



The Effect of the Tourism Sector on Regional Income of Regencies and Cities in East Java Province in 2016–2020

Novenna Rizka Pratiwi^(✉) and Maulidyah Indira Hasmarini

Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta, Surakarta, Indonesia
mi148@ums.ac.id

Abstract. This research was conducted to analyze and determine the impact of GRDP per capita, Number of Tourists, Population, and Number of Tourist Attractions in the local government revenue of Regencies and Cities in East Java Province in 2016–2020. The research method utilized secondary data (time series) 2016–2020 for East Java Province. The source of this research data was taken from the Central Statistics Agency (BPS) of East Java in 2016–2020 and analyzed using panel data regression. The final results of this research analysis prove that the GRDP per capita, the number of tourists, and the population can affect the Regional Income of Regencies and Cities in East Java Province during the 2016–2020 period. Meanwhile, there is no mutually influencing relationship between the variable number of tourist attractions and the regional income of regencies and cities in East Java Province during the 2016–2020 period. Since it was not covered in the previous essay, the author may now investigate how the tourism industry will affect the regional revenue of the cities and regencies in the east java province from 2016 to 2020.

Keywords: Regional Income · GRDP · Number of Tourists · Population · Number of Tourist Attractions

1 Introduction

As stated in the 1945 Constitution, Indonesian national development is focused on accomplishing development goals that may nurture equal social welfare so that everyone can benefit from growth. Equitable income distribution, accelerated economic growth, a favorable balance of payments, and generalized efficiency are the four cornerstones of economic development [1]. To achieve national development, the central government implements a decentralization and regional autonomy system. The objective is to grant regions complete autonomy so they can function as responsible autonomous regions, or, to put it another way, so local governments can manage regional spending and revenues with less reliance on the central government [2]. This is consistent with the goals outlined in Law Number 23 of 2014 of the right of regional autonomy granted by the central government to local governments for the benefit of governing their regions [3].

Today, tourism makes a significant economic contribution in many countries. Local government revenue is one aspect of the socioeconomic situation of the community that is impacted by the rise in tourism [4]. Tourism has the potential to be a dependable development factor given its contribution to foreign exchange earnings and the creation of the Gross Domestic Product. As a result, programs for growth can concentrate more on turning tourism into a significant business [5]. The development of tourism continues to be enhanced to equalize employment opportunities, boost state foreign exchange, promote regional development, and enhance community welfare because the presence of tourist areas allows the community to create new business opportunities like souvenir shops, dining establishments, and so forth [1]. In this manner, every district or city expects the area's income to rise.

Since local governments, particularly *Disparpora* (Department of Tourism and Sport), and the community do not work together well to manage tourist attractions, the government is unable to fully utilize the potential for tourism that already exists. To achieve optimal economic development through the tourism industry in the East Java Province, community-based principles must be used. It is necessary for this situation to increase the community's capacity and skill as well as the system for promoting alluring tourist attractions, as these factors might indirectly influence a tourist area's success due to their sound management practices. However, the reality is that there are still a lot of people who have not managed nearby tourist attractions in the best way possible.

East Java Province is one of the provinces which the central government has permitted to adopt regional autonomy. Of course, the government expects that the transfer of power will allow East Java Province to fully realize its regional potential, particularly in the tourism industry, to lessen its reliance on financial aid from the central government. 38 regencies and cities make up East Java Province, of which 29 are regencies and 9 are cities. That is to say, all areas must work together if East Java Province is to adopt regional autonomy successfully.

The Regional Income with the greatest 2019 value was Rp. 20026.46 billion. The lowest Regional Income value over the five years was Rp. 18555.28 billion in 2018. The Regional Income increased from a value of Rp. 15385.89 billion in 2016 to Rp. 19938.94 billion in 2017. Not only that but the growth from Rp. 18555.29 billion to Rp. 20026.46 billion took place from 2018 to 2019. As a result, it can be said that East Java Province's regencies and cities offer a respectable amount of potential for tourism, retail, education, and other industries, allowing for economic activity to indirectly enhance Regional Income.

A strategy is required to build positive relationships with domestic and international investors who wish to invest in the East Java tourism industry for the efforts of the Regency and City governments in the province of East Java to proceed without hiccups and by the program and the agreed-upon vision and mission. To assist the expansion of Regional Native Income, it is possible to explore and manage the area's potential tourism resources because tourism will promote regional economic growth [6]. This is done so that the tourism sector of East Java Province can fully contribute to the provincial regional income and accelerate growth.

Regional Native Income is one of the income sources that need to be utilized to pay the community in the form of quality services. A sufficient growth in regional income

contributions can gauge the extent to which districts and cities are independent of the central government in their regional development. To promote private sector economic growth, local governments can implement several policies, one of which is to make it easier to invest in the private sector. The primary source of funding for the region's governance and regional development, Regional Income is a pure source of regional revenue. Although Regional Income cannot fully fund all regional expenditures, the ratio of Regional Income to all regional receipts nonetheless reveals how financially independent a local government [7].

2 Theoretical Background and Hypotheses Development

2.1 Regional Income

According to Article 1 of Law Number 33 concerning the Financial Balance between the Central Government and Regional Governments, Regional Income is income obtained by the regions and collected by regional regulations. According to Article 26 of the Regulation of the Minister of Home Affairs Number 59 of 2007 regarding amendments to the Regulation of the Minister of Home Affairs Number 13 of 2006 concerning guidelines for regional wealth management, the grouping of sources of regional income is divided into four categories based on the income it generates, namely regional taxes, regional levies, the results of regional wealth management that are separated, and other legal sources of regional income [8]. The level of regional revenue has a significant impact on how quickly a region develops. The role of regions in optimizing the utilization of Regional Income revenue sources is very important because increasing Regional Income can increase regional finances. This is in line with the development of the regional economy which is increasingly integrated with the national and international economies.

2.2 GRDP

The phrase “the average income of a community in an area” can also be used to refer to the total income obtained by all of the residents. Many regions have a high per capita GRDP, but there are still many people living in poor conditions due to uneven income distribution. This is because the GRDP per capita cannot always describe people's real income [9]. A region's growth, economic structure, and success may all be seen in the GRDP, which provides an overview of economic growth. Along with GRDP growth, people's per capita income rises as well, and vice versa.

2.3 Number of Tourists

A person who goes from their home to a location, whether temporarily or permanently, is considered a tourist [10]. The socioeconomic condition of the community will be influenced by the increasing number of domestic and foreign tourists, which has an impact on increasing the income of the community and the region. Both domestic and foreign tourists will contribute more to the income of the tourism sector through consumption-based activities [11].

2.4 Population

The total population is the total number of individuals who are legally able to reside in a certain area or nation and who abide by all applicable rules and laws. The size of a region's population affects its level of income. Because of this, as the population increases, so does the region's revenue (Simanjuntak, 2001). BPS defines population as all individuals who have a legal residence in the Republic of Indonesia for six months or longer, or who have a temporary residence there to establish a permanent residence there [12]. The population's increasing contribution will result in a large number of experts and have an impact on technological advancement, creating prospects for new company ventures and a tendency for wealth to rise [13].

2.5 Number of Tourist Attractions

Tourist attractions, as defined by Law No. 9 of 2009 addressing tourism, are tourism objects that have prominent physical characteristics that appeal to both domestic and international tourists to visit, along with numerous tourist attractions that have to dominate abstract elements [14]. The number of objects in an area is also related to regional income because the more tourist objects there are in an area, the more sources of income there are in the region. Each tourist attraction will issue taxes and fees prescribed by law, and these taxes and fees must be deposited in the area.

3 Research Method

This study utilized secondary data, namely research findings that were attained through media intermediaries [15]. Cross-section data from 38 regencies/cities and time series of East Java Province from 2016 to 2020 are secondary data used in this study. The documentation method of collecting data from the collected data is the method used in this study to collect data published by the Central Statistics Agency (BPS) of East Java Province in various years of publication.

The equation model can be written as follows:

$$RI_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 GRDP_{it} + \beta_2 NT_{it} + \beta_3 POP_{it} + \beta_4 NTA_{it} + \varepsilon_{it}.$$

Notes:RI: Regional Income.

GRDP: Gross Regional Domestic Product (Rp).

NT: Number of Tourist (Soul).

POP: Population (Soul).

NTA: Number of Tourist Attractions.

ε : Error term.

i: Regency/City.

β_0 : Constant.

$\beta_1 \dots \beta_4$: Coefficient of independent variable regression.

t: Years to 2016–2020.

4 Result and Discussion

4.1 Analysis Results

Descriptive Analysis A panel data regression model was utilized in this investigation. The Central Statistics Agency (BPS) provided the study's dependent and independent variable data. The findings of evaluation produced common effect econometric models.

Approaches for the Continuous Effect Model (CEM), Fixed Effect Model (FEM), and Random Effect Model (REM). According to the findings of regression analysis, the Random Effect Model (REM) is the most effective model for the Chow test and the Hausman test. Table 1 displays the regression results using these three methods.

Selection of a Selected Estimation Model

Chow Test

To determine whether the FEM model is superior to the CEM, the Chow test was utilized. Table 2 displays the results of the Chow Test data processing.

Based on Table 2, it is known that H_0 is rejected because of the Sig. F-statistical value is $0.000000 < 0.05$, and the chosen model is a Fixed Effect Mode (FEM).

Table 1. Panel Data Analysis Results

Variable	Coefficient		
	CEM	FEM	REM
C	-4130.431	-1735.151	-2054.484
LogGDRP	285.1118	114.4951	153.2519
LogNT	107.9824	25.20348	28.31076
POP	0.000373	0.000628	0.000554
NTA	-5.280696	2.628871	1.167564
L	0.529588	0.985119	0.207227
R ²			
Adj R ²	0.519417	0.980997	0.190086
F-statistic	52.06815	238.9685	12.08952

Source: Processed Result E-Views 9

Table 2. Chow Test Results

Redundant Fixed Effects Tests (Chow test)			
Effects Tests	Statistic	d.f.	Prob.
Cross-section F	122.448001	(37.148)	0.0000
Cross-section Chi-square	656.171992	37	0.0000
R ² = 0.529588; F-Stat = 52.06815; Sig. F-Stat = 0.000000			

Source: Processed Results E-Views 9

Table 3. Hausman Test Results

Correlated Random Effects - Hausman Test			
Test Summary	Chi-Sq. Statistic	Chi-Sq. d.f.	Prob.
Cross-section random	6.245996	4	0.1815
$R^2 = 0.985119$; F-Stat = 238.9685; Sig. F-Stat = 0.000000			

Source: Processed Results E-Views 9

Hausman Test

Based on Table 3. It can be inferred that the model chosen is a Random Effect Model (REM) because H_0 is approved and the probability value on the cross-section random is $0.1815 > 0.10$, and a Lagrange Multiplier Test for Random Effect test is carried out (Tables 4 and 5).

Lagrange Multiplier

Goodness of Fit Test.

Existence Model Test (F Test) The good statistical test proves that the Random Effect Model (REM) estimation model exists, judging from the p-value, probability, or empiric significance of the F statistic which is worth 0.000 (<0.01), meaning that the variables GRDP per capita, Number of Tourists and Population affect Regional Income contribute.

R-Squared Interpretation The coefficient of determination with forecast power R^2 is 0.207227. This means that 20.72% of the Regional Income variable can be explained by the variables GRDP per capita, Population, Number of Tourist Attractions, and Number of Tourists. Other factors outside the model have an impact on the remaining 79.28% of the data.

Table 4. Lagrange Multiplier Test Results

Lagrange Multiplier Tests for Random Effects			
Test Hypothesis	Chi-Sq. Statistic	Time	Both
Breusch-Pagan	340.3535	1.184293	341.5378
	(0.0000)	(0.2765)	(0.0000)

Source: Processed Results E-Views 9

Table 5. Random Effect Model (REM) Test Regression Results

$RI_{it} = -2054.484 + 153.2519\log GDRP_{it} + 28.31076\log NT_{it} + 0.000554POP_{it} + 1.167564NTA_{it}$				
P-Value	Log(GDRP) 0.0093	Log(NT) 0.0579	POP 0.0001	NTA 0.4879
$R^2 = 0.207227$	DW-Stat = 1.968953	F-Stat = 12.08952	Prob (F-Stat) = 0.00000	

Source: Processed Result E-Views 9

Table 6. Validity Test Result Influence

Variable	T	Sig	Criteria	Conclusion
Log GDRP	2.627611	0.0093	< 0.01	Significant on $\alpha = 0,01$
Log NT	1.908087	0.0579	< 0.10	Significant on $\alpha = 0,10$
POP	3.892182	0.0001	< 0.01	Significant on $\alpha = 0,01$
NTA	0.695095	0.4879	> 0.10	Not Significant on $\alpha = 0,10$

Source: Processed Result E-Views 9

Effect Validity Test (T-test) The importance of each independent variable's influence can be evaluated using the influence validity test. The t-test can be used for the influence validity test. H_0 test $t \beta_i \neq 0$: the independent variable to i has a significant influence. If the p-value, probability, or statistical empirical significance $t > \alpha$; then H_0 will be accepted; otherwise, H_0 will be rejected. Table 6 displays the outcomes of the influence validity test.

Interpretation Variables

Separately GRDP per capita, Number of Tourists, and Population affect Regional Income with p-value, probability, or empirical significance of statistics t of 0.0093 (<0.01), 0.0597 (<0.10), 0.0001 (<0.01). Meanwhile, the variable Number of Tourist Attractions does not affect on Regional Income in East Java Province, with a p-value (value), probability, or statistical empirical significance t of 0.4879 (>0.10).

The test results showed that the variable GRDP per capita p-value of $0.0093 < 0.01$ had a positive and significant effect on Regional Income of $\alpha = 1\%$, with a regression coefficient of 153.2519, so H_0 was rejected. With a coefficient of 153.2519 which means that when the GRDP per capita increases by 1million / year, the amount of Regional Income in the Cities and Regencies of East Java Province will increase by 153.2519%. The results of this regression are in line with the study [16]. Because GRDP is a composite of several industries that power the regional economy, it has a beneficial impact on regional income. This is in line with [17] that an increase in Gross Domestic Product (GRDP) indicates an increase in economic activity and the economic sector is increasingly productive. The increase in government revenue will encourage the improvement of government services to the community so that it can increase community productivity which in turn can increase economic growth again [18].

The Number of Tourists variable has a p-value of $0.0579 < 0.10$ then H_0 is rejected. So that the NT variable has a positive and significant effect on Regional Income at $\alpha = 1\%$ with a regression coefficient of 28.31076. With a coefficient of 28.31076 which means that when the number of tourists increases by 1 million people/year, the amount of Regional Income in the Cities and Regencies of East Java Province increases by 28.31076 million people/year. The results of this panel data regression are in line with the study [19] that there is a positive relationship between the variable number of tourists and the regional income of the region. According to the research conducted by [20] each increase in the Number of Tourists by 1 person is expected to increase the Regional Income. This

is because the consumption of tourists has the potential to increase the income of the tourism sector which in turn can increase the regional income of the region.

The total population has a regression coefficient of 0.000554, with a pattern of linear-logarithmic relations. This means that if the population increases by 1 thousand people/year, then the amount of Regional Income in Cities and Regencies of East Java Province will increase by 0.000554 thousand people/year. The positive and significant population in the regencies and cities of East Java Province means that the size of the population affects Regional Income. This panel data regression provides results that are in line with previous studies [21], the influence of population on the level of production of an area is said to have a positive and significant effect on the regional income of the region. In line with the research [22], when the population of an area increases, it has a positive impact on the Regional Income of the region, assuming that the population is always productive. In preparing for the implementation of regional development, one of the important indicators is the factor of the population [23].

If the p-value of the variable Number of Tourists Attractions is $0.4879 > 0.10$ then H_0 is accepted, this indicates that the variable Number of Attractions has a positive and insignificant effect. Because several tourist destinations in the Regencies and Cities of the East Java Province are run by villagers rather than local administrations, In this case, the government has not fully managed the available tourist attractions. As a result, the Regency and City governments in East Java do not receive all income from this sector because part of it goes to the local village fund. As a result, the number of Regency and City tourist attractions in East Java Province does not affect Regional Income. The panel data regression's outcomes are consistent with the findings of [24] that the number of tourist attractions does not affect Local Income, indicating that building and facilitating tourist attractions alone is not enough to increase Regional Income. According to the research [25], The built-and-facilitated tourism attraction will not be able to boost local revenue if there is no accompanying demand and supply of guests. The lack of influence is a result of inadequate tourist attractions' infrastructure and facilities [3].

5 Conclusion

Random Effect Model (REM), whose Adjusted R-squared value results show the number 0.19, was used in this study. The results showed that independent factors, such as GRDP per capita, Number of Tourists, Population, and Number of Tourist Attractions, were able to explain the bound variable of Regional Income by 20% and that the remaining 20% was explained by variables outside the model.

Gross regional domestic product (GRDP) per capita has a positive and significant impact on the regional income of the regencies and cities in the East Java Province, with a probability value of 0.0093. As a result, the Regional Income will rise if the GRDP per capita rises. Because the increase in government revenue will have a positive impact on the public services provided by the government, thus indirectly increasing people's productivity and encouraging people to pay taxes and other local levies imposed by the government, both of which are necessary to increase economic growth.

The East Java Province's regencies and cities' regional income is positively and significantly impacted by the fluctuating number of tourists, with a probability value

of 0.0579. This is because tourists who visit regencies and cities in East Java Province not only visit tourist attractions, but also use nearby services such as hotels, restaurants, and other business places which in this case can help increase Regional Income. Consequently, if the number of tourists rises, the regional income amount will also rise.

The variable population influences the regional income of the regencies and cities in the province of East Java with a probability value of 0.0001. This means that if the population increases, so do the Regional Income. Population Increase is not always an obstacle to economic development if balanced with the quality of productive human resources so that they can produce and absorb production well. A high level of income is inextricably linked to high population growth because it will have an impact on the local taxpayer base, which may lead to an increase in regional income.

The number of tourist attractions has no bearing on the regional income of the regencies and cities in the East Java Province, with a probability value of 0.4879. This happened because of the lack of government attention to infrastructure maintenance, innovation, and promotion of tourist attractions in East Java Province which caused a lack of interest in visiting tourists. In addition, funds for tourism development are still insufficient due to the lack of investor capital. As well as a lack of human resources who are experts in serving tourism services so the Regency and City Tourism Objects in East Java Province do not influence on the receipt of Regional Income.

Acknowledgments. The author would like to thank Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta, Mrs. Ir. Maulidyah Indira Hasmarini, M.Sc., Secretary of the Department of Development Economics, Prof. Dr. Anton Agus Setyawan, Dean of the Faculty of Economics, and people who have given moral and material support throughout the research. The author would also like to thank the International Conference on Economics and Business Studies (ICOEBS), which has provided a forum for the authors to publish the scientific paper.

References

1. I. Puspitasari, M. Saleh, and D. Yunitasari, "Analisis Kontribusi Sektor Priwisata Terhadap Pendapatan Asli Daerah Kota Batu Periode Tahun 2011-2015," e-Journal Ekon. Bisnis dan Akunt., vol. 5, no. 1, p. 11, 2018, <https://doi.org/10.19184/ejeba.v5i1.7720>.
2. R. Simandjuntak, "Sistem Desentralisasi Dalam Negara Kesatuan Republik Indonesia Perspektif Yuridis Konstitusional," Jure J. Huk. dan Syar'iah, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 57–67, 2015, <https://doi.org/10.18860/j-fsh.v7i1.3512>.
3. 2021 Efrintya Elnin et al., "Pengaruh sektor pariwisata terhadap pendapatan asli daerah eks karisidenan madiun," J. Ekon. dan Bisnis, vol. 8, no. 2, p. 35, 2021.
4. O. Aydin, "Tourism Income of Turkey : A Panel Data Approach," Procedia Econ. Finance., vol. 38, no. October 2015, pp. 245–256, 2016, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671\(16\)30196-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671(16)30196-4).
5. N. D. Purwanti and R. M. Dewi, "Pengaruh jumlah kunjungan wisatawan terhadap pendapatan asli daerah kabupaten mojokerto tahun 2006-2013," J. Fak. Ekon. Univ. Negeri Surabaya, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 1–12, 2014.
6. F. & Deastina and S. R. Faridatussalam, "Analisis Pengaruh Pariwisata Terhadap Pendapatan Asli Daerah Di Pulau Jawa dan Bali Tahun 2016–2020," J. Ilm. Indones., vol. 7, no. 6, 2022.

7. G. M. A. Aprilianda, "Analisis Pengaruh Pendapatan Asli Daerah (PAD) Terhadap Kinerja Keuangan Pada Pemerintah Kabupaten dan Kota di Propinsi Jawa Timur," *Forum Bisnis Dan Kewirausahaan J. Ilm. STIE MDP* Hal -39, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 39–51, 2016.
8. I. Azhar, "Pengaruh Pendapatan Asli Daerah Terhadap Kinerja Keuangan Pemerintah Kota Langsa," *J. Transform. Adm.*, vol. 11, no. 02, pp. 164–174, 2021, <https://doi.org/10.56196/jta.v11i02.190>.
9. D. F. Waidah and O. Pernanda, "Analisis Pengaruh Kepadatan Penduduk Terhadap PDRB Per Kapita di Kabupaten Karimun Tahun 2013-2017," *Pelita Kota*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 13–25, 2020.
10. O. Laila, N. Rahmawati, E. Setyowati, and S. R. Faridatussalam, "Analysis of Factors Affecting Regional Original Revenue in Yogyakarta Special Regional Province 2016–2020," *Adv. Econ. Bus. Manag. Res.*, vol. 655, no. Icoebs, pp. 297–303, 2022.
11. Y. Kristiana, R. Pramono, T. C. Nathalia, and V. A. H. Goeltom, "Tourism and original local government revenue in Indonesia Tourism Provinces: The Java Island experience," *Syst. Rev. Pharm.*, vol. 11, no. 9, pp. 745–750, 2020, <https://doi.org/10.31838/srp.2020.9.105>.
12. K. Asmuruf, Vikie A, "Pengaruh Pendapatan Dan Jumlah Penduduk terhadap Pendapatan Asli Daerah (Pad)Di Kota Sorong," *J. Berk. Ilm. Efisiensi*, vol. 15, no. 05, p. 732, 2015.
13. S. K. Chairunisalda, "Analisis Pengaruh Sektor Pariwisata terhadap Pendapatan Asli Daerah Kab/Kota di Provinsi Jawa Timur (Tahun 2014–2018)," 2021.
14. N. Sabrina and I. Mudzhalifah, "Pengaruh Jumlah Objek Wisata, Jumlah Wisatawan Dan Tingkat Hunian Hotel Terhadap Pendapatan Asli Daerah Dengan Penerimaan Sektor Pariwisata Sebagai Variabel Moderating Pada Dinas Pariwisata Kota Palembang," *Balanc. J. Akunt. dan Bisnis*, vol. 3, no. 2, p. 464, 2018, <https://doi.org/10.32502/jab.v3i2.1449>.
15. M. Tobing, "Pengaruh Jumlah Obyek Wisata, Tingkat Penghunian Kamar, Dan Jumlah Kunjungan Wisatawan Terhadap Pendapatan Asli Daerah Kabupaten Simalungun," *J. Ekuilnomi*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 127–139, 2021, <https://doi.org/10.36985/ekuilnomi.v3i2.263>.
16. A. Muid and S. D. Pratomo, "Pengaruh Produk Domestik Regional Bruto dan Jumlah Penduduk Terhadap Pendapatan Asli Daerah (Studi Kasus di Kabupaten Gresik Tahun 1994-2013)," *Fak. Ekon. dan Bisnis Univ. Brawijaya*, 2015.
17. N. Kolompoy, Vecky A, "Pengaruh PDRB dan Jumlah Penduduk Terhadap PAD di Kabupaten Minahasa Selatan," *J. Berk. Ilm. Efisiensi*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 28–37, 2022.
18. febrianti I. N. Hikmawati, "Analisis Pengaruh PDRB, Pengeluaran Pemerintah, Jumlah Penduduk dan Investasi Terhadap Pendapatan Asli Daerah Provinsi Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta (Tahun 2010–2014)," *Society*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 1–19, 2019.
19. D. N. Dewi and S. W. Adi, "Analisis Sektor Pariwisata Terhadap Pendapatan Asli Daerah (PAD) (Studi Empiris Pada Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta Tahun 2012–2018)," *UM JEMBER Press*, pp. 702–711, 2021, <https://doi.org/10.32528/psneb.v0i0.5226>.
20. J. T. Aprilianto and Susilo, "Analisis Peran Sektor Pariwisata terhadap Pendapatan Asli Daerah Pada Kabupaten dan Kota di Jawa Timur," *J. Ilm. Mhs. FEB*, pp. 1–14, 2016, [Online]. Available: <https://jimfeb.ub.ac.id/index.php/jimfeb/article/view/3408>
21. D. L. Dewi, L. R. Indrawati, and Y. Septiani, "Analisis Pengaruh Jumlah Kunjungan Wisatawan, Jumlah Objek Wisata, Jumlah Hotel, dan Jumlah Penduduk Terhadap Pendapatan Asli Daerah (PAD) di Provinsi Jawa Tengah Tahun 2014-2018," *J. Econ.*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 647–658, 2020.
22. D. Priyono and H. retno Handayani, "Analisis Pengaruh PDRB, Inflasi, Jumlah Penduduk Terhadap Pendapatan Asli Daerah di Kabupaten Eks Karisidenan Pati Tahun 2012–2018," *Diponegoro J. Econ.*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 1–10, 2021, [Online]. Available: <https://ejournal3.undip.ac.id/index.php/jme/article/view/31614>
23. D. Ramdani, Darmansyah, and N. Ahmar, "Analisis Pengaruh PDRB, Belanja Modal, Jumlah Penduduk dan Inflasi Terhadap Pendapatan Asli Daerah Studi Kasus Pada Pemerintah Daerah Kabupaten/Kota Di Wilayah Provinsi Jawa Barat Dian," *J. Ilm. Akunt. Dan Keuang.*, vol. 04, no. 01, pp. 27–39, 2021.

24. F. Alyani and M. K. Siwi, "Pengaruh Jumlah Objek Wisata dan Jumlah Hotel Terhadap Pendapatan Asli Daerah (PAD) di Kabupaten/Kota Provinsi Sumatera Barat," *J. Ecogen*, vol. 3, no. 2, p. 212, 2020, <https://doi.org/10.24036/jmpe.v3i2.8763>.
25. A. hanafi Ahmad, "Pengaruh Jumlah Kunjungan Wisatawan, Objek Wisata, Dan Retribusi Pariwisata Terhadap Pendapatan Asli Daerah," *J. Sos. Ekon. Bisnis*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 50–61, 2022, <https://doi.org/10.55587/jseb.v2i1.34>.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

