International Journal of Economics, Business and Innovation Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJEBIR
E-ISSN : 2964-0865
IJEBIR

Feasibility Study Of Sugarcane Farming Development In Hulo Village, Kahu Subdistrict, Bone District

Muhammad Fadillah[1], Sahlan [2], Andi Amran Asriadi[3]

[1]Student of Agribussiness Study Program, Universitas Muhammadiyah Makassar
[2,3]Agribussiness Study Program, Universitas Muhammadiyah Makassar

Corresponding Author: a.amranasriadi@unismuh.ac.id

Abstract

This study aims to determine the income analysis and feasibility of sugarcane farming in Hulo Village, Kahu District, Bone Regency. The data collection tools used were purposive sampling and questionnaires, while the population at the research location amounted to 27 sugarcane farmers. Data analysis methods used include cost analysis, revenue, income and business feasibility. The results showed that the average cost was IDR. 61,893,865, the average revenue was IDR. 110,279,556, the net income was IDR. 48,385,690 per hectare, so that the R/C Ratio calculation value was 1.78. It can be interpreted that sugarcane farming in Hulo Village, Kahu Sub-District, Bone Regency is feasible or profitable to cultivate.

Keywords: Feasibility Study of Sugarcane Farming, Hulo Village, Bone Regency

INTRODUCTION

The development of sugarcane plants is intended to increase the supply of raw materials to the sugar industry in PG Camming located in Wanuawaru, Libureng District is expected to improve the welfare of sugarcane farmers by means of active participation of sugarcane farmers. In addition, the sugar industry can provide employment opportunities for the people of Indonesia and is one source of income for sugarcane farmers who will have an important role in the national sugar industry, especially in South Sulawesi. Sugarcane farming plays a very vital role in the plantation sector, because the results are the basic ingredients for making sugar, bioethanol, and various other products that are in great demand in the market. Based on information from BPS Indonesia, (2024),

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

smallholder plantations that rely on sugarcane with an area of about 316,400 hectares with a production of 1,607.00 (tons) become, one of the sources of income for thousands of sugarcane farmers and workers in the sugar sector. Sugar is a very important item that serves as a natural sweetener. It is obtained through an extraction process from sugar cane or beet and is widely used in household consumption as well as in the food industry (Wahyuni, 2019).

Kahu sub-district, Bone Regency saw the area and productivity of sugarcane plantations in this region fluctuate during the 2019-2024 period. The highest land area occurred in 2019 with 199 hectares, while the highest production occurred in 2019 with 8,267 tons. However, production and productivity dropped dramatically in 2020 before increasing again in the following years (BPS). This phenomenon shows that although there is great potential, the management and support of sugarcane farming is still not optimal. Sugarcane yields fluctuate due to several factors, such as drought that reduces water availability, low land productivity, and the use of inappropriate harvesting techniques. This decrease in yield can have an impact on sugar production.

Table 1. Sugarcane Production Data of Kahu District, Bone Regency

Year	Areal (Hektar)	Production (Tons)	Productivity (Tons/Hectare)
2019	198.00	7.120	45.15
2020	32.00	681	4.32
2021	65.00	756	4.79
2022	56.32	2.154	13.66
2023	139.97	4.415	27.99
2024	81.00	645	4.09
Total	555.29	15.771	100.00

Source: Secondary Data of BPS Kahu Sub-district, Bone Regency, 2025

Table 1 shows that the development of sugarcane production in Kahu District, Bone Regency, decreases every year. Production from 2019-2024 has decreased. In 2019, 198.00 tons rose and fell again in 2019 by 681 tons, an increase in the percentage decrease of 81.67%. In 2020 it was 681 tons until 2021 it was 756 with a percentage decrease of 5.81%, in 2023 production was 4,415 tons with a percentage increase of

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

20.54%, while in 2024 it was 645 tons with a percentage decrease of 44.08% (BPS, 2025).

This is the development of sugarcane production is the price of sugarcane and a decrease in the number of producers and the high consumer demand for sugarcane. The decline in sugar production is caused by several reasons, including reduced sugarcane yields, shrinking land area, and the impact on productivity. To increase the yield and productivity of sugarcane, two important elements need to be considered, namely the utilization of quality seeds and cultivation methods in accordance with established standards (Puspita, 2018). A decrease in yield will have an impact on farmers' income. When yields decrease, the income they receive will also decrease. This happens because farmers' income is closely related to the amount of production they can sell.

Production theory which states that the amount of goods produced and sold will generate income is one of the basic principles in economics (Sadono Sukirno, 2006). Farm income is the difference between revenue and all costs. Income from farming is obtained by multiplying the production yield by the selling price (Rahim dan Diah, 2007). The income received by farmers is money or crop yields obtained from one season. The level of income from agricultural activities is not only a major factor in determining the welfare of farming households, but also acts as one of the important elements that influence economic growth (Fattah et.al, 2022).

Meanwhile, business feasibility is the process of conducting a detailed study of a business or legal entity to determine whether the business is feasible (Kasmir, 2020). This needs to be done because of the importance of analyzing the feasibility of sugarcane farming in helping farmers to make the right decisions in managing sugarcane farming, so it is necessary to know an overview of how the feasibility of sugarcane farming is to obtain profits from the investment spent by sugarcane business owners. in Hulo Village, Kahu Subdistrict, Bone Regency. Based on the above description, the purpose of this research is to determine the income analysis and feasibility of sugarcane farming in Hulo Village, Kahu District, Bone Regency.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Sugarcane Farmers

Sugarcane farmers are individuals who grow sugarcane on their own land or on rented land. The harvest is sold to sugar factories, either directly or through cooperation with government policies. Smallholder sugarcane plantations are quicker to respond to change compared to plantations managed by the state and private companies (Nazir,

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

2010). Sugarcane farmers can be categorized based on how they relate to sugar mills. Some cane farmers work alone, while others collaborate as partners or plasma farmers. They operate a profit-sharing system or follow a specific contract with the sugar mill (Direktorat Jenderal Perkebunan, 2010).

Costs

The cost of sugarcane is all expenses incurred in the process of cultivating and harvesting sugarcane. Costs are costs whose amount is not affected by the level of production or the amount of output produced. In contrast, variable costs are the type of costs that change with fluctuations in the amount of output produced (Soekartawi, 2002). Cost is a sacrifice made to achieve a certain goal, measured by the expenditure or provision of resources (Hilton, 2020).

Revenue

Farm income is the multiplication of production obtained by the selling price (Shinta, 2011). Revenue in farming activities refers to all income earned by farmers as a result of production activities that have been carried out, without taking into account the costs that have been incurred during the production process (Husni et al., 2014). Revenue in farming refers to the entire gross income obtained by farmers from production activities, namely the results of sales without taking into account the costs incurred during the production process ((Husni dan Kusuma Brata, 2015).

Income

Income is the result obtained by individuals or households in return for business activities or work carried out. Sources of community income are very diverse, ranging from agricultural activities, fisheries, livestock, labor, trade, to jobs in the government and private sectors. (Nazir, 2010). Net business income is the result of subtracting the total cost of production from the total revenue earned from the sale of business products. (Suratiyah, 2015). According to (Bakari, 2019), there is a close relationship between production levels and income in farming activities.

Feasibility Of Sugarcane Farming (Kelayakan)

Business feasibility is measured by comparing the amount of profit or income earned with all costs that have been incurred to run the business (Hartono, 2003). The R/C ratio (Revenue to Cost Ratio) is used to evaluate the feasibility of a farming business

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

by comparing total revenue to total costs incurred from production to harvest. A higher R/C value indicates the business provides greater profits for farmers. (Soekartawi, 2006). According to (Husein, 2011) the main objective of a business feasibility study is to prevent farming businesses that require large costs but ultimately do not provide significant economic benefits.

RESEARCH METHODS

This research was conducted in Hulo Village, Kahu Sub-district, Bone District, which has the potential to produce food crops, especially sugarcane. A total of 27 respondents were selected by simple randomization. The data used included primary and secondary data. Primary data were obtained through structured interviews (questionnaires) with farmers, while secondary data were obtained from observation, documentation and related agencies. Quantitative data analysis included costs, revenue, income, and farm feasibility using the R/C ratio.

Cost Analysis

The cost analysis of this research study is all costs incurred by farmers in managing sugarcane farming. In the cost analysis conducted, it is divided into two categories: fixed costs and variable costs (Soekartawi, 2003)

$$TC = TFC + TVC$$

Where:
TC = Total Cost (IDR)
TFC = Total Fixed Cost (IDR)
TVC = Total Variabel Cost (IDR)

Revenue

Total revenue is the multiplication of the amount of production by the selling price. The equation used to determine the total revenue can be obtained by sugarcane farmers (Suratiyah, 2015)

$$TR = Py \cdot Y$$

Where:
TR = Total Revenue (IDR)
Py = Product Price (IDR/kg)
Y = Total Production (kg)

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Economics, Business and Innovation Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJEBIR
E-ISSN : 2964-0865
IJEBIR

Income

Sugarcane farming income or profit is the difference between total revenue and total costs of sugarcane farming activities. The equation used to determine the total income earned by sugarcane farmers in farming (Soekartawi, 2003)

$$\pi = TR - TC$$

Where:

π = Income (Rp)

TR = Total Revenue (Rp)

TC = Total Cost (Rp)

Revenue Cost Ratio (R/C Ratio) Analysis

Revenue Cost Ratio (R/C Ratio) is the ratio between total revenue and total cost in a business. This comparison is used to assess the feasibility and profitability of a business (Suratiyah, 2015).

$$R/C = \frac{\text{Total Revenue}}{\text{Total Cost}}$$

Where:

Revenue = The amount of revenue earned

Cost = The amount of costs incurred

There are three criteria in the calculation, namely:

a. If R/C > 1 means that the farm is profitable.

b. If R/C = 1 means that the farm breaks even.

c. If R/C < 1, it means that the farm is loss-making.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Sugarcane Farming Costs

Operational costs in this research study include all costs incurred by sugarcane farmers in Hulo Village, Kahu Sub-district, Bone Regency. These costs include those that directly affect the production process (variable costs) and those that do not directly affect the production process (fixed costs).

Cost Analysis

Fixed costs are expenses that need to be borne by farmers and are not used as wages in one production period. In this study, there were two types of fixed costs, namely

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

taxes (PBB) and equipment depreciation (NPA). Table 2 shows the fixed costs incurred by sugarcane farmers in Hulo village, Kahu Sub-District, Bone district.

Table 2. Fixed Costs of Respondent Sugarcane Farmers

No	Fixed Cost	Average (IDR)/Cropping Season
1.	Tool Depreciation	
	a. Tractor	6,296,296
	b. Sprayer	66,852
	c. Hoe	15,619
	d. Machete	16,717
	e. Scythe	11,566
	Total	6,407,050
2.	Land Taxes	45,556
	Grand Total	6,452,606

Source: Primary Data After Processing, 2025

Table 2 above explains that the average depreciation cost of tools, such as tractors is IDR. 6,296,296, splayers IDR. 66,852, hoes IDR. 15,619, machetes IDR. 16,717, sickles IDR. 11,566, while the land tax value is IDR. 45,556 so the total overall fixed costs incurred by sugarcane farmers is IDR. 6,452,606. This is in accordance with the opinion by Ersyafdi et al., (2021) saying that fixed costs are The ability of an organization to maximize the use of resources to achieve predetermined goals is very important. This is a key factor in the decision-making process for a company or organization. In contrast to the results of previous studies, the fixed costs incurred by fishermen were higher, reaching an average of IDR. 11,027,983 in Wringin Anom Village (Sri Untari & Al Fauzi, 2023). Meanwhile, the results of previous research by Fatah, A., Abubakar, A., & Fikri, (2024) stated that farmers' fixed costs were also higher at IDR. 24,232,765 in Pasirbungur Village, Purwadadi Subang District.

Variable Costs

Variable costs are costs that are influenced by production levels, such as production facilities and non-family labor. Variable costs in sugarcane farming in Hulo Village, Kahu Subdistrict, Bone Regency can be seen in Table 3.

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Economics, Business and Innovation Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJEBIR
E-ISSN : 2964-0865
IJEBIR

Table 3. Variable Costs of Sugarcane Farmer Respondents

No	Variable Costs	Average (IDR)
1.	Seedlings	19.319.963
2.	Urea Fertilizer	1.213.704
3.	Phonska Fertilizer	5.966.481
4.	Pesticides	464.074
5.	Labor	28.477.037
	Total	55.441.259

Source: Primary Data After Processing, 2025

Table 3 above explains that the average variable costs such as the purchase of seeds IDR. 19,319,963, urea fertilizer IDR. 1,213,704, phonska fertilizer IDR. 5,966,481, pesticides IDR. 464,074 and labor costs IDR. 28,477,037 so that the total variable costs incurred by sugarcane farmers is IDR. 55,441,259. In contrast to the results of previous research, these variable costs are higher than the variable costs incurred by sugarcane farmers of IDR. 7,568,089 in Pekat District, Dompu Regency (Abdullah Satriawan, Hayati, Muktasam, 2023). Meanwhile, the variable costs are lower than the variable costs incurred by sugarcane farmers amounting to IDR 57,618,636 in Pasirbungur Village, Purwadadi Subdistrict, Subang District (Fatah, A., Abubakar, A., & Fikri, 2024).

Reception

Sugarcane farmers' revenue is the product of the production obtained and the selling price. The average revenue of sugarcane farmers can be seen in Table 4.

Table 4. Acceptance of Sugarcane Farmers Respondents

No	Description	Total (Kg/IDR)
1.	Production (Kg)	7.877
2.	Price (IDR)	14.000
	Total Revenue (TR)	110.279.556

Source: Primary Data After Processing, 2025

Table 4 above shows the average revenue of respondent sugarcane farmers with a production volume of 7,877 per kilograms, with a selling price of IDR 14,000 per kilogram. So, the revenue amounted to IDR 110,279,556, - per growing season. Looking

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

at the comparison of the results of previous studies, this revenue is higher than the revenue spent by sugarcane farmers in Pekat District, Dompu Regency of IDR. 21,928,280 / hectare with a production of 49,837 kg with an average price per kg of IDR. 440 (Abdullah Satriawan, Hayati, Muktasam, 2023). Meanwhile, the revenue of sugarcane farmers was lower at IDR. 102,254,545 in Pasirbungur Village, Purwadadi Subang District (Fatah, A., Abubakar, A., & Fikri, 2024). The results of previous observations of previous research found that sugarcane farmers' income amounted to IDR. 92,169,750 per year (Deyon Yanuar Fitranto, Gyska Indah Harya, 2024).

Income

The income received by sugarcane farmers is the difference between the amount of money obtained from the sale of sugarcane and the costs incurred during the sugarcane farming process. Sugarcane farmers' income can be seen in Table 5.

Table 5. Income of Sugarcane Farmer Respondents

No	Description	Value (IDR)
1.	Revenue	110.279.556
2.	Total Cost of Production	61.893.865
	Income	48.385.690

Source: Primary Data After Processing, 2025

Table 5 shows that the total average cost incurred by farmers in sugarcane farming is IDR. 61,893,865 and the revenue received by farmers in conducting sugarcane farming is IDR. 110,279,556 / hectare which is gross income. So the total net income of sugarcane farmers in sugarcane farming is IDR. 48,385,690 / hectare one growing season, so the results of income research are very profitable for these sugarcane farmers.

Looking at the comparison of the results of previous studies, this income is higher than the income generated by sugarcane farmers in Pekat sub-district, Dompu district, which amounted to Rp. 13,183,244/hectare. (Abdullah Satriawan, Hayati, Muktasam, 2023). Meanwhile, the income of sugarcane farmers is lower, namely the income earned on average is IDR. 44,635,909.09 / harvest, while the profit earned on average is IDR. 20,403,143.93 / harvest in Pasirbungur Village, Purwadadi Subang District (Fatah, A., Abubakar, A., & Fikri, 2024). The results of previous research observations found that the

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

net income of sugarcane farmers was IDR 53,823,000. (Deyon Yanuar Fitranto, Gyska Indah Harya, 2024).

Feasibility Analysis of Sugarcane Farming

Analysis of the feasibility of sugarcane farming in this study was carried out using R/C ratio analysis. R/C ratio analysis is a comparison between the amount of farm income and the amount of farm costs incurred. The results of the R/C ratio analysis are presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Analysis of the Feasibility of Sugarcane Farmers Respondents

No	Description	Value (IDR)
1.	Reception	110.279.556
2.	Total Cost	61.893.865
	Feasibility R/C	1,78

Source: Primary Data After Processing, 2025

Table 6 shows that sugarcane farming has been calculated that the R/C Ratio is greater than one (R/C> 1). This shows that each rupiah value spent in production provides benefits in the amount of revenue value obtained. From the average revenue of IDR.110,279,556 / hectare with an average total cost of IDR. 61,893,865/ hectare, an R/C ratio of 1.78 is obtained. It can be interpreted that sugarcane farming in Hulo Village, Kahu Sub-district, Bone Regency is feasible or profitable to cultivate.

Based on the results of previous research, the Feasibility Analysis of Sugarcane Farming conducted in Pekat District, Dompu Regency, namely from the average revenue of IDR. 21,928,280 with an average total cost of IDR. 8,745,036 from these calculations, an R/C Ratio of 2.5 was obtained, this shows that the R/C Ratio is above the number one (>1), it can be concluded that this sugarcane farm is feasible or profitable to cultivate. (Abdullah Satriawan, Hayati, Muktasam, 2023). Furthermore, based on previous research, the Financial Feasibility Analysis of Sugarcane Farming in Pasirbungur Village, Purwadadi District, Subang Regency explained that the revenue was IDR.102,254,545.45 with an overall cost of IDR. 81,851,402, so that the average R/C value obtained by farmers is 1.25, which means that according to the R/C> 1 testing criteria, the sugarcane farm is feasible to cultivate. (Fatah, A., Abubakar, A., & Fikri, 2024). Furthermore, previous research on the financial feasibility of sugarcane farming

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

unloading ratoon with the results of the ratio value obtained is 3.5, this indicates that for every Rp1 invested in sugarcane farming, benefits of Rp 3.7 will be obtained. This means that the benefits or revenues generated are 70% greater than the costs incurred. Since this ratio is greater than 1, the project is considered financially viable and beneficial. (Deyon Yanuar Fitranto, Gyska Indah Harya, 2024).

CONCLUSION

Average cost of Rp. 61,893,865, average revenue of Rp. 110,279,556 per growing season, sugarcane farming income of Rp. 48,385,690. Then based on the income data received, as well as the R/C ratio value on total costs of 1.78, this shows that the R/C Ratio> 1, then sugarcane farming in Hulo Village, Kahu Sub-District, Bone Regency is profitable and feasible to cultivate and has prospects for the future.

REFERENCES

Abdullah Satriawan, Hayati, Muktasam, 2023. (2023). Analysis Feasibility of Bongkar Ratoon Sugarcane Farming (Case Study of Sugarcane Farmers in Pagu Subdistrict)).Agroteksos,33(2),584.https://doi.org/10.29303/agroteksos.v33i2.831.

Bakari, Y. (2019). Analysis of Cost and Income Characteristics of Rice Paddy Farming. Journal of Agricultural Social Economics, 15(3), 265. https://doi.org/ 10.20956/jsep.v15i3.7288.

BPS Indonesia, S. I. (2024). Statistics Indonesia. In Statistics Indonesia 2024 (Vol. 1101001). Statistik Indonesia. https://www. bps.go.id/id/ publication/2025/02/28/ 8cfe1a589ad3693396d3db9f/statistik-indonesia-2025.html.

BPS, K. B. (2025). BPS, Kabupaten Bone. https://bonekab. bps.go.id/id/publication/ 2025/02/28/48d59750f9d5a0ea6c2c5dea/kabupaten-bone-dalam-angka-2025.html.

Deyon Yanuar Fitranto, Gyska Indah Harya, I. S. R. (2024). Feasibility Analysis of Bongkar Ratoon Sugarcane Farming (Case Study of Sugarcane Farmers in Pagu District). Mimbar Agribisnis: Journal of Agribusiness Minded Scientific Society, 10(2), 3238–3246. https://doi.org/10.25157/ma.v10i2.14729.

Ersyafdi, I. R., Nahdlatul, Fauziyyah, N., Nahdlatul, & Hidayadi, T. (2021). Cost accounting(IssueJanuary).WidinaBhaktiPersada. https://www.researchgate.net/ publication/355978818_akuntansi_biaya.

Fatah, A., Abubakar, A., & Fikri, M. (2024). Analysis of the Financial Feasibility of Sugarcane Farming in Pasirbungur Village, Purwadadi Subang District,

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Adrian.Jurnal Ilmiah Wahana Pendidikan, 7(2), 8–13. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12176454.

Hartono, R. dan. (2003). Agribisnis Peternakan. https://opac.ut.ac.id/detail-opac?id=19334.

Husein. (2011). Business Feasibility Study. https://doi.org/9789796055784

Husni, Hidayah, A. K., & AF, M. (2014). Financial Analysis of Cayenne Pepper Farming (Capsicum Frutescens L) di Desa Purwajaya Kecamatan Loa Janan. JurnalAGRIFOR,13(1),49–52.https://media.neliti.com/media/publications/30058 - ID-analisis-finansial-usahatani-cabai-rawit-capsicum-frutescens-l-di-desapurwa jaya.pdf.

Husni dan Kusuma Brata, 2015). (2015). Increased Shelf life of Mackerel With Ethanolic Extract of Padina Sp. During Room Temperature Storage. Indonesian Journal of Fishery Product Processing,18(1),1–10. https://doi.org/ 10.17844/ jphpi.v18i1.9553.

Jenderal, D. (2010). General guidelines for sugarcane cultivation techniques. https://ditjenbun.pertanian.go.id/pedoman-kerja/pedoman-umum/.

Kasmir. (2020). Studi kelayakan bisnis. https://opac.perpusnas.go.id/detailopac.aspx?id=1307179.

Muhammad Arifin Fattah , Sri Mardiyati, F. (2022). Income and Feasibility of Onion Business. AgriMu: Jurnal Sosial Ekonomi Pertanian Dan Agribisnis, 2(1), 35–42. https://journal.unismuh.ac.id/index.php/AgriMu/article/view/6785.

Nazir. (2010). Analysis of Determinants of Income of Street Vendors in North Aceh District. Jurnal Agro Ekonomi, 23(1), 29–53. https://doi.org/0.21082/ jae.v23n1 .2005.30-53.

Puspita, B. (2018). Analysis of Sugarcane Farming Business in Bambanglipuro District, Bantul Regency, Yogyakarta Special Region. Jurnal Magrobis, 18(2), 11–20. http://ejurnal.unikarta.ac.id/index.php/magrobis/article/view/495.

Rahim, D. R. D. H. (2007). Agricultural economics: introduction, theory, and cases. Penebar Swadaya. https://inlislite.uin-suska.ac.id/opac/detail-opac?id=17896.

Ronald W. Hilton, D. E. P. (2020). Managerial Accounting: Creating Value in a DynamicBusinessEnvironment.https://books.google.co.id/books/about/manageial_accounting.html?id=GwwJxQEACAAJ&redir_esc=y.

Sadono Sukirno. (2006). Mikroekonomi: Teori Pengantar. RajaGrafindo Persada. https://inlislite.uin-suska.ac.id/opac/detail-opac?id=17740.

Shinta, I. A. M. . (2011). Farming Science. https://books.google.co.id/books?id=

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

qzyomaeacaaj.
Soekartawi. (2002). Basic Principles of Agricultural Produce Marketing Management. https://inlislite.dispustaka.sumselprov.go.id/opac/detail-opac?id=45160.
Soekartawi. (2003). Farm Analysis. https://kikp-pertanian.id/bbppbatu/opac/ detail-opac?id=1234.
Soekartawi. (2006). Farm Analysis. https://books.google.co.id/books?id= 40eZtAEACAAJ.
Sri Untari, W., & Al Fauzi, F. (2023). Economic Feasibility Analysis of Sugarcane Farming in Wringin Anom Village, Asembagus District, Situbondo Regency. Cermin: Jurnal Penelitian, 7(2), 574–581. https://doi.org/10.36841/cermin_ unars.v7i2.4028.
Suratiyah.(2015)TanBusinessScience.ttps://books.google.co.id/books?id=4aioCgAAQBAJ& printsec= frontcover&hl= id&source= gbs_ge_summary_ r&cad=0#v= onepage& q&f=false.
Wahyuni, S. (2019). Empowerment of Aren (Arenga pinnata Merr) Farmers through Diversification of Aren Nira Products in Mabar Village, Bangun Purba District, Deli Serdang Regency. Unri Conference Series: Community Engagement, 1(1), 104–107. https://doi.org/10.31258/unricsce.1.104-107.

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.