Department of Digital Business
Journal of Artificial Intelligence and Digital Business (RIGGS)
Homepage: https://journal.ilmudata.co.id/index.php/RIGGS
Vol. 5 No. 1 (2026) pp: 11586-11601
P-ISSN: 2963-9298, e-ISSN: 2963-914X

The Invisible Utility: Non-Monetary Drivers in Agricultural Household Economics

Muhammad Fauzan
Department of Agribusiness, Faculty of Agriculture, Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta, Indonesia
muhammad.fauzan@umy.ac.id

Abstract

Why do farm households persist in agriculture when monetary returns are often low, uncertain, or inferior to non-farm alternatives? This paper challenges the prevailing income-centered interpretation in agricultural household economics by introducing the concept of invisible utility, referring to non-monetary benefits that are behaviorally consequential yet largely overlooked in conventional models. Drawing on a structured and concept-driven synthesis of recent empirical and theoretical studies, the paper identifies key non-monetary drivers shaping farm household decisions across diverse contexts. The findings show that identity, autonomy, socio-cultural attachment to land, and psychological security are not peripheral influences, but integral components of household utility that interact dynamically with income, risk, and resource constraints. These dimensions are organized into a coherent typology and conceptually integrated into the agricultural household framework, demonstrating that farm persistence can be understood as a rational outcome within a multidimensional utility structure rather than as a consequence of inefficiency or constraint alone. By reframing utility beyond monetary metrics, this study advances agricultural household economics toward a more behaviorally grounded and theoretically complete framework. The paper further highlights methodological implications for incorporating non-monetary dimensions into empirical analysis and calls for more context-sensitive rural development policies that recognize the full spectrum of values underpinning farming livelihoods.

Keywords: Agricultural Household Model, Invisible Utility, Non-Monetary Drivers, Farm Persistence, Rural Livelihoods

1. Introduction

Smallholder farm households across diverse agroecological and socio-economic contexts continue to engage in farming despite persistent evidence that financial returns, exposure to production risks, and the opportunity cost of labor often render agriculture less attractive than non-farm alternatives. Empirical studies consistently document that, under prevailing market conditions, off-farm employment and alternative livelihood strategies frequently offer higher expected income and lower variability [1], [2], [3]. Yet, a substantial proportion of rural households maintain their involvement in farming, allocating labor, land, and capital to agricultural activities even when monetary incentives alone appear insufficient. This persistence raises a fundamental question within agricultural economics: why do farm households continue farming when income-based rationality suggests otherwise [4], [5].

Agricultural household economics has long provided a powerful framework for understanding such behavior by conceptualizing the household as a unit that simultaneously determines production, consumption, and labor allocation decisions within a unified utility-maximizing structure [6], [7], [8], [9]. Building on foundational contributions, this approach captures the interdependence of economic decisions under conditions of resource constraints, risk, and imperfect markets [10], [11], [12], [13]. Its analytical strength lies in formalizing how shocks, incentives, and constraints propagate across production choices, consumption outcomes, and labor supply, thereby offering a coherent explanation for a wide range of rural economic behaviors. This integrative perspective has also been widely applied in empirical studies to examine technology adoption, labor allocation, and livelihood diversification within farm households.

Recent developments in the literature further reinforce the continued relevance of this framework, particularly in the context of non-separability between production and consumption decisions, the role of market imperfections, and the diversification of household income sources. A growing body of research examines how households respond to commercialization, off-farm employment opportunities, and changing market structures, often

highlighting complex interactions between income generation, asset accumulation, and welfare outcomes [2], [14], [15], [16], [17], [18]. These studies suggest that farm household behavior cannot be fully understood through isolated decision domains, but rather requires a holistic view of interlinked economic processes. Indeed, contemporary applications increasingly embed the agricultural household model within broader inquiries into nutrition, resilience, and rural transformation, confirming that the framework remains analytically robust and empirically relevant.

However, despite these advances, existing explanations remain predominantly anchored in a monetary interpretation of household utility. Even when accounting for non-separability, credit constraints, labor market imperfections, and risk exposure, most models implicitly assume that households derive utility primarily from income, consumption, or profit-related outcomes [1], [10], [19], [20], [21]. As a consequence, non-monetary dimensions of decision-making; such as identity, social norms, autonomy, and psychological security; are often treated as secondary factors or incorporated indirectly as constraints or contextual variables, rather than as intrinsic components of utility formation. This tendency limits the explanatory power of existing frameworks, particularly in contexts where observed behavior systematically deviates from income-maximizing predictions.

Emerging evidence suggests that non-monetary considerations play a substantive role in shaping household decisions, especially under conditions of uncertainty, climate variability, and socio-cultural embeddedness [22], [23], [24], [25]. For instance, participation in farming may be sustained not only by its income-generating capacity but also by its role in providing security through diversification, preserving social identity, maintaining intergenerational continuity, or ensuring autonomy over labor allocation. These dimensions are often observed empirically yet remain under-theorized within the core structure of agricultural household models. Consequently, there exists a conceptual gap in explicitly recognizing non-monetary drivers as endogenous elements of household utility, rather than as peripheral or residual explanations.

This gap is particularly evident when juxtaposed with recent empirical findings across diverse agricultural contexts. A growing body of evidence shows that farm household decisions regarding production, labor allocation, and market participation are shaped by complex interactions between economic incentives and household-specific conditions, including demographic structure, risk exposure, and access to imperfect markets. For instance, recent studies demonstrate that non-separability remains a dominant feature of smallholder behavior, where production and consumption decisions are jointly determined due to market constraints [6], [26]. Similarly, research on off-farm employment highlights that labor allocation decisions not only affect income but also reshape production strategies and household welfare outcomes [27], [28], while studies on production diversity indicate that farming choices are closely linked to dietary patterns and broader well-being dimensions beyond income [29]. In the context of marginal and coastal farming systems, empirical evidence further reveals that technology adoption, labor allocation under income surplus, and even decisions related to economic exit are influenced by behavioral and structural factors embedded within the household, rather than purely by profitability considerations [6], [11], [14], [20]. Taken together, these findings suggest that even under improved income conditions or enhanced technological opportunities, farm households do not necessarily disengage from agriculture. Instead, their persistence reflects the presence of additional, less observable sources of utility, indicating that monetary incentives alone are insufficient to fully explain observed behavior.

In light of these limitations, this article aims to identify, synthesize, and reinterpret the non-monetary drivers that shape farm household decisions, and to position these drivers as integral components of utility formation within agricultural household economics. Specifically, the study develops a conceptually grounded framework that (i) classifies forms of non-monetary utility relevant to farming households, (ii) examines how these drivers interact with income, risk, and resource constraints, and (iii) offers a reinterpretation of farm persistence as a behavior consistent with multi-dimensional utility maximization. By moving beyond a strictly income-centered perspective, this paper contributes to the development of a more behaviorally and socially grounded understanding of agricultural household decision-making, thereby extending the analytical scope of the field.

2. Research Methods

2.1. Research Design

This study adopts a structured critical literature review to examine how the agricultural household economics literature explains farm household decision-making, with particular emphasis on the persistence of farming under

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31004/riggs.v5i1.7561

conditions where monetary returns are limited. Rather than functioning as a descriptive inventory of existing studies, this review is explicitly designed as a concept-driven analytical exercise aimed at uncovering underlying explanatory patterns, identifying conceptual blind spots, and developing a theoretically coherent reinterpretation of household utility.

The analytical orientation of this study moves beyond conventional narrative reviews by systematically engaging with the internal logic of the literature. Specifically, it interrogates how production, consumption, and labor allocation decisions are conceptualized within farm households, and how these domains are linked to prevailing assumptions about utility formation. In doing so, the review evaluates the extent to which monetary-centric explanations adequately account for observed behavioral persistence, particularly in contexts characterized by risk, imperfect markets, and structural constraints [1], [2], [4], [5], [30].

By mapping the co-evolution of key decision domains within the household, this approach enables a systematic assessment of where existing frameworks converge, where they diverge, and where they remain conceptually incomplete. The ultimate objective is not only to critique existing models, but to construct an integrative framework that positions non-monetary utility as an endogenous and analytically meaningful component of farm household behavior. In this sense, the structured critical review serves as a bridge between classical agricultural household models and emerging perspectives that emphasize behavioral, social, and ecological dimensions of decision-making.

2.2. Literature Search Strategy

The literature search covers the period 2005-2025, capturing contemporary developments in agricultural household economics while maintaining continuity with foundational theoretical contributions. The review draws primarily on peer-reviewed international journal articles, complemented by influential review papers and seminal works that have shaped the evolution of farm household modeling.

A structured search strategy was employed using a combination of title, abstract, and keyword queries. Core keywords include: agricultural household model, farm household behavior, non-separability, smallholder decision-making, off-farm labor, farm persistence, non-pecuniary benefits, non-monetary utility, farming identity, and household labor allocation. To ensure both breadth and depth, the search was complemented by backward and forward citation tracking, allowing the inclusion of both foundational studies and recent empirical contributions.

This approach ensures a corpus that is both comprehensive and conceptually relevant, particularly in relation to key themes such as production-consumption interdependence, labor allocation under market constraints, and household responses to economic and environmental shocks [10], [22], [24], [31]. Importantly, studies were not limited to those explicitly using the term “non-monetary utility”; instead, priority was given to works that engage substantively with behavioral, social, or institutional dimensions of household decision-making, including identity, autonomy, security, and intergenerational considerations [32], [33], [34], [35].

2.3. Inclusion and Analytical Criteria

The selection of literature follows a conceptually oriented inclusion framework, emphasizing analytical relevance over terminological alignment. Three criteria guide the inclusion process.

First, selected studies must engage with farm household decision-making within the domains of production, consumption, labor allocation, or farm sustainability, particularly in relation to how households respond to market conditions, risk, and structural constraints. This ensures that all included works are anchored within the core analytical space of agricultural household economics.

Second, studies must provide insight into the motivations, constraints, or determinants influencing the decision to farm or remain in farming. This includes both explicitly stated economic drivers and implicitly embedded behavioral or institutional factors that shape household choices beyond labor market participation.

Third, studies must demonstrate relevance to household utility formation, either explicitly or implicitly. Importantly, this criterion does not require the direct use of the term “utility.” Instead, studies are included when they illuminate dimensions such as identity, autonomy, social norms, security, ecological stewardship, control over

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31004/riggs.v5i1.7561

time use, or intergenerational continuity. This broader interpretive lens acknowledges that many empirical contributions capture non-monetary aspects of utility without framing them within formal economic terminology [15], [22], [36].

Where ambiguities arise regarding inclusion, studies are evaluated transparently based on their substantive contribution to understanding household behavior. Rather than excluding borderline cases, the analysis incorporates them while explicitly recognizing their limitations, thereby maintaining both analytical rigor and interpretive openness [16], [23], [37].

2.4. Analytical Procedure

The analytical procedure is structured into three sequential stages: mapping, concept extraction, and conceptual synthesis. This staged approach ensures transparency and coherence in moving from empirical observations to theoretical reinterpretation.

In the first stage, mapping, each study is categorized according to its primary analytical focus, including production-consumption linkage, labor allocation, market participation, livelihood diversification, farm persistence, and behavioral motivations. This mapping provides a systematic overview of how the literature conceptualizes farm household decision-making and reveals where non-monetary considerations are explicitly addressed or remain peripheral. It also allows for the identification of dominant analytical patterns and gaps within the existing body of knowledge.

The second stage, concept extraction, involves identifying both explicit and implicit elements of non-monetary utility within each study. Explicit elements include direct references to identity, autonomy, social meaning, and security, while implicit elements are inferred from mechanisms such as social networks, cultural norms, place attachment, ecological stewardship, and perceived control over labor allocation and decision timing. This stage focuses on understanding how these elements interact with monetary returns, risk, and constraints to shape observed behavior, thereby revealing dimensions of utility that are not fully captured by income-based measures [4], [22], [24], [32].

In the third stage, conceptual synthesis, the extracted elements are integrated into higher-order analytical categories that represent core dimensions of non-monetary utility. These include identity-based utility, autonomy-related utility, socio-cultural attachment, and psychological security and meaning. The synthesis then connects these categories to the existing agricultural household framework, enabling a reinterpretation of farm household behavior as a multi-dimensional utility maximization process rather than a purely income-driven one. This integration provides a coherent conceptual structure that is both theoretically grounded and empirically informed [22], [23], [34].

Taken together, the combination of structured design, systematic literature identification, transparent inclusion criteria, and staged analytical synthesis establishes a rigorous methodological foundation. This framework enables the identification and integration of non-monetary drivers in agricultural household decision-making, while maintaining consistency with the broader theoretical tradition of farm household economics.

3. Results and Discussions

3.1. Re-reading Agricultural Household Economics beyond Monetary Rationality

Agricultural household economics has long provided one of the most durable analytical foundations for understanding rural decision-making, particularly in settings where production, consumption, and labor allocation are tightly intertwined. Its enduring strength lies in the recognition that farm households are not merely production units responding to price signals, but also consumption and labor-organizing units whose choices are jointly shaped by internal resource endowments, household composition, market conditions, and risk. This integrative logic remains highly relevant in contemporary research, as recent studies continue to show that household behavior in agriculture cannot be adequately understood through fragmented or single-market perspectives alone. As the broader literature synthesized in this study indicates, the agricultural household framework remains highly relevant for explaining how farm families respond to imperfect labor, credit, and product markets, and how such constraints shape interdependent decisions across multiple domains of household life.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31004/riggs.v5i1.7561

A major contribution of this tradition is its rejection of overly simplified separability assumptions. Under complete markets, production and consumption decisions can in principle be analyzed independently. Yet in most smallholder settings, such conditions rarely hold. Empirical evidence from Indonesia by LaFave and Thomas [26], as further demonstrated in recent household-level analyses [6], [11], [14], [38], shows that smallholder households operate under substantial market incompleteness, such that labor demand, production decisions, and household consumption are jointly determined rather than separable. Similar insights emerge from earlier and related work on non-separability and farm labor allocation in Nepal and rural China [21], [39], [40]. These studies confirm that the agricultural household model is not merely a theoretical legacy, but a still-living framework capable of explaining why household decisions remain entangled under real-world constraints. In that sense, the literature has successfully demonstrated that production behavior is deeply embedded within household organization rather than reducible to firm-like profit maximization.

However, despite this analytical sophistication, the dominant interpretive horizon within much of the agricultural household literature remains predominantly monetary. Even when studies explicitly address non-separability, liquidity constraints, labor market imperfections, or welfare interdependence, household behavior is still commonly interpreted through categories such as income stabilization, expected returns, consumption smoothing, or risk minimization [2], [3], [22], [41]. In other words, the framework has become highly effective at showing that households do not behave like standard profit-maximizing farms, yet many empirical applications still evaluate their behavior through a monetary conception of utility. This tendency is visible across studies on agricultural commercialization, land rental, poverty alleviation, and resilience, where non-market conditions are often treated as modifiers of income-related incentives rather than as sources of utility in their own right [10], [23]. This perspective is further reinforced by studies on agricultural commercialization [42], supply chain integration [43], [44], [45], [46], and farm-level efficiency [47], [48], [49], [50], which show that household production decisions are shaped not only by price incentives but also by institutional arrangements, market linkages, and technical as well as allocative performance within farming systems. As a result, the literature often captures complexity in the structure of decisions while retaining relative narrowness in the interpretation of what households actually value.

This monetary emphasis becomes more problematic when confronted with a growing body of empirical findings that point to the persistence of farming even when income-based reasoning alone appears insufficient. Studies on off-farm employment, for instance, repeatedly show that households often diversify rather than exit agriculture, using external earnings not as a substitute for farming but as a complement to it [4]. Similarly, work on production diversity and dietary outcomes reveals that farm decisions are linked not only to profits, but also to nutrition, security, and broader welfare considerations. The evidence synthesized from recent studies suggests that diversification does not function merely as a revenue strategy; it also operates as a household-level means of buffering uncertainty, sustaining food access, and preserving flexibility in the face of unstable market or climatic conditions [29], [51], [52], [53], [54]. These findings do not invalidate the conventional agricultural household model. Rather, they expose an interpretive asymmetry: the observed behavior is multi-dimensional, but the explanatory vocabulary often remains disproportionately financial.

A parallel strand of scholarship further suggests that important dimensions of household behavior are tied to values and motivations that cannot be reduced to income metrics alone. Research on autonomy, gendered labor allocation, place attachment, pro-social and pro-environmental behavior, and multidimensional poverty has shown that households often act in ways that reflect control over time, social legitimacy, land attachment, moral commitments, and perceived security [5], [15], [55], [56], [57]. In agrarian settings, such factors may shape the decision to remain in farming even when agriculture offers lower monetary returns than non-farm alternatives. Likewise, studies of household labor-leisure non-separability and time allocation outside strictly agrarian contexts show that utility can be structured around care responsibilities, identity, and preferences over daily life, not simply around cash income [14], [58], [59], [60]. From this perspective, the persistence of farming may reflect not irrationality or mere constraint, but a broader utility structure in which autonomy, continuity, and meaning carry real behavioral weight.

Taken together, these strands of evidence invite a careful re-reading of agricultural household economics. The point is not to reject the established framework, which remains analytically indispensable, but to extend its interpretive reach. The field has already shown convincingly that farm households make interdependent decisions under imperfect markets, and that such decisions affect welfare across production, consumption, and labor domains. What remains underdeveloped is a sufficiently explicit treatment of non-monetary utility as a central explanatory component of those decisions. Re-reading the literature beyond monetary rationality therefore means recognizing that many behaviors long interpreted as second-best responses to constraint may also be expressions

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31004/riggs.v5i1.7561

of positively valued, though less visible, forms of utility. This is the conceptual opening pursued in this paper: to move from a framework in which non-monetary considerations appear as residual or peripheral influences toward one in which they are understood as endogenous and behaviorally meaningful elements of farm household decision-making.

3.2. The Emergence of Invisible Utility in Farm Household Decisions

The discussion in the previous subsection shows that agricultural household economics has been highly successful in demonstrating the interdependence of production, consumption, and labor allocation under imperfect market conditions. Yet once this interdependence is acknowledged, a further question inevitably arises: *what exactly are farm households maximizing when they persist in farming under conditions where measured monetary returns appear limited, unstable, or inferior to non-farm alternatives?* It is at this point that the concept of invisible utility becomes analytically necessary. The term is used here to refer to non-monetary benefits that are behaviorally consequential, socially intelligible, and often durable over time, yet insufficiently captured by conventional indicators such as net income, farm profit, or observed consumption. These benefits do not exist outside rational choice; rather, they expand the content of what is considered utility. In this sense, invisible utility is not a rejection of economic reasoning, but a refinement of it. It allows household behavior that appears suboptimal under a narrow monetary lens to be reinterpreted as coherent within a broader and more realistic welfare calculus [58], [61].

A closer reading of the literature suggests that invisible utility has long been present in the empirical record, although usually in implicit or fragmented form. Many studies document household choices that cannot be fully explained by prices, returns, or standard risk-coping arguments alone. For instance, evidence from non-separability studies shows that labor allocation decisions reflect not only wage comparisons or production needs, but also household-specific preferences over time use, work organization, and the interaction between farm and non-farm activities [21], [39], [40]. More broadly, household-level evidence on labor supply, leisure, and intertemporal substitution demonstrates that economic choice is frequently shaped by preferences that combine material and non-material considerations, including control over daily routines, coordination of family responsibilities, and the value attached to particular forms of work [59], [60], [62]. When viewed from this angle, farming is not merely an income-generating activity. It is also a mode of organizing life, time, responsibility, and social relation.

The emergence of invisible utility is particularly visible in studies showing that households often diversify their livelihood portfolios without exiting agriculture. If farming were valued only through current monetary return, then rising non-farm opportunities should, under many circumstances, lead to progressive withdrawal from agricultural activity. Yet empirical studies repeatedly show a more complex pattern. Off-farm employment often coexists with continuing engagement in farming, suggesting that agriculture retains value beyond its direct financial contribution [4], [63]. In some cases, non-farm earnings are used to stabilize or support on-farm activity rather than replace it, indicating that farming remains a meaningful component of the household's broader livelihood architecture. Similarly, the literature on production diversity and dietary outcomes shows that farm choices are linked not only to profit, but to food security, flexibility, self-provisioning, and household resilience. Even where diversification does not maximize monetary return, it may preserve access to food, reduce vulnerability, and maintain household control over essential aspects of reproduction and well-being [29], [51], [64]. These patterns strongly suggest that households derive utility from agriculture in forms that are not exhausted by market income.

Another important source of invisible utility lies in the domain of identity, status, and belonging. Farming is often more than an occupation; it is a social identity, a recognized role within kinship and community structures, and a basis for legitimacy in rural life. Research on care, gender, and household roles has shown that economic behavior is deeply entangled with socially meaningful identities and moral expectations [55], [56], [65]. In agrarian contexts, continuing to farm may affirm one's position as a responsible household head, a custodian of family resources, or a legitimate member of a rural community. This dimension becomes especially salient where land, lineage, and productive labor are central to how personhood and social worth are recognized. Thus, persistence in farming may be sustained not merely by necessity, but by the value households attach to being, and being seen as, cultivators. Such utility is "invisible" not because it is weak or incidental, but because it rarely enters the standard language of economic measurement.

A closely related dimension concerns autonomy and control, which the agrarian literature increasingly identifies as a meaningful basis of action. Work on repeasantization and agrarian autonomy has shown that households may value the capacity to govern their own labor processes, rhythms of work, and strategic decisions, even when this

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31004/riggs.v5i1.7561

autonomy does not maximize short-run income [66]. The appeal of farming may therefore reside partly in the ability to avoid subordinated wage relations, preserve discretion over time use, and maintain command over the deployment of family labor. This resonates with broader household and development literatures in which autonomy is treated not merely as an instrument for earning more, but as a substantive component of well-being itself [56], [67], [68]. In this regard, farm persistence can be understood not only as economic survival, but also as an effort to preserve a valued space of self-direction within uncertain rural economies.

Invisible utility also emerges through the symbolic and relational significance of land. In many farm households, land is not reducible to a productive factor or marketable asset. It can embody ancestry, inheritance, memory, dignity, and future security. Studies on place attachment and land-related behavior show that farmers often act to protect, retain, or invest in land for reasons tied to belonging, stewardship, and continuity across generations [57], [69]. Likewise, scholarship on women's land rights and household outcomes suggests that the significance of land often exceeds its current income stream, affecting bargaining power, intergenerational expectations, and household stability [32], [70]. These findings reinforce the view that decisions to remain in farming may be anchored partly in the non-monetary value of retaining a place in land-based social worlds. Households may continue farming not only because land yields crops, but because land secures identity, authority, attachment, and future possibility.

A further dimension of invisible utility concerns psychological security and meaning. A substantial body of work in welfare, resilience, and well-being studies suggests that households value routine, predictability, social embeddedness, and meaningful activity in ways that matter for behavioral choice, especially under uncertainty [71], [72], [73]. In rural settings characterized by climate variability, market volatility, and weak institutional protection, farming may provide not only income, but also a sense of continuity, familiarity, and existential grounding. Recent research on household welfare under climate stress and resilience in vulnerable settings supports the argument that well-being cannot be adequately read from monetary variables alone, because households value security, coherence, and socially embedded survival strategies as part of their overall welfare position [22], [23], [24]. This is especially relevant for understanding why some households maintain agricultural activity even when external observers interpret such persistence as economically inefficient. What appears inefficient from outside may in fact reflect a rational preference for forms of security and meaning that are real, experienced, and enduring.

Importantly, the recognition of invisible utility should not be misunderstood as a denial of the importance of prices, profits, risk, or liquidity constraints. Monetary factors remain central to household decision-making, and no serious reinterpretation of agricultural behavior can dispense with them. The point, rather, is that these factors operate within a wider utility space in which non-monetary values can complement, reinforce, or at times outweigh purely financial considerations. In many cases, observed behavior reflects neither pure profit maximization nor pure cultural inertia, but a multi-criteria process in which households balance income, risk, identity, autonomy, continuity, and security. Invisible utility thus should not be treated as a residual explanation invoked only when conventional theory appears insufficient. It should be understood as a constitutive part of how households evaluate alternatives and organize livelihoods.

This recognition carries important methodological implications. If invisible utility is behaviorally real, then research designs limited to income, output, and expenditure indicators will systematically understate part of the utility structure that shapes farm household decisions. This suggests the need for broader measurement strategies that combine conventional economic indicators with approaches capable of capturing non-market value, subjective well-being, perceived autonomy, social meaning, and attachment to land or occupation. Methodological advances in happiness-based valuation, multidimensional poverty assessment, and mixed-method welfare analysis provide useful tools in this regard [5], [72], [73], [74]. For agricultural household economics, the implication is not that it should abandon its analytical core, but that it should widen its empirical repertoire to better align theory with observed behavior.

Taken together, the literature reviewed here indicates that invisible utility is not a speculative add-on, but a concept grounded in recurring empirical patterns across labor allocation, diversification, gender relations, land attachment, resilience, and household well-being. Its emergence reflects an important shift in how farm household behavior can be interpreted: from a framework centered almost exclusively on measurable monetary returns toward one that recognizes agriculture as a site of material production, social identity, autonomy, continuity, and psychological grounding. This does not weaken the logic of agricultural household economics. On the contrary, it strengthens it by enabling a more complete account of why households remain in farming, how they evaluate alternatives, and why apparently suboptimal behavior may in fact be utility-consistent within a broader and more realistic

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31004/riggs.v5i1.7561

conception of welfare. On that basis, the next subsection develops a more systematic typology of the non-monetary drivers that constitute this invisible utility in farm household decision-making.

3.3. Typology of Non-Monetary Drivers in Agricultural Household Economics

Building on the emergence of invisible utility outlined in the previous subsection, this section develops a theoretically grounded typology of non-monetary drivers that shape farm household decision-making. While prior studies have documented various behavioral, social, and institutional influences on agricultural livelihoods, these elements have rarely been consolidated into a coherent analytical framework. As a result, non-monetary considerations often appear fragmented across the literature, limiting their integration into the core logic of agricultural household economics.

The typology proposed here addresses this gap by organizing recurring patterns of non-monetary utility into four analytically distinct yet interrelated domains: (i) identity and self-recognition, (ii) autonomy and control over work and life, (iii) socio-cultural attachment and intergenerational continuity, and (iv) psychological security and meaning. These categories are derived from a synthesis of empirical and theoretical contributions across development economics, agrarian studies, gender analysis, and behavioral welfare research. Importantly, they are conceptualized not as residual or auxiliary factors, but as constitutive components of household utility that interact with income, risk, and constraints to shape observed behavior.

3.3.1. Identity and Self-Recognition

Identity constitutes one of the most foundational dimensions of non-monetary utility in agricultural households. In many rural contexts, farming is not merely an economic activity but a central axis of self-definition, social recognition, and moral legitimacy. Households derive utility from being recognized as farmers, land stewards, or providers, and this identity is often deeply embedded within kinship structures, community norms, and intergenerational expectations.

Empirical and conceptual work across diverse settings demonstrates that identity shapes both the persistence and the transformation of agricultural practices. Studies on gender, empowerment, and rural livelihoods show that individuals' sense of worth and legitimacy is closely tied to their roles within productive systems, influencing decisions on labor allocation, resource use, and engagement with markets [68], [75], [76], [77], [78]. Similarly, qualitative evidence suggests that maintaining a farming identity can sustain participation in agriculture even when profitability declines, as exiting farming may entail a loss of status, dignity, or belonging [65], [79].

From a theoretical standpoint, identity-based utility challenges the implicit assumption that occupational choice is driven solely by comparative advantage in income generation. Instead, it suggests that households derive intrinsic value from alignment between economic activity and self-concept. This aligns with broader behavioral and institutional perspectives in which identity is treated as an endogenous determinant of economic behavior. Within agricultural household economics, incorporating identity-based utility provides a more complete explanation for why households may resist exit from farming, even when alternative income sources are available and economically attractive.

3.3.2. Autonomy and Control over Work and Life

A second major dimension of non-monetary utility concerns the value placed on autonomy and control. Farming often provides households with a degree of discretion over labor allocation, work intensity, timing, and decision-making processes that is difficult to replicate in wage-based employment. This control can be particularly important in contexts where non-farm opportunities involve hierarchical labor relations, contractual rigidity, or limited agency.

A substantial body of literature highlights autonomy as a central component of well-being and economic behavior. In agricultural settings, studies show that households frequently balance income gains from off-farm employment against the loss of control associated with wage labor, leading to hybrid livelihood strategies rather than full exit from farming [4], [80]. Research on empowerment further demonstrates that autonomy over production decisions and income use is strongly associated with improved welfare outcomes, even when monetary returns are comparable [81], [82], [83].

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31004/riggs.v5i1.7561

The agrarian literature on repeasantization extends this argument by suggesting that smallholders may actively maintain farming as a means of preserving autonomy in the face of market integration and structural transformation [66]. In this sense, autonomy is not merely instrumental, but constitutes a substantive component of utility. Within the agricultural household framework, autonomy-related utility helps explain why households may accept lower or more volatile incomes in exchange for maintaining control over their labor, time, and productive decisions.

3.3.3. Socio-Cultural Attachment and Intergenerational Continuity

A third dimension of invisible utility is rooted in socio-cultural attachment, particularly in relation to land, family, and intergenerational continuity. Land in agricultural households is rarely valued solely as a productive asset; it is also a repository of history, identity, and social belonging. Ownership and cultivation of land connect households to past generations while anchoring expectations for future inheritance and continuity.

Empirical research consistently demonstrates that land carries symbolic and relational value that exceeds its market price or immediate productive capacity [57], [69]. This is reinforced by inheritance norms, cultural expectations, and the role of land in sustaining family identity. As a result, decisions to remain in farming often reflect long-term considerations related to lineage, stewardship, and the preservation of family assets.

This dimension is further shaped by intra-household dynamics and gender relations. Studies on land rights and asset ownership show that control over land influences bargaining power, investment behavior, and household decision-making, particularly for women [32], [70], [84]. These dynamics highlight that land is not merely a factor of production, but a central institution through which economic, social, and relational power is negotiated.

Within agricultural household economics, incorporating socio-cultural attachment expands the understanding of land beyond its role in profit generation. It highlights that land-based decisions are embedded in a broader socio-temporal context, where households balance current returns against the preservation of identity, continuity, and social legitimacy across generations.

3.3.4. Psychological Security and Meaning

The fourth dimension of non-monetary utility relates to psychological security and the search for meaning. Farming, as a livelihood, often provides a structured way of life characterized by routine, familiarity, and embeddedness within a social and ecological environment. These elements contribute to a sense of stability and purpose that can be highly valued, particularly in contexts marked by economic uncertainty and institutional fragility.

The literature on well-being and resilience increasingly recognizes that households value not only material outcomes but also subjective experiences of security, coherence, and meaning [22], [72], [73]. In rural settings, farming can serve as a stabilizing anchor, offering a predictable rhythm of life and a sense of continuity even in the face of external shocks. This is particularly relevant in environments where alternative employment is uncertain, precarious, or socially disembedded.

Moreover, farming may embody broader values related to stewardship, self-reliance, and care for family and community. Qualitative research on rural livelihoods and ethics of care highlights how such values shape economic behavior, influencing decisions to remain in agriculture despite financial disadvantages [65], [67], [71]. These dimensions contribute to a form of utility that is not easily quantified but is nonetheless reflected in consistent behavioral patterns.

Recognizing psychological security and meaning as components of utility provides a more nuanced interpretation of farm persistence. It shifts the analytical focus from viewing such persistence as irrational or constraint-driven to understanding it as a rational response within a broader welfare framework that includes non-material dimensions of well-being.

3.3.5. Synthesis of the Typology

Taken together, identity, autonomy, socio-cultural attachment, and psychological meaning constitute a multi-dimensional structure of non-monetary utility that systematically shapes farm household decision-making. These

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31004/riggs.v5i1.7561

dimensions are not isolated influences but interact dynamically with monetary incentives, risk conditions, and institutional constraints. Their combined effect helps explain why households often maintain engagement in agriculture even when income-based models would predict exit.

This typology advances agricultural household economics by moving beyond a predominantly income-centered interpretation of behavior toward a more comprehensive framework in which utility is understood as a composite of material and non-material rewards. In this framework, persistence in farming is not merely a residual outcome of market imperfections, but a rational choice reflecting multi-dimensional utility maximization. Empirical evidence across contexts suggests that these non-monetary drivers exhibit both universal characteristics, rooted in social and psychological mechanisms, and context-specific expressions shaped by culture, gender norms, and institutional arrangements [61], [76], [81], [85].

By formalizing these dimensions, the typology provides a structured foundation for future empirical research. It enables the specification and testing of non-monetary drivers alongside conventional economic variables, thereby opening new avenues for integrating behavioral, social, and institutional insights into the analytical core of agricultural household economics.

3.4. Integrating Non-Monetary Drivers into Agricultural Household Economics

The typology developed in the previous section establishes that non-monetary drivers are not peripheral anomalies, but systematic and recurring features of farm household behavior. The central task of this section is therefore to integrate these drivers into the analytical core of agricultural household economics. This integration requires a shift from treating non-monetary factors as contextual modifiers toward recognizing them as endogenous components of utility formation. In doing so, the framework moves beyond a unidimensional interpretation of welfare toward a multidimensional conception in which monetary and non-monetary elements are co-determined and jointly optimized.

At its theoretical foundation, the agricultural household model is built upon the principle of utility maximization under constraints, where households simultaneously determine production, consumption, and labor allocation decisions. Historically, utility has been operationalized through observable economic indicators such as income, consumption, or profit. While analytically tractable, this operationalization implicitly narrows the welfare space to monetary outcomes. However, a wide body of literature; from non-separable labor supply models [39], [60] to intertemporal consumption frameworks [59]; demonstrates that preferences over labor, leisure, and production are inherently intertwined and cannot be reduced to financial returns alone. The incorporation of non-monetary drivers thus aligns with, rather than contradicts, the foundational logic of the model by enriching the content of the utility function itself.

Conceptually, this implies a shift toward a multidimensional utility framework, in which household welfare is composed of both pecuniary and non-pecuniary components. Monetary returns remain necessary but insufficient conditions for explaining observed behavior. Non-monetary rewards; such as identity, autonomy, land-based meaning, and psychological security; enter the utility function as valued outcomes in their own right. Importantly, these components interact through both complementarities and trade-offs. For example, engagement in off-farm employment may increase income while simultaneously reducing autonomy or weakening identity-based utility associated with farming. Conversely, continued farming may yield lower financial returns but sustain non-monetary benefits that contribute significantly to overall welfare. Such trade-offs are consistent with broader well-being and capability approaches, which emphasize that welfare is inherently multi-dimensional and context-dependent [61], [72].

Within this expanded framework, market imperfections should be reinterpreted not as the sole drivers of persistence in farming, but as moderators that shape how monetary and non-monetary utilities interact. Traditional explanations attribute continued engagement in agriculture to constraints such as imperfect labor markets, credit limitations, or information asymmetries [10], [31]. While these factors remain important, empirical evidence suggests that many households persist in farming even when such constraints are partially relaxed or when alternative income opportunities are available. This indicates that persistence is not merely a residual outcome of constraint, but often reflects active preference shaped by non-monetary utility. In this sense, market imperfections and non-monetary drivers operate jointly: constraints may amplify the value of non-monetary benefits, while non-monetary preferences may influence how households respond to constraints [15], [24], [36].

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31004/riggs.v5i1.7561

The integration of non-monetary drivers also calls for a reinterpretation of non-separability within the agricultural household model. Conventionally, non-separability arises from incomplete markets that link production and consumption decisions. However, when non-monetary utility is explicitly considered, these linkages can also emerge from endogenous preferences and intra-household dynamics. For instance, labor allocation decisions may reflect not only wage differentials but also preferences for autonomy, identity, or socially defined roles [55], [86]. Similarly, production choices may be influenced by land attachment or intergenerational considerations that are independent of short-term profitability [57], [69]. This suggests that non-separability is not exclusively a function of external market failure, but can also arise from internal preference structures embedded within households.

A further implication concerns the interpretation of risk and resilience. Standard models emphasize risk in terms of income variability and consumption smoothing [41]. While these remain central, the literature indicates that households also value forms of stability that are not captured by monetary indicators, including predictability of livelihood, continuity of social roles, and embeddedness within community networks. Farming may thus function as a source of psychological and social resilience, providing security that complements financial stability [22], [23]. This broader interpretation of resilience aligns with findings from well-being and social capital research, where non-material factors play a critical role in shaping adaptive capacity under uncertainty.

From a methodological perspective, the integration of non-monetary utility necessitates a rethinking of how welfare is measured and modeled in agricultural household studies. Reliance on income or consumption as sole indicators risks systematically underestimating the benefits derived from farming. Advances in non-market valuation, subjective well-being analysis, and multidimensional poverty measurement provide viable pathways for capturing these dimensions empirically [72], [73], [74]. In parallel, mixed-method approaches that combine quantitative indicators with qualitative insights offer a means to capture context-specific expressions of identity, autonomy, and meaning while maintaining analytical rigor [87], [88], [89].

Importantly, the proposed integration should be understood as a reframing rather than a replacement of existing theory. The agricultural household model remains a powerful analytical tool, but its explanatory capacity is enhanced when utility is interpreted as a multi-dimensional construct. In this reframed perspective, farm persistence emerges not as an anomaly or second-best outcome, but as a rational response within a broader welfare calculus that incorporates both material and non-material considerations.

Ultimately, this integration provides a conceptual bridge between classical agricultural household economics and emerging strands of research in behavioral economics, development studies, and well-being analysis. By explicitly incorporating non-monetary drivers into the utility framework, the model becomes better aligned with observed behavior and more capable of explaining the complex, context-dependent decisions of farm households. This not only strengthens the theoretical coherence of the field, but also enhances its empirical relevance in addressing contemporary challenges in rural development and agricultural transformation.

3.5. Implications for Future Research and Rural Development Policy

The integration of non-monetary drivers into agricultural household economics generates a set of implications that extend beyond incremental refinement, pointing instead toward a reorientation of both research agendas and rural development strategies. At its core, the argument advanced in this paper implies that the continued reliance on income, consumption, and productivity as dominant indicators of welfare is analytically incomplete. While these metrics remain indispensable, they fail to capture the full spectrum of utility that shapes farm household behavior. As a result, both empirical research and policy design risk systematically misinterpreting persistence in farming as inefficiency or constraint, rather than as an outcome consistent with a broader and more complex welfare calculus [61], [68], [81], [90], [91].

From a research perspective, the most immediate implication is the need to move toward a multidimensional and interdisciplinary framework of analysis. Agricultural household economics can no longer remain analytically confined within the boundaries of production theory and income-based welfare measurement. Instead, it must engage more explicitly with insights from behavioral economics, sociology, anthropology, and institutional analysis. The literature on autonomy, identity, and social embeddedness demonstrates that economic behavior is deeply shaped by relational and cultural contexts, suggesting that a purely econometric treatment of household decisions is insufficient [56], [71], [87], [88]. Integrating these perspectives does not weaken analytical rigor; rather, it enhances explanatory power by aligning models more closely with observed behavior.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31004/riggs.v5i1.7561

A second implication concerns the measurement of invisible utility. One of the central challenges identified in this study is that non-monetary drivers are rarely captured in conventional datasets. Future research must therefore invest in developing theoretically grounded and empirically robust instruments capable of operationalizing constructs such as identity, autonomy, land attachment, and psychological security. Advances in subjective well-being analysis, life satisfaction approaches, and multidimensional poverty frameworks offer promising methodological pathways for capturing such dimensions [72], [73], [74]. In parallel, mixed-method designs that combine quantitative indicators with qualitative inquiry can provide deeper insight into how these dimensions are experienced and expressed within specific contexts [87], [88], [89]. Without such innovations, models risk remaining internally consistent but empirically incomplete.

Third, there is a need to develop flexible modeling approaches that accommodate multi-criteria utility structures. Rather than relying on single-objective optimization frameworks, future studies should explore models that allow for the coexistence and interaction of monetary and non-monetary objectives. This may include extended utility specifications, discrete choice experiments, or hybrid frameworks that integrate stated preferences with revealed behavior [58], [76], [92]. Such approaches are particularly relevant in contexts characterized by climate risk and livelihood uncertainty, where households must continuously balance income generation with stability, autonomy, and social cohesion [22], [24].

Beyond methodology, the findings of this study underscore the importance of context-sensitive and comparative research designs. The relative importance of non-monetary drivers is likely to vary across institutional environments, cultural settings, gender norms, and stages of market development. Cross-country and cross-regional studies can help identify which dimensions of invisible utility are universal and which are context-specific, thereby refining both theory and policy relevance [55], [68], [69], [84]. Such comparative work is essential for avoiding overgeneralization and for developing models that are both analytically robust and contextually grounded.

The implications for rural development policy are equally profound. Many policy frameworks implicitly assume that households respond predictably to monetary incentives, such that increasing off-farm wages or improving agricultural productivity will lead to efficient reallocation of labor and resources. However, the evidence synthesized in this study suggests that such assumptions are incomplete. When non-monetary utility is taken into account, household responses to policy interventions may diverge significantly from income-based predictions. In particular, policies that aim to accelerate exit from agriculture may encounter resistance not only due to structural constraints, but also because they fail to account for identity, autonomy, and socio-cultural attachment to farming.

This implies that rural development policy must move toward a multi-dimensional and people-centered design framework. Rather than viewing agriculture solely as a sector to be transformed or exited based on productivity criteria, policymakers should recognize it as a domain of livelihood that generates both economic and non-economic value. Effective interventions should therefore aim not only to increase income, but also to preserve or enhance the non-monetary benefits that households derive from farming. This may involve supporting hybrid livelihood strategies, strengthening tenure security, enabling flexible labor arrangements, and acknowledging the role of land in sustaining identity and intergenerational continuity [57], [65], [67].

In addition, the integration of non-monetary drivers calls for a reconsideration of policy evaluation frameworks. Conventional impact assessments that focus exclusively on income, productivity, or asset accumulation may fail to capture important dimensions of welfare. Incorporating indicators of subjective well-being, autonomy, social cohesion, and perceived security can provide a more comprehensive assessment of policy outcomes, particularly in heterogeneous rural settings [23], [72], [73]. Such an approach is consistent with broader shifts in development thinking toward multidimensional welfare and human-centered metrics.

At the same time, it is important to recognize that non-monetary drivers do not operate uniformly across households. Heterogeneity in preferences, constraints, and socio-cultural contexts implies that the relative importance of monetary and non-monetary utility will vary. In some cases, income considerations may dominate decision-making, particularly under conditions of extreme poverty or acute vulnerability. In others, identity, autonomy, or land attachment may play a more decisive role. This reinforces the need for flexible policy design and heterogeneity-aware evaluation frameworks that can accommodate diverse household responses [68], [81], [88].

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31004/riggs.v5i1.7561

Finally, the integration of non-monetary utility suggests the potential for a dynamic feedback loop between research and policy. As empirical research develops more refined measures of invisible utility, policy interventions can be better tailored to reflect the lived realities of rural households. In turn, the implementation of such policies can generate new data and insights that further refine theoretical models. This iterative process offers a pathway toward a more adaptive and context-sensitive agricultural household economics; one that is capable of explaining not only how households respond to incentives, but also why they value particular livelihood strategies in the first place.

4. Conclusion

This paper argues that the persistence of farming among smallholder households cannot be adequately explained through a purely income-centered lens. By synthesizing insights from agricultural household economics and related literatures, the study demonstrates that non-monetary drivers; captured here as *invisible utility*; play a central role in shaping household decision-making. Identity, autonomy, socio-cultural attachment to land, and psychological security are shown to be not peripheral influences, but integral components of household utility. As a result, behaviors often interpreted as inefficient or constraint-driven can be more accurately understood as consistent with a multidimensional utility framework in which monetary and non-monetary considerations are jointly evaluated.

By making these dimensions explicit, this study advances a conceptual reframing of agricultural household economics that extends its explanatory power while remaining consistent with its foundational logic. The implication is clear: understanding farm household behavior requires moving beyond narrow economic indicators toward a more comprehensive view of what households value. In doing so, the paper not only provides a more realistic interpretation of farm persistence, but also opens a pathway for more behaviorally grounded research and more context-sensitive rural development policies. Ultimately, bringing invisible utility into analytical focus allows agricultural household economics to better explain not only how households respond to incentives, but why they choose to remain in agriculture in the first place.

Reference

[1] F. Chen, Q. Ma, and W. Huang, "Farm Households' Rice Production Behavior in China Under a Separability Assumption: A Metaheuristic Optimization Approach," *Nat. Resour. Model.*, vol. 32, no. 3, 2019, doi: 10.1111/nrm.12221.

[2] O. Schulte, J. Mumber, and T. T. Nguyễn, "Agricultural Commercialisation, Asset Growth and Poverty in Rural Vietnam," *Australian Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics*, vol. 67, no. 3, pp. 388–416, 2023, doi: 10.1111/1467-8489.12517.

[3] D. J. O'Brien, "A New Institutional Approach to Entrepreneurship and Inequality in Rural Russian Villages: Survey Findings From 1991 to 2006" *Journal of Eurasian Studies*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 41–48, 2012, doi: 10.1016/j.euras.2011.10.005.

[4] E. Yitbarek and W. M. Tesfaye, "Climate-Smart Agriculture, Non-Farm Employment and Welfare: Exploring Impacts and Options for Scaling Up," *Sustainability*, vol. 14, no. 23, p. 15981, 2022, doi: 10.3390/su142315981.

[5] S. Khosla, "Regenerative Agriculture Practices and Multidimensional Poverty in Eastern Rural India," *Sci. Rep.*, vol. 15, no. 1, 2025, doi: 10.1038/s41598-025-18461-5.

[6] M. Fauzan, Y. Syaukat, N. Kusnadi, and L. M. Baga, "Adoption of sandy coastal farming technology in Indonesia: A household economics analysis," *AGRARIS: Journal of Agribusiness and Rural Development Research*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 295–316, Dec. 2025, doi: 10.18196/agraris.v11i2.814.

[7] C. Nakajima, *Subjective Equilibrium Theory of The Farm Household*. Amsterdam: Elsevier Science Publisher, 1986.

[8] J. E. Taylor and I. Adelman, "Agricultural household models: genesis, evolution, and extensions," *Rev. Econ. Househ.*, vol. 1, pp. 33–58, 2003.

[9] I. Singh, L. Squire, and J. Strauss, *Agricultural Household Models: Extensions, Applications, and Policy*. Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986.

[10] E. Seewald, S. Baerthel, and T. T. Nguyễn, "Land Rental Markets as a Poverty Reduction Strategy: Evidence From Southeast Asia," *Journal of Economics and Development*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 102–119, 2023, doi: 10.1108/jed-10-2022-0217.

[11] M. Fauzan, Marbudi, R. A. Nugrahapsari, H. Tandra, and N. K. Mawardi, "Technology adoption and economic exit in coastal farming: A household model approach from Yogyakarta, Indonesia," in *E3S Web of Conferences*, Purwokerto: EDP Sciences, 2025, p. 01037. doi: 10.1051/e3sconf/202566501037.

[12] S. Leki, "Several factors that influence household economic decisions of rice farmers in Indonesia," *Russ. J. Agric. Socioecon. Sci.*, vol. 61, no. 1, pp. 172–179, 2017, doi: 10.18551/rjoas.2017-01.17.

[13] Heriyanto and Asrol, "Simultaneous equation model for economic calculation of households of independent rubber farmers in mineral land in Kampar Regency, Riau Province," *Journal of Geoscience, Engineering, Environment, and Technology*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 67–74, 2020, doi: 10.25299/jgeet.2020.5.2.3791.

[14] M. Fauzan, Y. Syaukat, N. Kusnadi, and L. M. Baga, "Labor allocation under income surplus: A coastal farming case in Yogyakarta, Indonesia," in *E3S Web of Conferences*, Purwokerto: EDP Sciences, 2025, p. 01036. doi: 10.1051/e3sconf/202566501036.

[15] M. Authelet, J. Subervie, P. Meyfroidt, N. Asquith, and D. Ezzine-de-Blas, "Economic, Pro-Social and Pro-Environmental Factors Influencing Participation in an Incentive-Based Conservation Program in Bolivia," *World Dev.*, vol. 145, p. 105487, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.worlddev.2021.105487.

[16] C. A. L. Herpacio and I. Irham, "Multidimensional Poverty Across Agroecology in Occidental Mindoro, Philippines," *Int. J. Adv. Sci. Eng. Inf. Technol.*, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 1323–1332, 2023, doi: 10.18517/ijaseit.13.4.18981.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31004/riggs.v5i1.7561

[17] L. Zheng, "Does Off-Farm Work Induce Farmland Abandonment? Evidence from China," *China Agricultural Economic Review*, vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 664–682, 2024, doi: 10.1108/caer-07-2023-0203.
[18] A. Endiris, Z. Brehanie, and Z. Ayalew, "The Impact of Off-Farm Activities on Rural Households' Food Security Status in Western Ethiopia: The Case of Dibatie District," *Cogent Food Agric.*, vol. 7, no. 1, 2021, doi: 10.1080/23311932.2021.1879425.
[19] S. K. Wegren, "The Development of Agrarian Capitalism in Post-Soviet Russia," *Journal of Agrarian Change*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 138–163, 2011, doi: 10.1111/j.1471-0366.2010.00298.x.
[20] M. Fauzan, "Modelling economic behavior of smallholder households in coastal areas of Yogyakarta Indonesia," *Electronic Journal of Education, Social Economics and Technology*, vol. 6, no. 1, 2025.
[21] Y. Liang, M. W. Feldman, S. Li, and G. C. Daily, "Asset Endowments, Non-farm Participation and Local Separability in Remote Rural China," *China Agricultural Economic Review*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 66–88, 2013, doi: 10.1108/17561371311294766.
[22] A. T. Terefe, M. Ketema, A. M. Workagegnehu, and W. M. Tesfaye, "Interdependence of Rural Household Welfare Measurement in the Context of Climate Variability in Ethiopia," *Heliyon*, vol. 10, no. 10, p. e30973, 2024, doi: 10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e30973.
[23] D. Giwa-Daramola and H. S. James, "COVID-19 and Microeconomic Resilience in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Study on Ethiopian and Nigerian Households," *Sustainability*, vol. 15, no. 9, p. 7519, 2023, doi: 10.3390/su15097519.
[24] S. K. Weldearegay, M. M. Tefera, and S. T. Feleke, "Impact of Urban Expansion to Peri-Urban Smallholder Farmers' Poverty in Tigray, North Ethiopia," *Heliyon*, vol. 7, no. 6, p. e07303, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e07303.
[25] M. Fauzan and G. W. Tuga, "Strategies for sustainable livelihoods of shallot picking workers households in Brebes Regency," *Enrichment: Journal of Management*, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 2561–5268, 2023, doi: https://doi.org/10.35335/enrichment.v13i4.1619.
[26] D. LaFave and D. Thomas, "Farms, Families, and Markets: New Evidence on Completeness of Markets in Agricultural Settings," *Econometrica*, vol. 84, no. 5, pp. 1917–1960, 2016, doi: 10.3982/ecta12987.
[27] E. Giannakis, S. Efstratoglou, and A. Antoniades, "Off-Farm Employment and Economic Crisis: Evidence From Cyprus," *Agriculture*, vol. 8, no. 3, p. 41, 2018, doi: 10.3390/agriculture8030041.
[28] S. F. A. Dedehouanou, A. Araar, A. Ousseini, A. L. Harouna, and M. Jabir, "Spillovers From Off-Farm Self-Employment Opportunities in Rural Niger," *World Dev.*, vol. 105, pp. 428–442, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.worlddev.2017.12.005.
[29] K. T. Sibhatu and M. Qaim, "Farm Production Diversity and Dietary Quality: Linkages and Measurement Issues," *Food Secur.*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 47–59, 2018, doi: 10.1007/s12571-017-0762-3.
[30] S. Lovo, "Market Imperfections, Liquidity, and Farm Household Labor Allocation: The Case of Rural South Africa," *Agricultural Economics*, vol. 43, no. 4, pp. 417–428, 2012, doi: 10.1111/j.1574-0862.2012.00593.x.
[31] K. Kuipers and E. B. P. d. Jong, "Resilient Livelihood Styles: An Enriched Perspective on Household Livelihood Resilience in the Sensitive Natural Environments of Indonesia," *Reg. Environ. Change*, vol. 23, no. 4, 2023, doi: 10.1007/s10113-023-02155-7.
[32] M. Hong, D. Zhou, and L. Lou, "Study of the Impact of Rural Land Transfer on the Status of Women in Rural Households," *Land (Basel).*, vol. 13, no. 1, p. 107, 2024, doi: 10.3390/land13010107.
[33] E. Birol, P. Koundouri, and Y. Kountouris, "Assessing the Economic Viability of Alternative Water Resources in Water-Scarce Regions: Combining Economic Valuation, Cost-Benefit Analysis and Discounting," *Ecological Economics*, vol. 69, no. 4, pp. 839–847, 2010, doi: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2009.10.008.
[34] H. H. Shaga, T. L. Mega, and M. Senapathy, "Determinants of Rural Household Poverty: The Case of Sodo Zuria Woreda, Wolaita Zone, Southern Ethiopia," *European Journal of Sustainable Development Research*, vol. 5, no. 2, p. em0157, 2021, doi: 10.21601/ejosdr/10844.
[35] G. D. Glass and D. J. O'Brien, "The Role of Household Social Organization in the Structure of Rural Economies: Comparing Forest Resource Dependent and Agriculturally Dependent Regions in Russia," *Rural Sociol.*, vol. 81, no. 4, pp. 635–654, 2016, doi: 10.1111/ruso.12109.
[36] H. Zhou *et al.*, "Willingness and Driving Factors of Rural Homestead Withdrawal in China's Major Grain Producing Areas From the New Quality Productivity Perspective," *Sci. Rep.*, vol. 15, no. 1, 2025, doi: 10.1038/s41598-025-08020-3.
[37] G. Selvananthan, S. Amaratunge, F. P.J.S., and R. R.M.A.K, "Decoding the Nexus Between Socioeconomic Factors and Poverty Alleviation in the Northern Province of Sri Lanka," *Sri Lankan Journal of Business Economics*, vol. 12, no. 1, 2023, doi: 10.31357/sljbe.v12.6438.
[38] S. Leki, N. Hanani, R. Dwiastuti, and B. Setiawan, "Household economic decisions of corn farmers at West Timor Indonesia," *Current Agriculture Research Journal*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 74–83, Jun. 2016, doi: 10.12944/carj.4.1.08.
[39] A. Abdulai and P. P. Regmi, "Estimating Labor Supply of Farm Households Under Nonseparability: Empirical Evidence From Nepal," *Agricultural Economics*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 309–320, 2000, doi: 10.1111/j.1574-0862.2000.tb00077.x.
[40] D. Christopoulos, M. Genius, and V. Tzouvelekas, "Farm and Non-Farm Labor Decisions and Household Efficiency," *Journal of Productivity Analysis*, vol. 56, no. 1, pp. 15–31, 2021, doi: 10.1007/s11123-021-00602-3.
[41] H. Kazianga and C. Udry, "Consumption Smoothing? Livestock, Insurance and Drought in Rural Burkina Faso," *J. Dev. Econ.*, vol. 79, no. 2, pp. 413–446, 2006, doi: 10.1016/j.jdeveco.2006.01.011.
[42] M. Fauzan, "Beyond the village gate: Commercializing smallholder agriculture in Indonesia," *RIGGS: Journal of Artificial Intelligence and Digital Business*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 10–21, Oct. 2024, doi: 10.31004/riggs.v3i3.400.
[43] Susanawati, M. Fauzan, and I. M. C. Fanestia, "Supply Chain Resources of Red Chili Based on Food Supply Chain Network in Kulonprogo Indonesia," in *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference of Food, Agriculture, and Natural Resource (IC-FANRES 2021)*, Atlantis Press, 2022, pp. 174–183. doi: 10.2991/absr.k.220101.023.
[44] K. Damayanti, Susanawati, and M. Fauzan, "Flexibility of Red Chili Supply Chain in Panjatan District Kulon Progo Regency," in *Proceedings of the International Conference on Sustainable Innovation Track Accounting and Management Sciences (ICOSIAMS 2021)*, Atlantis Press, 2022, pp. 269–275. doi: 10.2991/aebmr.k.211225.037.
[45] Susanawati, Y. T. N. Sari, M. Fauzan, and J. Sharifuddin, "Supply chain management of red chili based on the food supply chain network in Yogyakarta Indonesia," in *E3S Web of Conferences*, EDP Sciences, Nov. 2021. doi: 10.1051/e3sconf/202131601010.
[46] S. P. Susanawati and M. Fauzan, "Risk of shallot supply chain: An analytical hierarchy process (AHP) model in Brebes Java, Indonesia," *Int. J Sup. Chain. Mgt*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 124–131, 2019, [Online]. Available: http://excelingtech.co.uk/
[47] M. Fauzan, "Pendapatan, risiko dan efisiensi ekonomi usahatani bawang merah di Kabupaten Bantul," *AGRARIS: Journal of Agribusiness and Rural Development Research*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 107–117, 2016, doi: 10.18196/agr.2231.
[48] T. D. Saputri, M. Fauzan, T. Resiana, and D. R. Kamardiani, "Technical Efficiency Analysis of Environmentally Friendly Shallot Farming Based on the Planting Season in Bantul District," in *BIO Web of Conferences*, EDP Sciences, Nov. 2024. doi: 10.1051/bioconf/202414405005.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31004/riggs.v5i1.7561

[49] M. Fauzan, H. Akhmadi, K. S. R. Thach, and N. Dwi Maulidiawati, "Technical efficiency and corn farming productivity: A stochastic frontier analysis of small-scale farmer in Indonesia," in *E3S Web of Conferences*, EDP Sciences, Nov. 2023. doi: 10.1051/e3sconf/202344402026.
[50] Triyono, M. Fauzan, J. Mu'awanah, and M. Sedek, "Production factor efficiency of shallot farming in Pati, Central Java, Indonesia," *E3S Web of Conferences*, vol. 316, p. 02036, 2021, doi: 10.1051/e3sconf/202131602036.
[51] Y. Shen, "The Impact of Scientific Research on Economic Growth: An Empirical Study Based on Data From 20 Countries in 2000-2018," *Advances in Economics Management and Political Sciences*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 311–316, 2023, doi: 10.54254/2754-1169/21/20230267.
[52] M. R. Bellon, B. H. Kotu, C. Azzarri, and F. Caracciolo, "To Diversify or Not to Diversify, That Is the Question. Pursuing Agricultural Development for Smallholder Farmers in Marginal Areas of Ghana," *World Dev.*, vol. 125, p. 104682, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.worlddev.2019.104682.
[53] L. V Rasmussen *et al.*, "Joint Environmental and Social Benefits From Diversified Agriculture," *Science (1979).*, vol. 384, no. 6691, pp. 87–93, 2024, doi: 10.1126/science.adj1914.
[54] D. Race, A. P. Suka, S. N. Oktalina, A. R. H. Bisjoe, N. Muin, and N. Arianti, "Modern Smallholders: Creating Diversified Livelihoods and Landscapes in Indonesia," *Small-Scale Forestry*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 203–227, 2022
[55] S. Anderson and M. Eswaran, "What Determines Female Autonomy? Evidence From Bangladesh," *J. Dev. Econ.*, vol. 90, no. 2, pp. 179–191, 2009, doi: 10.1016/j.jdeveco.2008.10.004.
[56] J. Devine, L. Camfield, and I. Gough, "Autonomy or Dependence – Or Both?: Perspectives From Bangladesh," *J. Happiness Stud.*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 105–138, 2006, doi: 10.1007/s10902-006-9022-5.
[57] H. Li, Y. Chen, and W.-Y. Chang, "Place Attachment, Self-Efficacy, and Farmers' Farmland Quality Protection Behavior: Evidence From China," *Land (Basel).*, vol. 12, no. 9, p. 1711, 2023, doi: 10.3390/land12091711.
[58] J. Laitner and D. Silverman, "Estimating Life-Cycle Parameters From Consumption Behavior at Retirement," *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 2005, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.1093714.
[59] R. Blundell, L. Pistaferri, and I. S. Eksten, "Children, Time Allocation and Consumption Insurance," *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 2018, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.3097335.
[60] T. Yagihashi and J. Du, "Intertemporal Elasticity of Substitution With Leisure Margin," *Rev. Econ. Househ.*, vol. 21, no. 4, pp. 1473–1504, 2023, doi: 10.1007/s11150-022-09639-1.
[61] C. L. Ambrey, C. M. Fleming, and M. Manning, "The Social Cost of the Black Saturday Bushfires," *Australian Journal of Social Issues*, vol. 52, no. 4, pp. 298–312, 2017, doi: 10.1002/ajs4.21.
[62] R. Blundell, L. Pistaferri, and I. S. Eksten, "Consumption Inequality and Family Labor Supply," *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 2014, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.2404858.
[63] C. B. Barrett, T. Reardon, and P. Webb, "Non-farm Income Diversification and Household Livelihoods in Rural Africa: A Review of the Evidence," *Food Policy*, vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 315–331, 2001.
[64] M. Fauzan, "Household Economic of Shallot Farmers in Central Java Province, Indonesia," *PESHUM : Jurnal Pendidikan, Sosial dan Humaniora*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 4740–4748, Apr. 2025, doi: 10.56799/peshum.v4i3.9057.
[65] K. B. Hanrahan, "Living Care-Fully: The Potential for an Ethics of Care in Livelihoods Approaches," *World Dev.*, vol. 72, pp. 381–393, 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.worlddev.2015.03.014.
[66] K. Jansen, M. Vicol, and L. J. Nikol, "Autonomy and Repeasantization: Conceptual, Analytical, and Methodological Problems," *Journal of Agrarian Change*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 489–505, 2021, doi: 10.1111/joac.12468.
[67] H. Keller, "Psychological Autonomy and Hierarchical Relatedness as Organizers of Developmental Pathways," *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B Biological Sciences*, vol. 371, no. 1686, p. 20150070, 2016, doi: 10.1098/rstb.2015.0070.
[68] N. Rao, "Assets, Agency and Legitimacy: Towards a Relational Understanding of Gender Equality Policy and Practice," *World Dev.*, vol. 95, pp. 43–54, 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.worlddev.2017.02.018.
[69] D. Glover and J. Sumberg, "Youth and Food Systems Transformation," *Front. Sustain. Food Syst.*, vol. 4, 2020, doi: 10.3389/fsufs.2020.00101.
[70] N. Menon, Y. van der M. Rodgers, and H. T. L. Nguyễn, "Women's Land Rights and Children's Human Capital in Vietnam," *World Dev.*, vol. 54, pp. 18–31, 2014, doi: 10.1016/j.worlddev.2013.07.005.
[71] Z. Mumtaz and S. Salway, "Understanding Gendered Influences on Women's Reproductive Health in Pakistan: Moving Beyond the Autonomy Paradigm," *Soc. Sci. Med.*, vol. 68, no. 7, pp. 1349–1356, 2009, doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2009.01.025.
[72] H. Welsch and J. Kühling, "Using Happiness Data for Environmental Valuation: Issues and Applications," *J. Econ. Surv.*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 385–406, 2009, doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6419.2008.00566.x.
[73] C. L. Ambrey, C. M. Fleming, and A. Y. Chan, "Estimating the Cost of Air Pollution in South East Queensland: An Application of the Life Satisfaction Non-Market Valuation Approach," *Ecological Economics*, vol. 97, pp. 172–181, 2014, doi: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2013.11.007.
[74] S. F. A. Dedehouanou, J. Swinnen, and M. Maertens, "Does Contracting Make Farmers Happy? Evidence From Senegal," *Review of Income and Wealth*, vol. 59, no. S1, 2013, doi: 10.1111/roiw.12041.
[75] W. Kinati, E. C. Temple, D. Baker, and D. Najjar, "Pathways to Empowerment:Case Studies of Positive Deviances in Gender Relations in Ethiopia," *Gender Issues*, vol. 40, no. 1, pp. 86–118, 2022, doi: 10.1007/s12147-022-09305-x.
[76] L. Njogu, R. Adam, and C. R. Farnworth, "Assessing Women's Empowerment, Participation, and Engagement in Aquaculture in Bangladesh," *Aquaculture International*, vol. 32, no. 5, pp. 6303–6331, 2024, doi: 10.1007/s10499-024-01467-7.
[77] D. R. Kamardiani, M. Fauzan, and K. S. Riansyah, "The feasibility of environmentally friendly and conventional shallot farming in Bantul Regency," *IOP Conf. Ser. Earth Environ. Sci.*, vol. 883, no. 1, p. 012070, 2021, doi: 10.1088/1755-1315/883/1/012070.
[78] O. Wijaya, D. Mufti Agung, N. Man, and M. Fauzan, "The Relationship Between Entrepreneurial Characteristics of Farmers and The Performance of Shallots Farming in The Bantul Regency," in *E3S Web of Conferences*, EDP Sciences, Nov. 2024. doi: 10.1051/e3sconf/202459501017.
[79] V. Gramm, C. D. Torre, and A. Membretti, "Farms in Progress-Providing Childcare Services as a Means of Empowering Women Farmers in South Tyrol, Italy," *Sustainability*, vol. 12, no. 2, p. 467, 2020, doi: 10.3390/su12020467.
[80] N. Yang, Y. Ding, S. Min, and J. Bai, "Does Rubber Expansion Hinder the Migration of Rural Labor? Evidence From Southwest China?," *Rev. Dev. Econ.*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 1108–1131, 2022, doi: 10.1111/rode.12865.
[81] H. Malapit, C. Ragasa, E. Martínez, D. Rubin, G. Seymour, and A. Quisumbing, "Empowerment in Agricultural Value Chains: Mixed Methods Evidence From the Philippines," 2019, doi: 10.2499/p15738coll2.133456.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31004/riggs.v5i1.7561

[82] E. Bryan and E. Garner, "Understanding the Pathways to Women's Empowerment in Northern Ghana and the Relationship With Small-Scale Irrigation," *Agric. Human Values*, vol. 39, no. 3, pp. 905–920, 2022, doi: 10.1007/s10460-021-10291-1.
[83] J. Twyman, E. F. Talsma, K. Togka, C. Ferraboschi, and I. D. Brouwer, "Gender Equity Considerations in Food Environments of Low and Middle Income Countries: A Scoping Review," 2020, doi: 10.2499/p15738coll2.134225.
[84] A. Galiè *et al.*, "Women's Empowerment in Livestock Index," 2019, doi: 10.1037/t72245-000.
[85] P. Rajkhowa and M. Qaim, "Personalized Digital Extension Services and Agricultural Performance: Evidence From Smallholder Farmers in India," *PLoS One*, vol. 16, no. 10, p. e0259319, 2021, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0259319.
[86] K. Raghunathan, S. Kannan, and A. Quisumbing, "Can Women's Self-help Groups Improve Access to Information, Decision-making, and Agricultural Practices? The Indian Case," *Agricultural Economics*, vol. 50, no. 5, pp. 567–580, 2019, doi: 10.1111/agec.12510.
[87] M. Ryan, S. v. d. Burg, and M. J. Bogaardt, "Identifying Key Ethical Debates for Autonomous Robots in Agri-Food: A Research Agenda," *Ai and Ethics*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 493–507, 2021, doi: 10.1007/s43681-021-00104-w.
[88] I. Omondi *et al.*, "Gender Relations and Women's Empowerment in Small-Scale Irrigated Forage Production in Ethiopia," *PLoS One*, vol. 19, no. 12, p. e0309927, 2024, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0309927.
[89] H. Galiwango, R. F. Miiro, N. Turyahabwe, and A. Egeru, "Does the Climate-Smart Village Extension Model Enhance Farmer Empowerment?," *Outlook Agric.*, vol. 51, no. 3, pp. 281–292, 2022, doi: 10.1177/00307270221113600.
[90] M. Fauzan, "Spending Smart: The Role of Government Expenditure in Boosting Provincial Economic Performance in Indonesia," *RIGGS*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 150–156, Apr. 2025, doi: 10.31004/riggs.v4i1.389.
[91] M. Fauzan, "A strategy for development of shallot Agribusiness Sub Terminal (STA) in Brebes," in *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, IOP Publishing Ltd, Sep. 2020. doi: 10.1088/1755-1315/518/1/012048.
[92] F. M. M. Namayengo, J. A. C. v. Ophem, and G. Antonides, "A Comparative Study on the Role of Microcredit on Agricultural Production Improvement Among Resource-Poor Rural Women," *Front. Sustain. Food Syst.*, vol. 7, 2023, doi: 10.3389/fsufs.2023.1083660.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31004/riggs.v5i1.7561