Innovative Research Journal of Sociology and Humanities
ISSN(print 3050-6867, ISSN(online): 3050-6875
Volume 03 Issue 05 May 2026
DOI: 10.58806/irijsh.2026.v3i5n13
Page No: 490 - 496

Identification of Demand Factors and Economic Value of Agrotourism in Musi Rawas Regency. South Sumatra Province. Indonesia

Yusnizal Firdaus[1], M. Yusuf[2], Al Hushori[3], Muhammad Riska Maulana Effendi[4], Sopiyan AR[5]
[1,2,3,4]Sriwijaya State Polytechnic. Department of Business Administration. Palembang. South Sumatra. Indonesia
[5]Sriwijaya State Polytechnic. Department of Accounting. Palembang. South Sumatra. Indonesia

ABSTRACT

Agrotourism in Musi Rawas Regency has natural, tourism, conservation, and economic potentials that strongly support the local community's economy. The purpose of this study is to identify visitors' characteristics and perceptions, identify the factors influencing recreation demand, and estimate the economic value of agrotourism. This economic value was analyzed using the Travel Cost Method. The method was calculated based on total consumer surplus. The travel cost coefficient and the total number of visits by respondents. The average travel cost incurred by the 300 respondents during their visit was IDR 400.000., and the total overall travel cost was IDR 1.500.000. The consumer surplus per visit was IDR 15.880, and the consumer surplus per individual per visit was IDR 43.33. The economic value generated over one year amounted to IDR 237.600. The factors that influence demand are income, distance and length of time knowing the location. The factors that do not significantly affect demand are travel cost, education, number of family dependents, gender, and age of visitors.

KEYWORDS: Agrotourism, recreation demand, economic value. travel cost method

ARTICLE DETAILS

Published On:
27 May 2026

Available on:
https://irijsh.com/

1. INTRODUCTION

Musi Rawas Regency is one of the regencies in South Sumatra Province. Indonesia. Musi Rawas Regency has natural. Tourism, conservation, and economic potentials that strongly support the community's economy. This strongly supports the development vision and mission in Indonesia. Starting from villages within the framework of a unitary state. Optimizing village potentials such as agrotourism can be made into productive economic activities to improve community welfare. In supporting this vision and mission. Musi Rawas Regency focuses on development in areas including agribusiness, tourism, home crafts, manufacturing industry, and trade and services (Central Bureau of Statistics or BPS, 2024). Instagramable agrotourism spots in Musi Rawas Regency include Mepet Sawah Remis which serves food with varied dishes made from shellfish (remis) along with meals and drinks. There is also Angkringan Kampung Belimbing which serves starfruit dishes directly picked from the starfruit trees and offers other varied foods. Kaka Food and Drinks focuses more on being a hangout spot for young people. Mepet Sawah Restaurant, a cozy eatery nestled beside the rice fields, and several other places are owned by local communities. Agrotourism is a combination of tourism and agriculture where visitors can visit gardens and farms to buy products, enjoy performances, take part in activities, eat certain foods, or spend the night in a plantation or park area (Utama. 2012). Objects or attractions of agricultural cultivation that have potential and can be developed into agrotourism include plantations, food crops and horticulture, livestock, and fisheries. The supply aspects of tourism are attractions, transportation, facilities, and institutions. Yoeti (2008) states that the factors of tourism demand are: (1) physical motivation, namely the need to restore fitness after continuous work; (2) cultural motivation, namely the desire to witness the level of cultural advancement of a nation; (3) personal motivation, namely the desire to visit family members whom one has not met for a long time; (4) status and prestige motivation, namely the perception that traveling can increase family status and show that one has greater capability than others. Utama (2016) states that factors influencing tourism demand are price, income, socio-cultural factors, socio-political factors, family intensity, prices of substitute goods, and prices of complementary goods.

Effendi (2015) identifies the factors affecting agrotourism demand as the travel cost incurred by each individual to the agrotourism location, visitors' income level, education level, number of family dependents, distance, gender, and length of time knowing the agrotourism site, and visitors' age.

Based on data from the Statistics Indonesia of Musi Rawas Regency (BPS, 2024), the agrotourism business in Musi Rawas Regency contributes to local government revenue from the tourism sector, accommodation, levies, and other developing economic activities. Tax and levy revenues increased, reaching IDR 76.484.286 in 2024 compared to IDR 54.104.359 in 2023.

The location of this agrotourism is not far from Lubuklinggau City which is the second-largest city after Palembang as the urban center in South Sumatra Province. However, in practice, since COVID-19 some agrotourism sites have not been well maintained. The sites have been abandoned, and this has become a challenge in developing this business. These challenges may include the potential for land-use conversion, pollution of tourist sites due to community activities, and other impacts that may affect the surrounding environment. Based on these conditions. It is necessary to study the extent of the community's willingness to maintain the existence of agrotourism sites by examining the economic value of their natural resources.

Economic value is a measurement method for transforming the value of non-market goods or services into monetary value. Economic value can be used for several purposes, including assessing the contributions of an ecosystem to human welfare, understanding the consequences faced by policymakers in managing ecosystems, and evaluating the consequences of actions taken (Purwanto, 2013; Kusumawardani, 2012; Maille P, R Mendelsohn. 1992.). The method of economic valuation is also explained by Djajaningrat (2014) who states that valuation approaches can use several methods. including: (1) market price method; (2) productivity method; (3) hedonic pricing method; (4) travel cost method; (5) avoided damage cost method; (6) uncertainty valuation method; (7) uncertainty choice method; and (8) benefit transfer method.

One method that can be used to measure economic value is the travel cost method, which is used to assess a resource that does not have a market value by modeling the demand for environmental services in the form of recreational activities (Haab and McConnell. 2003). According to Fauzi (2014) the travel cost method is used to analyze demand for outdoor recreation, such as fishing, hunting, hiking, and the like.

The research problems in this study are: what are the characteristics and visitor perceptions of agrotourism objects in Musi Rawas Regency, what factors influence the demand for agrotourism recreation, and what is the economic value generated by agrotourism using the travel cost method approach.

The objectives of this study are to identify the characteristics and visitor perceptions of agrotourism objects. determine the factors that influence the demand for agrotourism recreation, and estimate the economic value generated by agrotourism objects using the travel cost method approach.

2. METHODOLOGY

This study uses descriptive research with a quantitative approach which reveals the factors influencing visitor demand and then calculates the magnitude of the economic benefit value. Data collection for in-depth analysis was conducted using the survey method. The object of this research is agrotourism in Musi Rawas Regency. South Sumatra Province. Indonesia. The sample was selected randomly from 300 visitors taken over 3 days during the holiday season. Data collection in this study was carried out using the survey method, namely through interviews, questionnaires, and observation.

The data collected consisted of two types: primary data and secondary data. Primary data included the frequency of visits to agrotourism sites, the total recreation cost incurred by each individual and visitors' perceptions of the area and services such as location. Cleanliness, environmental quality, recreational facilities, security, as well as services and information provided by the management. Secondary data included the characteristics of agrotourism, such as the history and status of the area, area size, location, physical condition, tourism potential, supporting facilities, and other aspects obtained from literature studies.

The factors influencing agrotourism demand in this study are travel cost, income level, education level, family dependents, travel distance, gender, length of time knowing the location, and visitors' age. The agrotourism demand function and its influencing factors are modeled in the form of regression and estimated as follows:

$$Y = b0 + b1X1 + b2X2 + b3X3 + b4X4 + b5X5 + b6X6 + b7X7 + b8X8 + e$$

Where:

Y = Agrotourism demand (frequency of visits to agrotourism sites)
X1 = Travel cost incurred by each individual to the agrotourism location (IDR/person)
X2 = Visitor's income level (IDR/month)
X3 = Education level (years)
X4 = Number of family dependents (persons)
X5 = Travel distance (km)
X6 = Gender (1 = male. 0 = female)

X7 = Length of time knowing the agrotourism site (years)
X8 = Visitor's age (years)
b0 - b8 = Regression coefficients
e = Error term

In this study, model feasibility test criteria were conducted, namely normality test. multicollinearity test. heteroscedasticity test and autocorrelation test. The travel cost calculation can be formulated as follows:
Bpt = BTr + BDk + BK+ BP + BSv +BTk + BL
Description:
BPt = Travel Cost (IDR/person/day)
BTr = Transportation Cost (IDR/person/day)
BDk = Documentation Cost (IDR)
BK = Consumption Cost during Recreation (IDR/person/day)
BP = Parking Cost (IDR)
BSv = Souvenir Cost (IDR)
BTk = Entrance Ticket Cost (IDR)
BL = Other Costs (IDR)

Meanwhile. the calculation of the average travel cost of visitors to reach the agrotourism site uses the following formula (Ekwarso. 2010):
ATC=∑BPT/n
Where:
ATC = Average travel cost of visitors
BPT = Total travel cost of visitors
n = Number of visitors interviewed

The consumer surplus value can be calculated using the travel cost coefficient. with the following formula (Fauzi 2014):
SK= (〖(β〗 _(0)- β_1 TC)^2)/ 〖2β〗 _1

This equation can also be simplified into:
SK=N^2/ 〖2β〗 _1
Where:
SK = Visitor consumer surplus (IDR)
N = Number of visits in a period
β_1 = Travel cost coefficient Furthermore, to estimate the economic value of visits to agrotourism.

The value is obtained from the total consumer surplus of visitors within a certain period of time.
NE = SK x TP
Where:
NE = Economic value of agrotourism in one year
SK = Visitor consumer surplus (IDR)
TP = Total number of visitors in one year

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Musi Rawas Regency is located in the westernmost part of South Sumatra Province. Indonesia. Its capital is located in Muara Beliti District. Geographically, this region borders Jambi Province to the north; Musi Banyuasin Regency and Penukal Abab Lematang Ilir Regency to the east; North Musi Rawas Regency. Lubuklinggau City and Empat Lawang Regency to the south; and Bengkulu Province to the west.

The number of visitors selected as respondents was 300 people. Of this total. 153 people or 51% were male, and the remaining 147 people or 49% were female. Based on occupation, most visitors worked as private employees, accounting for 36.1%, followed by students at 25.9%, entrepreneurs at 16.1%, and housewives at 7.9%, unemployed at 7.4%, civil servants at 4.2%, retirees at 1.1%, household helpers and teachers at 0.5% each and tour guides at 0.3%.

Visitors who came to the tourist site mostly had the purpose of refreshing, with a percentage of 56.7%. Picnics or gathering with family accounted for 32.7%, education 10%, while shooting and photography each accounted for 0.3%. On average. 46.6% of visitors to this agrotourism site were first-time visitors. Visitors who came twice accounted for 17.7%, three times 12.4%, four times

11.6%, five times 1.3%, and those who visited the agrotourism site more than five times accounted for 10.6%. Based on the mode of transportation used, most visitors used private cars for recreation, at 54.1%, motorcycles at 37.0%, and rental cars at 9.0%.

The characteristics of visitors' income varied according to their profession or type of work. The largest percentage of income ranged between IDR 2.500.000 and IDR 4.000.000, accounting for 27.70%. The second-largest income group, at 22.70%, was between IDR 1.000.000 and IDR 2.500.000. Visitors with an income of less than IDR 1.000.000 accounted for 25.9%; IDR 4.000.000 to IDR 5.500.000 accounted for 16.90%; IDR 5.500.000 to IDR 7.000.000 accounted for 3.20%; and those with an income of more than IDR 7.000.000 accounted for 12.10%.

This study uses 8 independent variables to analyze their influence on the number of visits (dependent variable). namely: (1) travel cost; (2) income level; (3) education level; (4) number of family dependents; (5) travel distance; (6) gender; (7) length of time knowing the agrotourism site; and (8) visitor's age. Based on the data processing results. The following regression analysis results were obtained:

Table 1. Regression Analysis

Source	Value	Standard error	T	Pr > |t|= Phitung	Lower bound (95%)	Upper bound (95%)
Intercept	0.5531	0.4180	1.3233	0.1866	-0.2688	1.3751
X1	0.0397	0.0291	1.3651	0.1730	-0.0175	0.0968
X2	-0.0796	0.0259	-3.0714	0.0023	-0.1305	-0.0286
X3	0.0039	0.0101	0.3847	0.7007	-0.0159	0.0236
X4	0.0361	0.0283	1.2734	0.2037	-0.0196	0.0918
X5	-0.0017	0.0004	-4.3675	< 0.0001	-0.0024	-0.0009
X6	0.0903	0.0460	1.9641	0.0503	-0.0001	0.1807
X7	0.2819	0.0117	24.1302	< 0.0001	0.2589	0.3049
X8	0.0018	0.0033	0.5423	0.5880	-0.0046	0.0082

Source: Research analysis. 2026

Based on Table 1, the demand function for recreation in agrotourism can be expressed as follows:

$Y = b0 + b1X1 + b2X2 + b3X3 + b4X4 + b5X5 + b6X6 + b7X7 + b8X8 + e$

$LnY = 0.55311 + 0.03968_X1 - 0.07955_X2 + 0.00387_X3 + 0.03608_X4 - 0.00165_X5 + 0.09030_X6 + 0.28191_X7 + 0.00176_X8$

The normality test of the data was conducted using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. The test produced a P-Value of 0.0516, which is greater than the significance level of 5%, so H0 is accepted. It can be concluded that the errors are normally distributed. For the multicollinearity test, the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) was used. If the VIF is greater than 10, it can be said that multicollinearity exists in the model.

Tabel 2. Multicollinierity Test

Statistic	X_1	X_2	X_3	X_4	X_5	X_6	X_7	X_8
Tolerance	0,7869	0,6497	0,8584	0,4392	0,8509	0,9323	0,9618	0,4143
VIF	1,2708	1,5391	1,1650	2,2767	1,1753	1,0726	1,0397	2,4138

Source: Research analysis, 2026

Based on the multicollinearity test results in Table 2, it shows that there is no multicollinearity since the VIF values for each variable are less than 10. Variable X1 has a VIF value of 1.2708, X2 is 1.5391, and X3, X4, X5, X6, X7, and X8 are 1.1650, 2.2767, 1.1753, 1.0726, 1.0397, and 2.4138 respectively. The heteroscedasticity test in this study used the White Test method. If F-calculated < F-table or if the P-value > α, then accept H0, meaning the residuals do not exhibit heteroscedasticity. Based on the test results, the P-value is 0.1471, which is greater than alpha 0.05 or the 5% significance level. This means the data meet the criteria for the heteroscedasticity test. The autocorrelation test using Durbin-Watson (DW) produced a value of 1.8020, which is nearly close to 2. This value indicates that there is no autocorrelation in the data. The regression analysis results show that three variables have a significant effect on the number of agrotourism visits, namely travel cost (X1), income (X2), distance (X5), and length of time knowing the location (X7). Meanwhile, the variables that do not affect agrotourism demand are education (X3), family dependents

(X4), gender (X6), and age (X8). Whether a variable has an effect depends on the calculated P-value. If the calculated P-value is less than the significance level of 0.05, the variable is declared to have a significant effect on the dependent variable

Based on the data processing results, it can be seen that travel cost (X1) does not affect the level of visits to agrotourism. This is evident from the regression probability value for the travel cost variable, which is 0.1866, indicating that the variable does not have a significant effect on the level of visits at a 95% confidence level, or is greater than the 0.05 significance level. The regression coefficient value for the travel cost variable is positive. This positive correlation indicates that a one percent increase in travel cost will increase visit frequency by 0.0397%, and conversely, if there is a decrease in travel cost, it will reduce the level of visits to the tourist site. Based on the research results, this occurs because, on average, visitors' trips to the agrotourism site are not their main travel purpose.

Based on the regression analysis, the income (X2) variable has a significant effect on agrotourism demand. This is proven by the calculated P-value of 0.0023, which is smaller than the significance level of 0.05, with a coefficient of -0.0796. This value indicates that a one percent increase in income will reduce visit frequency to agrotourism by 0.0796%, meaning the higher the visitor's income, the lower the visit frequency. If income is higher, visitors may be more interested in visiting other places that are better and more satisfying. This may occur because agrotourism is still a relatively new recreational site with facilities that are not yet fully complete, so it is reasonable that visitors would still prefer other tourist destinations if they have higher income.

Based on the data processing results, it can be seen that the education variable (X3) does not affect the level of visits to agrotourism. This is evident from the calculated P-value of the regression for the education variable, which is 0.7007, indicating that the variable does not have a significant effect on the level of visits at a 95% confidence level, or is greater than the 0.05 significance level. The regression coefficient for the education variable is positive. This positive correlation indicates that an increase of one year in education will increase visit frequency by 0.0039%, and conversely, if there is a decrease in the length of education, it will reduce the level of visits to the tourist site. However, it is evident that a higher level of education does influence visits

Based on the data processing results, it can be seen that the variable of the number of family dependents (X4) does not affect the level of visits to agrotourism. This is evident from the calculated P-value of the regression for the number of family dependents variable, which is 0.2037, indicating that the variable does not have a significant effect on the level of visits at a 95% confidence level, or is greater than the 0.05 significance level. The regression coefficient for the number of family dependents variable is positive at 0.0361. This positive correlation indicates that an increase of one person in the number of family dependents will increase visit frequency by 0.0361%, and conversely, if there is a decrease in the number of family dependents, it will reduce the level of visits to the tourist site.

The regression test results show that the distance variable (X5) has a significant effect on agrotourism demand. This is indicated by a calculated P-value of 0.0001, which is smaller than the significance level of 0.05, with a coefficient of -0.0017. This value means that if there is an increase of one kilometer in the travel distance to the agrotourism site, it will reduce visit frequency by 0.0017%. Based on field observations, this is evident as the average visitors come from areas around Musi Rawas Regency, while visitors from outside Musi Rawas Regency have a lower visit frequency. This is because the travel distance to the agrotourism site is very far.

The regression test results also show that the gender variable (X6) does not affect the level of visits to agrotourism. This is evident from the calculated P-value of the regression for the gender variable, which is 0.0503, indicating that the variable does not have a significant effect on the level of visits at a 95% confidence level, or is greater than the 0.05 significance level. The regression coefficient for the gender variable is positive at 0.0903. This positive correlation indicates that male visitors have a 0.0903 times greater chance of visiting compared to female visitors.

The regression test results show that the variable of length of time (X7) knowing the tourist site has a significant effect on agrotourism demand. This is indicated by a calculated P-value of 0.0001, which is smaller than the significance level of 0.05, with a coefficient of 0.2819. This value means that for every one-year increase in knowing the agrotourism site, visit frequency will increase by 0.2819%. Based on the research results, this is evident as the average visitors to the agrotourism site are people who have known the place for a long time.

Based on the regression results, it can be seen that the family age variable (X8) does not affect the level of visits to agrotourism. This is evident from the calculated P-value of the regression for the age variable, which is 0.5880, indicating that the variable does not have a significant effect on the level of visits at a 95% confidence level, or is greater than the 0.05 significance level. The regression coefficient for the age variable is positive at 0.0018. This positive correlation indicates that a one-year increase in age will increase visit frequency by 0.0018%.

Agriculture is the result of managing natural resources for human needs. In agribusiness, there are values with market prices such as agricultural products like vegetables, fruits, etc., which can be directly processed. Agriculture also has non-market values, such as the beauty of agricultural landscapes, scenery, and air produced by agriculture, etc. These are enjoyed by humans but obtained for free and have no market price.

The travel cost approach is one way to estimate the economic value of recreational services (Djajaningrat, 2014; *Shammin*, *M. R.,* 1999). Based on data processing, the total travel cost incurred by visitors to agrotourism is IDR 1,500,000. The average cost per visitor is IDR 400,000, indicating visitors are willing to pay IDR 400,000 per visit. This assumes the average cost is lower than the total cost due to differences in visitors' origin locations.

Several factors cause distance not to affect travel costs, including: (1) not all visitors incur transportation costs as some come with family (covered by family); (2) different transportation modes affect travel costs; (3) visitors may visit other tourist sites, so costs are shared.

Consumer surplus in the travel cost method shows how much someone values a recreational site based on their visits (Fauzi, 2014). The demand function for agrotourism visits, assuming only travel cost affects visits, is Y = 0.55311 + 0.03968X1. The travel cost method value can be calculated from respondents, visits per year, estimated annual visits, travel cost coefficient, and consumer surplus, as shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Travel Cost Method Estimation for Agrotourism

Descreption	Value
Number of respondents	)
Estimated number of visitors in 2025	)0
Visit frequency (y)	)6
Travel cost coefficient (*b*)	)397
Consumer surplus (IDR) SK= $y^2/2b$	752.324
Average consumer surplus per visit (IDR) = e/c	000
Average consumer surplus per visit per individual (IDR) = f/a	
Agrotourism economic value in 2025 (IDR) = g x b	7.600

Source: Research analysis, 2026

The average visitor expenditure during tourism is IDR 400,000. Regression analysis yields a travel cost method coefficient of 0.0397. The total consumer surplus is IDR 15,880, and per-individual consumer surplus per visit is IDR 43.33, with an annual average of IDR 13,000.

The average travel cost is IDR 400,000, with a total of OIDR 1,500,000. Consumer surplus per visit is IDR 13,000, and per-individual is IDR 50. The annual economic value is IDR 237,600, representing the previously unaccounted natural and environmental resource value of agrotourism.

This value shows agrotourism has more value than marketed. Visitors are willing to pay more (IDR 33), indicating potential for growth. Agrotourism can improve services, facilities, and promotion to increase visitor interest

4. CONCLUSION

The conclusions from this research are:

1. Factors affecting agrotourism demand are income, distance, and length of knowing the location, while factors not affecting demand are travel cost, education, family dependents, gender, and visitor age.
2. Consumer surplus represents the net benefit tourist's gain from agrotourism recreation, which is IDR 13,000 per visit, and IDR 33 per individual per visit. The 2025 consumer surplus, representing the economic value of agrotourism, is IDR 237,600.

Implications of this research are:

1. Given the previously unaccounted economic value, companies should improve the environment, as indicated by the small value of IDR 33 per individual per visit. Improvements can include conservation, adding attractions, and enhancing facilities. These can increase tourist attraction and willingness to pay, allowing managers to raise ticket prices and gain more profit.
2. Local government support is needed for agrotourism development, including funding, training, and infrastructure provision.
3. This research should be conducted regularly, as economic values can change annually, allowing comparison and informed decision-making. Visitor satisfaction with Sweetberry agrotourism should also be assessed.

REFERENCES

1) BPS. 2024. *Kabupaten Musi Rawas dalam Angka*. https://musirawaskab.bps.go.id/id/publication/2024/02/28/fb1b6cc10008727a16854fac/kabupaten-musi-rawas-dalam-angka-2024.html

2) Djajadiningrat. 2014. *Green Economy (Ekonomi Hijau) Edisi Revisi*. Bandung: Rekayasa Sains.
3) Efendi. 2015. *Nilai Ekonomi Jasa Wisata Pulau Tangkil Provinsi Lampung Dengan Pendekatan Metode Biaya Perjalanan.*Jurnal Kehutanan. Vol. 3 No. 3 (71—84), ISSN 2339-0913. (diunduh Februari 2017). Tersedia pada: http://www.e-jurnal.com /2016/10/nilai-ekonomi-jasa-wisata-pulau-tangkil.html.
4) Ekwarso. 2010. *Nilai Ekonomi Lingkungan dan Faktor-Faktor yang Mempengaruhi Permintaan Objek Wisata Air Panas Pawan di Kabupaten Rokan Hulu (pendekatan biaya perjalanan)*. Jurnal Ekonomi. 18(3): 103—200. http://ejournal.unri.ac.id/index.php/JE/article/view/766/0
5) Fauzi, A. 2014. *Valuasi Ekonomi dan Penilaian Kerusakan Sumber Daya Alam dan Lingkungan.* PT. Penerbit IPB Press: Bogor
6) Haab, T.C. dan McConnell, K.E. 2003. *Valuing Environmental and Natural Resources*. The Economic of Non-Market Valuation. Edward Elgar. USA. https://www.google.co.id/?gws_rd=cr,ssl&ei=mORyWIHXC8n1vgTs4qwCA#
7) Kusumawardani. 2012. *Analisis Surplus Konsumen dan Surplus Produsen Ikan Segar di Kota Bandung*. Jurnal Perikanan dan Kelautan. Vol. 2 No. 4, ISSN 2088-3137. http://jurnal.unpad.ac.id/jpk/article/viewFile/2556/2314.
8) Maille P, R Mendelsohn. 1992. *Valuating Ecotourism in Madagaskar. Journal of Inviromental Managenent.* http://fiesta.bren.ucsb.edu /~costello/courses/ESM204/ESM204_10/Readings/Valuing%20ecotourism%20in%20Madagascar.pdf
9) Purwanto. 2013. *Valuasi Ekonomi Ekowisata dengan Model Travel Cost dan Dampaknya Terhadap Usaha Kecil Pariwisata*. Jurnal Manajemen. Vol.15, No. 1 (89-102). (diunduh pada April 2017). Terdapat pada : jurnalmanajemen.petra.ac.id/index.php/man/article/viewFile/18668/18424
10) *Shammin*, *M. R.* (1999). *Application of the Travel Cost Method (TCM): A Case. Study of Environmental Valuation of Dhaka Zoological Garden. In Hecht, J. E. (Ed.)*. The economic value of Environment: Cases from South Asia. IUCN. http://www.joyhecht.net/professional/papers/SAsia.valuation.ch3.pdf
11) Utama IG. 2012. *Agrowisata Sebagai Pariwisata Alternatif di Indonesia*. Denpasar (ID). (diunduh 2016November).Tersedia pada: https://www.academia.edu/14527676 /Agrowisata Sebagai_Pariwisata_Alternatif Indonesia.
12) Utama, Rayindra C dan Hartono Djoni. 2016. *Analisis Daya Saing Harga Pariwisata Indonesia: Pendekatan Elastisitas Permintaan.*Jurnal Kepariwisataan. Deputi Penelitian dan Pengembangan Kebijakan Kepariwisataan (Kementrian Pariwisata).
13) Yoeti, Oka A. 2008. *Ekonomi Pariwisata (Introduksi, Informasi, dan Implementasi)*. PT. Kompas Media Nisantara: Jakarta.