ABSTRACT

RATNA WINANDI ASMANTAKA. The Analysis of Farm Household Economic Behaviors at Three Food and Estate Villages in Lampung Province (BUNASOR SANIM as Chairman, BONAR M SINAGA and M. PARULIAN HUTAGAOL as Members of the Advisory Committee).

The agricultural policies issued by the government are generally homogenous. In reality, farmers and families cannot be treated homogeneously since there are behavioral differences in economy that are different in agro ecosystem and the main commodities being cultivated. The success of agricultural development (Agricultural Revitalization), especially in improving the agricultural productivity and the farmer income, the policies applied should consider the behavioral differences.

The characteristics of farm households in Lampung Province specifically between food crops (rice and cassava) and estate crops (coffee) is assumed to have different impacts on the farm household economic behaviors. It especially has differences in the farm household workforce system, income, consumption, investment and saving. Therefore, it is interested to study the farm household economic behaviors in Lampung Province. The purposes of this study are (1) to analyze the farm household economy especially the structure of workforce use, income, expenditures and food sustainability in the villages with food and estate crops (2) to analyze the factors influencing the economic behaviors of the farm household of food and estate crops, and (3) to evaluate the impacts of external and internal factor changes on production, fertilizer use, income, consumption, investment and saving of food and estate crop farm households.

The analysis uses tabulation, test of differences and econometric methods using simultaneous equations. The results of economic analysis show that the income of rice and estate villages mainly comes from agriculture, whereas that of cassava comes from non agriculture. The use of family workforce to earn living has not fulfilled the Central Statistic Bureau criteria for full time workers, even though it has met those of food sustainability. The rice production is not responsive against price changes (except estate village), but responsive against the workforce use. Cassava and coffee productions are affected by prices even though it is not responsive. The use of workforce in the food villages are influenced by and responsive against the wage levels, whereas in the coffee village is influenced by and responsive against the values of coffee production. Food consumption in the three villages are influenced by the number of family members, even though it is responsive only in the rice village. In the estate village, the food consumption is very much influenced by and responsive against the values of coffee production. Human investment and saving of rice and estate villages are influenced by and responsive against agricultural income, whereas those in cassava village is influenced by non agricultural income. The increase of output price has a positive impact on production and input use, especially in food villages. On the other hand, the increase in input price has negative impact on production, especially in the rice village. The increase on the use of family workers has positive impact on farming productivity and household income, especially in rice village. In the estate village, the increase in agricultural equipment investment has a positive impact on production and income.
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