

# Local Institutional Participation in Agrotourism Management of Wonorejo Reservoir, Tulungagung, East Java, Indonesia

Bambang Tri Kurnianto<sup>1\*</sup>, Sugiyanto<sup>2</sup>, Kliwon Hidayat<sup>2</sup>, Kepi Sukesi<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>PhD Student, Faculty of Agriculture, University of Brawijaya, Malang, East Java Indonesia

<sup>2</sup>Lecturers, Faculty of Agriculture, University of Brawijaya, Malang, East Java Indonesia

## ABSTRACT

This research aimed to analyze the participation of local formal and non formal institutions in agrotourism management of Wonorejo Reservoir. Institutions studied were formal and non formal institutions operating in the reservoir area. There were 120 respondents from 12 local institutions comprising 6 formal institutions and 6 non formal constitutions. Of each institution, there were 10 respondents. Leaders of each institution were selected purposively to serve as key informants, the next nine respondents were selected by using snow ball method. Agrotourism management observed included activities of planning, organizing, coordinating, and controlling. Data were analyzed by using descriptive analysis. The result revealed that the participation rates of both local formal and non formal institutions in the agrotourism management were still low classified as Moderate Participation. The participation rate of local formal institutions in agrotourism management was slightly higher than that of local non formal institutions. Obstacles of local institutional participation in the agrotourism management were: 1) Public Company Jasa Tirta I Tulungagung that was supposed to be the leading institution for developing agrotourism was only a branch of Public Company Jasa Tirta I Malang and did not have full authorities in agrotourism management; 2) There was not any coordination among local institutions. 3) There were uncertainties of duties and authorities among formal institutions; 4) agrotourism was only considered as a byproduct.

**Key words:** Agrotourism management, institutional participation

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The presence of a reservoir is not as important for human survival, but it is still important for the socio economic development. This is related to the opportunities for the development of various forms of tourism, as well as with the specific properties of water. An artificial reservoir can be one of the most important factors creating tourist attractiveness of an area, and therefore it can have an impact on the level of tourism development. Further, sustainable and responsible rural tourism development is unbelievable without the application of economic and ecological thinking as well. Consequently tourism economy and ecology, as theory and practice, naturally helps developing the tourism of rural areas based on local natural, social and cultural resources (Katarzyna, 2101). This statement has also been supported by Kurek (2007) claiming that needs of local communities should be given serious attention in tourism development which will result in improvement of living level and quality; tourist expectations; protection of natural and cultural environments.

Tourism is one of the leading sectors to generate income, so that the utilization, development and management of tourist areas should be given serious attention by the government, stake holders, and also the participation of all walks of life (Nandi, 2008; Narayan, 2000).

Institutional participation is important because it clarifies project goals, reduces project cost, prevents/reduces management conflicts (that may be caused between development workers and local people), promotes the technology transfer to the people and encourages a culture of self-help and a commitment among the people (Katsumoto, 2007). Participation increases sustainability, productivity, efficiency, reduces cost and builds democratic organizations (FAO, 1997). Participation improves the status of women by providing them the opportunity to play a part in development activities ((UNDP, 1997). Participation creates the sense of responsibility and ownership in the beneficiaries which leads to sustainability (FAO, 1991). Participation breaks the mentality of dependence and promotes self-awareness and confidence (Mefenguza, 2007). Participation improves the efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and coverage of projects and programs and promoting stakeholder capacity, self-reliance and empowerment (FAO, 2000). Participation provides equitable development and creates a sense of self-determination, community development and self-development (CPA, 2000).

However, there are obstacles of people's participation in development programs. This participatory approach creates a balanced relationship and interdependence between the government and the public. Consequently, administrative decentralization supports the emergence of sectoral ego of each institution that had its own missions. Besides that, there are internal factors such as: socio-cultural and external factors such as government bureaucracy that might hamper people's participation in development programs (Lestari, 2012).

Wonorejo Reservoir is the biggest reservoir in South East Asia located at Wonorejo village, Pagerwojo sub-district, Tulungagung District, East Java, Indonesia. Agrotourism development of Wonorejo reservoir has to support the reservoir functions as: a power plant, irrigation, a clean water provider and as a tourism object (Kurniawan, 2008).

The reservoir was initially managed by the local government of Tulungagung, then emerged government regulation number 93/1999 imposing that the reservoir should be managed by Public Company of Jasa Tirta I (article 8). Meanwhile in efforts to improve local government revenue and to implement rural development programs, local government also had formal institutions that had authorities in the reservoir areas, that were: Regional Development and Planning Agency, Agricultural Agency, Tourism Agency, Forestry and Plantation Agency, and Marine and Fisheries Agency. Each agency had programs involving community groups or non formal institutions acting as targets of their programs, that were: Traders Association, Fish Farmers Association, Farmers Association, Traditional Artists Association, Tourists Association, and Youth Association.

This study intended to analyze the institutional participation of local formal and non formal institutions in the management of reservoir agrotourism. As a process, agrotourism management was a process of planning, organizing, coordinating, and controlling of resources to achieve goals effectively and efficiently (Griffin, 2008).

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Economic dimensions of tourism does not only depend on the input itself, but also in other sectors. One sector is the agricultural sector which is the complement of tourism (Çıkm, Çeken, and Ucar, 2009). Development of agriculture-based tourism is a trend affecting many European countries, the data showed a significant trend toward a more responsible and sustainable behavior on agrotourism activities (Giudici and Dessi, 2011). Agrotourism activities are diversified or consumption of natural resources and the local culture as well as the development of personal relationships between visitors and the local community (Iakovidou, 1997 in Lathiras et. al., 2010) and increase the economic income of the local community (Sosnowski and Ciepiela, 2011). The main reason for the economic motive to participate in agrotourism (Pillar et. al., 2012). Sustainable development of agrotourism should emphasize economic growth together with the preservation of local culture and environment, equitable benefit sharing and community participation (Chemnasiri, 2013).

Agrotourism is a tool that has been widely used around the world for the purpose of intensifying the socio-economic aspects of the local community (Hamzah et. al., 2012). Agrotourism is a catalyst for economic growth and income supplement (Das and Rainey, 2010) and a successful industry in increasing revenue (Chesky, 2009). Agrotourism considered means to maintain agricultural activities and promote economic diversification activities (Van der Ploeg and Renting, 2004). Agrotourism opportunities can be found in the most unexpected places and not exclusively as remote rural areas (Henderson, 2009). Rural tourism and agrotourism can contribute to rural development focuses on three main aspects: (a) rural tourism through its function as a means of regional development, (b) agrotourism through its function as a means of regional development and (c) the actual situation agrotourism and rural tourism (Xarba and Shehu, 2011). Agrotourism activities should aim to improve the quality of life by creating jobs, have an impact on the social and economic aspects, as well as the multifunctional development of rural sustainable development (Wyporska and Mosiej, 2010).

Agrotourism development also required the involvement and coordination of various parties, including government operators, communities and tourism for sustainability of agrotourism in China (Wang et. al., 2012). Most (30%) of the owners of the farm in a rural area of West Pomeranian region to learn about agrotourism from their friends who are involved in these activities, both municipal offices, television, newspapers and tourists (Brelík, 2011). Agrotourism development in Malopolska province is determined by the institutional management and forms management depends on the institution (Niedziółka and Brzozowska, 2009). Policy of the Government of Spain and the autonomous communities can be absorbed by the Romanian Government and local public authorities for sustainable development of agrotourism (Popescu, Cretu, and Sima, 2011). Government of India should participate in promoting agrotourism to ensure sustainable economic development and positive social change (Joshi and Bhujbal, 2012). Support local governments, agricultural organizations perfect, scientific land regulations, as well as good organizational system has demonstrated the characteristics of multi-functions and the economic and social benefits to the advancement of agro clear in Taiwan (Xiaoli and Feng, 2013).

## 3. MATERIALS AND METHODS

This research was conducted in Tulungagung. Wonorejo reservoir area was purposively selected due to Wonorejo reservoir was the biggest reservoir in South East Asia, while agrotourism was growing slowly. There were 120 respondents representing 12 local institutions comprising 6 formal institutions and 6 non formal institutions. Of each institutions, there were 10 respondents. Leaders of relevant institutions were purposively

selected as key informants, then subsequent respondents were selected by using snowball method. The six formal institutions were: 1) the Regional Development and Planning Agency; 2) Public Company of Jasa Tirta I Tulungagung, 3) Agricultural Agency, 4) Tourism Agency, 5) Forestry and Plantation Agency, and 6) Marine and Fisheries Agency. The six non formal institutions were: 1) Traders Association, 2) Fish Farmers Association, 3) Farmers Association, 4) Traditional Artists Association, and 5) Tourists Association, and 6) Youth Association.

Agrotourism management observed included activities of planning, organizing, coordinating, and controlling. Primary and secondary data were gathered by observation, personal interview, and material inspection. Primary data were classified into five categories: Non Participation (NP), Less Participation (LP), Moderate Participation (MP), Good Participation (GP) and Excellent Participation (EP). Each category had nominal values ranging from 1 to 5. Data were analyzed descriptively based on the distribution of frequency then were determined into five categories of participation, that were: No Participation (the scores ranged from 0 to 20), Less Participation (21 to 40), Moderate (41 to 60), Good (61-80), and Excellent (81 to 100).

#### 4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Local Institutional participation in agrotourism management of both formal and non formal institutions were in Moderate level. However, the participation rate of formal institutions in agrotourism management was slightly higher than that of non formal institutions. The former was 49.17 while the later was 47.25 (Table 1 and 2).

In Planning, the participation rate of formal institution was 54.33 that was higher than the institutional participation rate of non formal institution 48.67. Both were categorized into Moderate Participation.

Based on the order of rank from the highest to the lowest, institutional participation rates of formal institutions in Planing were: 1) Public Company Jasa Tirta I Tulungagung, 2) Regional Development and Planning Agency, 3) Tourism Agency, 4) Agricultural Agency, 5) Marine and Fisheries Agency, and 6) Forestry and Plantation Agency.

The institutional participation rates of the first three institutions were classified as Good Participation, the fourth was in Moderate Participation, while the next two institutions had institutional participation rates which were categorized as Less Participation.

Table 1. Frequency distribution of participation of formal institutions in Agrotourism Management

Formal Institutions		Frequency Distribution (FD)				Total Score	Average
		Planning	Organizing	Coordinating	Controlling		
1.	Regional Development and Planning Agency	70	42	38	42	192	48
2.	Public Company of Jasa Tirta I Tulungagung	78	44	64	82	268	67
3.	Agricultural Agency	42	80	32	44	198	49.5
4.	Tourism Agency	68	74	56	78	276	69
5	Forestry and Plantation Agency	30	40	36	32	138	34.5
6.	Marine and Fisheries Agency	38	24	22	24	108	27
TOTAL SCORE		326	304	248	302		295
Average Score		54.33	50.67	41.33	50.33		<b>49.17</b>

Table 2. Frequency distribution of participation of non formal institutions in Agrotourism Management

Formal Institutions		Frequency Distribution (FD)				Total Score	Average
		Planning	Organizing	Coordinating	Controlling		
1.	Traders Association	76	82	48	62	268	67
2.	Fish Farmers Association	50	34	46	46	176	44
3.	Farmers Association	40	76	44	54	214	53.5
4.	Traditional artists Association	68	84	58	60	270	67.5
5	Tourists Association	20	20	20	22	82	20.5
6.	Youth Association	38	24	28	32	122	30.5
TOTAL SCORE		292	320	244	276		283
AVERAGE SCORE		48.67	53.33	40.67	46		47.17

Inside of the reservoir areas, planning was mainly conducted by the Public Company Jasa Tirta I Tulungagung, the Regional Development and Planning Agency only planned supporting infrastructures outside of the reservoir areas, particularly means of transport such as roads leading to the reservoir. Whereas the Tourism Agency planned programs mainly related to promotional activities in which reservoir agrotourism was only one of tourist attractions in Tulungagung.

The agricultural agency had Moderate Participation. However, this local formal institution was mainly concerned with cultivating common crops which did not have special characteristics that could provide a tourist attraction.

The Marine and Fisheries Agency had not cultivated fish seeds in the reservoir since the last three years, because there was a lot of predator fish called '*simpilun*' that ate fish seeds planted by this institution. The small predator fish was ornamental fish that had beautiful red colour and cultivated by a chinese tourist. The number of this fish had been growing rapidly and even became problems for fish farmers.

The lowest rate of institutional participation of formal institution in Planning was from the Forestry and Plantation Agency. Forest areas that were within the authority of the Forestry and Plantation Agency were only as large as 20% while the rest was controlled by a non local institution Perhutani.

Based on the order of rank from the highest to the lowest, institutional participation rates of local non formal institutions in Planning were: 1) Traders Association, 2) Traditional Artists Association, 3) Fish Farmers Association, 4) Farmers Association, 5) Youth Association, and 6) Tourists Association.

The institutional participation rates of the first two institutions were classified as Good Participation, the third was in Moderate Participation, the next two institutions were in Less Participation, while the last was categorized into No Participation.

Traders association had Good Participation in Planning. There were regular meetings conducted by members of traders association at least to repay indebtedness and to discuss things especially problems that recently emerged. They also made proposals to relevant agencies to enhance their trading businesses. The several proposals were fulfilled by the relevant formal institutions, such as: soft loans for capital and construction of parking areas and stalls. However, there were also proposals which were rejected by Public Company Jasa Tirta I, especially programs that endangered water quality and reservation preservation, such as: tourism boats operated by local people and the construction of playground facilities near the reservoir.

Institutional participation of traditional artists association was categorized into Good Participation in Planning. This non formal institution planned to make schedule of when and types of traditional arts performed. According to the manager of tourism unit of the Public Company Jasa Tirta I Tulungagung, there were always many visitors when there were performances of traditional arts.

The lowest rate of non formal institutional participation in Planning was from Tourists Association. There were not any suggestion boxes provided in the area. Suggestion boxes were actually useful for getting suggestion from tourists to increase agrotourism performance. Moreover, none of tourists surveyed were even asked to give suggestion by relevant officers.

In Organizing, the institutional participation rate of formal institution was 50.67 that was lower than the institutional participation rate of non formal institution 53.33. Institutional participation rates of both were categorized into Moderate Participation.

Based on the order of rank from the highest to the lowest of institutional participation rates of formal institutions in Organizing were: 1) Agricultural Agency, 2) Tourism Agency, 3) Public Company Jasa Tirta I

Tulungagung, 4) Regional Development and Planning Agency, 5) Marine and Fisheries Agency, and 6) Forestry and Plantation Agency.

The institutional participation rates of the first two agencies were classified as Good Participation, the next two institutions were Moderate Participation, while the last two formal institutions were Less Participation.

The highest institutional participation rate of formal institutions in Organizing was from Agricultural Agency. The Agricultural Agency had Farmers Association as a target group of its program. The farmers association was well established, even in every village there was a field extension officer who regularly fostered and helped farmers to implement agricultural programs through institutions. However, the existing agricultural programs were not related to the reservoir agrotourism development in particular to increase aesthetic values and natural beauty and also to provide recreational values. Farmers only planted their lands according to the instructions of Agricultural Agency without any coordination with other formal institutions.

In overall view, the institutional participation rates of formal institutions in Organizing were quite low. There were obstacles of institutional participation of formal institutions in organizing, such as:

- 1) There were uncertainties of duties and authorities among formal institutions.

Historically, the reservoir was initially managed by the local government, then emerged government regulation number 93/1999 imposing that the reservoir should be managed by Public Company Jasa Tirta I (article 8). But this regulation was not well socialized. For instance, there was a debate in 2008 about who should repair the damaged roads encircling the reservoir. Leaders of non formal institutions had made many attempts to find out who should be responsible. They had come to Public Company Jasa Tirta I Tulungagung, Agrotourism Agency, Regional Development and Planning Agency. But officers they met were all saying that they were not responsible. This debate was finally resolved in the House of Representatives and found out that Public Company Jasa Tirta I was responsible. The Public Company Jasa Tirta I Tulungagung that was only a branch of Public Company Jasa Tirta I Malang did not have full authorities especially to programs that required high cost. Nevertheless, the damaged roads was not repaired yet.

- 2) The reservoir agrotourism was only considered as a byproduct.

For Public Company Jasa Tirta I, the reservoir agrotourism could be managed and developed as long as it did not harm water qualities and reservoir preservation. Agrotourism development was only considered as a byproduct.

Based on the order of rank from the highest to the lowest, institutional participation rates of local non formal institutions in Organizing were: 1) Traditional Artists Association, 2) Traders Association, 3) Farmers Association, 4) Fish Farmers Association, 5) Youth Association, and 6) Tourists Association. The institutional participation rates of the first two formal institutions were classified as Excellent Participation, the third was in Good Participation, whereas the last three institutions were categorized into No Participation.

Traders association and traditional arts association were non formal institutions that had intensive interaction with the Public Company Jasa Tirta I Tulungagung and Tourism Agency. Their institutional participation rates were categorized into Excellent Participation. This might be because of there had been many programs of formal institutions (Public Company Jasa Tirta I Tulungagung and Tourism Agency) which involved these two non formal institutions. Some programs required written reports which consequently made these two non formal institutions were functioning pretty well. Roles and duties of chairman, secretary and treasurer were clearly feasible. Besides that the locations of traders' stalls were close to the office of Public Company Jasa Tirta I Tulungagung and the traditional arts were often performed to attract visitors.

The institutional participation rate of Farmers Association in Organizing was classified as Good Participation. This non formal institution were well organized and under the guidance of field extension officers. Agricultural programs were mostly communicated through the institution.

The three non formal institutions that their institutional participation rates in organizing were categorized into Less Participation were Fish Farmers Association, Youth Association, and Tourists Association. These non formal institutions were not firmly established.

In Coordinating, the participation rate of formal institution was 41.33 classified as Moderate Participation, while the participation rate of non formal institution was 40.67 classified as Less Participation. Based on the order of rank from the highest to the lowest, institutional participation rates of local formal institutions in Coordinating were: 1) Public Company Jasa Tirta I Tulungagung, 2) Tourism Agency, 3) Regional Development and Planning Agency, 4) Forestry and Plantation Agency, 5) Agricultural Agency, and 6) Marine and Fisheries Agency.

Most rates of local institutional participation of formal institutions in coordinating were categorized into

Less Participation. The highest institutional participation rate which was classified as Moderate Participation was from the Public Company Jasa Tirta I Tulungagung. However, the Public Company Jasa Tirta I Tulungagung that was considered to be the leading institution to manage the reservoir agrotourism was only a branch of the Public Company Jasa Tirta I Malang. It had a lot of coordination only with the Public Company Jasa Tirta I Malang, not with other local formal institutions. There was not any coordination among local formal institutions. Moreover, the existing programs of the Public Company Jasa Tirta I Tulungagung relating to the reservoir agrotourism management were only programs that did not harm water quality and the reservoir conservation. The Public Company Jasa Tirta I Tulungagung also seemed to avoid high cost programs considering the number of tourists was still few.

In coordinating, institutional participation rates of all non formal institutions were still low. Four non formal institutions had Moderate Participation categories while the other two had Less Participation categories. Based on the order of rank from the highest to the lowest, institutional participation rates of local non formal institutions in Coordinating were: 1) Traditional Artists Association, 2) Traders Association, 3) Fish Farmers Association, 4) Farmers Association, 5) Youth Association, and 6) Tourists Association.

The highest institutional participation rate of non formal institutions in Coordinating was from Traditional Artists Association. However, this non formal institution only coordinated with the Public Company Jasa Tirta I Tulungagung especially when traditional arts would be performed.

In Controlling, the participation rate of formal institution was 50.33 classified as Moderate Participation, while the participation rate of non formal institution was 46.33 also classified as Moderate Participation. Based on the order of rank from the highest to the lowest, institutional participation rates of local formal institutions in Controlling were: 1) Public Company Jasa Tirta I Tulungagung, 2) Tourism Agency, 3) Agricultural Agency, 4) Regional Development and Planning Agency, 5) Forestry and Plantation Agency, and 6) Marine and Fisheries Agency.

The highest participation rate of local formal institutions in controlling was from Public Company Jasa Tirta I Tulungagung. This institution had dominant authorities of reservoir management and strictly controlled water quality and siltation of the reservoir by restricting activities and programs that could harm water quality and reservoir preservation.

Another local formal institution that had Moderate Participation in controlling was Tourism Agency. This local formal institution regularly made visits to the reservoir to find out whether there was an increase in the number of tourists and whether their non formal institutions (Traders and Traditional Arts Associations) were developing.

Based on the order of rank from the highest to the lowest, institutional participation rates of local non formal institutions in Controlling were: 1) Traders Association, 2) Traditional Artists Association, 3) Farmers Association, 4) Fish Farmers Association, 5) Youth Association, and 6) Tourists Association.

Local non formal institutions that had high rates of participation in Controlling were Traders Association and Traditional Arts Association. The manager of the tourism unit of The Public Company Jasa Tirta I Tulungagung often made visits to vendors and traditional arts and asked them to help oversee the reservoir tourism development. This was because the traders were always there at the site and their stalls were located close to the office of The Public Company Jasa Tirta I Tulungagung. While there were members of Traders Association, that were also members of Traditional Arts Association.

The lowest rate of institutional participation of local non formal institutions was from Tourists Association. There were not any suggestion boxes provided by the authorities in reservoir areas.

## 5. CONCLUSION

On the whole, the highest participation rate of local formal institutions was in Planning, while the highest participation rate of local non formal institutions was in Organizing. The lowest participation rates of both formal and non formal institutions were the same which were in Coordinating.

Based on the order of rank from the highest to the lowest, participation rates of local formal institutions in agrotourism management were: 1) Tourism Agency, 2) Public Company Jasa Tirta I Tulungagung, 3) Agricultural Agency, 4) Regional Development and Planning Agency, 5) Forestry and Plantation Agency, and 6) Marine and Fisheries Agency. While participation rates of local non formal institutions in management from the highest to the lowest were: 1) Traditional Artists Association, 2) Traders Association, 3) Farmers Association, 4) Fish Farmers Association, 5) Youth Association, and 6) Tourists Association.

Institutional participation rates of both formal and non formal institutions in agrotourism management were still low, which were categorized into Moderate Participation.

Obstacles of local institutional participation in the agrotourism management were: 1) Public Company Jasa Tirta I Tulungagung that was supposed to be the leading institution for developing agrotourism was only a branch of Public Company Jasa Tirta I Malang and did not have full authorities in agrotourism

management; 2) There were not any coordination among local institutions. 3) There were uncertainties of duties and authorities among formal institutions; 4) agrotourism was only considered as a byproduct.

## 6. REFERENCES

- Brelik, A. 2011. Agritourism Activity As An Example Of Diversification Of Agriculture. *Oeconomia* 10 (2), pp. 19–27.
- Chemnasiri, N. 2013. Community Potential Development for Sustainable Agrotourism in Thailand. *Jurnal IISTE Developing Country Studies* . Vol.3, No.5
- Chesky, A. 2009. Can Agritourism Save the Family Farm in Appalachia? A Study of Two Historic Family Farms in Valle Crucis, North Carolina. *Journal of Appalachian Studies*. Volume 15 Numbers 1 & 2
- Çıkin, A., H. ÇEKEN, and M. Uçar. 2009. Turizmin Tarım Sektörüne Etkisi, Agro-Turizm Ve Ekonomik Turizm Sonuçları. *Tarım Ekonomisi Dergisi*; 15 (1): 1-8.
- CPA, 2009. People, poverty and participation. Combat poverty agency (CPA). Bridgewater Centre, Island bridge, Dublin 8.
- Das, B.R. and D.V. Rainey. 2010. Agritourism in the Arkansas Delta Byways: Assessing the Economic Impacts. *Int. J. Tourism Res.* 12, pp. 265–280.
- FAO, 1991. Plan of action for people's participation in rural development. Twentysixth session FAO conference. Rome, 9-28 November 1991.
- FAO, 1997. Participation in practice: lessons from the FAO people's participation programme, Retrieved February 29, 2012, from <http://www.fao.org/sd/PPdirect/>
- FAO, 2000. Monitoring and evaluating stakeholder participation in agriculture and rural development projects: a literature review. Retrieved January 10, 2012, from <http://www.fao.org/WAICENT/FAOINFO/SUSTDEV/PPdirect/Ppre0074.htm>
- Giudici, E. and S. Dessi. 2011. A New Approach Is Born: The Slow Philosophy Via Agri-Tourism. *Review Of Business Research*, Volume 11, Number 5.
- Griffin, R. 2006. Business, 8th Edition. NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hamzah, A., S.M. Yassin1, B.A. Samah, J.L. D'Silva, N.T. Tiraiyaei, H.A.M.M. Shaffril, and J. Uli. 2012. Socio-Economic Impact Potential Of Agro Tourism Activities On Desa Wawasan Nelayan Community Living In Peninsular Malaysia. *African Journal of Agricultural Research* Vol. 7(32), pp. 4581-4588.
- Henderson, J.C. 2009. Agro-tourism in Unlikely Destinations: A Study Of Singapore. *Journal Managing Leisure* 14, pp. 258–268.
- Joshi, MPV. and MMB. Bhujbal. 2012. Agro-Tourism A Specialized Rural Tourism: Innovative Product Of Rural Market. *International Journal of Business and Management Tomorrow* Vol. 2 No. 1
- Katarzyna, D.G. 2010. Lakes, Reservoir and Regional Development through Some Examples in Poland and Hungary. *GeoJournal of Tourism and Geosites* ISSN 2065 0817, E ISSN 2065 1198 Year III, no. 1, vol. 5, pp. 16-23
- Katsumoto, S. 2007. Participation in international development. Retrieved February 22, 2012, from <http://socialresearchmethods.net/katsumoto/shuzo.html>
- Kurek, W. 2007. Turystyka [Tourism]. Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN. Warszawa.
- Kurniawan, I. 2008. Ecotourism Development in Cacaban Reservoir Area, Tegal Regency. *Journal of Environmental Studies*, 2 (25), pp. 1-25.
- Lathiras, P., A. Zopidou, J. Mylonakis, P. Tahinakis, N. Protogeros, and I. Valachis. 2010. An Evaluation Of Websites Quality Factors In Agro Travel And Ecotourism. *Tourism and Hospitality Management*, Vol. 16, No. 1, pp. 11-30
- Lestari, P. 2012. Persepsi dan partisipasi masyarakat dalam program keluarga berencana from [ebookbrowse.com/jurnal-dimensia-persepsi-dan-partisipasi-...](http://ebookbrowse.com/jurnal-dimensia-persepsi-dan-partisipasi-...)
- Mefenguza, N. 2007. An analysis of community participation in local government integrated development planning with reference to King Sabata Dalindyebo Local Municipality. Unpublished thesis, department of public administration, nelson Mandela metropolitan university.
- Nandi, 2008. Tourism and Human Resource Development. *Jurnal "GEA" Department of Geography Education* Vol 8, No.1.
- Narayan, P.K. 2000. Fiji's Tourism Industry: A SWOT Analysis. *Journal of Tourism Studies*, Vol 11 No 2 , pp. 15-24

- Niedziółka, A. and A. Brzozowska. 2009. Aspects Of Agritourism Management Inmalopolska Voivodeship. *Annals of the University of Petroșani, Economics*, 9(4), pp. 105-112.
- Pilař, L., J. Pokorná, T. Balcarová, and J. Hron. 2012. Factors Determining the Entry of Agricultural Farms into Agritourism. *Journal Agris on-line Papers in Economics and Informatics. Volume IV Number 4 – Special*
- Popescu, L., R.C. Crețu, and E. Sima. 2011. Researches Into The Spanish Tourist Policy Aimed At Developing Agrotourism. *Lucrări Științifice - vol. 54, Nr. 1, seria Agronomie*
- Sosnowski, J. and G.A. Ciepiela. 2011. Financial Result Analysis Of Agrotouristic Farms Activities In Siedlce Region. *Oeconomia 10 (1)*, pp. 97–108.
- UNDP, 1997. Empowering people – a guide to participation. United Nations development programme, Washington DC.
- Van der Ploeg, J. D. and H. Renting. 2004. Behind the redux: a rejoinder to David Goodman. *Sociologia Ruralis*, Vol. 44, No. 2, pp. 233–242.
- Wang, L., S. Cheng, Q. Min, and L. He . 2012. Driving force and development strategies of agro-tourism in China. *Journal of Eco-Agriculture 2012 Vol. 20 No. 6*, pp. 681-687
- Wyporska, K. and J. Mosiej. 2010. Technical Infrastructure For Environmental Protection At The Level Of Farms As A Factor Of Sustainable Rural Development. *Journal Economic and Environmental Studies Vol. 10, No. 1*, pp. 71-84.
- XiaoLi, D. and J. Feng. 2013. Experiences and enlightenments of agro-tourism development in Taiwan. *Journal Acta Agriculturae Jiangxi Vol. 25 No. 1*, pp. 145-147
- Xarba, B. and H. Shehu. 2011. . Rural tourism, a new alternative for the south of Albania. *European Scientific Journal June, vol. 18, pp. 27-40.*