

the field farmers face is that the seeds recommended by the government often need to match the arrival time with the planting season. This causes farmers to frequently use seeds they produce themselves even though they have not been tested.

In addition to land and seeds, crop management is the variable that partially has a significant effect on rice farming production. Research shows that crop management is carried out by those with the power to make decisions. Power in decision-making does not depend on the landowner alone but can also be seen in sharecroppers. In sharecropper relations, the decision to implement crop management is in the hands of the sharecropper, while the owner farmer passively waits for the distribution of results. The decision to implement good crop management is related to the farmer's experience. Crop management, such as the decision to use pest and disease-resistant or superior seeds, the decision to carry out maintenance, or the decision to use certain fertilizers, significantly affects rice farming production.

Fertilizers, pesticides, and labor are input variables that partially do not affect rice farming production. These three input variables have one thing in common: they can be substituted. Chemical fertilizers used by farmers can be substituted with organic fertilizers. Likewise, chemical pesticides can be replaced with natural pesticides or specific techniques such as crop rotation or other treatments, such as using light to overcome insect attacks. Meanwhile, labor variables can be replaced with different equipment to improve rice farming efficiency.

C. Review of Independent Variables in Rice Farming Input-Output Model

In the previous section, the input-output model of rice farming was analyzed through multiple regression analysis. The results show that each of the six independent variables has its characteristics, which is essential to note. This section will explore the role of each input based on the results of the multiple regression analysis. The input-output analysis, as presented in Table I, shows two groups of inputs based on the regression coefficients. The first group includes inputs with significant regression coefficients. The other group has very small coefficients (not up to 1), and even one variable shows a negative number. This can also be seen in the T-test, where three variables (land, seeds, and crop management) with significant coefficients partially influence rice farming production (Table III).

In the first input group, this study shows that the potential for rice production can still be increased. This can be done through the extensification of farming, namely the addition of land or the printing of new rice fields. The land is not just a means of agricultural production as an expanse; land for farmers can be collateral to obtain agrarian credit, which can be used to increase capital to finance their farms. Culturally, land is also a symbol of one's social status in the countryside. One's prominence is also largely determined by land ownership. Land is thus not merely an expanse where rice grows but can also function as credit collateral and a symbol of social status [39].

The problem farmers face in Indonesia concerning land is that land ownership is narrow and scattered in various places. Local farmers rarely have rice farming land that stretches

widely in one stretch. Generally, the land needs to be more cohesive, resulting in efficient rice farming management. This differs from rice farming land owned by transmigrants who receive 2 hectares of land to manage. The land is centralized, making it easier for farmers to use equipment in rice farming.

In addition, technology is needed for seeds that provide optimal yields, are resistant to pests and diseases, and can adapt to climate change. However, it is equally essential to increase the capacity of farmers to manage their farms. The current farmers are older. They have experience but need to gain more knowledge of technology. The government must pay serious attention to these older farmers so that they can keep up with agricultural developments, including updated information on marketing, prices, and the quality of paddy desired by the market [24], [40].

The three variables with small regression coefficients, and some even minus, are fertilizers, pesticides, and labor. The results show that farmers are highly dependent on chemical fertilizers, which can cause soil fertility to decline over time. As a result, farmers will continue to increase the fertilizer used until production yields decline.

In addition to the chemical content of fertilizers that can cause soil damage, the availability of fertilizers in Indonesia is currently minimal. Farmers must register to become members of farmer groups and enter the need to buy subsidized fertilizers based on land area; fertilizers are also often late in reaching farmers. The scarcity of fertilizers means that farmers must purchase non-subsidized fertilizers, which are very expensive. The scarcity of fertilizers has caused the price of non-subsidized fertilizers to increase, and in some cases, this scarcity has contributed to the illegal trade in subsidized fertilizers.

IV. CONCLUSION

Research on input-output using multiple regression allows the combination of technical and non-technical variables as independent variables. The technical variables are land, seeds, fertilizers, pesticides, and labor. The non-technical variable in this research is farm management. This combination provides a new perspective on the input-output model of rice farming that can examine the contribution of each factor to rice production in Indonesia. From multiple regression analysis, the land, seeds, and farm management variables contribute significantly to rice production. In another articulation, this study succeeded in showing that these three inputs have the potential to be developed to achieve optimal production. This study benefits farmers by optimizing farm management variables and expanding land for optimal rice production. This analysis is also helpful for the government as a policy maker in developing a sustainable agricultural development design.

REFERENCES

- [1] N. Koch, "Food as a weapon? The geopolitics of food and the Qatar-Gulf rift," *Security Dialogue*, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 118-134, Jun. 2020, doi: 10.1177/0967010620912353.
- [2] A. C. Corrales-Øverlid, "Food as a social weapon: Peruvian immigrant entrepreneurs claiming home, belonging, and distinction in Southern California," *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, vol. 46, no. 15, pp. 3338-3359, Mar. 2023, doi: 10.1080/01419870.2023.2193244.
- [3] K. Pawlak and M. Kołodziejczak, "The Role of Agriculture in Ensuring Food Security in Developing Countries: Considerations in

- the Context of the Problem of Sustainable Food Production,” *Sustainability*, vol. 12, no. 13, p. 5488, Jul. 2020, doi:10.3390/su12135488.
- [4] B. Neimark, S. Osterhoudt, H. Alter, and A. Gradinar, “A new sustainability model for measuring changes in power and access in global commodity chains: through a smallholder lens,” *Palgrave Communications*, vol. 5, no. 1, Jan. 2019, doi: 10.1057/s41599-018-0199-0.
- [5] G. Soffiantini, “Food insecurity and political instability during the Arab Spring,” *Global Food Security*, vol. 26, p. 100400, Sep. 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.gfs.2020.100400.
- [6] J. M. L. Laforge, B. Dale, C. Z. Levkoe, and F. Ahmed, “The future of agroecology in Canada: Embracing the politics of food sovereignty,” *Journal of Rural Studies*, vol. 81, pp. 194–202, Jan. 2021, doi:10.1016/j.jrurstud.2020.10.025.
- [7] D. Tommasi, “Control of resources, bargaining power and the demand of food: Evidence from PROGRESA,” *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, vol. 161, pp. 265–286, May 2019, doi:10.1016/j.jebo.2019.04.008.
- [8] B. Wood, O. Williams, V. Nagarajan, and G. Sacks, “Market strategies used by processed food manufacturers to increase and consolidate their power: a systematic review and document analysis,” *Globalization and Health*, vol. 17, no. 1, Jan. 2021, doi: 10.1186/s12992-021-00667-7.
- [9] Oscar Ingasia Ayuya, “Ethnicity, social connectedness, and the rural-urban food continuum: Food security among urban informal settlement dwellers in Kenya,” *Heliyon*, vol. 10, no. 9, p. e30481, May 2024, doi:10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e30481.
- [10] H. Lu and A. Carter, “Social determinants of rural food security: Findings from Michigan’s Upper Peninsula,” *Journal of Rural Studies*, vol. 107, p. 103256, Apr. 2024, doi: 10.1016/j.jrurstud.2024.103256.
- [11] R. H. Bates, “Governments and Agricultural Markets in Africa,” *The Role of Markets in the World Food Economy*, pp. 153–183, Jul. 2019, doi: 10.1201/9780429314391-9.
- [12] C. Henderson, “The power of food security,” *Globalizations*, pp. 1–13, May 2022, doi: 10.1080/14747731.2022.2075616.
- [13] K. Sohag, M. M. Islam, I. Tomas Žiković, and H. Mansour, “Food inflation and geopolitical risks: analyzing European regions amid the Russia-Ukraine war,” *British Food Journal*, vol. 125, no. 7, pp. 2368–2391, Nov. 2022, doi: 10.1108/bfj-09-2022-0793.
- [14] K. E. Giller et al., “The future of farming: Who will produce our food?,” *Food Security*, vol. 13, no. 5, pp. 1073–1099, Sep. 2021, doi:10.1007/s12571-021-01184-6.
- [15] M. Crippa, E. Solazzo, D. Guizzardi, F. Monforti-Ferrario, F. N. Tubiello, and A. Leip, “Food systems are responsible for a third of global anthropogenic GHG emissions,” *Nature Food*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 198–209, Mar. 2021, doi: 10.1038/s43016-021-00225-9.
- [16] A. S. Putra, G. Tong, and D. O. Pribadi, “Food Security Challenges in Rapidly Urbanizing Developing Countries: Insight from Indonesia,” *Sustainability*, vol. 12, no. 22, p. 9550, Nov. 2020, doi:10.3390/su12229550.
- [17] Sutardi et al., “The Transformation of Rice Crop Technology in Indonesia: Innovation and Sustainable Food Security,” *Agronomy*, vol. 13, no. 1, p. 1, Dec. 2022, doi: 10.3390/agronomy13010001.
- [18] Y. Zhu, M. Li, S. Lu, H. Wang, J. Wang, and W. Wang, “Research on the Input-Output Model of the Rural Agricultural Eco-Economic System Based on Emergy Theory,” *Sustainability*, vol. 14, no. 7, p. 3717, Mar. 2022, doi: 10.3390/su14073717.
- [19] A. Kazeem, “Economic efficiency of rice farming: a stochastic frontier analysis approach,” *Journal of Agribusiness and Rural Development*, vol. 58, no. 4, pp. 423–435, Dec. 2020, doi:10.17306/j.jard.2020.01377.
- [20] F. N. Muteti, I. Akite, T. P. Mpofo, and B. Mugonola, “Determinants of technical efficiency among smallholder upland rice farmers in northern Uganda—a Cobb–Douglas stochastic frontier approach,” *SN Business & Economics*, vol. 4, no. 1, Dec. 2023, doi:10.1007/s43546-023-00597-z.
- [21] Y. Tsujimoto, T. Rakotoson, A. Tanaka, and K. Saito, “Challenges and opportunities for improving N use efficiency for rice production in sub-Saharan Africa,” *Plant Production Science*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 413–427, May 2019, doi: 10.1080/1343943x.2019.1617638.
- [22] S. Fahad et al., “Major Constraints for Global Rice Production,” *Advances in Rice Research for Abiotic Stress Tolerance*, pp. 1–22, 2019, doi: 10.1016/b978-0-12-814332-2.00001-0.
- [23] H. A. Ba, Y. de Mey, S. Thoron, and M. Demont, “Inclusiveness of contract farming along the vertical coordination continuum: Evidence from the Vietnamese rice sector,” *Land Use Policy*, vol. 87, p. 104050, Sep. 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.landusepol.2019.104050.
- [24] M. Connor, A. H. de Guia, A. B. Pustaka, Sudarmaji, M. Kobarsih, and J. Hellin, “Rice Farming in Central Java, Indonesia—Adoption of Sustainable Farming Practices, Impacts and Implications,” *Agronomy*, vol. 11, no. 5, p. 881, Apr. 2021, doi: 10.3390/agronomy11050881.
- [25] K. P. Devkota et al., “Economic and environmental indicators of sustainable rice cultivation: A comparison across intensive irrigated rice cropping systems in six Asian countries,” *Ecological Indicators*, vol. 105, pp. 199–214, Oct. 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.ecolind.2019.05.029.
- [26] B. Lakitan, “Research and technology development in Southeast Asian economies are drifting away from agriculture and farmers’ needs,” *Journal of Science and Technology Policy Management*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 251–272, Mar. 2019, doi: 10.1108/jstpm-11-2017-0061.
- [27] U. A. Naher, M. N. Ahmed, M. I. U. Sarkar, J. C. Biswas, and Q. A. Panhwar, “Fertilizer Management Strategies for Sustainable Rice Production,” *Organic Farming*, pp. 251–267, 2019, doi:10.1016/b978-0-12-813272-2.00009-4.
- [28] H. Kanthilanka, T. Ramilan, R. J. Farquharson, and J. Weerahewa, “Optimal nitrogen fertilizer decisions for rice farming in a cascaded tank system in Sri Lanka: An analysis using an integrated crop, hydro-nutrient and economic model,” *Agricultural Systems*, vol. 207, p. 103628, Apr. 2023, doi: 10.1016/j.agsy.2023.103628.
- [29] M. A. Salam, M. N. I. Sarker, and S. Sharmin, “Do organic fertilizer impact on yield and efficiency of rice farms? Empirical evidence from Bangladesh,” *Heliyon*, vol. 7, no. 8, p. e07731, Aug. 2021, doi:10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e07731.
- [30] V.-N. Hoang, T. T. Nguyen, C. Wilson, T. Q. Ho, and U. Khanal, “Scale and scope economies in small household rice farming in Vietnam,” *Journal of Integrative Agriculture*, vol. 20, no. 12, pp. 3339–3351, Dec. 2021, doi: 10.1016/s2095-3119(21)63612-2.
- [31] A. Rosyada, R. E. Putra, and W. Gunawan, “Dynamics of Competitiveness and Efficiency of Rice Farming in Java Island, Indonesia,” *3BIO: Journal of Biological Science, Technology and Management*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 105–119, Nov. 2022, doi:10.5614/3bio.2022.4.2.5.
- [32] M. H. Alamri, A. Rauf, and Y. Saleh, “Analisis Faktor-Faktor Produksi Terhadap Produksi Padi Sawah di Kecamatan Bintauna Kabupaten Bolaang Mongondow Utara,” *AGRINESIA: Jurnal Ilmiah Agribisnis*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 240–249, Aug. 2022, doi:10.37046/agr.v6i3.16145.
- [33] R. I. K. A. Mantiri, D. C. Rotinsulu, and S. Murni, “Analisis Faktor-Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Produksi Padi Sawah di Kecamatan Dumoga,” *Jurnal Pembangunan Ekonomi Dan Keuangan Daerah*, vol. 18, no. 1, Jul. 2019, doi: 10.35794/jpekd.10766.18.1.2016.
- [34] A. Qadir et al., “Commercial rice seed production and distribution in Indonesia,” *Heliyon*, vol. 10, no. 3, p. e25110, Feb. 2024, doi:10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e25110.
- [35] M. Ishfaq et al., “Alternate wetting and drying: A water-saving and ecofriendly rice production system,” *Agricultural Water Management*, vol. 241, p. 106363, Nov. 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.agwat.2020.106363.
- [36] Y. Ren, Y. Peng, B. Castro Campos, and H. Li, “The effect of contract farming on the environmentally sustainable production of rice in China,” *Sustainable Production and Consumption*, vol. 28, pp. 1381–1395, Oct. 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.spc.2021.08.011.
- [37] C. Li, “Climate change impacts on rice production in Japan: A Cobb-Douglas and panel data analysis,” *Ecological Indicators*, vol. 147, p. 110008, Mar. 2023, doi: 10.1016/j.ecolind.2023.110008.
- [38] Md. S. Islam, R. W. Bell, M. A. M. Miah, and M. J. Alam, “Determinants of farmers’ fertilizer use gaps under rice-based cropping systems: Empirical evidence from Eastern Gangetic Plain,” *Journal of Agriculture and Food Research*, vol. 17, p. 101228, Sep. 2024, doi: 10.1016/j.jafr.2024.101228.
- [39] L. L. Delina, I. Fuerzas, W. Dharmiasih, M. J. Dulay, and A. Salamanca, “Are capital assets under pressure? The state of and challenges to indigenous rice farming in the cultural ricescapes of Indonesia and the Philippines,” *Journal of Rural Studies*, vol. 106, p. 103235, Feb. 2024, doi: 10.1016/j.jrurstud.2024.103235.
- [40] N. Khan, R. L. Ray, G. R. Sargani, M. Ihtisham, M. Khayyam, and S. Ismail, “Current Progress and Future Prospects of Agriculture Technology: Gateway to Sustainable Agriculture,” *Sustainability*, vol. 13, no. 9, p. 4883, Apr. 2021, doi: 10.3390/su13094883.