages of female workers compared to male workers are due to differences in human capital, namely education. Education level is one of the factors that influence the quality of human resources and in turn will affect the level of wages received by workers. The higher the level of education a worker has, the higher the wages they receive. For example, a person who has graduated from high school will receive a higher wage than someone who only graduated from elementary school.

Changes in education levels facilitate female's entry into the labor market. The more educated female, the higher the level of participation. In Indonesia, the phenomenon of increasing the level of education of female in 2015-2018 accompanied the increase in men. However, if we look further, it is found that there are differences in the level of education of the male and female population based on the average length of schooling (Table 1). In general, in all provinces, female take 7.35 - 7.72 years of education, which is still shorter than male 8.35 - 8.62 years. This means that the level of education of female in Indonesia is still lower than that of male.

	Average Length of Schooling (years)							
Province	Male				Female			
	2015	2016	2017	2018	2015	2016	2017	2018
Aceh	9.16	9.19	9.36	9.49	8.4	8.54	8.62	8.71
North Sumatra	9.42	9.48	9.55	9.61	8.66	8.78	8.96	9.08
West Sumatra	8.63	8.72	8.86	8.87	8.32	8.49	8.6	8.66
Riau	8.8	8.81	9.02	9.12	8.17	8.36	8.49	8.71
Jambi	8.46	8.5	8.59	8.67	7.44	7.63	7.7	7.77
South Sumatra	8.17	8.18	8.3	8.32	7.37	7.48	7.67	7.68
Bengkulu	8.7	8.72	8.76	8.93	7.89	8.01	8.16	8.28
Lampung	7.92	7.93	8.08	8.14	7.19	7.33	7.49	7.5
Bangka Belitung Islands	7.99	8	8.1	8.17	7.14	7.31	7.48	7.51
Riau Islands	9.86	9.87	10	10.01	9.36	9.46	9.57	9.6
Jakarta	11.21	11.34	11.43	11.46	10.2	10.42	10.61	10.63
West Java	8.36	8.37	8.59	8.6	7.35	7.52	7.69	7.71
Central Java	7.59	7.68	7.79	7.86	6.5	6.65	6.78	6.87
DI Yogyakarta	9.64	9.67	9.74	9.87	8.4	8.6	8.73	8.8
East Java	7.75	7.81	7.93	7.96	6.57	6.69	6.78	6.85
Banten	8.86	8.9	9.07	9.18	7.66	7.82	7.98	8.04
Bali	9.18	9.2	9.35	9.5	7.33	7.53	7.75	7.82
West Nusa Tenggara	7.51	7.54	7.63	7.81	6.02	6.13	6.27	6.36
East Nusa Tenggara	7.27	7.32	7.46	7.62	6.61	6.75	6.87	7
West Kalimantan	7.42	7.49	7.59	7.61	6.43	6.44	6.49	6.62
Central Kalimantan	8.43	8.49	8.62	8.7	7.59	7.73	7.91	8
South Kalimantan	8.29	8.38	8.45	8.46	7.23	7.4	7.52	7.53
East Kalimantan	9.57	9.61	9.75	9.86	8.68	8.82	8.93	9.06
North Kalimantan	9.12	9.14	9.27	9.52	8.25	8.43	8.44	8.69
North Sulawesi	8.9	8.93	9.1	9.24	8.86	9	9.19	9.24
Central Sulawesi	8.27	8.38	8.56	8.76	7.66	7.84	8	8.27
South Sulawesi	7.97	8.08	8.31	8.32	7.34	7.46	7.63	7.76
Southeast Sulawesi	8.79	8.83	8.98	9.13	7.7	7.86	7.95	8.26
Gorontalo	6.76	6.82	6.98	7.14	7.34	7.41	7.56	7.76

Table 1: Average Length of Schooling by Gender in Indonesia

503	6th Sriwij Busine	aya H ss Co	Econo onfero	omics ence (, Acc (SEA	ount BC)	ing, a 2020	and
	West Sulawesi	7.33	7.4	7.55	7.66	6.71	6.91	7.0
	Maluku	9.42	9.47	9.63	9.75	8.91	9.08	9.1
	North Maluku	8.91	8.99	9.05	9.15	7.8	8.06	8.1

9.81

6.9

8.41

9.79

6.85

8.35

Source: Sakernas, BPS, 2018

West Papua

Papua

Indonesia

Several recent studies have shown that female's participation in the labor market is increasing. The level of participation in Indonesia shows a fluctuating situation but the trend is increasing (Table 2). In 2018 the LFPR for male was 82.68 percent, increasing slightly to 83.13 in the following year. Meanwhile, the LFPR for female in the same period did not change at 51.88 percent. In general, the LFPR (Labor Force Participation Rate) for male is still much higher than the LFPR for female, where the LFPR for male is higher, around 1.5 times the LFPR for female.

9.89

7.02

8.56

10.09

7.26

8.62

6.71

5.02

7.35

7.08

9.17

8.17

6.9

5.44

7.65

6.8

5.32

7.5

7.28

9.41

8.28

7.01

5.7

7.72

Table 2: LFPR based on Gender in Indonesia

Gender	August 2018	February 2019	August 2019
Male	82.68	83.18	83.13
Female	51.88	55.50	51.89
National	67.26	69.32	67.49

Source: Labor Market Indicators, BPS, 2019

Based on occupation, women workers dominate in types of work (1) Professional, technician and related occupations; (3) Clerical and related occupations; (4) Sales worker and (5) Services worker. Male workers are more dominant in the type of work (2) Managerial and supervisory occupations; (6) Agriculture, forestry, hunting and fishing workers and laborers; (7) Production workers, operation of machinery workers; and (8) others.

Table 5. Tereentage of Workers by Occupation and Ochuer in Indonesia						
Occupation	KBJI Code	Male	Female			
Professional, technician and related occupations	1	5.77	10.59			
Managerial and supervisory occupations	2	1.95	0.86			
Clerical and related occupations	3	5.21	7,18			
Sales worker	4	14.53	26.53			
Services worker	5	4.22	9.66			
Agriculture, forestry, hunting and fishing workers and laborers	6	27.96	24.35			
Production workers, operation of machinery workers	7	37.57	20.68			
Others	8	2.79	0.15			

Table 3. Percentage of Workers by Occupation and Gender in Indonesia

Source: Labor Market Indicators, BPS, 2019

The dominance of female in this type of work is 2 times more than that of male workers in this type of work (Table 3). The highest percentage of female workers is in the type of work (4) Sales worker, namely 26.53 percent, while male workers are mostly in the type of work (7) Production workers, operation of machinery workers, namely 37.37 percent.

In earlier empirical studies, discrimination in the labor market was calculated by applying the standard decomposition. Oaxaca (1973) studied the gender wage gap in the US labor market. He found that the wage gap between females and males is quite large. In the same year, Blinder (1973) exploited US



data to explore the gender and race wage gap. He concluded that there is a difference in wages across different genders and races. Both studies focused on the contribution of discrimination to wage differentials in the labor market. Since then, many more empirical studies have applied the Blinder-Oaxaca decomposition analysis to explore various aspects of discrimination. Coelli (2014), the main finding of this investigation is that occupational differences do contribute to the gender wage gap in Australia when occupation is defined at an appropriately disaggregated level. Joonmo Cho & Donghun Cho (2011) finds out that the wage differential between the formal and the informal sector found among female workers does not appear in the group of male workers. Based on this empirical result, their study speculates that the dual labor market structure aggravates the overall gender earning gap, as female workers are penalized more by locating themselves in the informal labor market than are male workers.

The main objective of this research is to find out whether the characteristics of provinces, especially the characteristics of workers based on length of schooling, LFPR and dissimilarity in each province are the causes of the wage gap in Indonesia 2015-2018.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Human capital per worker h usually uses a measure average years of schooling of the population of working age (age at over 15 or under 65 years). This measure is considered the most appropriate because human capital is reflected of the exponential function of mean years of schooling (Savvides, 2009). Moreover, these parameters can be used to see the return of schooling from micro studies. This study was conducted to see the effect of increasing school years to an increase in individual wages.

Muhyiddin (2018) states that differences in wages paid to workers arise because there are differences in *human capital* and differences in types of work. In addition to wages, many companies impose compensation *non-wage* or *fringe benefits* or *benefits in kind*. Wage and non-wage compensation are analyzed in theory *hedonic*. Philosophically, *hedonic* comes from the hedonian concept which hypothesizes that the population pursues utility and rejects disutility. The size of the wages is determined by labor market conditions. The difference in the amount of wages is due to differences in *human capital*, namely workers who have a certain education and as compensation, these workers will get wages that are not the same as workers who have other education.

Human capital per labor h usually uses a measure average years of schooling of the population of working age (age at over 15 or under 65 years). This measure is considered the most appropriate because human capital is reflected of the exponential function of mean years of schooling (Savvides, 2009). Moreover, these parameters can be used to see *the return of schooling* from micro studies. This study was conducted to see the effect of increasing school years to an increase in individual wages.

In addition to wages, many companies impose compensation *non-wage* or *fringe benefits* or *benefits in kind*. Wage and non-wage compensation are analyzed in theory *hedonic*. Philosophically, *hedonic* comes from the hedonian concept which hypothesizes that the population pursues utility and rejects disutility. The size of the wages is determined by labor market conditions. The difference in the amount of wages is due to differences in *human capital*, namely workers who have a certain education and as compensation, these workers will get wages that are not the same as workers who have other education.

The equation Ln (W_0) or log income is a constant function of Ln (W_0) and S is the length of *schooling*. Income can vary according to work experience or age. The *life cycle* wage pattern has an inverted U pattern, so the equation becomes:

$$LnW_0 = \beta_0 + \beta_1 S + \beta_2 A + \beta_3 A^2 + \varepsilon$$
 (1)

Where: $LnW_0 = Log Wage$ $\beta_0 = LnY coefficient$ $\beta_1 = School coefficient$



S = length of schooling (years) $\beta_2 =$ Work Experience Coefficient A = Work Experience

 $\beta_3 =$ Work Experience Coefficient Quadratic

 A^2 = Work Experience Squared

Mincer Model is known as the Mincer *wage equation (mincerian wage equation)*. According to Mincer's model of time in education is used as the main determination to increase income (Mincer, 1958).

Hanushek (2020) and Ahmad (2015) say that the production function of education is closely related to the labor market and as a determinant of workers' wages. The reason is because by following the education process it will increase knowledge, skills and expertise. Likewise, Azhar *et al.* (2018), Megasari and Purnastuti (2016) who concluded that education level has an effect on income, and income has an effect on work experience. The higher the level of education, the greater the return on investment in education received. Toutkoushian & Paulsen (2016) and Psacharopoulus and Patrinos (2004), argue that investment in education behaves with investment and physical capital, where there are positive and considerable financial benefits from education.

Differences in income and / or occupation are due to differences in human capital investment (Becker, 1993). Similarities in human capital will lead to similarities in occupation and income. When differences in occupation and income exist, is it due to different attributes of human capital, for example formal education, age, health, residence, presence of children and age, and marital status. Characteristics such as family attitudes and preferences (household utility), family income, national origin, or primary language are also important factors of human capital (Becker, 1993, Bloomquist, 1990, Kidd and Shannon, 1994).

The analysis of the difference in wage compensation can be explained in two ways; The market for risky jobs and the hedonic wage function. Suppose there are two types of jobs in the job market. Some jobs offer a very safe environment so that the chance of injury on this job is equal to zero. Other jobs offer a permanent risk environment so that the chances of injury in this job are equal to one.

It is assumed that workers have perfect information about the level of risk at each job. In other words, the worker knows whether he is working in a safe or risky job. As workers decide whether to accept job offers from risky companies or from safe companies, a company must also decide whether to provide a risky or safe work environment for its workers. The workers' decisions are indicated by their utilitarian function whereas the firm's choice will depend on the profit function.

Market compensation differentials equalize supply and demand and provide the necessary gratuities to attract the last worker hired by the company at risk. The difference in wage compensation and the number of workers working in risky jobs is determined by the intersection of the market supply and demand curves. The supply curve is ascending while the demand curve is decreasing. If the wage differential exceeds the equilibrium level, more people will work for the firm at risk than are demanded, so the wage compensation gap will fall. Likewise, if the wage differential is below the equilibrium level, too few workers will want to work in jobs at risk relative to demand, and the wage compensation differential will increase.

Now, through the hedonic wage function, it is assumed that workers do not like risk and suppose that there are many types of firms. The odds of injury on the job will be various values between 0 and 1. Different workers have different preferences for risk indicated by



indifference curves. The slope of the indifference curve shows how much wages must be increased to make voluntary workers change jobs more risky. To explain how a company chooses the type of environment it offers for its employment, it is shown with an isoprofit curve. This curve is ascending and concave in scope. Different companies have different isoprofit curves.

The job market marries risk-averse workers with firms that provide a safe environment; Workers who do not think about the risks will run into companies that find it difficult to provide a safe environment. This relationship between wages and job characteristics is called the hedonic wage function. Because workers do not like risk and because it is expensive to provide a safety factor, the hedonic wage function is an upward slope. The slope indicates the increase in wages offered by a slightly more risky job.

The key implications of this theory are summed up easily: As long as everyone in the population agrees on whether a particular job characteristic is "good" or "bad", good job characteristics are associated with low wage rates and bad job characteristics are associated with high wage rates. For example, a job that is physically demanding may be more unpleasant than other jobs, and is therefore expected to pay a higher wage rate.

His theory, however, suggests that markets compensate for wage differences measuring what is needed to make marginal workers accept certain jobs. If marginalized workers happen to like being hired in risky jobs or being told what to do at that job, the market wage differentials will go in an apparently wrong direction (Borjas, 2013).

The wage gap between male and female may arise due to gender differences in the assessment of certain aspects of work. Several empirical studies provide evidence that female prefer to work in certain jobs and firms, because they are associated with lower investment in job-specific training (Becker, 1971), less competitive environment (Niederle and Vesterlund, 2007), depreciation rate of human capital. lower levels (Gorlich and de Grip, 2009, and Polacheck, 1981), and more pleasant and family-friendly working conditions (Bender, Donohue, and Heywood, 2005; Budig and England, 2001). For this desire, the non-cash job characteristics of women seem willing to accept lower wages.

Ismail and Jajri (2012) in their observations in Malaysia found that differences in wages or income received by workers were caused by race, human capital and job characteristics, saying that workers who received training, had higher education, would be able to receive a higher salary. high when compared to workers who do not attend school as well as people who have more work experience for the various sectors of work they do. Likewise, Tanzel and Bircan (2010) show that the employment sector has an influence on the gap in determining the income received. In the case that occurred in Turkey, it shows or explains that someone who works in the public sector will receive much greater rewards in the form of money compared to someone who works in the private or special sector.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research uses secondary data obtained from the 2018 National Labor Force Survey (Sakernas). The data used are the level of wages, length of schooling, Labor Force Participation Rate (LFPR), and the number of men and women workers based on types of occupation of various provinces in Indonesia in 2015 - 2018.

A dissimilarity index was built to measure occupational segregation (Duncan and Duncan, 1955). First, the percentage of all workers in each province where each occupation group is calculated. This index is then half of the absolute total value of the difference between the specific locations of the distribution,

$$ID_{ij} = 0.5 \sum |F_{ij} / F_{j} - M_{ij} / M_{j}| (2)$$



where ID is the Dissimilarity index; F_i is the number of female workers in occupation i, M_i is the number of male workers in occupation i; F_j is the number of female workers in j province; M_j is the number of male workers in the province j.

The absolute value of the sum of the difference between the percentage distribution of males and females in each occupation is halved (because there are two groups of males and females) to produce values that range in the index from 0 (perfect integration) to 1 (perfect segregation). Then the multiple regression equation used in this study is:

$$L_nWG_{it} = \alpha + \beta_1 ID_{it} + \beta_2 LS_{it} + \beta_3 LFPR_{it} + \mu_{it}$$
(3)

where: WG is the difference in income; ID is the Dissimilarity Index; LS is the length of school; LFPR is the level of labor force participation; i is the province; t is the year (2015-2018) and μ is the error rate.

Equation (3) is a general form of the panel data regression equation. The analytical method used is the OLS (*Ordinary Least Square*) using eviews software. The use of panel data has several advantages, among others (Baltagi, 2005); able to control individual heterogeneity; provides more information, is more varied, reduces collinearity between variables, increases degrees of freedom, and is more efficient; Better for decision-making studies; able to identify and measure effects that simply cannot be obtained from *cross section* puredata or puredata *time series*; and can test and build more complex behavioral models.

The existing research model will be estimated using 3 approaches, namely the *Common Effect, Fixed Effect* and the Random Effect approach. To find out whether the wage gap is influenced by dissimilarity, length of schooling and LFPR, a model specification test was conducted.

In order to choose the most appropriate model to use from the three models above, several tests can be carried out, including the Chow test; Breusch-Pagan test or LM test; and the Hausman test. (1) Chow test is a test to determine *Common Effects* or *Fixed effects* model that is most appropriate to use in estimating panel data; (2) LM test used to test whether *Common Effects* or *Random Effects* are most appropriate for estimating panel data; (3) The Hausman test is a statistical test to choose whether themodel *Fixed effects* (FEM) or *Random Effects* (REM)is most appropriate to use in estimating panel data. The difference between the two is the presence or absence of a correlation between the individual effects and the independent variables. The Hausman test aims to find out whether there is a correlation as mentioned above. The null hypothesis is that there is no correlation, REM estimators are consistent and efficient. While the FEM estimator is consistent but inefficient. If there is a correlation, the FEM estimator is consistent and efficient but the REM estimator is inconsistent. In addition to the test method, model selection can also be done by testing standard errors. The model with the smallest standard error value is selected. All tests are carried out using the Eviews program (Richard, 2013).

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The selection of the first best regression model was carried out by using the Fixed Effect method significance test Chow test. The following table is the result of the Chow test:

Table	4: ChowResult	S			
Effects Test	Statistic	df	Prob.		
Cross-section F	2.015967	(26.78)	0.0095		
ource: processed data					



Chow test which is shown in Table 4 gives the conclusion that the hypothesis choosing the model is *Common Effect* rejected. This conclusion is based on the value of the probability of cross section F smaller than alpha 5 percent (0.0095 < 0.05). Thus, based on the Chow test, the best model used to analyze in this study is themodel*Fixed Effect*.

Second, the significance test of the Fixed Effect method and the Random Effect method. Based on The Hausman test in Table 5 shows that the probability value of *random cross section* is 0.6163, this means that it is greater than 5 percent alpha, so Ho is not rejected and the model chosen is *random effect*.

Table 5: HausmanResults					
Test Summary	Chi- Sq.statistics	Chi-Sq. df	Prob.		
Cross-section random	1.793775	3	0.6163		

Source: processed data

Third, because the Chow and Hausman tests give inconsistent results where Chow and Hausman estimates show differences in the results of selecting the best model, so the best model is determined using the LM test.

Table 6: LM Test Results						
Null(no rand. Effect) Alternative	Cross- section One-sided	Period One-sided	Both			
Breusch-Pagan	1.275788	0.700678	1.976466			
Honda	(0.2587) -1.129508	(0.4026) 0.837065	(0.1598) -0.206788 (0.5810)			
King-Wu	(0.8707) -1.129508 (0.8707)	0.837065	(0.3819) 0.429299 (0.3330)			
GHM			(0.3339) 0.700678 (0.3774)			

Source: processed data

Estimated results from the *Breusch-Pagan test* show that the value *Prob.Cross-section one-sided* greater than the significance level α (0.2587> 0.05) so that H₀ is not rejected, which means that the best model according to the LM test is the Common *Effect Model*.

Based on the Chow, Hausman and LM tests, it can be seen that there are differences in results, the Chow test chooses the *Fixed Effect Model* as the best model while the Hausman test chooses the *Random Effect Model* as the best model. So for the final stage of selecting the best model using the LM test which selects the *Common Effect Model*. Thus the final model selection chooses the *Common Effect Model* as the best model.

The choice of the model must be supported by statistical results, based on statistical model comparisons showing that the *Fixed Effect Model (FEM)* is a model that can be interpreted statistically because almost all variables are partially significant, in contrast to the *Common Effect*



Model (CEM) and Random Effect Model (REM) which statistically cannot be interpreted in the discussion because all variables are declared partially insignificant, so that through consideration of these statistical results in order to be interpreted perfectly both in theory and in effect, the model chosen is the Fixed Effect Model (FEM).

The estimation results of panel data using the model fixed effect based on Table 7 can be written as follows:

Ln WG = - 0.000789 * ID - 1.125065 * LS - 0.012293 * LFPR + 14.63319 + [CX = F]

Table 7: Estimation Result of Fixed Effect Model							
Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.			
С	14.63319	0.603029	24.26615	0.0000			
ID?	-0.000789	0.011155	-0.070733	0.9438			
LS?	-1.125065	0.232033	-4.848728	0.0000			
LFPR?	-0.012293	0.004104	-2.995425	0.0037			
Fixed Effects (Cross)							
_ACEH - C	0.151367						
_NORTHSUMATERA - C	-0.170948						
_WESTSUMATERA - C	-0.848893						
_RIAU - C	-0.251767						
_JAMBI - C	0.314680						
_SOUTHSUMATERA - C	-0.239398						
_BENGKULU - C	-0.017785						
_LAMPUNG- C	-0.475383						
_BANGKABELITUNGISLANDS - C	0.300465						
_RIAUISLANDS - C	-0.198176						
_JAKARTA - C	0.562013						
_WESTJAVA - C	-0.708122						
_CENTRALJAVA - C	0.475494						
_YOGYAKARTA - C	-0.053245						
_EASTJAVA - C	0.151386						
_BANTEN - C	0.481071						
_BALI - C	0.266304						
_EASTNUSATENGGARA - C	-0.516302						
_WESTKALIMANTAN - C	0.831807						
_NORTHSULAWESI - C	-1.124913						
_SOUTHSULAWESI - C	0.216644						
_GORONTALO - C	-1.509741						
_WESTSULAWESI - C	0.076998						
_MALUKU- C- C	-0.807663						
_NORTHMALUKU - C.	0.228275						
_WESTPAPUAC	2.135759						
_PAPUA - C	0.730073						

Source: processed data

Based on the regression result equation, the average value of the (random error component random error component) is 14.63319. The Dissimilarity Index (ID), the difference in length of schooling (LS) and the difference in LFPR show a negative effect on the income differences between male and female workers (LNWG) in Indonesia. Of the three determinants of gender income differences, Index D does not significantly influence it and the coefficient is also very small. It can be stated that this variable has a very small and insignificant effect on the difference in income statistically.



The ability to explain the gender income gap by these three variables is 48.34 percent. The proportion of variations in income differences that can be explained by these 3 variables is less than 50 percent. More than 50 percent of the determinants that affect differences in income should be explained.

Referring to the regression coefficient value of each independent variable in the estimation result equation, it can be explained that assuming other factors are constant, the dissimilarity index coefficient of -0.000789 means that each increase in the index score by 1 percent will reduce the worker's income gap by 0.000789 percent. If the difference in length of schooling for male and female workers increases by 1 percent, it will also reduce the worker's income gap by 1.125065 percent. Each increase in the difference between men's and women's LFPR by 1 percent will reduce the income gap for workers by 14.63319 percent. So, the factor that most dominantly affects the income gap is the difference in school length. In the case of the length of school coefficient being negative, this is due to the influence of factors that are not statistically observed. When the education level of male workers is higher than the education of female workers it causes the income gap to decrease, this is because there are other important factors that are not observed such as continuous working years and age of workers.

The findings in this study contradict studies which show that occupational segregation is a major contributor to the gender wage gap (Blau and Kahn 2007; England, Hermsen, and Cotter 2000). At the same time, the decline in occupational segregation was the main factor contributing to the increase in real income for women during the last period of the decade. Hsieh et al. (2010) estimate that between 1960 and 2008 about 60 percent of growth in real wages for black women, 40 percent for white women, and 45 percent for black men could be attributed to a decrease in the rate of occupational segregation; during the same time they estimated a 5 percent decrease in real wages for white males as a result of changes in occupational composition by gender. Just as Hori (2000) found, the gender wage gap can be explained by occupational segregation of only 5.1 percent, likewise Sorensen (1990) shows that in the United States 15-30 percent of the gender wage gap can be explained by occupational segregation.

Based on Table 7, it can be calculated the percentage of worker wage gap for each province, as shown in Table 8. The wage gap getting closer to zero means that the wage gap is low and vice versa if the average wage gap is close to 100.So, overall provinces in Indonesia are not experience a significant labor wage gap. West Papua and Papua are provinces with the highest average wage gap, namely 16.77 and 15.36; while Gorontalo and North Sulawesi were provinces with the lowest income differences, namely 13.12 and 13.51. More than half of the provinces in Indonesia (51.85 percent) show that the difference in the income of male and female workers exceeds the difference in the national average (14.63).

I uble 0	I mea Lifeet iii		
province	coefficient	wage gap (percentage)	
Aceh	14.784557	0.151367	
North Sumatra	14.462242	-0.170948	
West Sumatra	13.784297	-0.848893	
Riau	14.381423	-0.251767	
Jambi	14.947870	0.31468	
South Sumatra	14.393792	-0.239398	
Bengkulu	14.615405	-0.017785	
Lampung	14.157807	-0.475383	
Bangka Belitung Islands	0.300465	14.933655	
Riau Islands	14.435014	-0.198176	
Jakarta	15.195203	0.562013	
West Java	13.925068	-0.708122	

Table 8: Fixed Effect Model Estimation Results



Central Java	15.108684	0.475494
Yogyakarta	14.579945	-0.053245
East Java	14.784576	0.151386
Banten	15.114261	0.481071
Bali	14.899494	0.266304
East Nusa Tenggara	14.116888	-0.516302
West Kalimantan	15.464997	0.831807
North Sulawesi	- 1.124913	13.508277
South Sulawesi	0.216644	14.849834
Gorontalo	13.123449	-1.509741
West Sulawesi	14.710188	0.076998
Maluku	13.825527	-0.807663
North Maluku	14.861465	0.228275
West Papua	16.768949	2.135759
Papua	15.363263	0.730073
average		14.633190

Source: Data processed

Province	Wage Gap (Rp)				Average
	2015	2016	2017	2018	-
Aceh	1,002,464	582,564	712,490	544,204	710,431
North Sumatera	844,372	599,922	585,212	549,069	644,644
West Sumatera	620,180	327,265	591,634	801,449	585,132
Riau	1,032,413	605,644	639,699	599,981	719,434
Jambi	588,780	450,017	669,987	536,224	561,252
South Sumatera	1,496,190	655,792	564,731	604,642	830,339
Bengkulu	914,886	631,520	350,410	856,546	688,341
Lampung	808,998	566,908	567,248	299,731	560,721
Bangka Belitung Islands	1,512,321	796,169	668,827	488,003	866,330
Riau Islands	153,218	1,391,348	873,680	1,098,945	879,298
DKI Jakarta	1,064,557	891,246	915,571	1,007,456	969,708
West Java	1,049,078	533,054	704,700	603,505	722,584
Central Java	926,833	619,514	586,338	732,473	716,290
Yogyakarta	803,330	533,910	489,031	523,958	587,557
East Java	917,228	652,833	587,910	618,126	694,024
Banten	1,489,075	471,750	491,007	574,116	756,487
Bali	1,049,851	747,964	910,302	898,011	901,532
East Nusa Tenggara	616,711	219,894	446,324	388,226	417,789
West Kalimantan	1,069,901	542,567	608,225	711,810	733,126
North Sulawesi	434,966	179,343	415,312	224,640	313,565
South Sulawesi	897,384	613,974	1,089,388	1,167,344	942,023
Gorontalo	1,003,115	357,962	431,212	430,263	555,638
West Sulawesi	799,098	383,069	756,186	1,015,684	738,509
Maluku	724,040	242,576	511,752	287,784	441,538



			(·	- / -	-	
North Maluku	915,912	641,719	573,700	751,673	720,751	
West Papua	332,000	409,228	29,370	778,648	387,312	
Papua	739,971	1,052,037	809,963	874,620	869,148	

Source: Data processed

Observing what is shown in Table 9 in nominal wage gap of workers in line with the data on Table 8. North Sulawesi Province is an area with a low income difference category, as well as a region showing a high category, namely DKI Jakarta, South Sulawesi and Bali.

5. CONCLUSION

The Dissimilarity Index (ID), length of schooling (LS) and LFPR show a negative effect on the income differences between male and female workers (LnWG) in Indonesia. Of the three determinants of gender wage gap, Index D does not significantly influence it and the coefficient is also very small. The most dominant factor affecting wage gap is the difference in length of schooling. In the case of the length of schooling coefficient being negative, this is due to the influence of factors that are not statistically observed.

LIMITATION AND STUDY FORWARD

This research still does not include the factors that determine the wage gap from other aspects of human capital, namely the skills or experience of workers. The wage gap between provinces in Indonesia can also be explained more clearly if we look at the economic growth in each province. Another limitation is that not all provinces can be analyzed due to the unavailability of data for several provinces in the years observed. The division of regions based on islands can also be an alternative for the analyzed area data. Subsequent research can also measure dissimilarity in the form of horizontal and vertical segregation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The research of this article was funded by DIPA of Public Service Agency of Sriwijaya University.

SP DIPA-023.17.2.677515 / 2020, revision 01, on March 16,2020. In accordance with the Rector's Decree Number: 0685 / UN9 / SK.BUK.KP / 2020, on July 15, 2020.

REFERENCES

- Anker, R. 1998. *Gender and Jobs. Sex Segregation and Occupations in the World*. International Labour Office, Geneva.
- Azhar Mukhamad., Suwanto., Machmud Amir. 2018. Determinan Return to Education in Indonesia. *Jurnal Manejerial*, 3(4), 52-69.
- Baltagi, Badi H. 2005. *Econometrics Analysis of Panel Data*. Chichester: John Willey & Sons Publisher.
- Banerjee, Biswait, 2014. Occupational Segregation and Gender Differential in Earning in Macedonia. IZA Journal of European labor Studies. 3(4). 1-27.
- Becker, G. 1971. The Economics of Discrimination. 2nd ed., University of Chicago Press.
- Becker, G. S. 1993. *Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis With Special Reference to Education*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago, 3, 19-29.
- Bender, K., S. Donohue and J. Heywood. 2005. Job Satisfaction and Gender Segregation. Oxford *Economic Papers*, 57, 479-496.



- Blau, Francine D. and Lawrence M. Kahn. 2007. The Gender Pay Gap. *The Economists' Voice*, 4 (4), Article 5.
- Blinder. A. 1973. Wage Discrimination: Reduced Form and Structural Estimates. *Journal Of Human Resource*, 8 (4). 436-455.
- Bloomquist, L.E., 1990. Local Labor Market Characteristics and the Occupational Concentration of Different Sociodemographic Groups. *Rural Sociology*. 55(2). 199-213.
- Borjas, George J. 2013. Labor Economics. Third Edition. Irwin Mc Graw HillPublished.
- BPS, 2019, Indikator Pasar Tenaga Kerja. Jakarta.
- Budig, M., and P. England. 2001. The Wage Penalty for Motherhood. *American Sociological Review*, 66(2), 204–225.
- Cassels, R. Vidyattama, Y. Miranti, R., J McNamara. 2009. *The Impact of Sustained Gender Wage Gap on the Australian Economy*. Nastem, Canbera, Australia.
- Coelli, Michael B. 2014. Occupational Differences and the Australian Gender Wage Gap. The Australian Economic Review. 47 (1). 44-62.
- Duncan, O.D., and B. Duncan. 1955. Residential Distribution and Occupational Stratification. *The American Journal of Sociology*, (60), 493-503.
- England, Paula, Joan M. Hermsen, and David A. Cotter. 2000. The Devaluation of Women's Work: A Comment on Tam. *American Journal of Sociology*, *105* (6), 1741–1751.
- Görlich, Dennis, and Andries de Grip. 2009. Human Capital Depreciation during Hometime. Oxford Economic Papers, 61 (2008), 98–121.
- Hanushek, E. A. 2020. Education In Production Functions. *The Economics of Education*. Academic Press. 161-170.
- Hori, H. 2000. Labor Market Segmentation and The Gender wage Gap. *Japan Labor Revie*, 6 (1). 5-20.
- Hsieh, Chang-Tai, Erik Hurst, Charles I. Jones, Peter J. Klenow. 2010. The Allocation of Talent and U.S. Economic Growth. *NBER Working Paper No. 18693*.
- Ismal, Rahmah dan Jajri, Idris. 2012. Gender Wage Differentials and Discrimination in Malaysian Labour Market. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 9 (5), 719-728.
- Jacob. M. 2006. Changes In The Wage Gap Of Gender In Caste Groups In India Dissertation Submitted to The faculty Of Graduate School Of The University Of Maryland (Unpublished).
- Joonmo Cho & Donghun Cho. 2011. Gender Difference Of The Informal Sector Wage Gap: A Longitudinal Analysis For The Korean Labor Market. *Journal of the Asia Pacific Economy*, *16*, (4), 612-629. DOI: 10.1080/13547860.2011.621363
- Kidd, M.P., and M. Shannon. 1994. An Update and Extension of the Canadian Evidence on Gender Wage Differentials. *Canadian Journal of Economics*, 27 (4), 918-938.
- Megasari, D. N., & Purnastuti, L. 2016. Disparitas Gender dalam Tingkat Pengembalian Investasi Pendidikan di Jawa Barat. Jurnal Economia. 12(1). 23-31.



Mincer. J. 1958. Investment in Human Capital and Personal Income Distribution. *The Journal of Political Economy*. 66(4). 77-87.

Muhyiddin, Nurlina T. 2018. Ekonomi Ketenagakerjaan. Idea Press. Yogyakarta.

- Niederle, M., and L. Vesterlund. 2007. Do Women Shy Away from Competition? Do Men Compete too Much?. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, *12*, 1067–1101.
- Oaxaca, R.L. 1973. Male-Famale Wage Differentials in Urban Labor Markets. International Economic Review. Vol.14(1). Hal: 693-709.
- Psacharopoulos, G., & Patrinos, H. A. 2004. Returns to Investment in Education: A Further Update. *Education Economics*. 12(2). 111–134.
- Polacheck, S. 1981. Occupational Self-Selection: A Human Capital Approach to Sex Differences in Occupational Structure. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, *63*, 60-69.
- Richard S. 2013. *E-Views Illustrated for Version* 8. University of California. IHS Global Inc. Santa Barbara.
- Savvides, Andreas and Thanasis Stengos. 2009. Human Capital And Economic Growth. Stanford University Press. Stanford. California.
- Sorensen E. 1990. The Crowding Hypothesis And Comparable Worth. *Journal Human Resources*. 25, (1). 55–89.
- Tanzel, A. dan Bircan F. 2010. Demand For Education in Turkey: A Tobit Analysis of Private Tuttoring Expenditures. *Economics of Education Review*, 25, 303-313.
- Toutkoushian, R. K., and Paulsen, M. B. 2016. Private And Social Returns To Higher Education. *Economics of Higher Education*. Springer. Dordrecht.