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From the perspective of UNDP (United Nations Development Program) (2018), human development is formulated as an enlarging the choices of people as well as the level achieved from these efforts. The UNDP concept of human development contains four elements: productivity, equity, sustainability, and empowerment. UNDP data (2018) shows Indonesia's progress in each HDI indicator puts Indonesia in the high human development category and Indonesia is in 111th position out of 189 countries and regions. The increase of Indonesian human development index is a positive signal for the development of Indonesia's human resources.

The increase of human resources can be said as a non-physical investment or better known as human resource investment, is the number of funds spent and the opportunity to earn income during the investment process. Such investment is called human capital (Simanjuntak, 2001: 138). The term human capital was known since thirty years ago when Gary S. Becker, a Nobel laureate in economics, wrote a book entitled Human Capital in 1964. The human capital theory proposed by Becker (1975: 17) explains that a person can increase his income by increasing their education. Income increases with age where the increase is also directly proportional to individual expertise due to increased education (Nathan, 1989). It can be interpreted that the knowledge and skills possessed will increase so that it can increase one's productivity. This is the basis for the assumptions of human capital. The most strategic target in developing quality human resources is children. Children as part of family members and also as the next generation are very important to be able to increase human resources in national development. This can be achieved through education, Weiss (2006) and Todaro and Smith (2011: 27-29) state that education is one of the most powerful instruments a society has to reduce poverty and vulnerability.

The issue of gender emerged as a deconstruction of the patriarchal culture that had hegemonized the paradigm of society for at least three thousand years. Gender is more emphasized on the differences in roles and functions that exist and is made by society. Gender differences often lead to various inequalities and injustices for women. These forms of gender injustice are not by human rights, so in 1993 the United Nations made a Declaration on the Elimination of Violence Against Women. In Indonesia, the government is working towards the realization of gender equality through Presidential Instruction No. 9 of 2000 concerning Gender Equality in National Development. The World Bank in the book Engendering Development states that gender equality is a major development issue that will strengthen the country's ability to develop, reduce poverty, and run government effectively (Sofiani, 2009). The progress of the times is often accompanied by the development of information and the level of human intellectual ability, so the role of women in life continues to change to respond to the challenges of the times and improve household welfare. According to Mangkuprawira and Vitalaya (2007), women's decision to work is not only motivated by economic factors but because of knowledge skills and self-actualization as well as wanting to gain inner satisfaction caused by the general assumption that the world of work is the world of men so that women will feel that they have been able to sit in line with men by self-actualizing themselves through work, however, women cannot be separated from their nature. Women have the opportunity to appear in a world that is traditionally considered the world of men because of women's movements and studies (Saskara et al, 2012).

The rise of working housewives creates the formation of a new role for women that is different from normal gender roles, which becomes an important study. According to Suroto (1992: 15), household welfare can be achieved through additional income obtained by household members both wife and husband from outside the household life. Once working mother carry out household activities and also activities in the public sector, they will be faced with conditions where their role in the household economy becomes increasingly important. At the same time, women get higher formal education opportunities and enable them to enter competitive employment. It is difficult to identify a causal relationship between maternal educational attainment and children's outcomes because mothers who have higher levels of education or return to school tend to be different from mothers who do not (Brooks-Gunn, Guo, & Furstenberg, 1993; Felmlee, 1988; Leadbeater, 1996; Way & Leadbeater, 1999). The changing role of women initially led to allegations of changes in relationship patterns in the household. A change in women’s role in the household occurred once she is employed and creates her own income, which also creates a change in men’s (Nurhamida, 2013). Working mother have more power in decision-making related to important household decisions, where men whose wives work will be more involved in carrying out household tasks which tend to be more egalitarian. The power that men (fathers) and women (mothers) have in the household can have different impacts on children's welfare.

This study aims to determine the impact of working mother’s bargaining power, where bargaining power in this study is proxied by women’s household decision making power over her spouse shown by the relative education and relative income of working mother on children's human capital in Indonesia, where children's human capital is seen from children's education, namely from the years of schooling. Several empirical studies in the intrahousehold resources allocation framework that have been conducted in Indonesia have been focusing on education as an indicator of welfare. There are various other indicators in measuring children's human capital related to education. The location of the residence, namely the demographics of the area in the village or the city, is very different, where generally children who live in cities have better quality human capital than those who live in villages because of the advancement of technology and information. As well as access, in this case, the distance from residence to school and vice versa from school to residence also affects children's education where the farther the access from home to school, the lower the child's human capital will be. The age of the mother and the age of the father, the number of family members where the more the number of individuals in the family will affect the consumption pattern, and household income including the child's education.

The imbalance of resource allocation among children is a strong conclusion in several studies that specifically discuss the effects of birth orders in intrahousehold resources allocation. The effect of birth orders on resource allocation is ambiguous on which theory (biology, psychology, and culture) states that there is a negative effect of birth order with resource allocation, which means that the eldest child will benefit more than his younger siblings (Ejrnaes, 2002). Meanwhile, empirically, the relative order obtained has a positive impact, meaning that children who are born later, get a better allocation of resources than their siblings who were born earlier (Ejrnes 2002, 2004; Horton 1988). Therefore, indicators are used as control variables in seeing how women's power affects children's human capital.

Many studies include measures that would be considered indicators of women's power, such as ownership of assets (Beegle et al 2001; Quisumbing 1994; Doss 2006; Friedemann-Sa´nchez 2006; Setyari et al 2018) which provide empirical evidence of the influence on resource allocation household. However, this framework has not been explored much to see the impact of resource allocation within the household on household decisions, especially on the bargaining power of working women who are mothers regarding decisions about their children's education level. The combination of short-term and long-term assistance is the government's strategy to sustainably lift Program Keluarga Harapan (Conditional Cash Transfer, PKH) recipients from poverty (Nazara and Sri, 2013). Also, the government has issued several programs, The Bantuan Langsung Tunai (Unconditional Cash Transfer, BLT) and Bantuan Langsung Sementara Masyarakat (another type of unconditional cash transfer, BLSM), where these programs, especially regarding the field of education, will have an impact on improving the quality of children's human capital, where households that have children and receive programs can send their children to a higher level of education. In this study, indicators, location of residence, access to education, and PKH provided by the government, assets, mother's age, father's age, number of family members, and childbirth order were used as control variables.

The level of children's welfare cannot be separated from the role of the mother because by using her abilities, a mother can allocate resources owned by the household. This depends on the amount of power possessed by the mother in the household to carry out her preferences (Doss, 2013). Therefore, the measure of power is very important to do, especially mothers to allocate resources in the household which will have an impact on the welfare of their children. Given that the role of women today and in the past is very different, where the progress of the era is often accompanied by the development of information and the level of human intellectual ability, resulting in the role of women in life that continues to change to respond to the challenges of the times and improve household welfare. When women who work not only carry out household activities, but have already carried out activities in the public sector, they will be faced with conditions where their roles will be increasingly complex and children who are the younger generation who are expected to become the nation's successor and the ideals of national development, working mother who have power in household decision making will have an impact on the human capital of children in Indonesia.

**Research Method**

This research was conducted in Indonesia because it uses IFLS Micro Data. The Indonesia Family Life Survey (IFLS) or Survey of the Aspects of Indonesian Household Life (SAKERTI) is the most comprehensive longitudinal household survey ever conducted in Indonesia, conducted and collected by an organization or institution called RAND. The IFLS data used is IFLS5, which was passed down between late October 2014 and late April 2015 with remote tracking until the end of August 2015, adding the following modules beyond those used in IFLS4. This paper uses IFLS-5 data with criteria from respondents, namely households were women as working mothers have school children aged 6-18 and have a life partner.

Data analysis methods used in this study are Ordinary Least Square (OLS) and Chow-test. The impact of the Power of Working mother (X) on Children's Human Capital in Indonesia (Y) can be formulated by the following equation:

i=β0 + β1Ɵi+βk XKi...........................................................(1)

Information:

i = Children's human capital

β0.β1 .βk = Regression coefficient of each Ɵ1, Xk

Ɵ = The relative power of working mother as measured by the relative education and relative income of working mother against their partners

Xk = Control Variable (X3,X4, X5, X6, X7, X8, X9, X10, X11, X12, X13, X14, X15)

However, at the time of testing, there will be two models, namely:

i = β0 + β 11 X11i + βk XKi...........................................................(2)

Information:

X11 = the relative education of working mother

i = β0 + β 11 X12i +βk XKi...........................................................(3)

Information:

X12 = relative income of working mother

The test to determine the difference in the effect between relative education and the relative income of working mother on children's human capital in Indonesia is used the Chow-test. Chow-test is a tool to test the test for equality of coefficients or the coefficient similarity test and this test was found by Gregory Chow. The Chow test can be used to detect whether there are differences between groups (Wooldridge, 2016: 246). The standard F test can be used for this purpose in an unlimited model that includes the interaction between the dummy group and all variables. If the value of F count> F table or if sig F <0.1 then the null hypothesis is rejected and concludes that there is a different influence between the power of working mother as proxied by the relative education of working mother and the relative income of working mother on the human capital of children in Indonesia.

**Result and Discussion**

Several studies that focus on the distribution of power in households to children's education include Klugman et al (2012), Wong (2012) where the distribution of power in household decision making, especially for women, has been shown to improve welfare by increasing human capital in the household. From the IFLS wave, 4 data used in this study consisted of variables of relative income, relative education, location, PKH, age of working mother, age of spouse, age of children, number of family members, birth order, child status. However, by making the test more restricted / the variable increases, namely the variables of assets and access, there is a decrease in the number of observations. In this study, 2,301 people were categorized as children, the average age of working mother was 37 years old.

Table 1 is a summary of the descriptive statistics of all variables used in this study. Educ\_ar2014 is the human capital of children in Indonesia, namely children's education, measured by the number of years the child has studied. This variable is used as an outcome variable. Meanwhile, relative\_educ and relative\_income are the projected impact of working mother's power with the relative education of working mother against their partners and the relative income of women working towards their partners and include several indicators that are used to control the impact of women's power at work on children's human capital in Indonesia.

**Table 1.** Descriptive statistics

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Obs | | Mean | | std. dev. | | | | | Min | Max | |
| Human Capital | 2.355 | | 3.677707 | | 2.475743 | | | | | 0 | 11 | |
| Relative\_Educ | 2.355 | | 1.220171 | | 1.090919 | | | | | .0833333 | 12 | |
| Relative\_Income | 2.355 | | 21.49927 | | 25.9138 | | | | | 0 | 100 | |
| Location | 2.355 | | .5027601 | | .5000986 | | | | | 0 | 1 | |
| variable dummy (1 for urban, 0 for others) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Blsm | 2.355 | | .1626327 | | .3691086 | | | | | 0 | 1 | |
| variabel dummy (1 for BLSM recipient, 0 for others) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pkh | 2.355 | | .0454352 | | .208301 | | | | | 0 | 1 | |
| variabel dummy (1 for PKH recipients, 0 others) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Blt | 2.355 | | .1757962 | | .3807275 | | | | | 0 | 1 | |
| variable dummy (1 for BLT recipients, 0 for others) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Women’s Age | 2.355 | | 37.2259 | | 6.529126 | | | | | 21 | 67 | |
| Partner’s Age | 2.355 | | 41.7617 | | 7.440428 | | | | | 24 | 79 | |
| Children’s Age | 2.355 | | 10.06879 | | 2.467706 | | | | | 6 | 14 | |
| hhsize1 | 2.355 | | 4.778344 | | 1.32621 | | | | | 3 | 13 | |
| Birth Order | 2.355 | | 1.512527 | | .7105171 | | | | | 1 | 6 | |
| Biological | 2.355 | | .9774947 | | .1483515 | | | | | 0 | 1 | |
| variable dummy (1 for biological children, 0 for others) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Asset | | 2.355 | | .2919089 | | .4688285 | | 0 | | | | 19.8 |
| Access | | 2.355 | | 12.969 | | | 18.71715 | | 1 | | | 600 |

Source: IFLS4, processed data

**Table 2.** Regression Results on the impact of working mothers on children’s human capital in Indonesia

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| VARIABLES | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| bols\_r | bols\_ur | bols\_ur1 | bols\_ur2 | bols\_ur3 |
| rel\_educ2014 | -0.0555 | 0.0184 | 0.0232\* | 0.0267 | 0.0208 |
| (0.0436) | (0.140) | (0.0139) | (0.0237) | (0.0198) |
| rel\_inc2014 | 0.00898\*\*\* | -0.000780 | -0.000807 | -9.11e-05 | -0.00113 |
| (0.00161) | (0.000526) | (0.000524) | (0.000946) | (0.000794) |
| Location |  | 0.136\*\*\* | 0.121\*\*\* | 0.142\*\*\* | 0.0713\* |
|  | (0.0288) | (0.0288) | (0.0502) | (0.0421) |
| Access |  |  |  |  | 0.000836 |
|  |  |  |  | (0.00159) |
| BLSM |  |  | -0.105\*\*\* | 0.0201 | 0.0152 |
|  |  | (0.0406) | (0.0774) | (0.0639) |
| PKH |  | -0.155\*\* | -0.0175 | 0.0422 | 0.0987 |
|  | (0.0634) | (0.0660) | (0.129) | (0.104) |
| BLT |  |  | -0.200\*\*\* | -0.220\*\*\* | -0.133\*\* |
|  |  | (0.0399) | (0.0764) | (0.0641) |
| Asset |  |  |  | 0.0693\* | 0.0739\* |
|  |  |  | (0.0376) | (0.0379) |
| Women’s age |  | 0.00661\* | 0.00616\* | 0.00419 | 0.00483 |
|  | (0.00346) | (0.00345) | (0.00633) | (0.00534) |
| Partner’s age |  | -0.00217 | -0.00163 | -0.00709 | -0.00241 |
|  | (0.00297) | (0.00296) | (0.00549) | (0.00460) |
| Children’s age |  | 0.922\*\*\* | 0.924\*\*\* | 0.928\*\*\* | 0.945\*\*\* |
|  | (0.00489) | (0.00488) | (0.00883) | (0.00959) |
| HHsize |  | -0.0581\*\*\* | -0.0521\*\*\* | -0.0497\*\* | 0.000327 |
|  | (0.0107) | (0.0107) | (0.0214) | (0.0195) |
| Birth Order |  | -0.0592\*\* | -0.0485\*\* | -0.0183 | -0.104\*\*\* |
|  | (0.0238) | (0.0238) | (0.0441) | (0.0361) |
| Biological |  | 0.357\*\*\* | 0.371\*\*\* | 0.237 | 0.215 |
|  | (0.0742) | (0.0739) | (0.149) | (0.134) |
| Constant | 4.543\*\*\* | -5.886\*\*\* | -5.916\*\*\* | -5.597\*\*\* | -6.004\*\*\* |
| (0.0740) | (0.117) | (0.116) | (0.221) | (0.193) |
| prob. F | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| R-Squared | 0.005 | 0.899 | 0.900 | 0.900 | 0.903 |

Source: IFLS5 processed with STATA.

Standard errors in parentheses

\*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1

Table 2 shows the results of the regression carried out with the help of STATA14. These results then become the basis for describing the independent variables on the dependent variable in this study. The results of research on the impact of working mother's power on children's human capital in Indonesia can be explained on Table 2.

The location variable has a significant positive effect on children's human capital in the unrestricted, unrestricted 1, unrestricted 2, and unrestricted3 tests. The location of the residence, namely the demographics of the area in the village or the city, is very different, where generally children who live in cities have better quality human capital than those who live in villages because of the advancement of technology and information. Conversely, the access variable, in this case, the distance from residence to school and vice versa from school to residence, has no effect on children's human capital. This means that the farther or closer access from home to school does not affect the child's human capital. Government program assistance has a significant negative effect, where BLSM with a coefficient value of -0.105 in the unrestricted test1, PKH of -0,155 in the unrestricted test, and BLT of -0.133 in the unrestricted test3. The negative results indicate that government assistance is still distributed inequality.

Asset ownerships also has a significant positive effect, where the coefficient value shows 0.0693 and 0.0793 on the unrestricted 2 and unrestricted 3 test. This shows that the share of assets during the marriage will increase women's bargaining power in decision making, which is related to children's education. The proportion of power will increase between women and men depending on their age. From the results obtained, the age of women working has a significant positive effect with a coefficient value of 0.0061 for unrestricted1, this shows that where women's power increases according to their age. However, the age of the partner does not affect the child's human capital with a coefficient value of -0.0024. While children's age has a significant positive effect on children's human capital with a coefficient value of 0.945 for unrestricted3, this means that the increasing age of the child, the higher the level of education taken according to their age.

The coefficient value of the number of family members of -0.0497 has a significant negative effect on children's human capital in the unrestricted2 test, the negative results indicate that the more number of family members the lower the value, this is because of the more the number of family members the more expenditure in the household. The birth order variable shows that smaller the child has greater the opportunity to get a higher education, whereas the child's birth order has a negative effect and a significant result with a coefficient of -0.104 in unrestricted3, this indicates that there is an imbalance between siblings. This can be due to differences in school achievement that are relatively lower than the national standard as the age increases. And the status of biological children has a significant positive effect with a coefficient value of 0.371 for unrestricted1. This shows that the status of biological children has the opportunity to receive higher education than the status of other children.

Based on the regression results obtained, it can be seen R-square (R2) of 0.903 or 90.3 percent. This shows that the human capital of children in Indonesia is influenced by the impact of women's power to work by 90.6 percent, while 9.4 percent is influenced by other variables not found in the equation or research model used.

To test whether there is a significant difference between the relative education of working mother and the relative income of working mother on the human capital of children in Indonesia, the Chow-test is used.

**Table 3.** Results of Testing the Effect of Relative Education and Working mother's Relative Income on Children's Human Capital in Indonesia

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | -1 | 2 |
| VARIABLES | bols2 | bols2 |
| Relative\_educ | -0.00575 |  |
|  | (0.0156) |  |
| Relative\_income |  | -0.00111 |
|  |  | (0.000794) |
| Location | 0.0815\*\* | 0.0679 |
|  | (0.0349) | (0.0419) |
| Acess | 0.000323 | 0.000853 |
|  | (0.000881) | (0.00159) |
| Blsm | 0.0432 | 0.0156 |
|  | (0.0538) | (0.0639) |
| PKH | 0.0201 | 0.101 |
|  | (0.0861) | (0.104) |
| BLT | -0.184\*\*\* | -0.131\*\* |
|  | (0.0534) | (0.0641) |
| Asset | 0.0791\*\* | 0.0739\* |
|  | (0.0367) | (0.0379) |
| Women’s Age | 0.000863 | 0.00465 |
|  | (0.00444) | (0.00534) |
| Partner’s Age | -0.00269 | -0.00204 |
|  | (0.00385) | (0.00458) |
| Children’s Age | 0.943\*\*\* | 0.944\*\*\* |
|  | (0.00798) | (0.00959) |
| HHsize | -0.00463 | 0.000211 |
|  | (0.0155) | (0.0195) |
| Birth Order | -0.0932\*\*\* | -0.104\*\*\* |
|  | (0.0295) | (0.0361) |
| Biological | 0.0672 | 0.222\* |
|  | (0.119) | (0.134) |
| Constant | -5.681\*\*\* | -5.989\*\*\* |
|  | (0.169) | (0.193) |
| R-squared | | 0.900 | 0.902 |

Source: IFLS5 processed with STATA.

Standard errors in parentheses

\*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1

From Table 3, by conducting a test of each variable of interest on children's human capital, it shows that the variable of interest, namely the relative education and relative income of women working partially does not affect children's human capital in Indonesia, this means that power cannot be reflected by only a few indicators or by, In other words, each variable cannot stand alone and decisions in the household are also influenced by the partner's power.

**Table 4** Results Of Chow-Test

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| |  | | --- | | F( 1, 1656) = 456.93  Prob > F = 0.0000 | |

Sumber:IFLS processed with STATA.

The Chow-test results in Table 4 obtained a Ftest value of 456,93 and a significance value of 0.0000 which is smaller than 0.1 or 10 percent alpha then H0 is rejected. This means that there is a significant difference between the effect of working mother's relative education and the relative income of working mother on the human capital of children in Indonesia. The magnitude of this difference in influence, namely the relative income of working mother has an effect of -0.001, which is greater than the relative education of working mother and has an effect of -0.005 on the human capital of children in Indonesia.

**The Effect of Working Mothers' Relative Education on Children's Human Capital in Indonesia**

The projected impact of women's power at work with the relative education of working mother has a positive and significant impact on children's human capital in Indonesia. Children's human capital is strongly influenced by the example of a mother in the household. The entry of women into the public employment causes a dual role for women, where domestic work, which was originally a woman's nature, has now developed with emancipation. Education of women in emancipation is now important, so women should get an education to the highest level. The level of women's education will certainly affect women's power in decision making in the household, such as the education of their children. The tendency is that the higher the level of education of women is, the more likely it is that decisions taken can be used as a reference in the household.

The higher the relative education of working mother compared to their partners, the children's human capital will increase, this means that more educated working mother will provide higher achievement compared to their educated partners. Qian (2008) uses educational attainment as an outcome for an analysis of power in China. Brown (2006) found that more educated parents tended to invest more education in their children. Furthermore, the marginal effect of the education of female decision-makers on education investment is greater than that of male decision-makers.

**The Effect of Working mother's Relative Income on Children's Human Capital in Indonesia**

The relative income of working mother has a positive and significant effect on children's human capital in Indonesia. The income earned by working mother can give women a direct bargaining position. If women work to control the money they make, then they may have the ability to directly influence outcomes that require spending. Working outside the home and earning an income can provide bargaining power in other forms. Working mother who have relatively more income than their partners will have more power in the household in making household decisions.

Women's employment and income have been positively associated with children's outcomes and their well-being. The results of this study are in line with the results of Qian's (2008) study, which shows that an increase in women's income relative to their partner increases the survival rate of girls in China. The income of working mother gives them direct bargaining power and their control over income as a financial resource to fund decisions such as school expenses (Doss, 2013). Higher incomes also increase women's bargaining power in negotiations.

**Differences in the Effect of the Impact of the working mothers’ on Children's Human Capital in Indonesia**

The relative education of working mother and the relative income of working mother has a different effect, where the income of working mother has a greater influence on the human capital of children in Indonesia than the relative education of working mother. This is related to the ability of working mother to decide directly the allocation of income that they receive themselves, compared to household income that is obtained from their partners. Basically, children's human capital is not only influenced by the decisions of one party, mother or father. That means the decision the decision are often collective or decided together. However, the results show that if a mother works and earns her own money, she will be able to allocate money directly to increase her child's human capital compared to the money she gets from her partner.

The results of this study are in line with several studies, where the power of women who have dual roles as mothers and work is not followed by an increase in women's power in the household. Nurhamida (2013) in her research which aims to find out power in marriage among working mothers and housewives, states that from the data, over all the power of men who have wives as working mother remains higher so that they have the decision to be involved limitedly in the division of household duties. The power of men in the household remains even though women work. Women who have incomes experience only a slight increase in power and continue to work on the unprofessional division of domestic labor.

Some studies measure women's power without considering the power of husbands, such as Handa's (1996) study using mother's education as a proxy for women's power and the result is that there is no significant impact on the highest level of education of children in female-headed households in Jamaica. However, taking into account the significant effects of maternal education in male-headed households suggests that the relative strength of women can play a role in children's outcomes. Maternal education can show a direct effect of their schooling on children's educational outcomes (Leibowitz, 1974), but does not reflect the indirect effect of their relative ability to negotiate with fathers on resource allocation in household households (Doss, 2013).

**Conclusion**

The human capital of children in Indonesia is influenced by the power possessed by working mother, where the power of working mother as proxied by the relative education and relative income of working mother has a significant effect. The higher the relative education of working mother compared to their partners, the children's human capital will increase, this means that more educated working mother will provide higher achievement compared to their educated partners. Meanwhile, the relative income of working mother provides direct bargaining power and control over income as a financial resource to fund decisions such as children's school expenses. So that the higher the relative income of working mother, the children's human capital will increase with higher educational attainment.

There is a significant difference between the projected relative power of working mother and the relative education and income of working mother to the human capital of children in Indonesia. Where the relative income of working mother has a greater influence on children's human capital in Indonesia. This is related to the ability of working women to decide directly the allocation of income that they receive themselves, compared to household income that is obtained from their partners. Human capital of children in Indonesia is not only influenced by the power of working mother, but is also influenced by the power of their partners.

The implication of the test results can be used as a basis for future actions, both in making a policy related to children's human capital, namely in children's education and intra-household. This research does not escape from various shortcomings and limitations. The limitation of this study is the lack of variables used, where the impact of women's power at work can be measured or proxied by various indicators, but in this study the power of women to work is proxied by using only two indicators, namely relative education and relative income of working women. Human capital, in this case children's human capital, only uses the children's education indicators. We suggest for future research to add more relevant indicators in measuring the impact of working mother’s bargaining power and indicators related to human capital.

**References**

Agarwal, Bina. 1997. “Bargaining” and Gender Relations: Within and Beyond the Household”. *Feminist Economics, 3(1):1-51*.

Aji, S., Syarifudin, D., dan Ishak, R. F. (2014). Identifikasi Tipologi Wilayah Perbatasan Antar Kabupaten/ Kota dan Indeks Pembangunan Manusia di Provinsi Jawa Barat. *Proceeding Presentasi Hasil Penelitian Hibah Program Desentralisasi, Sentralisasi dan Hibah Internal Unpas* *2014*, 145-149. Bandung: Lembaga Penelitian Universitas Pasundan.

Atmanti Dwi Hastarini. 2005. Investasi Sumber Daya Manusia melalui Pendidikan. *Dinamika Pembangunan*. Volume 2. No: 1. 30-39.

Arikunto, Suharsimi. 2002. *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktek* Cetakan Ketigabelas. Jakarta: PT.Rineka Cipta

Balbuzanov, Ivan and Colby Colleg. 2009. Searching for Evidence of Boy-Girl Discrimination in Household Expenditure Data: Evidence from Gansu Province China. *Issues in Political Economy, Vol. 19, 2009, 90-107.*

Basu, Kaushik. 2006. “Gender and Say : A Model of Household Behaviour with Endogenously Determined Balance of Power.” *The Economic Journal*, 116 (511): 558–80.

Becker, G. 1964. *Human Capital*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Becker, G.S. 1973. A Theory of Marriage: Part I. *Journal of Political Economy*, 81, 813-846.

--------------1975. Investment in Human Capital :A Theoretical Analysis*. Journal of Political Economy.* 9-49. Tersedia di: <http://www.nber.org/books/beck75-1.hen> [diunduh:20 Desember 2019].

Beegle, Kathleen., Ducan Thomas, and Elizabeth Frankenberg. 2001. Bargaining Power Within Couples and Use of Prenatal and Delivery Care in Indonesia.[*Studies in Family Planning*](https://www.researchgate.net/journal/1728-4465_Studies_in_Family_Planning), 32(2):130 – 146, May 2001. Doi:*10.1111/j.1728-4465.2001.00130.x.*

Boediono. 2012. *Ekonomi Mikro*. Yogyakarta : BPFE.

Brooks-Gunn, J., Guo, G., & Furstenberg, F. F. 1993. Who drops out and who continues beyond high school? A 20-year follow-up of Black urban youth. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 3, 271–294.

Budiman, Arief. 1986. *Pembagian Kerja Secara Seksual, Sebuah Pembahasan Sosiologis Tentang Peran Wanita Di Dalam Masyarakat*. Jakarta : Gramedia

Bustami. 2013. Peran Ibu Rumah Tangga Dalam Keluarga (Kasus Ibu-Ibu Yang Bekerja Sebagai Guru Sekolah Dasar) di Kecamatan Tanjungpinang Barat. Universitas Maritime Raja Ali Haji. Tanjung Pinang.

Davis-Kean, Pamela. 2005. The Influence of Parent Education and Family Income on Child Achievement: The Indirect Role of Parental Expectations and Home Environment. *Journal of Family Psychology, 19(2), 294-304*.

Doss, C.R. 1996. Testing among Models of Intrahousehold Resources Allocation.  *World Development,* 24(10), pp. 1597-609*.*

------------2006. “The Effects of Intrahousehold Property Ownership on Expenditure Patterns in Ghana.” *Journal of African Economies* 15 (1): 149–80.

------------2013. Intrahousehold Bargaining and Resource Allocation in Developing Countries. *The World Bank Research Observer, vol. 28, no. 1 (February 2013)*

Duflo, E. (2012). Women Empowerment and Economic Development. *J Econ Lit 50(4):1051–1079*

Ebert, Udo., Moyes, Patrick. 2009. Household Decisions and Equivalence Scales. *Journal of Population Economics*, 22(4): 1039-1062. Doi:[*10.1007/s00148-008-0186-7*](https://doi.org/10.1007%2Fs00148-008-0186-7)

Fattah N. 2004. *Ekonomi dan Pembiayaan Pendidikan.* Bandung: PT. Remaja Rosdakarya.

Felmlee, D. H. (1988). Returning to School and Women’s Occupational Attainment. *Sociology of Education*, 61, 29 – 41.

Flouri, Eirini., Denise Hawkes. (2008). Ambitious Mothers-Successful Daughters: Mothers’ Early Expectations for Children’s Education and Children’s Earnings and Sense of Control in Adult Life. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 78, 411-433.

Folbre, Nancy. 1986. Hearts and Spadess: Paradigms of Household Economics. *World Development*, 14(2): 245-255. Doi:[*10.1016/0305-750X(86)90056-2*](https://doi.org/10.1016%2F0305-750X%2886%2990056-2)

Friedemann-Sa´nchez, G. 2006. “Assets in Intrahousehold Bargaining Among Cut-Flower Workers in Colombia.” *Feminist Economics* 12 (1-2): 247– 69.

Gitter, Seth R. dan Barham, Bradford L. 2008.Women's Power, Conditional Cash Transfers, and Schooling in Nicaragua. *The World Bank Economic Review*, Volume 22, Issue 2, 2008, Pages 271-290.

Ghozali, Imam. 2006. *Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate dengan Program SPSS. Edisi Kedua*. Yogyakarta. Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.

Ginanjar, Kartasasmita. 1996. *Pembangunan untuk Rakyat, Memadukan Pertumbuhan dan Pemerataan.* Jakarta: CDES.

Gujarati, Damodar N. 1998. Basic Econometric, Fourth edition. The Mc Graw Hill Companies Inc, New York.

Gujarati, D. 2012. *Dasar-Dasar Ekonometrika Edisi Lima*. (diterjemahkan oleh: Mangunsong, R.C.). Jakarta: Salemba Empat.

Haddad, L., J. Hoddinott, and H. Alderman (eds.). 1997. *Intra-Household Resource Allocation in Developing Countries: Methods, Models, and Policy. Baltimore.* MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Handa, Sudhanshu. 1996. Maternal Education and Child Attainment In Jamaica: Testing The Bargaining Power Hypothesis. *Oxford Bulletinof Economics and Statistics*, 58(1), 119-137. Doi:*10.1111/j.1468-0084.1996.mp58001006.x*

Hasan Shadly, *Sosiologi untuk Masyarakat Indonesia* (Jakarta:Rineka Cipta,1993)

Hair et al. (2010). *Multivariate Data Analysis, Seventh Edition. Pearson Pretice Hall*

Hendrawan S. 2012. *Pengembangan Human Capital*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.

Hikmat, R Harry. 2010. *Strategi Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Edisi Revisi.* Bandung: Humaniora Utama Press.

Kementerian Pemberdayaan Perempuan dan Perlindungan Anak. 2018. *Pembangunan Manusia Berbasis Gender 2018*. Kemeterian Pemberdayaan Perempuan dan Perlindungan Anak Republik Indonesia.

Klugman, J., Hanmer, L., Twigg, S., Hasan, T., McCleary-Sills, J., and Santamaria, J. 2014. Voice and Agency: Empowering Women and Girls For Shared Prosperity. *World Bank Publications*.

Leadbeater, B. J. (1996). School Outcomes for Minority-Group Adolescent Mothers at 28 and 36 Months Post-Partum: A Longitudinal Follow-Up. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 6, 629 – 648.

Leibowitz, A. 1974. “Home Investments in Children” Marriage, Family, Human Capital, and Fertility. *The Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 82(2), Pp. 111-135.

Lim, S.S., L. Dandona, J.A. Hoisington, S.L. James, M.C. Hogan, and E. Gakidou. 2010. India’s Janani Suraksha Yojana, a Conditional Cash Transfer Programme to Increase Births in Health Facilities: An Impact Evaluation.*The Lancet 375 (9730): 2009–23*.

Malapit, Hazel Jean L., Esha Sraboni, Agnes R. Quisumbing, and Akhter U. Ahmed. 2019. Intrahousehold Empowerment Gaps in Agriculture And Children’s Well- Being in Bangladesh. *Development Policy Rev.* Volume 37, Issue 2, Pages:176–203, 2019.

Maulana, R. & Bowo, P. A. (2013). Pengaruh Pertumbuhan Ekonomi, Pendidikan dan Teknologi terhadap IPM Provinsi di Indonesia 2007-2011. *Journal of Economics and Policy*, 6 (2), 163-169.

Melliana, A. & Zain, I. (2013). Analisis Statistika Faktor yang Mempengaruhi Indeks Pembangunan Manusia di Kabupaten/Kota Provinsi Jawa Timur dengan Menggunakan Regresi Panel. *Jurnal Sains dan Seni Pomits*, 2 (2), D237–D242.

Nazara, Suahasil dan Sri Kusumastuti Rahayu. 2013. Program Keluarga Harapan (PKH): Indonesian Conditional Cash Transfer Programme. *Policy Research Brief,* No.42 October 2013.

Neuenschwander, Markus P., Mina Vida, Jesicca L. Garrett, Jacquelynne S. Eccles, (2007). Parents’ Expectations and Students’ Achievement in Two Western Nations. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 31(6), 594-602.

Nurhamida, Yuni. 2013. *Power in Marriage* Pada Ibu Bekerja dan Rumah Tangga. *Jurnal Psikogenesis. Vol. 1, No. 2/ Juni 2013*.

Pangaribowo, E.H., Tsegai, D., and Sukamdi. 2018. Women’s Bargaining Power and Household Expenditure in Indonesia; The Role Of Gender-Differentiated Assets and Social Capital. *Geojournal. Doi: 10.1007/S10708-018-9901-4.*

Psacharopoulos, G. 1981. Returns to Education: An Updated International Comparison. Comparative Education. *Journal of Education Finance.* Volume17. No: 3. 321-341. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3098688>.

Qian, N. (2008). Missing Women and the Price of Tea in China: The Effect of Sex-Specific Earnings on Sex Imbalance. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 123(3), 1251–85.*

Quisumbing, A. R. and Maluccio, J. A. 2003. Resources at Marriage and Intrahousehold Allocation: Evidence from Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Indonesia, and South Africa. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics, 65(3).*

Redja Mudyahardjo. 2001. *Pengantar Pendidikan.* Jakarta : Kharisma Putra Utama Offset.

Rustiadi, E., Saefulhakim, S., dan Panuju, D. R. 2011. *Perencanaan dan Pengembangan Wilayah*. Bogor: Crestpent Press & Yayasan Pustaka Obor Indonesia.

Salaa, Jeiske. 2015. Peran Ganda Ibu Rumah Tangga Dalam Meningkatkan Ekonomi Rumah tangga Di Desa Tarohan Kecamatan Beo Kabupaten Kepulauan Talaud. *Jurnal Holistik VIII No. 5*

Samarakoon, Shanika and Rasyad A. Parinduri. 2015. Does Education Empower Women? Evidence from Indonesia. *World Development*, Vol. 66, pp. 428–442, 2015.

Samuelson, P. 1956. “Social Indiffence Curves”. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 70(1), 1-22.

Sanderson, Stephen K. 2003. Makro Sosiologi Sebuah Pendekatan Terhadap Realitas Sosial, Ed. 2 Cet. 4. *Rajawali Pers*. Jakarta.

Sofiani, Triana. 2009. Membuka Ruang Partisipasi Perempuan Dalam Pembangunan. *MUWAZAH: Jurnal Kajian Gender* Vol. 1(1) Januari-Juni 2009.

Setyari, Ni Putu Wiwin. 2013. Distribusi Alokasi Sumber Daya Dalam Rumah Tangga di Indonesia: Anak Sekolah atau Bekerja?. *PIRAMIDA*, Volume IX No. 2 Desember 2013.

Setyari, Ni Putu Wiwin. Widanta, A.A Bagus Putu dan Ida Bagus Putu Purbadharmaja. 2018. Women’s Control Over Economic Resources Effect to Family Welfare. *Jejak* Vol. 11 (2) (2018): 280-293, DOI: *https://doi.org/10.15294/jejak.v11i2.16051*

Soetomo, 2014, *Kesejahteraan dan Upaya Mewujudkannya dalam Perspektif Masyarakat Lokal*, Penerbit Pustaka Pelajar, Yogyakarta.

Sholikah, Himayatus. 2014. Peran Perempuan Sebagai Pengambil Keputusan Dalam Keluarga Miskin. Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta.

Swerberg, Richard, Mark Granovetter. 1992. *The Sociologi of Economic*. Westview Press, inc.

Sugit Agus Tricahyono. (2008). *Pemberdayaan Komunitas Terpencil Di Provinsi NTT*, Yogyakarta: B2P3KS.

Todaro P Michael, Smith C Stphen, *Pembangunan Ekonomi Di Dunia Ketiga,* Edisi Indonesia, Penerbit Erlangga, Jakarta, 2003.

------------2006*. Pembangunan Ekonomi*, Jakarta: Erlangga.

------------2011*. Pembangunan Ekonomi*, Jakarta: Erlangga.

Thomas, Duncan Contreras, Dante; Frankenberg, Elizabeth. 2017. Distribution of Power Within the Household and Child Health. *MPRA Paper No.80075,* Posted 13 Juli 2017

Umar, H. 2005. Riset SDM Dalam Organisasi. Jakarta : Bumi Aksara.

Undang-Undang No. 1 Tahun 1974. Tentang Perkawinan Pasal 1.

UNESCO. 2010. Out-of-School Adolescents. Montreal: UNESCO Institute for Statistics.

Utama, Suyana. 2012. Aplikasi Analisis Kuantitatif. Denpasar: Sastra Utama

Way, N., & Leadbeater, B. J. (1999). Pathways Toward Educational Achievement Among African American and Puerto Rican Adolescent Mothers: Reexamining The Role of Social Support From Families. *Development and Psychopathology*, 349 –364.

Wong, Y. N. 2012. World Development Report 2012: Gender Equality And Development. *Forum for Development Studies,* 39(3), 435-444.

Wooldridge, Jeffrey M. 2016. *Introductory Econometrics: A Modern Approach, Sixth Ed*. Boston:Cengage Learning.