

DOI 10.18551/rjoas.2019-12.21

**LEVEL OF COMMUNITY WELFARE IN THE FOOD INSECURE AREA
IN SUBJECTIVE WELLBEING PERSPECTIVE: A CASE STUDY OF BARU VILLAGE,
BANYUASIN OF SOUTH SUMATRA, INDONESIA**

Yamin Muhammad*, Putri Nurilla Elysa, Mulyana Eka

Study Program of Agribusiness, Faculty of Agriculture, University of Sriwijaya, Indonesia

*E-mail: yamin@unsri.ac.id

ABSTRACT

Experience shows that handling food insecure areas requires a relatively long time. it is important to understand what is felt and needed by the community. So that acceleration occurs in the response because it is in line with what is felt by that community. Therefore this study aims to identify the level of welfare through the Subjective Wellbeing approach. The identification results were analyzed using the scoring method with class interval analysis techniques and described descriptively. The results of this study indicate that personal satisfaction, social satisfaction, feeling satisfaction, and meaning of life are in the category of satisfaction. So it can be concluded that subjectively people feel prosperous.

KEY WORDS

Welfare, food insecure, area, subjective wellbeing.

History proves that food security is closely related to social security, economic stability, political stability and security or national security (FAO, 2013; Mulyono, et al). In addition, food security in the sense of food affordability is also closely related to efforts to improve the quality of Indonesian human resources (Fitriani, 2016). Without adequate and quality food support, it is impossible to produce quality human resources. Therefore building a strong food security system is an absolute requirement for national development (Suandi et al, 2014; Basrowi, 2010).

Various underdeveloped regional development programs have been carried out by the government. The problem of underdeveloped areas is usually there are also problems of food insecurity in the area (Husaini, 2012). Food insecurity conditions occur in many disadvantaged areas where the level of food availability, food accessibility and food utilization is still low due to the lack of basic infrastructure (Hanani, et al., 2015; Keho, 2015).

So the study of food security and underdeveloped areas that require accelerated efforts in its response. Innovation is needed in determining the concept of acceleration of underdeveloped areas with a subjective wellbeing approach. It is expected to be able to provide innovations to tackle food security and accelerate disadvantaged areas in Indonesia. Not only focusing on economics but also on the psychology of society for its welfare (Astuti, 2017; Muflikhati et al, 2010). In addition, it is also able to change people's paradigms in an effort to increase accessibility, availability and better use of food. So that it can contribute to the growth and development of underdeveloped. This research is considered important to better understand the psychology of people in food insecure areas in Indonesia. The results of the research are expected to be a government policy considering subjective wellbeing in development policies to accelerate the response of underdeveloped and food insecure areas. So that manifested increased welfare and food security of the community in the development of underdeveloped areas in South Sumatra (Hayati, 2016). Then the purpose of this study is to analyze the Subjective Wellbeing of the community in an effort to accelerate the prevention of food insecurity in South Sumatra.

METHODS OF RESEARCH

The research method used was a survey method (Zah, 2011). Sampling is done by simple random sampling method. Other sources of information were key informants who are

considered community leaders and observations. To measure subjective well-being, it is done by calculating Class Intervals through a score system. There are 5 indicators to measure subjective well-being which consists of physical, economic, social, psychological, and spiritual well-being. Each indicator is measured by 4 categories, namely a score of 4 for the very satisfied category, a score of 3 for the satisfied category, a score of 2 for the moderately satisfied category, and a score of 1 for the category, the scores obtained are transformed into an index score. Indicator index values are at intervals of 0-100. The assessment criteria are divided into four classifications with interval length = $100-0 / 4 = 25.00$. Score and conversion intervals, as well as criteria for measurement results can be seen in the following table.

Table 1 – Intervals and score criteria

Score Number	Score Interval	Interval Class	Categories
1	1,00 - 1,75	0,00 - 25,00	Not Satisfied (NS)
2	1,76 - 2,50	25,01 - 50,00	Almost Satisfied (AS)
3	2,51 - 3,25	50,01 - 75,00	Satisfied (S)
4	3,26 - 4,00	75,01 - 100,00	Very Satisfied (VS)

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Subjective well-being is how the farmer evaluates his life which includes cognitive evaluation. It consists of life satisfaction as well as affective evaluations in the form of positive emotions and negative effect. Subjective well-being is measured based on personal satisfaction, social satisfaction, feelings (affection), and life goals. The results of the measurement of subjective well-being will be explained in each indicator.

Personal Satisfaction. Personal satisfaction is an individual's cognitive evaluation or evaluation of personal life including education, work, household income, health, and home conditions. Table 2 shows the results of personal satisfaction of farmers in Baru Village.

Table 2 – Personal Satisfaction of Farmers in Baru Village

No.	Measurement Components	Average Score	Categories
1	Efforts to get food	3,57	VS
2	Satisfaction with food	3,37	VS
3	Suitability of work with adequate food	2,93	S
4	Satisfaction of farming products with adequate food	2,93	S
5	Adequacy of income to meet needs	2,97	S
6	Income satisfaction	3,00	S
7	Mental health conditions to meet food needs	1,57	NS
8	Family health satisfaction	3,33	VS
9	Condition of home facilities	3,17	S
10	Home and food conditions	3,23	S
11	Satisfaction of getting and buying food	3,17	S
12	Satisfaction of food sufficiency	3,23	S
13	Food storage and processing satisfaction.	3,20	S
14	Food hygiene satisfaction	3,20	S
15	Satisfaction of the availability of clean water	3,17	S
	Total	46,03	S

Table 2 shows that the personal satisfaction of farmers is on the criteria of satisfaction, the average score of 46.03. This means that farmers are satisfied with their work, health and food conditions.

Social Satisfaction. Social satisfaction is a cognitive assessment of social life which includes family harmony, leisure, social relationships and security. Table 3 shows the results of social satisfaction of farmers in Baru village. Table 3 shows that the social satisfaction of farmers is on the criteria of satisfaction, an average score of 47.37. This means that farmers feel satisfied with family harmony, free time, social relations, and security conditions related to food. This is because people often do social activities and strong togetherness.

Table 3 – Social Satisfaction of Farmers in Baru Village

No.	Measurement Components	Average Score	Categories
1	Food availability	3,33	VS
2	Harmony of the family with food	3,50	VS
3	Leisure activities	3,00	S
4	Food owned	3,43	VS
5	Social relationships and food sharing	3,43	VS
6	Trust in community leaders	3,30	VS
7	Participation in decision making	3,40	VS
8	Security of residence	1,60	NS
10	The government provides food assistance	3,03	S
11	Concern for sharing food	3,30	VS
12	food storage	3,13	S
13	The concern of leaders in meeting basic needs	3,17	S
14	Market as a place to buy food	3,13	S
	Total	47,37	S

Feeling (Affection). Feelings (affection) are the results of evaluations of experiences that have taken place in living everyday life.

Table 4 – Feeling (Affection) Satisfaction of Farmers in Baru Village

No.	Measurement Components	Average Score	Categories
1	Feeling happy in daily life and good food is available	3,60	VS
2	Feeling happy in daily life and good food is available	3,43	VS
3	Feelings of pleasure in farming activities because the results can meet family food needs	3,27	VS
4	Feelings of anxiety / worry in daily life	3,20	S
5	Feelings of anxiety / worry in farming activities due to food shortages	3,20	S
6	Feelings of anxiety / worry in farming due to flooding	3,10	S
7	Feelings are not anxious / worried in farming because of pests and diseases	3,07	S
8	Feelings are not anxious / worried in farming because of low prices	3,07	S
9	Feelings are not depressed in everyday life.	3,03	S
10	Feelings are not depressed in farming activities because of low prices	3,03	S
11	Feeling not worried because you can't buy food	3,07	S
12	Feelings of not being afraid because of not being able to buy food.	3,10	S
13	Feelings are not afraid to consume food because it is always healthy	3,07	S
14	Feeling quite satisfied because the food is nutritious and healthy	3,27	VS
15	Feeling satisfied with the availability of clean water and food ingredients	3,03	S
	Total	47,53	S

Table 5 – Meaning of Life Satisfaction of Farmers in Baru Village

No.	Measurement Components	Average Score	Categories
1	Independence in making decisions about the food consumed	3,23	S
2	Independence is not easy to change daily food choices	2,83	S
3	The ability to create comfortable conditions with available food	3,23	S
4	Consistent with self-development	3,03	S
5	Discussion to increase knowledge	3,07	S
6	Positive relationships that are beneficial for food supply	3,07	S
7	Commitment to sharing happiness and food	3,20	S
8	Optimistic in meeting family food	3,23	S
9	Have a life purpose that must be achieved	3,30	VS
10	The ability to self-acceptance	3,17	S
11	The ability to accept food consumed	3,03	S
12	Ease of obtaining food	3,07	S
13	Healthy food storage	3,03	S
14	Sufficient income for food needs	2,93	S
15	Health and family nutrition adequacy	3,13	S
	Total	46,57	S

Based on Table 4 feelings (affection) are in the category of satisfaction, the average score of 47.53. This means that farmers in Baru village feel happy, not depressed, and worried when dealing with food.

Meaning of Life. The meaning of life is one's satisfaction with their abilities. These abilities consist of: independence, environmental mastery, personal development, positive relationships, life goals, and self-acceptance. Table 5 shows the results of the meaning of life of farmers in Baru village.

Table 5 shows that the meaning of life is in the satisfied category, the average score is 46.57. This means that farmers in Baru village have a positive attitude towards themselves and others. In addition, can make their own decisions, can set a comfortable environment for them, have a purpose in life, and try to develop.

CONCLUSION

Four indicators that have been described, the total subjective welfare score of farmers in Baru village are in the satisfied category. This proves that the farmer is satisfied with his personal and social life, is happy in carrying out his daily life and has a meaning in his life.

Table 6 – Total subjective score of farmers' welfare in Baru village

No.	Measurement Components	Average Score	Categories
1	Personal Satisfaction	46,03	S
2	Social Satisfaction	47,37	S
3	Feeling (Affection) Satisfaction	47,53	S
4	Meaning of Life	46,57	S
Total		187,50	S

Based on the data shows that the total subjective well-being score on score of 187.50 in the satisfaction category. So it can be concluded that in subjective wellbeing, people in Baru village feel prosperous, even though the area is food insecure.

REFERENCES

1. Astuti. 2017. Mapping of Family Welfare Levels in South Banjarmasin District. *Journal of Geography Education*, 4 (2): 20-34.
2. Basrowi, Juariyah. 2010. Analysis of Socio-Economic Conditions and Educational Level of the Community of Srigading Village, Labuhan Maringgai District, East Lampung Regency. *Journal of Economics and Education*, 7 (1); 58-81.
3. FAO. 2003. Food Balance Sheet. <http://apps.fao.org/>
4. Fitriani. 2016. Socio-Economic Characteristics of Small Farmers in Poncowarno Village, Kalirejo District, Lampung Tengah Regency in 2015. Thesis. Lampung University.
5. Hanani, Sujarwo, Asmara R. 2015. Indicators and Assessments of Kelurahan food insecurity level for urban areas.
6. Husaini, M. 2012. Households Socio-Economic Characteristics and Level of Food Security of Farmers Households in Barito Kuala Regency. *Agribusiness Journal*, 2(4): 320-332.
7. Keho. 2015. Food Security and Security. kehotanjung.blogspot.com.
8. Muflikhati et al. 2010. Socio-Economic Conditions and Family Welfare Level: A Case in the Coastal Areas of West Java. *Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences*, 3 (1): 1-10.
9. Puspitasari, N. 2012. Gender Roles, Women's Economic Contribution and Family Welfare of Horticultural Farmers in Sindangjaya Village, Cipanas District, Cianjur Regency. Essay. Bogor: Bogor Agricultural University.
10. Suandi et al. 2014. Relationship between Population Characteristics and Family Welfare in Jambi Province. *Pyramid Journal*, 10 (2): 71-11.
11. Zah. 2011. Sustainable Coastal Tourism Development Policy. IPB Graduate School Dissertation. Bogor.