

## THE EFFECT OF PRICES AND SOCIAL MEDIA ON THE INCOME OF CHILI SEED FARMERS IN JEBUNG KIDUL VILLAGE, TLOGOSARI DISTRICT BONDOWOSO REGENCY

Maidatul Imamah<sup>1</sup>, Widya Anggita Putri<sup>2</sup>, Izzah Dienillah<sup>3</sup>,  
Ahmad Hendra Rofiullah<sup>4</sup>, Ahmad Muhyidin<sup>5</sup>  
Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Syariah Abu Zairi Bondowoso, Indonesia  
e-mail: [1maidatulimamah3@gmail.com](mailto:1maidatulimamah3@gmail.com) [2widya23maret@gmail.com](mailto:2widya23maret@gmail.com)  
[3izzahdienillah@stisabuzairi.ac.id](mailto:3izzahdienillah@stisabuzairi.ac.id) [4hendraalmahyra2@gmail.com](mailto:4hendraalmahyra2@gmail.com)  
[5ahmadmuhyidin@stisabuzairi.ac.id](mailto:5ahmadmuhyidin@stisabuzairi.ac.id)

### Abstract

*The agricultural sector in Indonesia plays an important role in the economy, contributing around 13% to GDP and providing employment for the majority of the population. However, farmers face challenges such as price fluctuations and limited access to market information, impacting their income. Farm income is heavily influenced by the price of agricultural products, and low prices can result in losses. Advances in digital technology, especially social media, open up opportunities for farmers to access market information and improve competitiveness. This study aims to analyze and determine the effect of price and social media on the income of chili seedling farmers in Jebung Kidul village. This type of research uses descriptive with a quantitative approach, the sample is taken using the Simple Random Sampling method and the data collection method uses a questionnaire. A total of 155 as respondents. Hypothesis analysis was carried out using multiple linear regression techniques. The results showed that (1) price has a significant effect on the income of chili seed farmers in Jebung Kidul village and (2) social media has no significant effect on the income of chili seed farmers in Jebung Kidul village. (3) Price and social media have a significant influence on the income of chili seedling farmers in Jebung Kidul village.*

**Keywords:** Price; Social Media; Income.

### Abstrak

*Sektor pertanian di Indonesia memegang peranan penting dalam perekonomian, menyumbang sekitar 13% terhadap PDB dan menyediakan lapangan kerja bagi mayoritas penduduk. Namun, petani menghadapi berbagai tantangan, seperti fluktuasi harga dan keterbatasan akses informasi pasar, yang berdampak pada pendapatan mereka. Pendapatan petani sangat dipengaruhi oleh harga produk pertanian, dan harga yang rendah dapat mengakibatkan kerugian. Kemajuan teknologi digital, khususnya media sosial, membuka peluang bagi petani untuk mengakses informasi pasar dan meningkatkan daya saing. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis dan mengetahui pengaruh harga serta media sosial terhadap*

*pendapatan petani bibit cabai di Desa Jebung Kidul. Jenis penelitian ini menggunakan metode deskriptif dengan pendekatan kuantitatif, sampel diambil menggunakan teknik Simple Random Sampling, dan metode pengumpulan data menggunakan kuesioner. Sebanyak 155 responden terlibat dalam penelitian ini. Analisis hipotesis dilakukan dengan teknik regresi linier berganda. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa (1) harga berpengaruh signifikan terhadap pendapatan petani bibit cabai di Desa Jebung Kidul, (2) media sosial tidak berpengaruh signifikan terhadap pendapatan petani bibit cabai di Desa Jebung Kidul, dan (3) harga dan media sosial secara bersama-sama berpengaruh signifikan terhadap pendapatan petani bibit cabai di Desa Jebung Kidul.*

**Kata Kunci:** *Harga; Media Sosial; Pendapatan.*

## **A. Introduction**

The agricultural sector in Indonesia plays a vital role in the economy, contributing approximately 13% of GDP (Sihite et al., 2025) and providing employment for the majority of the population (Zuhdi, 2024). However, farmers face several challenges, such as price fluctuations (Regency, 2024), (Wahyuni et al., 2024), and limited access to market information (Muda Harahap et al., 2024), which impact their income.

Farm income is significantly influenced by agricultural product prices (Sabyan & Wiarta, 2024). Low prices can result in losses, negatively impacting farmer income. Furthermore, farmers may lack market information and be unable to make informed decisions when setting selling prices. Low prices often prevent farmers from covering their production costs, resulting in lost income. Price fluctuations significantly impact farmers' ability to earn a reasonable profit from their crops. Rising seed prices and competition from imported products also put pressure on farmer incomes.

According to (Ardhianto Karsa Sunaryono et al., 2021), (Kristina et al., 2021), (Sari et al., 2023), (Pirngadi et al., 2023), and (Darasa Panjaitan et al., 2024), prices can affect income. However, studies (Suhartini et al., 2021) and (Rahmanda & Amanah, 2021) indicate that assets have no effect on income.

Other factors influencing income include social media (Rahmanda & Amanah, 2021), (Hardiansyah, 2023), (Syukramadani, 2023), and (Cahyo et al., 2024). Advances in digital technology, particularly social media, have opened up opportunities for farmers to access market information and increase competitiveness. Advances in digital technology, particularly social media, have provided opportunities for farmers to access more comprehensive market

information. Farmers can utilize social media to access information on commodity prices, market trends, and available market opportunities. This will help farmers improve their bargaining power and develop more effective marketing strategies. Meanwhile, social media usage among Indonesian farmers is increasing rapidly. Farmers can use social media platforms like WhatsApp, Facebook, and Instagram to share information, share knowledge, and connect with consumers.

The more people learn about a farm's products on social media, the more consumers will be interested in purchasing them. In other words, the more consumers are interested in and purchase a farm's products, the greater the income and profits they will receive from selling those products. However, other studies, such as those by Desiana et al., 2024 and Lestari & Damhudi, 2021, indicate that social media has no impact on income. Based on this research background, the following research hypotheses can be formulated:

H1: Price significantly influences the income of chili seedling farmers

H2: Social media significantly influences the income of chili seedling farmers

H3: Price and income significantly influence the income of chili seedling farmers

## **B. Research Methods**

The research approach used was a quantitative approach, with a descriptive research method. The data collection technique used simple random sampling, with a population of 280 farmers and a sample of 155 respondents. The sample size was determined using the Isaac and Michael table with a 5% margin of error. To obtain data, this study used primary data in the form of a closed-ended questionnaire with a Likert scale, supported by secondary data from various sources such as journals, books, the internet, and other sources. Data analysis in this study used multiple linear regression with SPSS Version 22.0. The analysis involved several stages, including instrumental testing, multiple linear regression testing, and classical assumption testing.

## **C. Results and Discussion**

### **Validity Test**

A validity test was conducted to determine whether the statement items were valid in measuring the variables. To test validity, the  $r$  table criterion was used at a significance level of 0.05 with a two-tailed test. If the calculated  $r$  value is positive and the calculated  $r$  value is greater than the calculated  $r$  value, the indicator is considered valid. Conversely, if the calculated  $r$  value is positive and the calculated  $r$  value is less than the calculated  $r$  value, the indicator is considered invalid.

In this study, the significance test was conducted by comparing the calculated  $r$  value with the calculated  $r$  value for degrees of freedom ( $df$ ) =  $n-2$ , where  $n$  is the number of samples and 155 respondents were used (margin of error 5%). Therefore, the calculated  $r$  value used is ( $df$ ) =  $155-2 = 153$ , and the  $r$  value of 153 in the table is 0.157 (two-tailed). The results of the validity test are shown in the following table:

**Table 1.** Validity Test Results

| No.                      | Statement   | r Count | r table | Information |
|--------------------------|-------------|---------|---------|-------------|
| <i>Price (X1)</i>        |             |         |         |             |
| 1.                       | Statement 1 | 0,683   | 0,157   | Valid       |
| 2.                       | Statement 2 | 0,650   | 0,157   | Valid       |
| 3.                       | Statement 3 | 0,601   | 0,157   | Valid       |
| 4.                       | Statement 4 | 0,524   | 0,157   | Valid       |
| 5.                       | Statement 5 | 0,625   | 0,157   | Valid       |
| 6.                       | Statement 6 | 0,585   | 0,157   | Valid       |
| <i>Social Media (X2)</i> |             |         |         |             |
| 1.                       | Statement 1 | 0,582   | 0,157   | Valid       |
| 2.                       | Statement 2 | 0,543   | 0,157   | Valid       |
| 3.                       | Statement 3 | 0,512   | 0,157   | Valid       |
| 4.                       | Statement 4 | 0,485   | 0,157   | Valid       |
| 5.                       | Statement 5 | 0,511   | 0,157   | Valid       |
| 6.                       | Statement 6 | 0,516   | 0,157   | Valid       |
| 7.                       | Statement 7 | 0,432   | 0,157   | Valid       |
| 8.                       | Statement 8 | 0,528   | 0,157   | Valid       |
| <i>Income (Y)</i>        |             |         |         |             |
| 1.                       | Statement 1 | 0,669   | 0,157   | Valid       |
| 2.                       | Statement 2 | 0,676   | 0,157   | Valid       |
| 3.                       | Statement 3 | 0,686   | 0,157   | Valid       |
| 4.                       | Statement 4 | 0,686   | 0,157   | Valid       |

Source: Primary data processed by SPSS, 2025

Based on the validity test results, it is known that the calculated  $r$ -value for all statement items is greater than the table  $r$ -value (0.157). Therefore, all statement items are considered valid.

### Reliability Test

Reliability testing is conducted to determine the extent to which a research instrument can be used repeatedly at other times and locations, producing the same results. To test reliability, an instrument or questionnaire is considered reliable if its Cronbach's Alpha value is greater than or equal to 0.60. The results of the reliability test for the research questionnaire items are shown in the table below:

**Table 2.** Realibility Test Result

| No. | Variable                 | <i>Cronbach Alpha</i> | Standar <i>Cronbach Alpha</i> | Information |
|-----|--------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|-------------|
| 1.  | <i>Price (X1)</i>        | 0,615                 | 0,60                          | Reliabel    |
| 2.  | <i>Social Media (X2)</i> | 0,600                 | 0,60                          | Reliabel    |
| 3.  | <i>Income (Y)</i>        | 0,612                 | 0,60                          | Reliabel    |

Source: Primary data processed by SPSS, 2025

Table 2 shows that the Cronbach's Alpha value for the price variable (X1) is the highest (0.615 > 0.60), and the social media variable (X2) is the lowest, equal to the standard Cronbach's Alpha value (0.600 > 0.60). The reliability test results indicate that this research instrument is reliable.

### Multiple Linear Regression Test

The multiple linear regression test aims to determine the influence or relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable using the formula  $Y = a + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2$ . Furthermore, to determine the significance of the independent variables on the dependent variable (hypothesis testing), a multiple linear regression test using the t-test was conducted. If the calculated t-value is greater than the table t-value, the hypothesis is accepted. Next, the coefficient of determination (R<sup>2</sup>) and model fit (F) tests were conducted. The following table shows the results of the multiple linear regression test:

**Table 3.** Multiple Linear Regression Test Results

| Model                    | B      | r Count | Sig.  | Information           |
|--------------------------|--------|---------|-------|-----------------------|
| (Constant)               | 24,914 | 11,202  | 0,000 |                       |
| <i>Price (X1)</i>        | 0,215  | 2,960   | 0,004 | Significant Influence |
| <i>Social Media (X2)</i> | 0,077  | 0,337   | 0,183 | no significant impact |

Source: Primary data processed by SPSS, 2025

Based on Table 3, the regression model for this study is as follows:

$$Y = 24.914 + 0.215X_1 + 0.077X_2$$

This means:

24.914 : If the price and social media variables are zero, then revenue is 24.914.

0.215 : If the price increases by one unit and other variables remain constant, then revenue is 21.5%.

0.077: If the social media increases by one unit and other variables remain constant, then revenue is 7.7%.

The results of the multiple linear regression test indicate that the price variable has a significant effect on revenue. This is indicated by a significance value of 0.004, which is less than 0.05. Meanwhile, regarding the percentage effect on revenue, price has a 21.5% effect. Conversely, social media does not have a significant effect on revenue. This is indicated by a significance value of 0.183, which is greater than 0.05, or as can be seen from the beta value, which indicates that the social media variable only has a 7.7% effect on revenue.

#### t- Test

The calculated t-value is used to test the partial effect of each independent variable on the dependent variable. The criterion used is that the calculated t-value must be greater than the table t-value with a significance level of less than 0.05. The results of the t-test can be seen in the table below:

**Table 4.** t-Test Output Results

| Model             | T count | T table | Sig.  | Information         |
|-------------------|---------|---------|-------|---------------------|
| (Constant)        | 11,202  | 0,157   | 0,000 |                     |
| Price (X1)        | 2,960   | 0,157   | 0,004 | Hypothesis Accepted |
| Social Media (X2) | 0,337   | 0,157   | 0,183 | hypothesis rejected |

Source: Primary data processed by SPSS, 2025

Table 4 shows that hypothesis one (H1), namely the price variable, is accepted, because the calculated t-value (2.960) is greater than the table t-value (0.157), and the significance value of 0.004 is less than 0.05. Hypothesis two (H2), namely that social media has no significant effect on income, is rejected, because the significance value of 0.183 is greater than 0.05.

#### Coefficient of Determination (R2)

The coefficient of determination (R2) essentially measures the extent to which the independent variable is able to explain the dependent variable. To see the results of the determination test, see the r table below:

**Table 5.** Results of the Coefficient of Determination (R2) Test Output

| Model | R     | R Square | Adjust R Square |
|-------|-------|----------|-----------------|
| 1     | 0,310 | 0,096    | 0,084           |

Source: Primary data processed by SPSS, 2025

Based on the analysis results in Table 5, the R-square value is 0.096, meaning that 9.6% of the income variable is determined by price and social media, with the remainder determined by other variables not examined in this study.

**Ui F**

The F test is used to examine the effect of all independent variables collectively on the dependent variable. The decision-making criterion in the F test is that if the F significance value is less than 0.05, then  $H_0$  is accepted ( $H_a$  is rejected). The results of the F test can be seen in the table below:

The results of the determination test can be seen in the table below:

**Table 6.** F-Test Output Results

| Variables              | F Count | Sig.  | Information           |
|------------------------|---------|-------|-----------------------|
| Price and Social Media | 8,103   | 0,000 | Significant Influence |

Source: Primary data processed by SPSS, 2025

Based on Table 6, the significance value of 0.000 is less than 0.05, indicating that the regression equation model used in this study meets the goodness of fit criteria.

**Classical Assumption Test**

**Normality Test**

The normality test is used to determine whether the standardized residual values in the regression model are normally distributed. Standardized residual values with a normal distribution are considered normally distributed if their values are largely close to the mean. This study tested for normality using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, which tests for normality using the cumulative distribution function. Standardized residual values are normally distributed if their significance value is greater than 0.05. The results of the normality test using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test can be seen in the table below:

**Table 7.** Results of the One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test for Normality

| Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test |                | Unstandardized Residual |
|-------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|
| N                       |                | 155                     |
| Normal Parameters       | Mean           | 0,0000000               |
|                         | Std. Deviation | 1,84404640              |
| Exact Sig. (2-tailed)   |                | 0,311                   |

Source: Processed data, 2025

Table 7 shows that the Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality test results for 155 respondents are normally distributed, as indicated by the significance value (Exact

Sig. 2-tailed) of 0.311. Because the significance value is greater than 0.05 ( $0.311 > 0.05$ ), the residual values are normally distributed (spread out).

### Heteroscedasticity Test

The heteroscedasticity test is used to determine residual variation in a regression model. Homoscedasticity means constant residual variance, while heteroscedasticity means non-constant residual variance. A good regression model is one that does not exhibit heteroscedasticity symptoms. The criterion used in the heteroscedasticity test in this study is that if the significance value is greater than or equal to 0.05, it can be concluded that there are no symptoms of heteroscedasticity in the regression model. To see the results of the heteroscedasticity test, see below:

**Table 8.** Heteroscedasticity Test Output Results

| No. | Variables         | Sig.  | Information                     |
|-----|-------------------|-------|---------------------------------|
| 1.  | Price (X1)        | 0,247 | There is not heteroscedasticity |
| 2.  | Social Media (X2) | 0,076 | There is not heteroscedasticity |

Source: Processed data, 2025

Based on Table 8, the output shows a correlation between price (0.247) and social media (0.076) with a significance value greater than 0.05. Therefore, the data in this study are declared to be free of heteroscedasticity.

### Multicollinearity

The presence of correlation between independent variables in a regression model can be identified using a multicollinearity test. The Tolerance and Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values are the main indicators. In this study, the multicollinearity test is performed if the Tolerance is greater than 0.1 or the VIF is less than 10, indicating no multicollinearity. The results of the multicollinearity test can be seen below:

**Table 9.** Multicollinearity Test Output Results

| No. | Model             | Colinearity Statistics |       |
|-----|-------------------|------------------------|-------|
|     |                   | Tolerance              | VIF   |
| 1.  | (Constant)        |                        |       |
| 2.  | Price (X1)        | 0,844                  | 1,185 |
| 3.  | Social Media (X2) | 0,844                  | 1,185 |

Source: Processed data, 2025

Table 9 shows that the tolerance values for both variables are greater than 0.10, and the variance inflation factor (VIF) is less than 10. The tolerance values for price and social media are  $0.844 > 0.10$ . Meanwhile, the VIF values for price and social media are  $1.185 < 10$ , indicating no signs of multicollinearity between the variables.

## **Discussion**

### **The Effect of Price on Income of Chili Seed Farmers in Jebung Kidul Village**

Based on the results of the multiple linear regression test, the price variable (X1) significantly influences income (Y), as the price variable's significance value of 0.004 is less than 0.05. In this study, the hypothesis testing criteria are accepted if the calculated t-value is greater than the t-table (0.157) and the Sig. value is less than 0.05.

These results indicate that the price variable has a significant influence on income, as the Sig. value of 0.004 is less than 0.05. Therefore, the research hypothesis (Ha) is accepted. The calculated t-value (2.960) is greater than the t-table (0.157, 2-tailed). Therefore, the Ha hypothesis is accepted (H0 is rejected). Therefore, Hypothesis 1 (H1), which states that price significantly influences the income of chili seed farmers in Jebung Kidul Village, is accepted. The beta (B) value is 0.215 (21.5%), indicating that price has a 21.5% effect on revenue if its value is increased by one unit while other variables remain constant.

These results align with previous studies conducted by (Ardhianto Karsa Sunaryono et al., 2021), (Kristina et al., 2021), (Sari et al., 2023), (Pirngadi et al., 2023), and (Darasa Panjaitan et al., 2024), which showed that price affects revenue. This study contrasts with previous studies conducted by (Suhartini et al., 2021) and (Rahmanda & Amanah, 2021), which showed no effect on revenue.

### **The Influence of Social Media on the Income of Chili Seedling Farmers in Jebung Kidul Village**

Based on the results of the multiple linear regression test, the social media variable (X2) did not significantly influence income (Y) because the significance value of the social media variable was 0.183, which is greater than 0.05. Although the calculated t-test (0.337) was greater than the t-test (0.157), the Sig. value of 0.183 was greater than 0.05. Therefore, H0 was accepted (Ha was rejected). Therefore, Hypothesis 2 (H2) was rejected, meaning social media did not significantly influence the income of chili seedling farmers in Jebung Kidul Village. Furthermore, the beta (B) value of 0.077 (7.7%) indicates that social media only had a 7.7% effect on income if the value was increased by one unit while other variables

remained constant. This study found that social media used for promotion by chili seedling farmers is not a source of income for chili seedling farmers. This is because the majority of customers who purchase chili seedlings are older people who do not use social media. The results of this study align with previous research conducted by (Desiana et al., 2024) and (Lestari & Damhudi, 2021), which showed that social media had no effect on income. However, the results of this study are inversely related to previous research conducted by (Rahmanda & Amanah, 2021), (Hardiansyah, 2023), (Syukramadani, 2023), and (Cahyo et al., 2024), which found that social media significantly influences income.

### **The Effect of Price and Social Media on the Income of Chili Seedling Farmers in Jebung Kidul Village**

Based on the results of a multiple linear regression test, the variables price (X1) and social media (X2) on income (Y) indicate a significant effect, as the significance value of both variables is 0.000, which is less than 0.05. In this study, the F-test was used to test the effect; if the significance value is less than 0.05, the hypothesis is accepted.

These results indicate that the variables price and social media have a significant effect, as the Sig. value of 0.000 is less than 0.05, thus the hypothesis is accepted. The R-squared value is 0.096, indicating that 9.6% of the income variable is determined by price and social media. These results align with previous research conducted by Yafi Faishal Riskiyady and Raya Sulistyowati (2021), which showed that price and social media significantly influence income.

### **D. Conclusion**

Price significantly influences income because the significance value is  $0.004 < \alpha 5\% (0.05)$ , and the research hypothesis is accepted because the calculated  $t (2.960) > t \text{ table } (0.157)$ , meaning that price significantly influences income from chili seedlings in Jebung Kidul Village. Social media does not significantly influence income because the significance value is  $0.183 > \alpha 5\% (0.05)$ , and the research hypothesis means that social media does not significantly influence income from chili seedlings in Jebung Kidul Village. Price and social media significantly influence income because the significance value is  $0.000 < \alpha 5\% (0.05)$ , and the research hypothesis is accepted, meaning that price and social media significantly influence income from chili seedlings in Jebung Kidul Village.

### **Reference**

Ardhianto Karsa Sunaryono, R., Adhi Saputro, W., Sulistyowati, E., & Sulistyowati, E.

- (2021). Pengaruh Modal, Pengalaman, Jam Kerja Dan Harga Kakao Terhadap Pendapatan Petani Kakao Di Taman Teknologi Pertanian Nglanggeran. *Jurnal Bisnis Manajemen Dan Akuntansi (BISMAK)*, 1(1), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.47701/bismak.v1i1.1180>
- Cahyo, P. N., Wulansari, D. D., Romadhoni, D. A., & Damayanti, A. (2024). Pengaruh Media Sosial Dan Perluasan Akses Pasar. *Seminar Nasional LPPM UMMAT*, 22, 342–349.
- Darasa Panjaitan, P., G Purba, D., & Nainggolan, N. (2024). Analisis Pengaruh Modal, Volume Penjualan, dan Harga terhadap Pendapatan Pengecer Jeruk di Kota Pematang Siantar. *Jurnal Ekuilnemi*, 6(1), 39–45. <https://doi.org/10.36985/6236kj29>
- Desiana, D., Bintari, V. I., & Nanda, U. L. (2024). E-commerce, Financial Technology, Media Sosial dan Pengaruhnya terhadap Pendapatan UMKM Kota Tasikmalaya. *Owner*, 8(3), 2139–2149. <https://doi.org/10.33395/owner.v8i3.2264>
- Hardiansyah, E. (2023). Pengaruh Penggunaan Media Sosial Dan Qris (Quick Response Code Indonesian Standard) Terhadap Peningkatan Pendapatan Umkm Di Kecamatan Curup. *E-Theses IAIN Curup*.
- Kristina, M., Daro, S., Moan Banda, Y., & Ma, S. G. (2021). Biaya Pemeliharaan Dan Harga Jual Terhadap Pendapatan Petani Cengkeh di Desa Selalejo Timur. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dasar Dan Sosial Humaniora*, 1(2), 275–287. <https://www.bajangjournal.com/index.php/JPDSH/article/view/930>
- Lestari, T., & Damhudi, D. (2021). Peran Media Penjualan Terhadap Pendapatan E-Commerce Pada Usaha Mikro. *Jurnal Perspektif*, 19(2), 150–157. <https://doi.org/10.31294/jp.v19i2.11295>
- Muda Harahap, L., Gloria Pakpahan, T., Aulia Wijaya, R., & Zacky Nasution, A. (2024). Publikasi Ilmu Tanaman dan Agribisnis (BOTANI) Dampak Transformasi Digital pada Agribisnis: Tantangan dan Peluang bagi Petani di Indonesia. *Botani*, 1(2), 99–108. <https://doi.org/10.62951/botani.v1i2.55>
- Pirngadi, R. S., Utami, J. P., Siregar, A. F., Salsabila, Habib, A., & Manik, J. R. (2023). Analisis Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Pendapatan Usahatani Cabai Merah Di Kecamatan Beringin. *Jurnal Pertanian Agros*, 25(1), 486–492. <https://e-journal.janabadra.ac.id/index.php/JA/article/view/2422>

- Rahmanda, E., & Amanah, L. (2021). Pengaruh Modal Pribadi, Harga dan Sosial Media terhadap Pendapatan UMKM. *Jurnal Ilmu Dan Riset Akuntansi*, 10(10), 1–17.
- Regency, B. (2024). *Pengaruh Fluktuasi Harga Nener Bandeng Terhadap Etos Kerja Petani Pembudidaya di Kabupaten Buleleng , Bali*. 15(2), 231–240.
- Sabyan, & Wiarta, I. (2024). Faktor-Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Pendapatan Petani Karet Di Kabupaten Sarolangun. *Jurnal Dinamika Manajemen*, 12(2), 67–77.
- Sari, D. Y., Harmain, H., & Atika. (2023). Humantech Jurnal Ilmiah Multi Disiplin Indonesia Pengaruh Harga Pupuk, Modal, Harga Jual, Luas Lahan, Jumlah Tenaga Kerja Terhadap Pendapatan Petani Kelapa Sawit Dalam Perspektif Islam. *Humantech : Jurnal Ilmiah Multidisplin Indonesia* , 2(6), 1027–1041.
- Sihite, M., Hsb, A. M., Syahputra, R., Amri, M. R., Alwi, R., Sakuntala, D., Islam, U., Sumatera, N., Pembangunan, U., Budi, P., Medan, K., & Utara, S. (2025). *PERAN SEKTOR PERTANIAN DAN DISTRIBUSI PENDAPATAN DI INDONESIA : ANALISIS MODEL FAKTOR SPESIFIK PERAN SEKTOR PERTANIAN DAN DISTRIBUSI PENDAPATAN DI INDONESIA : ANALISIS MODEL FAKTOR SPESIFIK*. 3(1).
- Suhartini, A., Juliarsih, E., & Misissaifi, M. (2021). Pengaruh Biaya Produksi dan Harga Terhadap Pendapatan Budidaya Tambak Udang. *Al-Mutharahah: Jurnal Penelitian Dan Kajian Sosial Keagamaan*, 18(2), 119–131. <https://doi.org/10.46781/al-mutharahah.v18i2.341>
- Syukramadani, H. (2023). Pengaruh Modal Usaha Dan Media Sosial Terhadap Pendapatan Usaha Mikro Kecil dan Menengah (UMKM) Di Kabupaten Pinrang. *NBER Working Papers*, 01, 1–23. <http://www.nber.org/papers/w16019>
- Wahyuni, P. R., Hamzah, A., & Anwar, M. (2024). *Analisis kebijakan hukum dalam perlindungan petani terhadap fluktuasi harga komoditas pertanian di kabupaten sumenep*. 14(2), 138–150.
- Zuhdi, N. (2024). Data BPS Buktikan Sektor Pertanian Serap Tenaga Kerja Tertinggi di Kuartal I. *Media Indonesia*. <https://www.metrotvnews.com/read/NQACqWdR-data-bps-buktikan-sektor-pertanian-serap-tenaga-kerja-tertinggi-di-kuartal-i>