

Comparison of the Happiness Level of Farmers at Suburban Villages with Farmers at Remotes Villages

Jabal Tarik Ibrahim^{1,*}, *Fithri Mufriantje*¹, *Nur Ocvanny Amir*¹, *Hariyady Hariyady*², and *Kamarudin Mohammad Fauzi*³

¹Faculty of Agriculture and Animal Science, University of Muhammadiyah Malang, Jl. Raya Tlogomas No. 246, Malang 65144, East Java, Indonesia

²Faculty of Computing and Informatics, University Malaysia Sabah, 88400 Kinabalu City, Sabah, Malaysia

³Faculty of Technology Management and Technopreneurship, Universiti Teknikal Malaysia Melaka, 76100 Durian Tunggal, Melaka, Malaysia

Abstract. The study aims to analyze the level of happiness of farmers at two villages. The research was conducted at X village, Pare sub-district, Kediri Regency (a suburban village), and Y village, Ngancar district, Kediri Regency (a village far from the city center or rural villages). The two villages have different geographical, topographical, cultural, and central commodities. The number of respondents who have been taken is 50 people in each village, so the total is 100. Data were collected by interview using a questionnaire, in-depth discussion, and documentation. The data analysis is descriptive quantitative analysis and the average difference test (unpaired t-test). The results showed that the happiness of farmers in remote areas, who grew pineapples on mountain slopes was higher than food crops farmers in lower plains and on the outskirts of cities with urban infrastructure. Of the 20 indicators of happiness, 18 indicators score significantly higher in farmers who are far from cities, live in the mountains, and grow pineapples. Only two indicators have the same score (*i.e.*, optimism in achieving life goals and satisfaction with religious activities). Life satisfaction, feelings, and meaning of life for farmers in remote villages that live on mountain slopes, pineapple farmers feel more satisfied.

Keywords: Feeling, life satisfaction, rural villages, suburbium, welfare

1 Introduction

The Ministry of Agriculture of Indonesia is trying to reposition the agricultural sector into a sector that has a significant contribution to national economic development through the following strategies: (i) achieving self-sufficiency in rice, corn, soybeans, chilies, shallots

* Corresponding author: jabal@umm.ac.id

and increasing sugar and meat production; (ii) increasing food diversification; (iii) increasing value-added and competitive commodities in meeting export markets and import substitution; (iv) provision of raw materials for bio-industry and bio-energy; (v) increasing the income of farmer's families; and (vi) good performance accountability of government officials [1].

In the strategic plan document, the concept of welfare is repeatedly used as the expected positive impact of agricultural development programs. Welfare mentioned a lot in the strategic development plan is objective welfare, namely the achievement of a decent income, fulfillment of basic needs, and a healthy and safe physical environment. An increase in the gross domestic product has no impact on farmers' happiness [2]. Sutawi *et.al.* [2] research results indicate that national and regional economic environmental conditions do not affect happiness. Suppose a country's income is high or low. In that case, it does not automatically cause an increase in the population's income level, and the income level does not automatically affect the level of happiness. There are things outside of income that affect the level of happiness. The results of Sutawi *et. al* [2] research align with the description of Rahayu article [3], which states that there is a paradox between income and happiness (The Esternlin paradox). An increase in one's income does not necessarily increase happiness [3].

Various other research results that discuss the objective welfare of farmers have been carried out, but there are still fewer studies on subjective welfare. Subjective well-being concerns the happiness felt by individuals. Nugroho's research [4] tries to link the level of food security with welfare, and it is proven that there is indeed a relationship between these two things. In measuring welfare indicators, Nugroho includes life satisfaction as a measure of subjective happiness [4].

The measure of the farmer's happiness level is divided into three dimensions: life satisfaction, feelings, and the meaning of the farmer's life. Life satisfaction is divided into two sub-dimensions: personal and social life satisfaction. Based on this, the sub-dimensions of happiness measurement are divided into five: personal life satisfaction, social life satisfaction, feelings, and the meaning of life. Each sub-dimension is further clarified with indicators of happiness. The sum of all indicators of happiness is amount of 20 [5].

Various indicators of happiness show that many things influence a person's happiness level. For example, the community environment in which a person's life affects how a person gets an education, employment, household income, health services, and housing conditions. Social relationships, physical environmental conditions, and security conditions of residence contribute to the happiness level. Feelings of worry, depression, self-development in the environment, positive relationships with others, and other meanings of life are influenced by behavior, norms, values, and culture in the community one lives in. People who live in urban, suburban, and rural areas have different views of the meaning of life because of the influence of different behaviors, values, norms, and cultures in their communities [5].

The description above shows that a person's level of happiness (including farmers) is influenced by the social system in which the person lives. Farmers' happiness level differs between farmers in rural areas and the suburbs. Understanding the level of happiness in different locations can lead to different development programs and activities according to the needs of farmers. Based on this statement, this research aims to:

- i) Analyzing the level of happiness of farmers in two different villages, namely suburban and remote villages (rural areas).
- ii) Analyzing the difference in the happiness level of farmers in suburban with remote villages.

2 Research methods

The research location was chosen purposively, namely Kediri Regency. The consideration is that this district has an agricultural culture that is still strong, the number of farmers is still large, the life of farmers is relatively rural. The selected villages are suburban villages and remote villages with different agricultural commodities. The research samples were all members of the youth farmer group in X village and members of the pineapple farmer group in Y village. All members of farmer groups in both villages were collected. The number of farmers taken was 50 people in suburban villages and 50 people in remote villages. The total number of respondents is 100 farmers. Primary data collection was carried out by interviewing farmers using a questionnaire guide [6]. The data analysis tool used to calculate the happiness index is a measure that has been compiled by the Central Bureau of Statistics and has proven its validity and reliability in the annual happiness index survey.

3 Results and discussion

3.1 Differences in research areas characteristics and differences in happiness scores in suburban and rural villages

The research was conducted in two villages with different sociological, topographical, geographical and commodity characteristics. The differences between the two villages can be seen in the Table 1.

Table 1. Differences in sociological, topographical, geographical, and commodity characteristics in the research sites.

Plain village on the outskirts of the city (village X, Pare district, Kediri Regency)	Remote village on the slope of the mountain (village Y, Ngancar district, Kediri Regency)
The expanse of the village in the form of plains	The expanse of the village in the form of hills/mountains
The main commodities are food crops (rice, corn, and vegetables)	The main commodity is pineapple
Urban infrastructure	Rural infrastructure

The suburban village is close (less than 2 km) to city infrastructures such as the primary market, retail market, modern shops, clothing or food or household appliances, and entertainment venues. The remote village comprises pineapple plantation areas and grocery shops, far from entertainment places such as cinemas or large cafes, agricultural shops, and natural tourist areas. Both villages have the majority population with the same religion (Islam) has Javanese ethnicity and most of the population work as farmers.

The results of analyzed showed that happiness indicators in remote villages were greater (18 of the 20 happiness indicators measured in remote villages greater than in suburban villages). The other two indicators have the same value (the score is not significant). In general, the level of satisfaction of farmers in remote villages is at the level of "satisfied" and "very satisfied". The same two indicators, namely feeling optimistic about achieving life goals and satisfaction with the religious life they adopted, show the same level of happiness, namely very happy. In Table 2, enviromental development showed that all farmers were happy. A study on Chinese farmers stated that good environmental conditions can improve welfare [7].

Table 2. Scores of happiness indicators in suburban villages and remote villages in the mountains in Kediri Regency.

Dimension	Sub dimension	Indicator	Suburban villages	Remote villages
Life satisfaction	Personal life satisfaction	Level of satisfaction with education and skills	6.49	7.78*
		Level of satisfaction with work as a farmer	6.98	8.06*
		Level of satisfaction with income as a farmer	6.53	8.02*
		Level of satisfaction with personal health	7.64	8.32*
		Level of satisfaction with the house owned and its facilities	7.15	7.88*
	Social life satisfaction	Level of satisfaction with family harmony	7.47	8.68*
		Level of satisfaction with the availability of free time	7.22	7.92*
		Level of satisfaction in social relations	7.29	8.42*
		Level of satisfaction with physical environment situation around their house	7.53	8.42*
		Level of satisfaction with their security	7.50	8.24*
Feelings	Feeling happy/joyful in everyday life		7.77	8.16*
	Feelings of not worry/anxiety		4.88	6.32*
	Feelings unstressed		4.27	6.26*
Meaning of life	Level of independence (ability to make decisions for yourself)		7.21	8.22*
	Environmental development (creating comfortable conditions for yourself)		7.28	8.32*
	Consistency in self-development		7.18	7.94*
	Positive relationship with others (benefit for others)		7.42	8.06*
	Life goals (feeling optimistic about achieving life goals)		8.22	8.04(ns)
	Self-acceptance ability (Qana'ah ability)		7.42	8.64*
Religiosity	Level of satisfaction with religious life they adopted		9.06	9.26(ns)

Notes: i) 0 to 2.0 = very unhappy; ii) 2.01 to 4.00 = unhappy; iii) 4.01 to 6.00 = somewhat happy; iv) 6.01 to 8.00 = happy; v) 8.01 to 10.00 = very happy. (ns) = non-significant different mean.

3.2 Life satisfaction

The analysis of individual life satisfaction results (Table 3) shows that the indicators of satisfaction between the suburban village and remote village has significant differences, where the satisfaction level of remote village farmers is higher than that of the suburban village.

Satisfaction with the education and skills of remote rural farmers is higher than those in suburban villages. This result is different from the fact that village education comes from inadequate facilities and infrastructure, lack of teaching staff, and simple technology. Village farmers feel satisfaction from their solid social bond. They also avoid using

technology that can trigger a lack of interaction in their community, such as cell phone dependence, which causes individualism.

Table 3. Personal life satisfaction score.

Dimension	Sub dimension	Indicator	Suburban villages	Remote villages
Life satisfaction	Personal life satisfaction	Level of satisfaction with education and skills	6.49	7.78*
		Level of satisfaction with work as a farmer	6.98	8.06*
		Level of satisfaction with income as a farmer	6.53	8.02*
		Level of satisfaction with personal health	7.64	8.32*
		Level of satisfaction with the house owned and its facilities	7.15	7.88*

Notes: i) 0 to 2.0 = very unhappy; ii) 2.01 to 4.00 = unhappy; iii) 4.01 to 6.00 = somewhat happy; iv) 6.01 to 8.00 = happy; v) 8.01 to 10.00 = very happy.

The job satisfaction of remote rural farmers is higher than that of suburban farmers. The work of farmers in remote villages is homogeneous or the same. Their lives depend on the agricultural sector, while suburban village farmers only work partly in agriculture and have non-agricultural jobs [8]. The farmers in remote villages prioritize satisfaction with agricultural products supported by infrastructure and geographical environment. Agricultural land in remote villages is still natural and easy to manage, with the existence of farmer groups and self-management. In contrast, the work of farmers in suburban villages tends to be individual. They have less work due to the influence of technology and narrow land area. This result is different from other research which concluded that internet facilities can increase farmers' happiness [9].

Satisfaction with income as suburban farmers is less than with rural farmers, and this is because the average suburban village farmer has a narrow land area, affecting farmers' income. The wider the land area, supported by adequate infrastructure, will provide greater satisfaction, and make farmers happier. This score may indicate that pineapple farmers have higher incomes than crop farmers in the suburbs. The income of rice farmers is IDR $4.5 \times 10^6 \text{ mo}^{-1}$, and the income of pineapple farmers is IDR 1.3×10^7 .

The satisfaction with the personal health of farmers from a rural area is higher due to physical activities supported by the natural environment and not contaminated with pollution. While in suburban villages, satisfaction with personal health is lower because they pay less attention to their health and prefer a lifestyle that tends to be consumptive. Psychosomatic stress in suburban areas is also higher than in rural areas.

The satisfaction level with houses owned by farmers in remote areas is higher than those in the suburbs. The results of observations of the shape and the luxury of homes of farmers that grow pineapples are better than farmers in the suburbs. The higher income of pineapple farmers could be the basis for constructing more luxurious houses.

In Table 4, it is stated that all happiness indicators (five indicators) of farmers in remote villages are higher than farmers in sub urban villages. Social life satisfaction level affects the level of family harmony, the availability of free time, social relations, the state of the physical environment around their house and security conditions. The social life satisfaction level between suburban and remote villages is almost the same. When a comparison is made based on the social life satisfaction level between these two villages is

higher in rural villages than in suburban ones. The findings are in line with Veenhoven’s findings that social conditions determine happiness [10].

Table 4. Social life satisfaction score.

Dimension	Sub dimension	Indicator	Suburban villages	Remote villages
Life satisfaction	Social life satisfaction	Level of satisfaction with family harmony	7.47	8.68*
		Level of satisfaction with availability of free time	7.22	7.92*
		Level of satisfaction in social relations	7.29	8.42*
		Level of satisfaction with physical environment situation around their house	7.53	8.42*
		Level of satisfaction with their security	7.50	8.24*

Notes: i) 0 to 2.0 = very unhappy; ii) 2.01 to 4.00 = unhappy; iii) 4.01 to 6.00 = somewhat happy; iv) 6.01 to 8.00 = happy; v) 8.01 to 10.00 = very happy.

Rural life in remote villages significantly affects the sense of family bond. With a small community, their population is not as much as in the city. The growth of rural villages is also not massive because the villagers must consider the balance of natural potential [11]. The population density is low, while the ratio between area and population is small. It is visible from the houses in the village that still have yards and do not stick with their neighbors. The physical, biological, and socio-cultural environments are maintained well, and their social differentiation is low. There is not much difference between one resident and another. The residents have similarities in work, customs, language, and even kinship [12].

Social relations and social interactions in rural communities are more intensive. The communication is also personal, so they know each other, while the suburban village is more individual. The physical, biological, and socio-cultural environments are still well maintained, supported by good environmental security [13]. In comparison, the suburban village has a deficient level of security because it is prone to many crimes.

3.3 Feelings

The second dimension of the measure of happiness is feelings. Indicators of happiness include happy, anxious/worried, and depressed or free. The feelings indicator scores related to happiness can be seen in the Table 5.

Table 5. Scores of indicators of feelings of happiness in suburban villages and remote villages.

Dimension	Indicator	Suburban villages	Remote villages
Feelings	Feeling happy/joyful in everyday life	7.77	8.16*
	Feelings of not worry/anxiety	4.88	6.32*
	Feelings unstressed	4.27	6.26*

Notes: i) 0 to 2.0 = very unhappy; ii) 2.01 to 4.00 = unhappy; iii) 4.01 to 6.00 = somewhat happy; iv) 6.01 to 8.00 = happy; v) 8.01 to 10.00 = very happy.

Pineapple farmers in remote villages are happier in their daily lives, different with suburban farmers which often feel stressed, for example worried about fertilizer price [14]. They do not feel stressed or anxious, even though they live close to a volcano that erupted a few years ago. Farmers that live in the mountains have less stress than suburban farmers because they have a comfortable environment, good religious life (score nine), socially

harmonious lives, and sufficient income for a rural lifestyle [15]. All indicators of personal/social life satisfaction, all that lead to higher happiness scores.

3.4 Meaning of life and religiosity

The religious life in the two villages (Table 6) is equally good, meaning that most of the population, including the research respondents, are Muslim and similarly active in religious activities. Their rituals the religion is almost the same. Farmers are content with their religion (score above nine). Both groups of farmers have a sense of good optimism in achieving life goals (score eight, very optimistic).

Table 6. Scores of the meaning of life indicators in the suburban villages and the remote villages.

Dimension	Indicator	Suburban villages	Remote villages
Meaning of life	Level of independence (ability to make decisions for yourself)	7.21	8.22*
	Environmental development (creating comfortable conditions for yourself)	7.28	8.32*
	Consistency in self-development	7.18	7.94*
	Positive relationship with others (benefit for others)	7.42	8.06*
	Life goals (feeling optimistic about achieving life goals)	8.22	8.04(ns)
	Self-acceptance ability (Qana'ah ability)	7.42	8.64*
Religiosity	Level of satisfaction with religious life they adopted	9.06	9.26(ns)

Notes: i) 0 to 2.0 = very unhappy; ii) 2.01 to 4.00 = unhappy; iii) 4.01 to 6.00 = somewhat happy; iv) 6.01 to 8.00 = happy; v) 8.01 to 10.00 = very happy.

Remote rural farmers have higher scores in understanding the meaning of life than suburban farmers. The mountain farmers where the research is located feel more able to make their own decisions, develop a comfortable environment, consistently develop themselves, have better relationships with other people, and accept their conditions. In religious life, the ability to accept their condition (score of eight) is thought to be the core of the excellent score of other meaning of life indicators. Someone who is Qana'ah tends to be patient, grateful, not anxious, optimistic, not depressed, cheerful in everyday life, satisfied with the income earned (considered it as a blessing), satisfied with the house he has, has a harmonious household, and has good relations with neighbors [16].

Remote village farmers are satisfied and content with their personal and social life, have happy feelings and have a better meaning in their life. All of that makes them live psychologically healthy [17, 18, 6]. The level of happiness from this sub-dimensional meaning of life is higher than a study conducted on young farmers conducted in other previous studies [19]. The low level of happiness among suburban farmers indicates that farmers in that area need a holistic agricultural development approach that is not only focused on agricultural production.

4 Conclusion and suggestion

4.1 Conclusion

Farmers in the suburban were generally happy (71.25), but farmers in remote mountain areas were more satisfied (80.05). Rural farmers feel happier on 18 of the 20 indicators of happiness measured. Two indicators, optimism in achieving life goals and satisfaction with religious activities, have different scores but are not significantly different.

4.2 Suggestion

Efforts to develop agricultural communities, especially in suburban areas, require psychological, sociological, anthropological, and religious content to improve subjective well-being in the form of indicators of happiness that make up happiness.

References

1. Ministry of Agriculture RI. *Rencana Strategis Kementerian Pertanian Tahun 2020-2024* [Ministry of Agriculture Strategic Plan 2020-2024] [Online] from [https://rb.pertanian.go.id/upload/file/RENSTRA%20KEMENTAN%202020-2024%20REVISI%20%20\(26%20Ag%202021\).pdf](https://rb.pertanian.go.id/upload/file/RENSTRA%20KEMENTAN%202020-2024%20REVISI%20%20(26%20Ag%202021).pdf) (2020) [in Bahasa Indonesia]
2. S. Sutawi, A. Winaya, A. Sutanto, I. Prihatini, J.T. Ibrahim, A. Tain, Trop. Agric. Res. Extension, **24**,4: 351–359 (2021) <http://doi.org/10.4038/tare.v24i4.5557>
3. T.P. Rahayu, J. Ekonomi Bisnis, **19**,1: 149–170 (2016) [in Bahasa Indonesia] <https://doi.org/10.24914/jeb.v19i1.485>
4. T.W. Nugroho, *Peran Modal Sosial Terhadap Ketahanan Pangan dan Kesejahteraan Masyarakat Pedesaan: Analisis Data Indonesian Family Life Survey 5* [The Role of Social Capital on Food Security and the Welfare of Rural Communities] [Dissertation] Faculty of Agriculture, Brawijaya University, Malang (2022) [in Bahasa Indonesia] <http://repository.ub.ac.id/id/eprint/192455/>
5. U. Suchaini, W.P.S. Nugraha, I.K.D. Dwipayana, S.A. Lestari. *Indeks Kebahagiaan 2021* [The Happiness Index 2021]. Central Bureau of Statistic, Jakarta (2021) [in Bahasa Indonesia] <https://www.bps.go.id/publication/2021/12/27/ba1b0f03770569b5ac3ef58e/indeks-kebahagiaan-2021.html>
6. J.T. Ibrahim, *Metode Penelitian Sosial Ekonomi Pertanian* [Agricultural Socioeconomic Research Methods] Malang: UMM Press (2020). p.112 [in Bahasa Indonesia] <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=qJzzDwAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover&hl=id#v=onepage&q&f=false>
7. W. Qi, W. Xu, X. Qi, M. Sun, J. Happiness Stud., **24**: 505–528 (2023) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-022-00606-2>
8. T. Uchiyama. *Recent trends in young people's entry into farming in Japan: an international perspective*. FFTC-RDA 2014 Proceeding of the International Seminar on Enhanced Entry of Young Generation into Farming, (Jeonju, Korea, 2014). Food and Fertilizer Technology Centre, 1–16 (2014) <https://ap.ffc.org.tw/article/756>
9. M.S. Rahman, H. Toiba, T.W. Nugroho, R. Hartono, M.I. Shaleh, S. Sugiono, et al., Cogent Soc. Sci., **9**,2: 1–16 (2023) <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2023.2243716>
10. R. Veenhoven, Int. J. Psychol., **50**,5: 379–391 (2015) <https://doi.org/10.1002/ijop.12161>
11. A.M. Arias-Monsalve, S. Arias-Valencia, D.C. Rubio-León, D.C. Aguirre-Acevedo, L.R. Rengifo, J.A.E. Cortes, et al., Int. J. Psychol. Res., **15**,1: 70–83 (2022) <https://doi.org/10.21500/20112084.5329>
12. J.T. Ibrahim, *Sosiologi Pedesaan* [Rural Sociology] 2nd ed. Malang: UMM Press (2015). p.186 [Bahasa Indonesia] <https://books.google.co.id/books?hl=en&lr=&id=>

[Y8NrEAAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA58&dq=info:0nPXu_zVPDUJ:scholar.google.com&ots=pqMn6s8vql&sig=zvKnuTVjS7x84aoVBtO0FgwD3No&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false](https://scholar.google.com/oi=fnd&pg=PA58&dq=info:0nPXu_zVPDUJ:scholar.google.com&ots=pqMn6s8vql&sig=zvKnuTVjS7x84aoVBtO0FgwD3No&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false)

13. S. Sutawi, I. Prihartini, K. Khotimah, D. Iswatiningsih, F. Kusumastuti, J. Indones. Trop. Anim. Agric., **47**,1: 76–84 (2022) <https://doi.org/10.14710/jitaa.47.1.76-84>
14. F.B. Qiao, J.K. Huang, J. Integr. Agric., **20**,7: 1987–1995 (2021) [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2095-3119\(20\)63450-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2095-3119(20)63450-5)
15. W.W.T. Lam, R. Fielding, I. McDowell, J. Johnston, S. Chan, G.M. Leung, et al., Health Edu. Res., **27**,5: 767–779 (2012) <https://doi.org/10.1093/her/cys087>
16. H. Tiliouine, Happiness in Islam. In: *Encyclopedia of Quality Life Well-Being Research*. A.C. Michalos (Eds). Springer, Dordrecht (2014). p.2662–2667 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-0753-5_1544
17. T. Markussen, M. Fibaek, F. Tarp, N.D.A. Tuan, J. Happiness Stud., **19**: 1613–1636 (2018) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-017-9858-x>
18. I.W. Suparta, R. Malia, J. Ekonomi Pembangunan, **9**,2: 56–65 (2020) [in Bahasa Indonesia] <https://doi.org/10.23960/jep.v9i2.79>
19. J.T. Ibrahim, F. Mufriantje, I. Baroh, M.Z. Mazwan, I. Minarsih, A. Bakhtiar, Int. J. Agric. Environ. Res., **8**,2: 303–317 (2022) <https://doi.org/10.51193/IJAER.2022.8207>