Available online at: http://alive.lppm.unand.ac.id/

Andalasian Livestock

ISSN 3063-1912 (Online)

Research Article

Analysis of the Socioeconomic Characteristics of Non-Cash Food Assistance (BPNT) Recipients in the Agricultural Sector in Indonesia

Alam Nur*, M. Nazer, Febriandi Prima Putra

Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Andalas, Padang, West Sumatra, 25163, Indonesia
*Corresponding author: alamnoer.agr@gmail.com
License and copyright: Copyright © 2026 by the authors. Open access publication under the terms and conditions of the **Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial-ShareAlike (CC BY-NC-SA)** license.

Article History | Received: August 20, 2025 | Revised: December 18, 2025 | Accepted: January 20, 2026 | Published: January 30, 2026

ABSTRACT

The non-cash food assistance (BPNT) program in Indonesia is designed to reduce poverty and improve welfare by providing non-cash food assistance. In the agricultural sector, where many rural households depend on farming activities as their primary source of livelihood, this program needs to support vulnerable communities. The program also contributes to the achievement of SDGs 1 (no poverty) and 2 (zero hunger), which aim to reduce poverty and ensure food security. However, the implementation of this program is often affected by various factors that can lead to biases in the targeting and distribution of assistance. This study explores the socioeconomic characteristics of BPNT recipients in the agricultural sector and identifies potential biases in program implementation. The data used include various socioeconomic variables, such as education level, employment status, home ownership, housing infrastructure conditions, sanitation facilities, lighting sources, and food insecurity. The analysis shows that BPNT recipients often come from households whose heads have lower educational attainment, unstable employment conditions, or do not own their homes. Inadequate housing conditions and limited sanitation facilities are also significantly associated with receiving assistance. These findings indicate that the BPNT program still faces challenges in achieving appropriate and effective targeting. This study proposes several recommendations for improved implementation, including improved targeting mechanisms, periodic evaluations, and policy adjustments to minimize bias. Thus, BPNT can be better targeted in addressing the food needs of the most vulnerable communities while supporting the achievement of sustainable development goals.

Keywords: animal-source food, BPNT program, food security, Indonesia, poverty

INTRODUCTION

Indonesia, as an agrarian country, possesses abundant natural resources; however, this has not been sufficient to eradicate poverty, particularly in rural areas. In March 2019, the number of people living in poverty in rural areas reached 15.15 million, while in urban areas, it amounted to 9.99 million (BPS, 2019). According to Statistics Indonesia, 49.41% of poor households depend on the agricultural sector as their primary source of livelihood. Therefore, improving farmers' welfare is highly strategic, considering that the majority of poor households reside in rural areas. Ruauw (2010) states that most Indonesians utilize available natural resources to meet their daily needs, including through farming activities (Yacoub, 2020).

The development of rural areas is an important indicator of successful development in developing countries. If rural populations achieve socioeconomic mobility, development can be considered successful in reaching the community (Yustika, 2013). In developing countries, rural

DOI: https://doi.org/10.25077/alive.v3.n1.p34-44.2026

areas are often characterized as regions where the population works in the agricultural sector and independently fulfills their basic needs (Ministry of Agriculture, 2010).

The goal of agricultural and national development is to create prosperity for farmers. However, the agricultural sector, which serves as the primary source of livelihood in rural areas, faces various complex challenges and exhibits welfare levels below the national average. The government aims to improve public welfare through policies and programs that provide broader access to education, healthcare, and employment opportunities. These efforts are expected to reduce social and economic disparities and enable individuals to reach their full potential (Hafizah, 2019). Public welfare is fundamentally the responsibility of the state (Suharto 2008). Public policies encompass services, protection, and prevention of social problems in accordance with the mandate of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia (Suharto, 2015).

An individual's welfare level is influenced by the income earned and the utility obtained. The higher the income, the higher the level of welfare (Albert & Hahnel, 1990). Welfare reflects the total utility derived from goods and services consumed (Hentschel & Lanjouw, 1997). Social welfare involves programs that redistribute resources to improve the welfare of individuals and communities (Lu et al., 2013). Welfare can be observed through the fulfillment of basic needs and an increase in purchasing power. Although Indonesia has vast agricultural land, many rural communities, particularly farmers and agricultural laborers, still live in poverty (Warto, 2015). Saragih (2017) states that farmers are often closely associated with poverty, and two-thirds of the poor rely on subsistence agriculture for their livelihoods (Yacoub, 2020).

The Indonesian government has initiated various programs to improve public welfare, including social assistance programs for low-income families, educational programs, workforce training, and health services. Social protection has also become a major strategy for poverty reduction through legislation such as Law No. 40 of 2004 on the National Social Security System (SJSN) and Law No. 11 of 2009 on Social Welfare.

Social assistance programs support community welfare, particularly for vulnerable groups. These programs help poor families meet their basic needs and improve access to essential services, such as education and healthcare. They also play a role in social inclusion and in building a foundation for inclusive and sustainable welfare. One such program is the Non-Cash Food Assistance program (*Bantuan Pangan Non Tunai* – BPNT), which enables beneficiaries to purchase rice and eggs for their needs, aiming to provide balanced nutrition while optimizing government budget use.

The BPNT program is an Indonesian government initiative aimed at improving the welfare and food security of low-income communities. However, its implementation often faces various obstacles that hinder the optimal achievement of its objectives. In practice, mismatches between beneficiary data and actual conditions, delays in aid distribution, and misuse result in assistance that is not properly targeted. Ideally, the BPNT program should provide maximum benefits to eligible recipients without technical or administrative barriers, ensuring that assistance reaches those who truly need it.

Based on this phenomenon, several research questions arise: What are the characteristics of BPNT recipients in Indonesia, and do biases exist in program implementation that cause assistance to be misdirected? Addressing these questions is expected to yield recommendations to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the BPNT program in the future.

According to the World Bank (2010), poverty is defined as deprivation in well-being that includes multiple dimensions, such as low income and the inability to access essential goods and services necessary for survival. Sumodiningrat (1999) stated that government-designed

 DOI: https://doi.org/10.25077/alive.v3.n1.p34-44.2026

community empowerment programs aim to address three main development problems: unemployment, inequality, and poverty alleviation.

Poverty is a complex issue caused by several key factors. At the micro level, poverty arises from unequal thinking and unequal resource use, leading to unfair income distribution. In addition, low human resource quality resulting from low educational attainment, discrimination, or hereditary factors leads to low productivity and wages. Differences in access to capital also exacerbate poverty (Kuncoro, 2010). Poverty results in individuals' inability to meet basic needs, such as food, clothing, housing, and healthcare, causing their living standards to fall below those of the broader society. In addition to economic factors, poverty is also influenced by social and psychological factors (Simanjutak, 2003).

According to Krisnamurthi (2006), poverty can be classified into several categories. First, absolute poverty occurs when an individual's or household's income or expenditures fall below the minimum threshold for a decent standard of living, known as the poverty line. Second, relative poverty occurs when income or expenditures are lower than those of the surrounding community. Third, chronic or structural poverty persists over a long period. Fourth, temporary or transitory poverty arises from sudden shocks that push individuals or households into poverty. Fifth, mass poverty occurs when the majority of the society experiences poverty. Finally, individual poverty occurs when only a small share of the population is poor.

Poverty can also be defined as a condition in which an individual or group's standard of living is lower than the prevailing standard in their society. Its impacts include reduced purchasing power and difficulty in fulfilling family nutritional needs. Governments can implement policies to address poverty, such as the Non-Cash Food Assistance (BPNT) program (Abu, 2009).

The BPNT program is a government initiative that assists beneficiary families (*Keluarga Penerima Manfaat* - KPM) by providing food assistance through electronic accounts. This assistance was used to purchase food items at the designated partner outlets. The primary objective of BPNT is to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of social assistance distribution, support financial inclusion, and reduce household expenditure burdens while ensuring balanced nutrition for beneficiaries in a timely and targeted manner.

Before BPNT, the government implemented the *Raskin* program (rice for poor households) to alleviate poverty. This program focused on increasing farmers' incomes, strengthening food security, and maintaining national economic stability. *Raskin*, later renamed *Rastra* in 2015, provided subsidized rice to poor households at a fixed price to meet nutritional needs. The change from *Raskin* to *Rastra* aimed to shift the paradigm from merely providing aid to improving community welfare (Masta, 2016). BPNT, which succeeded the *Rastra* program, provides non-cash food assistance in the form of vouchers redeemable for staple foods, such as rice, eggs, and cooking oil, at various distribution outlets. The program is regulated under the Regulation of the Minister of Social Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia No. 11 of 2018, which aims to facilitate poor communities' access to more varied and nutritionally balanced food options.

BPNT targets beneficiary families (KPM), who, in 2017, comprised individuals in the lowest socioeconomic conditions in the program implementation areas. The names of KPM are listed in the Integrated Database for Poverty Handling Programs (DT-PFM), which has been verified and validated by local governments. The program has proven capable of reducing household expenditure burdens by providing a portion of food needs, ensuring balanced nutritional intake for beneficiaries, improving the accuracy and timeliness of food assistance distribution, and promoting sustainable development.

Each KPM receives an assistance amount of IDR 110,000 per month through the electronic Prosperous Family Card (*Kartu Keluarga Sejahtera* – KKS), which can be used to purchase rice and eggs from designated agents in several areas. The BPNT program was gradually introduced in 2017 in selected regions across Indonesia that had adequate access and supporting facilities. In addition to providing more diverse food options, this distribution mechanism aims to encourage productive behavior among communities by offering flexibility in withdrawing assistance and opportunities to accumulate assets through savings. Ultimately, the distribution of non-cash food assistance is expected to improve the beneficiaries' welfare and economic capacity by enabling easier access to financial services.

Overall, BPNT represents a government initiative to reduce the financial burden on poor populations and provide tangible benefits in meeting monthly food needs. BPNT was established as a replacement for the Rastra program, which was considered less effective in implementing the 6T principles (accurate targeting, accurate quantity, accurate price, timely distribution, appropriate quality, and proper administration). The government began implementing BPNT in 2017, with the expectation that the program would operate effectively in line with its objectives through proper coordination among stakeholders, detailed data-collection systems, and organized distribution processes (Ministry of Social Affairs et al., 2019).

The implementation of the BPNT program faces several challenges, as identified by various studies. Siregar et al. (2019) noted that lack of information, weak government supervision, and low compliance among implementers constitute major obstacles. Herviyanti et al. (2021) highlighted that the BPNT program in Jambi City has been relatively well targeted at improving the welfare of beneficiary farmers. However, certain health-related issues still need to be addressed. Arfandi and Sumiyarti (2022) found that most BPNT recipients belong to the poorest groups, although some recipients also come from wealthier groups. Fardian (2022) identified the demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of BPNT beneficiaries, who predominantly live in rural areas, work in the informal sector, and have adequate housing but lack access to inclusive financial services.

Ajun et al. (2024) found that the distribution of social assistance in Gorontalo was poorly targeted, with many non-recipient households eligible to receive assistance, whereas some relatively prosperous households continued to receive aid. Tusianti and Siagian (2024) evaluated the accuracy of social assistance distribution. They found that the targeting accuracy of the BPNT program was approximately 76%, indicating considerable inaccuracy in the program distribution, particularly in rural areas.

Overall, these studies suggest that although BPNT is designed to assist poor households, many obstacles and inaccuracies remain in its implementation that must be addressed to ensure that assistance is effectively targeted and delivered.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

This study employed cross-tabulation (Crosstabs) for data analysis. Cross-tabulation is a simple yet highly effective analytical technique for examining the relationships between variables. Several basic principles must be considered to ensure that the relationships between variables are clearly observed in cross-tabulation tables. In this analysis, the chi-square test (denoted χ^2) was used to examine the relationships between variables.

This method is used to test the correlation between variables in contingency tables, allowing researchers to determine whether the proportions of two variables are independent or associated. The chi-square test is relatively simple and can be easily calculated using cross-tabulation results.

 DOI: https://doi.org/10.25077/alive.v3.n1.p34-44.2026

In cross-tabulation analysis, conclusions about the relationships among research variables are based on the frequency distributions within the table's cells, enabling the clear observation of the association between two variables. The chi-square test is considered a straightforward statistical tool. However, it does not indicate whether the relationship is positive or negative, nor whether it is linear or nonlinear. Therefore, the contingency coefficient is used to measure the strength of the relationship between two variables. It should be emphasized that the contingency coefficient is also a relatively simple statistical measure.

All measurement indicators included in the research framework were based on the questionnaire of the National Socioeconomic Survey (SUSENAS) conducted by Statistics Indonesia (BPS), including the KOR and MKP consumption panel for March 2019. Further details regarding the definitions and operational concepts of all variables used are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Definition and Operational Concept of Research Variables

Variable	Operational Definition
Gender	1 = Male; and 2 = Female
Marital status	1 = Single; 2 = Married; and 3 = Divorced
Education level	1 = No Formal Certificate; 2 = Elementary School; 3 = Junior High School; 4 = Senior High School; 5 = University
Employment status of household head	1= Employed; and 0=Others
Employment sector	1= Agriculture; and 0=Others
Housing ownership status	1 = Owned; 2 = Rented/Leased; 3 = Rent-Free; 4 = Official/Service Housing; and 5 = Others
Main roofing material	1= Concrete; 2= Tile; 3= Asbestos; 4= Zinc; 5=Bamboo; 6=Wood/Shingles; 7=Straw/Fiber/Leaves/Thatch; and 8=Others
Main wall material	1=Brick/Concrete Wall; 2=Plastered Bamboo/Wire Weaving; 3=Wood/Boards; 4=Bamboo Weaving; 5= Wooden Logs; 6=Bamboo; and 7=Others
Main floor material	1= Marble/Granite; 2= Ceramic; 3= Parquet/Vinyl/Carpet; 4= Tile/Terrazzo; 5= Wood/Boards; 6= Cement/Brick; 7= Bamboo; 8=Soil; and 9=Others
Sanitation facility ownership	1= Used Only by Household Members; 2= Shared with Certain Households; 3= Communal Sanitation Facility; 4= Public Sanitation Facility; 5= Household Does Not Use Toilet; and 6= No Facility
Main source of lighting	1= PLN Electricity with Meter; 2= PLN Electricity without Meter; 3= Non-PLN Electricity; and 4= Non-Electric Source
Concern about food availability	1=Yes; and 5=No
Residential area classification	1=Urban; and 2=Rural
Victim of Violence	1= Yes; and 5=No

Source: National Socioeconomic Survey (SUSENAS) 2022, processed data.

The dependent variable in this study was a social assistance program implemented by the Indonesian government to help low-income households access food. The independent variables used in this study refer to the eligibility criteria for BPNT beneficiaries. According to the 2019 General Guidelines for Non-Cash Food Assistance, BPNT beneficiaries are families with the lowest socioeconomic conditions in program implementation areas, whose names are included in the List of Beneficiary Families (DPM) determined by the Ministry of Social Affairs. These beneficiaries generally work in the agricultural sector, which includes food crop farming (rice and secondary crops), horticulture, plantations, fisheries, livestock, forestry, and other farming activities. Several eligibility criteria established by the government are regulated under Law No. 13 of 2011 concerning the Handling of the Poor and Regulation of the Minister of Social Affairs No. 3 of 2021 for inclusion in the Integrated Social Welfare Database (DTKS). The criteria that must be met include the following:

1. Individuals lacking a permanent shelter or place to live are directly categorized as extremely poor.
2. The head of the household or the acting household head was unemployed.
3. The household had concerns about food or experienced food shortages within the past year.
4. Food expenditure accounts for more than half of the total household expenditure.
5. No expenditure was incurred on clothing in the last year.
6. The floor of the dwelling is primarily made of soil and/or plaster.
7. Dwelling walls are primarily made of bamboo, wire, wooden boards, tarpaulin, cardboard, unplastered brick, thatch, or zinc.
8. The household does not have a private toilet facility or use communal sanitation facilities.
9. The main sources of lighting were electricity (450 VA) or non-electric sources.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

To understand and address poverty in the agricultural sector, it is important to analyze the characteristics of agricultural and poor households within the sector. This study aims to identify and examine various variables that predict the economic status of agricultural households. The agricultural sector referred to in this study includes agriculture in general, encompassing rice and secondary crop farming, horticulture, plantations, fisheries, egg production, forestry, and other agricultural activities. The analysis focuses on identifying significant differences between households categorized as poor and those categorized as non-poor.

Table 2 presents the characteristics of households in the agricultural sector and the differences between poor and non-poor households within this sector. The data indicate significant differences across several variables. In terms of the gender of the household head, 60.72% of households are headed by males, and 39.28% are headed by females. Female-headed households show a slightly higher poverty rate (13.57%) than male-headed households (12.78%). Regarding marital status, 72.10% of household heads are married, and 13.75% are classified as poor. Meanwhile, those who are not married, accounting for 27.90% of the total, show a lower poverty rate (11.39%)

Most agricultural households (87.87%) live in rural areas, and 13.38% are classified as poor. In urban areas, only 12.13% of households are engaged in agriculture, with 10.98% categorized as poor. Education also influences poverty levels. Among households whose heads have only elementary education or no schooling, 13.71% are classified as poor, which is higher than that for households with higher levels of education (12.21%).

 DOI: https://doi.org/10.25077/alive.v3.n1.p34-44.2026

Table 2. Characteristics of Agricultural Households and Poor Households

Variable	Category	Household Percentage	Economic Status (%)	
			Poor	Noon-Poor
Gender	Male	60.72	12.78	87.22
	Female	39.28	13.57	86.43
Marital Status	Married	72.10	13.75	86.25
	Not Married	27.90	11.39	88.61
Residential Classification	Rural	87.87	13.38	86.62
	Urban	12.13	10.98	89.02
Education	Elementary School & No Schooling	58.36	13.71	86.29
	Others	41.64	12.21	87.79
Employment Status	Employed	98.34	13.31	87.87
	Unemployed	1.66	10.28	89.72
Home Ownership	Not Own Property	8.32	9.21	90.79
	Own Property	91.68	13.44	85.65
Main Roofing Material	Adequate	92.47	12.95	87.05
	Inadequate	7.53	14.83	85.17
Main Wall Material	Adequate	91.82	11.78	88.22
	Inadequate	8.18	27.71	72.29
Main Floor Material	Adequate	88.45	11.82	88.18
	Inadequate	11.55	22.81	77.19
Sanitation Facility	Private	70.39	11.18	88.82
	Others	29.61	17.62	82.38
Source of Lighting	PLN Electricity	87.69	12.72	87.28
	Non-PLN Electricity	12.31	15.73	84.27
Food Insecurity	Yes	25.11	18.36	81.64
	No	74.89	11.32	88.68

Most household heads (98.34%) were employed; however, 13.31% remained classified as poor. Households that did not own their homes (8.32%) had a lower poverty rate (9.21%) than those that did (13.44%). Housing infrastructure conditions also played an important role. Houses with adequate roofing, walls, and flooring materials showed lower poverty rates. For example, houses with adequate wall materials had a poverty rate of 11.78%, while houses with inadequate walls had a poverty rate of 27.71%. Households with private sanitation facilities also had a lower poverty rate (11.18%) than those with other sanitation facilities (17.62%). Electricity supplied by the national electricity company (PLN) was more commonly used (87.69%). It was associated with a poverty rate of 12.72%, while households using non-PLN electricity sources (12.31%) had a higher poverty rate of 15.73%.

Food insecurity also has a significant impact. Among households experiencing food insecurity, 18.36% are categorized as poor, compared with 11.32% among households that do not experience food insecurity. Higher poverty rates among households headed by women, those with lower educational attainment, and those living in rural areas reflect greater vulnerability among these groups. To reduce poverty, it is important to expand educational access and provide targeted support to female-headed households. In rural areas, improvements in infrastructure and basic services, such as roads and healthcare facilities, can have a significant positive impact.

Households with inadequate infrastructure tend to exhibit higher poverty rates, emphasizing the importance of improving housing infrastructure as part of poverty alleviation strategies. Assistance programs that provide affordable, high-quality building materials can improve housing conditions and reduce vulnerability to poverty. The high level of food insecurity among agricultural households underscores the need for more effective interventions in food assistance programs, such as BPNT, which should be more targeted to households that truly need support within the agricultural sector. In addition, improving access to agricultural markets and stabilizing food prices can help increase farmers' household income, thereby reducing the risk of poverty.

The receipt of BPNT represents one of the Indonesian government's primary strategies to reduce poverty and improve welfare. This study focuses on the characteristics of BPNT recipients in the agricultural sector, a vital sector of the rural economy that often serves as the main source of livelihood for many poor households. By analyzing the characteristics of BPNT recipients in the agricultural sector, this research aims to identify the factors that influence the eligibility and effectiveness of the distribution of such assistance. Various predictor variables examined include education level, employment status, home ownership, and basic housing infrastructure conditions (roofing, walls, and flooring materials), as well as supporting facilities (lighting sources and sanitation facilities).

This analysis aims to provide deeper insights into the profile of BPNT recipients in the agricultural sector and evaluate how assistance can be distributed more accurately and effectively to improve the welfare of farming households. By understanding recipients' characteristics in detail, better recommendations can be developed to improve the distribution system and enhance the impact of the BPNT program.

Based on the data analysis, the characteristics of households receiving BPNT can be explained through several predictor variables. The following section describes the relationship between the predictor variables and BPNT recipient status based on the chi-square probability value (Probability Chi2) and the percentage of recipients versus non-recipients (Table 3).

The analysis indicates that several factors, including education, employment status, home ownership, and housing infrastructure conditions, significantly influence BPNT recipient status. Households with lower levels of education, unstable employment, and inadequate housing conditions tend to receive BPNT more frequently. This reflects a targeting policy that prioritizes the most vulnerable households in need of assistance. In addition, the quality of infrastructure, such as roofing, wall, and floor materials, as well as the ownership of sanitation facilities and sources of lighting, also shows a significant correlation with BPNT receipt. This highlights the importance of improving basic infrastructure in poverty alleviation efforts. Programs that improve poor households' access to better basic facilities can reduce their dependence on social assistance and enhance long-term welfare.

Food insecurity also plays an important role in determining who receives BPNT, indicating that the program is effective in assisting households that experience food shortages. However, households that already have access to adequate basic facilities and stable sources of lighting tend to receive BPNT less frequently, suggesting that improvements in accessibility and quality of basic facilities can reduce the need for food assistance.

Households whose heads have lower levels of education (elementary school or no formal education) tend to receive BPNT more frequently than households with higher levels of education. Previous research, Becker (1964), indicates that lower educational attainment is often associated with limited access to economic opportunities and lower income levels. Higher education is generally linked to improved skills and productivity, which positively affect income and economic

 DOI: https://doi.org/10.25077/alive.v3.n1.p34-44.2026

status. With limited skills, households with lower educational attainment may be more dependent on social assistance, consistent with the findings that higher education can reduce dependence on such assistance.

Table 3. Characteristics of BPNT Recipients in the Agricultural Sector

Variable	Category	Chi-Square Probability	Recipient Status (%)	
			Received	Not Received
Education	Elementary School & No Schooling	0.000	9.09	90.91
	Others		5.17	94.83
Employment Status	Employed	0.011	7.49	92.51
	Unemployed		5.34	94.66
Home Ownership	Own Property	0.000	7.69	92.31
	Others		4.87	95.13
Main Roofing Material	Adequate	0.000	2.49	97.51
	Inadequate		7.86	92.14
Main Wall Material	Adequate	0.000	7.16	92.84
	Inadequate		10.83	89.17
Main Floor Material	Adequate	0.000	6.65	93.35
	Inadequate		13.65	86.35
Sanitation Facility	Private	0.000	7.08	92.92
	Other		8.37	91.63
Source of Lighting	PLN Electricity	0.000	8.31	91.69
	Non-PLN Electricity		1.40	98.60
Food Insecurity	Yes	0.000	7.20	92.80
	No		7.54	92.46

In addition, households with unemployed heads are more likely to receive BPNT than those with employed heads. Blau and Kahn (2007) indicate that job instability or unemployment often leads to dependence on social assistance. The absence of stable employment can hinder households' ability to meet basic needs, increasing their reliance on assistance programs. Kimmel and Powell (2006) also support this view, indicating that households with unemployed members tend to experience higher poverty rates and greater dependence on social programs.

Homeownership is another important factor. Households that do not own their homes are more likely to receive BPNT than those who do. Haurin et al. (2002) suggest that homeownership is often considered an indicator of economic stability, as homeowners tend to have more stable economic conditions than renters or those without property. Households without homeownership may face greater economic difficulties and thus rely more heavily on social assistance.

The condition of housing materials, such as roofing, walls, and flooring, is also associated with BPNT receipt. Schuler et al. (2016) indicate that poor housing conditions are often linked to economic instability. Inadequate housing infrastructure can affect health and quality of life, thereby increasing dependence on social assistance. This is consistent with the findings that households with inadequate infrastructure often face greater economic challenges.

Inadequate sanitation facilities are also associated with BPNT receipt. Access to adequate sanitation facilities is an important indicator of quality of life and health. Pickering and Davis

(2012) emphasize that limited access to sanitation can increase vulnerability to disease, which negatively affects economic capacity. Households without adequate sanitation facilities may therefore rely more on social assistance.

Furthermore, households that rely on non-PLN electricity sources tend to receive BPNT more frequently than those using PLN electricity. Limited access to reliable energy sources often reflects economic instability. Komatsu et al. (2014) found that access to reliable energy is associated with improved quality of life and better economic opportunities. Households that depend on non-PLN energy sources may face greater difficulties meeting their basic needs, thereby becoming more dependent on social assistance.

Households experiencing food insecurity are more likely to receive BPNT than those that do not experience food insecurity. Food insecurity is a significant indicator of poverty. FAO research (2017) indicates that households experiencing food insecurity often face serious economic difficulties and rely more heavily on social assistance. The BPNT program aims to reach households facing food shortages; therefore, households experiencing food insecurity are more likely to be identified as program beneficiaries.

CONCLUSION

This study analyzed the socioeconomic characteristics of non-cash food assistance (BPNT) recipients in Indonesia's agricultural sector. The findings indicate that BPNT recipients are predominantly households with higher socioeconomic vulnerability, including those with lower educational attainment, unstable employment, lack of home ownership, and inadequate housing infrastructure. Limited access to basic facilities, such as sanitation and reliable electricity, as well as experiences of food insecurity, are also associated with a higher likelihood of receiving BPNT assistance. These results suggest that the BPNT program generally targets households with lower socioeconomic conditions within the agricultural sector. However, improving program effectiveness requires more accurate targeting mechanisms, regular updates of socioeconomic data, and stronger monitoring systems to ensure that assistance reaches the most vulnerable households. Strengthening the implementation of BPNT is expected to support poverty reduction and improve household food security, contributing to the achievement of SDGs 1 (No Poverty) and 2 (Zero Hunger).

REFERENCES

Ayyash, M., & Sek, S. K. (2020). Decomposing inequality in household consumption expenditure in Malaysia. Economies.

Badan Pusat Statistik Indonesia. (2020). People's Welfare Indicators. Jakarta: Statistics Indonesia.

Bungin, B. (2003). Qualitative Research Data Analysis: Philosophical and Methodological Understanding Toward the Application Model. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.

Caliendo, M. (2008). Some practical guidance for the implementation of propensity score matching. Journal of Economic Surveys, 22(1), 31-72.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.

Dwi, R., & Indriani. (2021). The effectiveness of the Rastra program and the BPNT program on the income level and welfare of beneficiary families in Yukum Jaya Village, Terbanggi Besar District, Central Lampung Regency.

 DOI: https://doi.org/10.25077/alive.v3.n1.p34-44.2026

Gultom, H., Kindangen, A., & George, M. V. (2020). Analysis of the impact of the Non-Cash Food Assistance (BPNT) program and the Family Hope Program (PKH) on poverty in Southeast Minahasa Regency. Vol. 21(1).

Hafizah, D., Hakim, D., Harianto, & Nurmalina, R. (2019). Analysis of the impact of the Prosperous Rice policy and non-cash assistance policy on the equilibrium point of poor households in Indonesia. Vol. 3(4).

Hasbudianto, & Aslinda, A. (2019). Implementation of the Prosperous Rice (Rastra) program in Sawakong Village, South Galesong District, Takalar Regency. Vol. 8(2), August.

Hendrik. (2011). Analysis of income and welfare levels of fishing communities in Lake Pulau Besar and Lake Bawah in Dayun District, Siak Regency, Riau Province. Journal of Fisheries and Marine Sciences, 16(1), 21–32.

Khandker, S. R., Koolwal, G. B., & Samad, H. A. (2010). Handbook on impact evaluation: Quantitative methods and practices. Washington, DC: The World Bank.

Lu, S., Lin, Y.-T., Vikse, J., & Huang, C.-C. (2013). Effectiveness of social welfare programmes in reducing poverty and income inequality in China. Journal of Asian Public Policy, 6(3), 277–291. https://doi.org/10.1080/17516234.2013.850226

Ministry of Agriculture. (2010). General Guidelines for Rural Agribusiness Development Program (PUAP). Jakarta: Ministry of Agriculture.

Ministry of National Development Planning/National Development Planning Agency (Bappenas). (2014). Social Protection in Indonesia: Challenges and the Way Forward (First Edition). Jakarta.

Ministry of National Development Planning/National Development Planning Agency (Bappenas). (2017). Guidelines for the Implementation of Non-Cash Food Assistance.

Ministry of Social Affairs (Kemensos). (2018). General Guidelines for the Prosperous Rice Social Assistance Program. Jakarta: Ministry of Social Affairs.

Moleong, L. J. (2013). Qualitative Research Methodology (Revised Edition). Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.

Nawawi, H. (2005). Applied Research. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.

Suhardin, Y. (2012). The role of the state and law in eradicating poverty through the realization of public welfare. Journal of Law and Development, 40(3), 390.

Suharsimi, A. (2002). Research Procedures: A Practical Approach. Jakarta: PT Rineka Cipta.

Suharto, E. (2015). The role of social protection in addressing poverty in Indonesia: A case study of the Family Hope Program. Vol. 17(1), 22–28.

Wiyaka, A., & Endang, M. (2019). Implementation of the BPNT program in social protection in Gerih District and Geneng District, Ngawi Regency, in 2018.

Yacoup, Y., & Mutiaradina, H. (2020). Analysis of farmers' welfare and rural poverty in Indonesia. Annual Academic Seminar on Economics and Development Studies 2020 (SATIESP 2020), ISBN: 978-602-53460-5-7, 101.