The structure of strategic food demand in Indonesian urban: An application of a Linearized Almost Ideal Demand System (LA/AIDS)

Ana Arifatus Sa'diyah[1*], *Elly* Lestari[2], *David* Forgenie[3], *Doppy* Roy Nendissa[4], and *Nikmatul* Khoiriyah[5]

[1]Departement of Agribusiness, Faculty of Agriculture, University of Tribhuwana Tungga Dewi, Malang, Indonesia
[2]Departement of Management, Faculty of Economic, University of Tribhuwana Tungga Dewi, Malang, Indonesia
[3]Departement of Agricultural Economics and Extension, Faculty of Food and Agriculture, The University of The West Indies, St. Augustine Campus, Trinidad
[4]Departement of Agribusiness, Faculty of Agriculture, University of Nusa Cendana, Kupang, Indonesia
[5]Departement of Agribusiness, Faculty of Agriculture, University of Islam Malang, Malang, Indonesia

Abstract. Indonesia's strategic food refers to a group of food products that are important in meeting national food needs. This strategic food is the focus of government attention because of its significant impact on food security, the economy, and social stability. The research aims to analyze urban household preferences for strategic food, analyze estimates of urban household demand for strategic food, and analyze the impact of price changes and urban household expenditure on strategic food demand. The research uses Susenas data for 2023, specifically for urban households. Strategic Foods are grouped into rice, corn, soybeans, shallot, chilies, poultry meat, poultry eggs, ruminant meat, consumer sugar, and fish. Analysis of household preference data was carried out using expenditure shares. Demand estimates were analyzed using the LA/AIDS model with the SUR approach. The results of the analysis show that the highest share of urban household expenditure is for rice. Beef is still a luxury commodity with elastic price elasticity. Poultry meat, poultry eggs, and ruminant meat are commodities that are substitutes for each other.

1 Introduction

Designing effective policies for strategic food fulfillment often requires grouping households based on their rural or urban status [9]. Through Government Regulation Number 59 of 2022, the Indonesian government stipulates that urban areas are a form of area with certain boundaries whose residents have main activities in the industrial, service, trade, or non-agricultural sectors. According to [10], strategic food fulfillment policies need to consider the location of urban and rural households because the needs and challenges of each region

* Corresponding author: ana.arifatus@unitri.ac.id

are different. [8]state Urban households typically face accessibility issues and higher food prices, while rural households rely more on local production and may face infrastructure challenges. Therefore, strategies tailored to local conditions will more effectively ensure food availability, affordability, and security for all groups.

The number of Indonesian households in 2022 is 70,628,952, which are spread into two groups of residential areas, namely urban, with 39,655,323 households, and rural, with 30,973,629 households. The fulfillment of strategic food for urban households has been widely attempted, including the development of urban farming, strengthening the food distribution chain, and food subsidy programs. But Data shows that urban households' expected food pattern (PPH) score is still 86.9%. This condition shows that in urban households, food consumption patterns still need to be more diverse and nutritionally balanced, as seen from the failure to achieve the ideal PPH score of 100.

Several researchers have conducted strategic food research in Indonesia. Among them by [6] with the research title Unravelling the Provisioning System of a Strategic Food Commodity to Minimise Import Dependency: A Study of garlic in Indonesia, [5] with the title Food Security Management for Indonesia: The Strategy during the Covid-19 Pandemic, [13] with the title The strategic food demand for non poor rural households in Indonesia. Comprehensive research on 11 strategic commodities (rice, corn, soybeans, shallot, chilies, poultry, poultry eggs, ruminant meat, consumption sugar, cooking oil, and fish has never been conducted. This study was designed to see the grouping of 11 strategic commodities in Indonesia. The research focuses on urban areas in Indonesia, hoping that this research will provide new insights into food consumption behavior in increasingly urban environments, which may differ from rural areas.

The study of Strategic Food Structure in Urban Households in Indonesia aims to provide empirical data on factors that influence the demand for strategic food in urban households, the influence of prices and income of urban households on the consumption of strategic food in urban households, and the elasticity of demand for strategic food in urban households in Indonesia. The results of the study are expected to be used as a reference for policymaking in meeting the diverse consumption of strategic food in urban households. The results of this study can provide important information for policy makers in designing programs that support food security and more sustainable consumption patterns in urban areas. Given the rapid social and economic changes in Indonesia, this study provides an up-to-date picture of how communities adapt to these changes in the context of food consumption.

2. Methodology

2.1 Method of collecting data

Research focuses on eleven strategic foods: rice, corn, soybean, shallot, chili, poultry, eggs, beef, sugar, cooking oil, and fish. Since prices paid by households are not reported in Susenas data, unit prices are obtained by dividing expenses by quantity. Household data is 141,591. This research is on a national scale, with the boundaries of the research area being in the territory of Indonesia. Related to the research title, several essential things are the focus of research, namely food demand, food price elasticity, cross price elasticity, income elasticity, and the impact of price changes on food demand.

2.2 Specification of the demand function

The demand parameter estimates of interest are the own-price, cross-price, and income elasticities of demand. These values indicate the percentage change in the quantity demanded of a

particular strategic food type to a one percent change in the price of that strategic food type, in the prices of substitute strategic food types, and in consumer incomes, respectively. The analysis uses the LA-AIDS model [11];[16];[1];[19];[21]

The LA/AIDS model formulation used in the study is described as follows: [4] Mathematical models

w-kel$_i$ = f (estimated price of commodity group, total expenditure/index, stone price, number of household members, IMR)

1. Econometric Models

The LA/AIDS model using expenditure share is formulated as follows (Green, R., & Alston, J. M., 1990) :

$$\omega_i = \alpha_i + \sum_j \gamma_{ij} lnP_j + \beta_j ln\left[\frac{X}{P}\right] + \varepsilon_i \quad \text{..... (1)}$$

The use of the LA/AIDS model in research according to the variables studied is further described as follows:

$$\omega_1 = \alpha_{11} + \gamma_{11}LnP_1 + \gamma_{12}LnP_2 + \gamma_{13}LnP_3 + \gamma_{14}LnP_4 + \gamma_{15}LnP_5 + \gamma_{16}LnP_6 + \gamma_{17}LnP_7 + \gamma_{18}LnP_8 + \gamma_{19}LnP_9 + \gamma_{110}LnP_{10} + \gamma_{111}LnP_{11} + \beta_1 Ln\left(\frac{X}{P}\right) + \delta_1 LnART \quad \text{..... (2)}$$

$$\omega_2 = \alpha_{21} + \gamma_{21}LnP_1 + \gamma_{22}LnP_2 + \gamma_{23}LnP_3 + \gamma_{24}LnP_4 + \gamma_{25}LnP_5 + \gamma_{26}LnP_6 + \gamma_{27}LnP_7 + \gamma_{28}LnP_8 + \gamma_{29}LnP_9 + \gamma_{210}LnP_{10} + \gamma_{211}LnP_{11} + \beta_2 Ln\left(\frac{X}{P}\right) + \delta_2 LnART \quad \text{..... (3)}$$

$$\omega_3 = \alpha_{31} + \gamma_{31}LnP_1 + \gamma_{32}LnP_2 + \gamma_{33}LnP_3 + \gamma_{34}LnP_4 + \gamma_{35}LnP_5 + \gamma_{36}LnP_6 + \gamma_{37}LnP_7 + \gamma_{38}LnP_8 + \gamma_{39}LnP_9 + \gamma_{310}LnP_{10} + \gamma_{311}LnP_{11} + \beta_3 Ln\left(\frac{X}{P}\right) + \delta_3 LnART \quad \text{..... (4)}$$

$$\omega_4 = \alpha_{41} + \gamma_{41}LnP_1 + \gamma_{42}LnP_2 + \gamma_{43}LnP_3 + \gamma_{44}LnP_4 + \gamma_{45}LnP_5 + \gamma_{46}LnP_6 + \gamma_{47}LnP_7 + \gamma_{48}LnP_8 + \gamma_{49}LnP_9 + \gamma_{410}LnP_{10} + \gamma_{411}LnP_{11} + \beta_4 Ln\left(\frac{X}{P}\right) + \delta_4 LnART \quad \text{..... (5)}$$

$$\omega_5 = \alpha_{51} + \gamma_{51}LnP_1 + \gamma_{52}LnP_2 + \gamma_{53}LnP_3 + \gamma_{54}LnP_4 + \gamma_{55}LnP_5 + \gamma_{56}LnP_6 + \gamma_{57}LnP_7 + \gamma_{58}LnP_8 + \gamma_{59}LnP_9 + \gamma_{510}LnP_{10} + \gamma_{511}LnP_{11} + \beta_5 Ln\left(\frac{X}{P}\right) + \delta_5 LnART \quad \text{..... (6)}$$

$$\omega_6 = \alpha_{61} + \gamma_{61}LnP_1 + \gamma_{62}LnP_2 + \gamma_{63}LnP_3 + \gamma_{64}LnP_4 + \gamma_{65}LnP_5 + \gamma_{66}LnP_6 + \gamma_{67}LnP_7 + \gamma_{68}LnP_8 + \gamma_{69}LnP_9 + \gamma_{610}LnP_{10} + \gamma_{611}LnP_{11} + \beta_6 Ln\left(\frac{X}{P}\right) + \delta_6 LnART \quad \text{..... (7)}$$

$$\omega_7 = \alpha_{71} + \gamma_{71}LnP_1 + \gamma_{72}LnP_2 + \gamma_{73}LnP_3 + \gamma_{74}LnP_4 + \gamma_{75}LnP_5 + \gamma_{76}LnP_6 + \gamma_{77}LnP_7 + \gamma_{78}LnP_8 + \gamma_{79}LnP_9 + \gamma_{710}LnP_{10} + \gamma_{711}LnP_{11} + \beta_7 Ln\left(\frac{X}{P}\right) + \delta_7 LnART \quad \text{..... (8)}$$

$$\omega_8 = \alpha_{81} + \gamma_{81}LnP_1 + \gamma_{82}LnP_2 + \gamma_{83}LnP_3 + \gamma_{84}LnP_4 + \gamma_{85}LnP_5 + \gamma_{86}LnP_6 + \gamma_{87}LnP_7 + \gamma_{88}LnP_8 + \gamma_{89}LnP_9 + \gamma_{810}LnP_{10} + \gamma_{811}LnP_{11} + \beta_8 Ln\left(\frac{X}{P}\right) + \delta_8 LnART \quad \text{..... (9)}$$

$$\omega_9 = \alpha_{91} + \gamma_{91}LnP_1 + \gamma_{92}LnP_2 + \gamma_{93}LnP_3 + \gamma_{94}LnP_4 + \gamma_{95}LnP_5 + \gamma_{96}LnP_6 + \gamma_{97}LnP_7 + \gamma_{98}LnP_8 + \gamma_{99}LnP_9 + \gamma_{910}LnP_{10} + \gamma_{911}LnP_{11} + \beta_9 Ln\left(\frac{X}{P}\right) + \delta_9 LnART \quad \text{..... (10)}$$

$$\omega_{10} = \alpha_{101} + \gamma_{101}LnP_1 + \gamma_{102}LnP_2 + \gamma_{103}LnP_3 + \gamma_{104}LnP_4 + \gamma_{105}LnP_5 + \gamma_{106}LnP_6 + \gamma_{107}LnP_7 + \gamma_{108}LnP_8 + \gamma_{109}LnP_9 + \gamma_{1010}LnP_{10} + \gamma_{1011}LnP_{11} + \beta_{10} Ln\left(\frac{X}{P}\right) + \delta_{10} LnART \quad \text{..... (11)}$$

$$\omega_{11} = \alpha_{111} + \gamma_{111}LnP_1 + \gamma_{112}LnP_2 + \gamma_{113}LnP_3 + \gamma_{114}LnP_4 + \gamma_{115}LnP_5 + \gamma_{116}LnP_6 + \gamma_{117}LnP_7 + \gamma_{118}LnP_8 + \gamma_{119}LnP_9 + \gamma_{1110}LnP_{10} + \gamma_{1111}LnP_{11} + \beta_{11}Ln\left(\frac{X}{P}\right) + \delta_{11}LnART \quad (12)$$

Where:

w_{1-11}	: the proportion of food expenditure i
$P_1 - 1$	: Prices of rice, corn, soybean, shallot, chili, poultry, eggs, beef, sugar, cooking oil, and fish.
x	: Total spending on food consumption (Rp)
p*	: Stone price index, where $\ln p^* = \Sigma w_i . \ln p_i$
μ	: *error term*
α, d	: parameter intersep
β	: expenditure parameters
γ	: price parameters
ART	: number of household members (people)
Expd	: Household expenditure (Rp/month)
i, j	: 1 (rice), 2 (corn), 3 (soybean), 4 (shallot), 5 (chilli), 6 (poultry), 7 (eggs), 8 (beef), 9 (sugar), 10 (cooking oil), 11(fish)

2.3 Analysis of the Impact of Changes in Prices and Income on Demand

Measuring changes in demand can be done through analysis of the elasticity of demand because changes in demand for commodities are caused by changes in price changes of these commodities (own price elasticity), due to changes in consumer income (income elasticity), and as a result of changes in the prices of other commodities (cross-price elasticity). The elasticity of demand can be analyzed using the Marshallian and Hicksian demand function approach [3], which suggests that elasticity can be calculated using the following formula:

1. Marshallian elasticity, where there is an income effect derived from total expenditure, so that:
   Marshallian own price elasticity value:
   $$\in_{ii}^{M} = -1 + \frac{\gamma_i}{w_i} - \beta_i \quad (13)$$
   Marshallian cross-price elasticity values:
   $$\in_{ij}^{M} = \frac{\gamma_{ij}}{w_i} - \beta_i \frac{w_j}{w_i} \quad (14)$$
2. Hicksian price elasticity only has an effect of expenditure prices, so the value of elasticity is known as:
   Hicksian own price elasticity value:
   $$\in_{ii}^{H} = -1 + \frac{\gamma_i}{w_i} + w_i \quad (15)$$
   Hicksian cross price elasticity value:
   $$\in_{ij}^{H} = \frac{\gamma_{ij}}{w_i} + w_j \quad (16)$$
3. Expenditure elasticity is obtained from:
   $$\eta_i = \frac{\partial\ log\ q_i}{\partial\ log\ x} = 1 + \left(\frac{1}{w_i}\right)\left(\frac{\partial w_i}{\partial \log x}\right) = 1 + \left(\frac{\beta_i}{w_i}\right) \quad (17)$$
4. The elasticity of the household spending margin is obtained from
   $$m_i = \eta_i . w_i: \quad (18)$$

Where:

$\in_{ii}^{M}$	: Marshallian Own Price Elasticity
$\in_{ij}^{M}$	: Marshallian Cross Elasticity
$\in_{ii}^{H}$	: Hicksian Own Price Elasticity

$\in_{ij}^{H}$: Hicksian Cross Elasticity
η_i : Elastisitas Pengeluaran
m_i : Elastisitas Margin Pengeluaran
w_i : budget share
γ_{i-j} : commodity price parameters
β_{i-j} : Expenditure parameters
i : commodity as the dependent variable
j : commodity as independent variable

3. Result

3.1 Parameter Estimation for Strategic Food Expenditure Share

Estimates of the share of Indonesian household expenditure on strategic food are presented in Table 1. Parameter estimates of the share of Indonesian household expenditure on strategic food were carried out using the LA-AIDS model using SUR analysis through the STATA software. Table 1 shows the estimated share regression coefficient of animal food expenditure for Indonesian aggregate households. From a total of 165 regression coefficients, 151 coefficients (91.51%) are significant at the 99% confidence level.

https://doi.org/10.1051/bioconf/202414301007

Table 1. Parameter estimation results for strategic food demand function

Independent variable	Dependent variable										
	Share of Rice	Share of Corn	Share of Soybean	Share of Shallot	Share of Chilli	Share of Poultry	Share of Eggs	Share of Beef	Share of Sugar	Share of Cooking Oil	Share of Fish
Alpha(Constant)	0,38	-0,01	-0,01	-0,07	0,11	0,30	-0,04	0,16	-0,41	-0,26	0,84
	(0,00)	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**
Expenditure beta	0,03	0,07	0,00	-0,02	0,01	0,03	-0,03	0,01	-0,19	-0,04	0,07
	(0,00)	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**
Rice price	0,02	-0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	-0,01	-0,01	-0,03
	(0,92)	**(0,01)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,02)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**
Corn price	-0,01	-0,01	0,01	-0,01	0,01	-0,01	0,01	0,01	-0,01	0,01	0,01
	(0,01)	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**
Soybean price	0,01	0,01	-0,17	0,00	0,00	0,01	0,00	0,01	0,00	0,01	0,00
	(0,01)	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,01)**	**(0,60)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,45)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,11)**	**(0,02)**	**(0,00)**
Shallot price	0,01	-0,00	0,00	0,02	-0,01	-0,04	0,04	-0,01	0,01	0,01	-0,11
	(0,00)	**(0,00)**	**(0,01)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,01)**	**(0,00)**
Chilli price	0,01	0,00	0,00	-0,01	0,01	0,00	-0,01	0,01	-0,00	-0,01	0,01
	(0,00)	**(0,00)**	**(0,61)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**
Poultry price	0,01	-0,05	0,01	-0,04	0,01	0,03	-0,02	0,03	-0,14	-0,03	0,02

	(0,00)	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**
Eggs price	0,01	0,00	0,00	0,01	-0,01	-0,02	0,02	-0,02	0,0125	-0,0008	-0,0207
	(0,00)	**(0,00)**	**(0,45)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,04)**	**(0,00)**
Beef price	0,01	0,01	0,01	-0,02	0,01	0,01	-0,02	-0,02	-0,01	-0,03	0,028
	(0,00)	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**
Sugar price	-0,00	-0,11	0,00	0,01	-0,02	-0,01	0,01	-0,01	0,03	0,02	-0,04
	(0,02)	**(0,00)**	**(0,06)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**
Cooking Oilt price	-0,01	0,02	0,01	0,01	-0,01	-0,03	-0,01	-0,03	0,02	0,07	-0,03
	(0,00)	**(0,00)**	**(0,02)**	**(0,01)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,040)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**
Fish Price	-0,03	0,03	0,00	-0,02	0,01	0,02	-0,02	0,01	-0,04	-0,03	0,113
	(0,00)	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**
Eta (total of household members)	-0,01	0,00	0,00	0,04	0,03	0,00	0,03	0,01	0,02	0,03	0,07
	(0,00)	**(0,93)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,09)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**
Eta (village/city)	-0,00	0,00	0,00	-0,01	0,01	0,00	0,01	0,01	-0,01	-0,00	-0,01
	(0,00)	**(0,39)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**	**(0,00)**

Source: March 2023 Susenas.

Table 1 shows that the increase in corn, soybean, and beef prices reduces the share of expenditure on related commodities. Meanwhile, the increase in prices of rice, shallot, chili, poultry, eggs, sugar, cooking oil, and fish increased the consumption of related foods. The share of household expenditure on strategic food depends on the volume and prices consumed. The analysis results show that the coefficient of price parameters related to corn, soybean, and beef commodities is negative, which means that an increase in the price of corn, soybean, and beef reduces the share of demand for corn, soybean, and beef. This is by the Downward Sloppin demand curve theory and supports the research results [14];[20].

The research results show that increasing the total of household members will increase the share of household expenditure on corn, soybean, shallot, chili, poultry, eggs, beef, sugar, cooking oil, and fish. Moreover, conversely, an increase in the total of household members will reduce the share of household expenditure on rice. Ini sebuah temuan yang menarik dan tidak umum. This condition is caused by urban households having higher household incomes than rural households. In line with the findings [17], the higher the household income level, the lower the household's food consumption. Other findings show that the expenditure of household members will increase the share of household expenditure on strategic foods except shallot, eggs, sugar, and cooking oil.

3.2 The Effect of Price Changes and Expenditure of Strategic Food on Indonesian Household Demand

Marshallian price elasticity of demand (often referred to as price elasticity of demand) is a measure that describes the responsiveness of the quantity demanded of a good to changes in the price of that good. More formally, price elasticity of demand measures the percentage change in quantity demanded resulting from a percentage change in price. Meanwhile, Hicksian elasticity of demand, also known as compensation elasticity or compensatory price elasticity, measures the responsiveness of quantity demanded to changes in price, assuming that consumer utility (satisfaction) is fixed or constant. This differs from the Marshallian elasticity of demand, which does not assume utility remains constant. The results of the Marshalian and Hicksian price elasticity analysis are presented in Table 2.

https://doi.org/10.1051/bioconf/202414301007

Table 2. Price Elasticity and Cross Price Elasticity of Indonesian Urban Households

Commodity	Rice	Corn	Soybean	Shallot	Chilli	Poultry	Eggs	Beef	Sugar	Cooking Oil	Fish
Marshallian Elasticity (*Uncompensated*)											
Rice	**-1,027**	-0,002	0,0003	0,024	0,033	0,008	0,034	0,022	0,022	-0,022	-0,151
Corn	-0,160	**-2,913**	0,013	-0,011	0,230	-0,146	0,228	1,327	-0,154	0,504	-0,054
Soybean	0,470	0,458	**-12,671**	-0,179	-0,002	0,834	-0,098	9,323	0,004	0,450	0,056
Shallot	0,225	0,002	-0,003	**-0,851**	-0,015	0,028	0,027	0,013	-0,018	-0,051	-0,063
Chilli	0,134	0,019	0,001	-0,047	**-0,950**	-0,037	-0,125	0,061	0,029	-0,192	-0,052
Poultry	-0,071	-0,010	0,001	-0,024	-0,039	**-0,837**	-0,123	-0,004	-0,005	-0,210	-0,047
Eggs	0,236	0,016	-0,001	0,021	-0,058	-0,064	**-0,792**	-0,002	0,012	-0,070	0,002
Beef	0,234	0,481	0,093	-0,016	0,227	-0,065	-0,116	**-2,743**	-0,027	-0,078	0,177
Sugar	0,618	-0,009	0,003	0,048	0,136	0,152	0,122	0,023	**-1,002**	0,097	0,216
Cooking Oilt	0,088	0,037	0,009	-0,031	-0,114	-0,167	-0,062	0,005	0,017	**-0,247**	-0,031
Fish	-0,299	-0,023	0,004	-0,061	-0,025	-0,016	-0,056	0,018	-0,036	-0,075	**-0,781**
Hicksian Elasticity (C*ompensanted*)											
Rice	**-0,691**	0,0033	0,004	0,095	0,099	0,104	0,130	0,037	0,071	0,061	0,090
Corn	0,208	**-2,907**	0,013	0,067	0,302	-0,043	0,331	1,343	-0,101	0,593	0,204
Soybean	0,900	0,465	**-12,670**	-0,088	0,083	0,957	0,024	9,342	0,067	0,555	0,364
Shallot	0,448	0,005	-0,002	**-0,803**	0,029	0,092	0,091	0,023	0,015	0,004	0,097
Chilli	0,502	0,025	0,002	0,032	**-0,877**	0,068	-0,020	0,078	0,083	-0,102	0,212
Poultry	0,362	-0,003	0,002	0,068	0,047	**-0,712**	-0,003	0,016	0,059	-0,103	0,264

Eggs	0,458	0,019	0,004	0,068	-0,014	-0,002	**-0,729**	0,008	0,044	-0,015	0,161
Beef	0,816	0,491	0,093	0,108	0,342	0,102	0,049	**-2,717**	0,058	0,065	0,594
Sugar	0,491	-0,011	0,002	0,021	0,111	0,1149	0,086	0,018	**-1,020**	0,066	0,125
Cooking Oilt	0,248	0,040	0,001	0,003	-0,082	-0,1207	-0,017	0,012	0,040	**-0,208**	0,083
Fish	0,124	0,005	0,002	0,029	0,058	0,106	0,064	0,037	0,026	0,029	**-0,478**

Source: March 2022 Susenas

Price elasticity values, both Marshalian and Hicksian, are all negative. This finding is based on the law of demand, which states that if the price of a commodity increases, the demand for that commodity decreases. Rice, corn, soybean, beef, and sugar are Marshalian elastic. Meanwhile, corn, soybean, beef, and sugar are Hicksian elastic. Rice in urban households is elastic to price changes, which is an unusual finding. This finding needs to be studied more deeply. There is a suspicion that the increase in rice in urban areas makes households switch to consuming other carbohydrates, such as bread, potatoes, or others.

Shallot, chili, poultry, eggs, cooking oil, and fish are everyday goods because they are inelastic in both Marshalian and Hicksian terms. The price increase for these six commodities was higher than the increase in demand. These six commodities are not very responsive to price increases. Beef is the most elastic commodity in both Marshalian and Hicksian terms. The price elasticity value for mutton is 2,743 on a Marshalian basis and 2,716 on a Hicksian basis. This condition shows that beef is a superior good for Indonesian urban households.

Marshalian cross-price elasticity shows that eggs are a substitute for poultry and beef. This means that if the price of eggs rises, households will switch to consuming poultry and beef. Cooking oil is a commodity that complements each other with rice, corn, soybean, beef, and sugar. According to the findings [18 Corn is substituted with rice. Fish is substituted with poultry and eggs. This finding supports the research results [13].

The findings of the Hicksian elasticity analysis show that rice and fish will be consumed with all other commodities (rice, soybean, shallot, chili, poultry, eggs, beef, sugar, and cooking oil). Fish, beef, and chili are complementary commodities for cooking oil based on the results of Hicksian cross-analysis.

In economic analysis, expenditure elasticity and marginal elasticity are two concepts used to measure the sensitivity of consumer expenditure to changes in prices and income. Expenditure elasticity measures the responsiveness of total spending on a good to changes in the price of that good. This can help understand how price changes affect overall consumer spending on the good. Marginal elasticity measures the marginal change in demand for a good in response to total expenditure or income changes. It is essential in economic analysis to understand how additional spending or income affects the demand for certain goods. The results of the analysis of expenditure elasticity are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Income Elasticity and Marginal Expenditure Share

Commodity	Income elasticity
Rice	1,0599
Corn	1,1356
Soybean	1,1355
Shallot	0,0704
Chilies	1,1607
Poultry Meat	1.1369
Eggs	0.7005
Ruminant Meat	1.8338
Sugar	-0.4017
Cooking Oil	0.5048
Fish	1.3324

Source: March 2023 Susenas.

Table 3 shows that all strategic food commodities have positive expenditure elasticity except for the consumption of sugar. This finding explains that rice, corn, soybean, shallot, chilies, poultry meat, beef, eggs, cooking oil, and fish are everyday goods. An interesting finding is that the elasticity value of sugar is negative, which means that sugar is an inferior commodity for urban households. Urban households tend to shift to healthier food patterns

along with increasing health awareness. The income of urban households is relatively higher than that of rural households, making it possible for urban households to buy healthier alternative products than the consumption of sugar.

4. Conclusion

Price elasticity values, both Marshalian and Hicksian, are all negative**.** Rice in urban households is elastic to price changes, which is an unusual finding. This finding needs to be studied more deeply. There is a suspicion that the increase in rice in urban areas makes households switch to consuming other carbohydrates, such as bread, potatoes, or others. The elasticity value of sugar is negative, which means that sugar is an inferior commodity for urban households. Urban households tend to shift to healthier food patterns along with increasing health awareness. The income of urban households is relatively higher than that of rural households, making it possible for urban households to buy healthier alternative products than sugar consumption.

The elasticity values of rice, ruminant meat (beef, goat, sheep), and poultry meat are positive in line with the findings [22]. Toxicity values of onion, poultry eggs, and cooking oil commodities are 0.0704, 0.7005, and 0.5048, respectively. Low elasticity values (less than 1) indicate that onion, poultry eggs, and cooking oil are basic necessities. This means that if consumer income increases by 1%, the demand for onion, poultry, eggs, and cooking oil will increase by less than 1%. This shows that onion, poultry, eggs, and cooking oil are not very sensitive to changes in income, reflecting the characteristics of inferior goods or goods whose demand remains stable even though income increases.

Acknowledgments

We extend our heartfelt gratitude to the Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology (Indonesian: Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi, abbreviated Kemendikbudristek) as an funding for this research with the contract number: 041/SP2H/PT/LL7/2024; 04/TB-LPPM/TU-220/VI/2024. We also sincerely appreciate the Central Bureau of Statistics of Indonesia, which has served well in purchasing data for the National Survey of Social Economics.

Reference

1. R. Anindita, F. Amalina, A. A. Sa'diyah, N. Khoiriyah. and A. W. Muhaimin. Food demand for carbohydrate sources: Linear approximation-almost ideal demand system/LA-AIDS approach. *International Journal of Horticulture, Agriculture and Food Scienc*e. **6,** 11-19 (2022). doi:https://dx.doi.org/10.22161/ijhaf.6.2.
2. E. Biørn, E. Moment estimators and the estimation of marginal budget shares from household panel data. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics*. **5,** 133-154.
3. A. Deaton. Price elasticities from survey data: extensions and Indonesian results. *Journal of econometrics*. **44,** 281-309 (1990). doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-4076(90)90060-7.
4. M. Delport, M. Louwn, T. Davids, H. Vermeulen. H, and F. Meyer. Evaluating the demand for meat in South Africa: an econometric estimation of short term demand elasticities. *Agrekon*, **56,** (2017) 13-27. Doi: https://hdl.handle.net/10520/EJC-62ff443fe
5. S. Darma, and D.C. Darma. Food security management for Indonesia: the strategy during

the Covid-19 pandemic. *Management Dynamics in the Knowledge Economy*, **8**, 4 (2020)
6. A. M. Kiloes, A. Sulistyaningrum, N. Khaririyatun, D. Mulyono, S. Prabawati, M. J. A. Syah, and N. F. Devy. Unravelling the provisioning system of a strategic food commodity to minimise import dependency: A study of garlic in Indonesia. *Food Policy*, ***123***, 102604 (2024)
7. R. Green, and J. M. Alston. Elasticities in AIDS models. *American journal of agricultural economics*. **72,** 442-445 (1990). doi:https://doi.org/10.2307/1242346
8. C. Tacoli. The links between urban and rural development. *Environment and urbanization*, **15,** 1 3-12 (2003).
9. M. K. Nair, L. F. Augustine, and A. Konapur. Food-based interventions to modify diet quality and diversity to address multiple micronutrient deficiency. *Frontiers in public health*, **3**, 277 (2016).
10. A. Zezza, and L. Tasciotti, Urban agriculture, poverty, and food security: Empirical evidence from a sample of developing countries. *Food policy*, *35*(4), 265-273 (2010).
11. G. Mustafa, W. Huo, A. Pervaiz, M. R. Ullah, and M. Zulfiqar. Validating LA/AIDS model in the food market of Pakistan. *Heliyon*, **8**, 9 (2022). Doi: https://www.cell.com/heliyon/pdf/S2405-8440(22)01987-9.pdf.
12. D. R. Nendissa, R. Anindita, N. Khoiriyah, and A. A. Sa'diyah. Consumption and Beef Price Changes on Demand in East Nusa Tenggara, Indonesia. *AGRIS on-line Papers in Economics and Informatics*, **13**, 2 97-107 (2021).
13. A. A. Sa'diyah, R. Anindita, N. Hanani, and A. W. Muhaimin. The strategic food demand for non poor rural households in Indonesia. *EurAsian Journal of BioSciences*, **13**, 2 (2019).
14. A. G. Shibia, and D. G. Barako. Determinants of micro and small enterprises growth in Kenya. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*. **24,** 105-118 (2017).
15. S. S. Namini. Analysis of US Household Final Consumption Expenditure using LA/AIDS Approach. *International Journal of Current Advanced Research*. **6,** 6315-6320 (2017). doi:0.24327/ijcar.2017.6320.0917.
16. M. A. Siddique. Estimating the demand elasticity of rice in bangladesh: An application of the AIDS model. *Asian Journal of Agriculture and Rural Development*. **10,** 721-728 (2020). doi:10.18488/journal.ajard.2020.103.721.728.
17. S. U. Haq, I. Boz, P. Shahbaz, and M. R. Murtaza, Rural families food intake behaviour in relation to livelihood diversification, income differences and family size. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, **44**, 5 481-498 (2020).
18. A. Melesse, Substitution effect of maize (Zea mays) with grain milling by-products on egg production and hatchability of eggs in white Leghorn layer hens. *Journal of Biology, Agriculture and Healthcare*, **10**, 9 10-17(2020).
19. I. Ullah, and A. U. Jan, An Estimation of Food Demand in Pakistan Using LA/AIDS. *Sarhad Journal of Agriculture*. **32** (2016).
20. D. Zhou, X. Yu, D. Abler, and D. Chen. Projecting meat and cereals demand for China based on a meta-analysis of income elasticities. *China Economic Review*. **59** (2020).
21. X. Zhou. Using almost ideal demand system to analyze demand for shrimp in US food market. *International Journal of Food and Agricultural Economics (IJFAEC*). **3,** 31-46 (2015). doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.22004/ag.econ.208848.
22. M. Ulubasoglu, D. Mallick, M. Wadud, P. Hone, and Haszler, H. Food demand elasticities for A ustralia. *Australian Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics*, **60,** 2 177-195 (2016).