

**WILLINGNESS TO ACCEPT VALUE OF LAND DEVELOPMENT VALUE AS A BASIS FOR
CONSERVATION PROGRAM PADDY FIELDS SEKARSULI SUB
IN VILLAGE DISTRICT BERBAH SLEMAN**

**WILLINGNESS TO ACCEPT VALUE OF LAND DEVELOPMENT VALUE
AS A BASIS FOR CONSERVATION PROGRAM PADDY FIELDS
SEKARSULI SUB IN VILLAGE DISTRICT BERBAH SLEMAN**

Hamdi Sari Maryoni¹⁾, Wahyu Hidayati²⁾

¹⁾²⁾Faculty Of Economics and Business, Gadjah Mada University
email : hamdiyoni@yahoo.co.id

Abstract

This study discusses the conversion of paddy fields in Sleman are constantly increasing over time. Sleman District Government to establish areas of productive agricultural centers to maintain the ability to produce food, especially rice. The subjects were farmers who have land in the village of as many as 35 people Sekarsuli obtained using snowball sampling. Paddy land conservation program will be sustained when the value of the program is received and in accordance with the expectations of landowners. One model is the determination of the value of conservation programs is the value of land development rights. Value of land development rights is the difference between the expected value of the optimal land to the value of land. Estimates of the value of further land development rights offered to landowners if they agreed that if the value was used as the basis of determining the value of land conservation programs. Conclusion: (1) based on the estimates obtained by the average value of land amounting to 55 percent of the estimated value of the optimal land. The amount of excess is an average of 45 percent, hereinafter referred to as the value of land development rights (Value Development Right). (2) Respondents who agreed with conservation programs by 24 respondents, while the other does not agree as much as 11 respondents. The land area and distance lands to public facilities be an influential factor on the landowner's decision to accept or reject the programs offered.

Key words: Konservasi Farmland, The Development and Land Use

Abstrak

Penelitian ini membahas tentang alih fungsi lahan persawahan di Kabupaten Sleman yang terus mengalami peningkatan dari waktu ke waktu. Pemerintah Kabupaten Sleman menetapkan kawasan sentra pertanian produktif untuk menjaga kemampuan memproduksi pangan khususnya padi. Subjek penelitian ini adalah petani yang memiliki lahan di Desa Sekarsuli sebanyak 35 orang yang diperoleh menggunakan *snowball sampling*. Program konservasi lahan persawahan akan berkelanjutan ketika nilai program diterima dan sesuai dengan harapan pemilik lahan. Salah satu model penentuan nilai program konservasi adalah nilai hak pengembangan lahan. Nilai hak pengembangan lahan adalah selisih antara ekspektasi nilai lahan optimal dengan nilai guna lahan. Estimasi nilai hak pengembangan lahan selanjutnya ditawarkan kepada pemilik lahan apakah mereka setuju jika nilai itu digunakan sebagai basis penentuan nilai program konservasi lahan. Kesimpulan: (1) berdasar estimasi diperoleh rata-rata nilai guna lahan sebesar 55 persen dari estimasi nilai lahan optimal. Besarnya kelebihan adalah rata-rata sebesar 45 persen yang selanjutnya disebut sebagai nilai hak pengembangan lahan (*Value Development Right*). (2) Responden yang menyatakan setuju dengan program konservasi sebanyak 24 responden, sedang yang tidak setuju sebanyak 11 responden. Adapun luas lahan dan Jarak lahan ke fasilitas umum merupakan faktor yang berpengaruh terhadap keputusan pemilik lahan untuk menerima atau menolak program yang ditawarkan.

Kata kunci : konservasi lahan pertanian, nilai pengembangan dan guna lahan

BACKGROUND

Lahore District Government is working to make arrangement of land use, to control the productive rice lands remain available and used optimally without compromising the demand of land for non agricultural use.

To protect the food self - sufficiency program that has pioneered the government, the Protection of agricultural lands absolutely must be done by District Government Lahore. Based on data from the Department of Agriculture and Forestry Sleman, the effect of land conversion of productive

**WILLINGNESS TO ACCEPT VALUE OF LAND DEVELOPMENT VALUE AS A BASIS FOR
CONSERVATION PROGRAM PADDY FIELDS SEKARSULI SUB
IN VILLAGE DISTRICT BERBAH SLEMAN**

agricultural land, especially rice, actually happened a long time, as has been experienced in most other regions in Indonesia. The following data shows the rate of change in the growth of paddy fields and yards in the district of Lahore during the period 2005 -2008, as shown in the table below.

**Tabel
Development of Land and Land Rice
Yard in Kabupaten Sleman**

| No | Year | Rice field (ha) | Perkarangan (ha) |
|----|------|-----------------|------------------|
| 1 | 2006 | 25.135,437 | 18.578,979 |
| 2 | 2007 | 25.127,019 | 18.587,286 |
| 3 | 2008 | 25.003,346 | 18.636,095 |
| 4 | 2009 | 24.983,346 | 18.657,435 |
| 5 | 2010 | 24.889,612 | 18.429,685 |

Source: BPS, Kabupaten Sleman in Figures 2007- 2011

BPS Data from the years 2006-2011 shows that the change in productive land use is almost less than 2 percent annually, while the land area of the yard showing an upward trend on average 0.74 percent per year based on table 1.1. The ratio of the rice fields in Sleman with a total area of rice fields reached 41 per cent of the province. Terlihat decrease of the total land area of rice fields in Sleman especially and most of DIY Effect of expansion of the city of Yogyakarta that suppress the change of use of land in Lahore.

The following table shows the development of paddy land in the Yogyakarta province during the period 2006 - 2011.

**Tabel 2
Development of Rice Land in
Yogyakarta province (heactares)**

| No | Year | Rice field | Rice field |
|----|------|--------------------|------------------|
| | | in Kab.Sleman (ha) | in Prop.DIY (ha) |
| 1 | 2005 | 23.191 | 57.762 |
| 2 | 2006 | 23.121 | 57.661 |
| 3 | 2007 | 23.062 | 57.443 |
| 4 | 2008 | 23.005 | 57.081 |
| 5 | 2009 | 22.914 | 56.712 |
| 6 | 2010 | 22.819 | 56.538 |

Source: BPS, Yogyakarta in Figures 2007- 2011

To date efforts to maintain the District Government Lahore productive agricultural land, especially paddy fields, is to establish area of Sustainable Agricultural Land. Policy of Sustainable Agricultural Land Area Determination of the Lahore District Government efforts to protect and maintain the productive agricultural land from land use practices.

Determination of the Sustainable Agriculture On Land Area Regional Center for Productive Agriculture is expected to answer kerisis degradation faced by the Lahore district. Sustainability of agricultural land preservation program areas, especially rice was a significant improvement for the agricultural sector. Determination of the value of the conservation program based on the concept of land development rights (Value Development Right) are considered more suitable for areas that are experiencing degradation of land use practices as a result of the influence of the expansion of rice area of the city. Sekarsuli village is part of Sleman District has an area of 286.50 hectares of rice fields. Included in the green and affordable technical irrigation systems. Sekarsuli villages under threat of this land use terlihat with large areas of land began to be ready for habitation. Land conservation programs for sustainable agriculture productive centers of the region is expected to run and press the rate of conversion of paddy fields. The question is, considering there has been no application of the basic mechanisms of land development rights value. The problem is not land conservation program based on the value of land development rights.

Research objectives

1. Identify the value of land and development rights of the rice fields.

**WILLINGNESS TO ACCEPT VALUE OF LAND DEVELOPMENT VALUE AS A BASIS FOR
CONSERVATION PROGRAM PADDY FIELDS SEKARSULI SUB
IN VILLAGE DISTRICT BERBAH SLEMAN**

2. Identify the landowner response to the estimated value of land development rights if offered as a basis for setting the value of the conservation program.

2. Reader review Rice fields in Sleman profile

Sleman district is the mainstay of agriculture for the Province of DIY pengahsil Degradation of agricultural land loss due to the economic transformation (from agricultural land to non agricultural land) can mengangu agricultural activities in Sleman. Unresolved issues faced by classical as decline in soil fertility, scarcity of fertilizers in the market, and the availability of water resources is a cause of decline in the pertania (Widjanarko et al, 2006:21). Picture of decline in agricultural land area in Lahore Kabupaten can be seen in table 3.

**Table 3.
Rice production in Sleman 2008-2010**

| No | Description | Year's | | |
|----|--------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| | | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 |
| 1 | Area of wetland (ha) | 23,005 | 22,914 | 22,819 |
| 2 | Production (ton) | 267,607 | 226,140 | 294,500 |
| 3 | Productivity (kg/m) | 0,6 | 0,6 | 0,6 |
| 4 | Productivity DIY (kw/ha) | 62,61 | 60,50 | 63,23 |

Source: BPS, Sleman in the figures, from 2009 to 2011.

Benefits of rice fields

According to Agus and Irawan (2006:312-313) that the multifunctional rice fields is very difficult to quantify than the economic side of which is the ability to withstand flood mitigation or

collect rain water and residential water flow, erosion control and sendimen-tasik namely natural disasters such as landslides, mitigation increase in air temperature, water resource recycling, organic waste receptacle and pad-reducing groundwater nitrate levels.

Conversion of paddy fields

The conversion of paddy fields, often caused by economic factors such as farmers, compared to the high cost of agricultural oprsiaonal acceptable results, which forces farmers to sell land persawahannya, although the resulting loss of livelihood resources (Irawan et al,2001, Winoto, 2005 see Abdurachman, 2010:78).

Changes of spatial plans, the direction of development policy and market mechanisms is another factor that causes land conversion of paddy fields. In the past there was more because of two things to the last, due to lack of sense of community and government officials about the spatial, or spatial plans are difficult to realize. In line with development policies

that emphasize the aspects of ease of growth through investment facilities, both to local and foreign investors in the provision of land, the land use change from agriculture to non agriculture is widespread (Widjanarko et al, 2006:22-23).

Theoretical value of agricultural land

According Hidayati and Hardjanto (2003:52-55) states that in analyzing the highest and best use of the asset value of the land there are 4 (four) criteria must be met, namely: (1) physically possible, (2) are authorized by regulation; (3) financially feasible, (4) provide maximum results. Then based on the highest and best use of, the physical condition of the infrastructure that has pertanaian field

**WILLINGNESS TO ACCEPT VALUE OF LAND DEVELOPMENT VALUE AS A BASIS FOR
CONSERVATION PROGRAM PADDY FIELDS SEKARSULI SUB
IN VILLAGE DISTRICT BERBAH SLEMAN**

that has been well supported by local regulations, and has result in food production, should be maintained as agricultural areas or where agricultural cultivation.

Fiechtiger and Salhofer (2011: 1-3) NPV method or methods of determining land prices as a basis for judging the basis for awarding compensation farmland conservation program. One of the land capability is menghasilkana pendapatan until the time is not up. Therefore, the application of this method can be explained by systematic differences. Referring to the model NVP, the maximum rates of payments to farmers (willing to pay) for a farm at the time period t is equal to summing the discounted expectation in the future of agriculture. In general it can be written.

$$L_t = \frac{E_t(R_t + 1)}{(1+r)^1} + \frac{E_t(R_{t+1})}{(1+r)^2} + \dots + \frac{E_t(R_{t+n})}{(1+r)^n} \dots(2.1)$$

Where L_t is the NPV or maximum price paid bersedian agricultural land for each unit of land at end of period t. E_t Idikasi expectations at time t and $r_t + 1$ relationship discount in period t + i is used for the payment of income $R_t + i$. in this situation without government interference, $R_t + i$ can be interpreted in the lease, the land revenue stream for the land after the cost of all factors of production, including opportunity cost, after reducing semuanaya. Equation (1) generally means that different assumptions and different land lease discount rate of each period n. For simplicity, but without menghilangkan in general, assume that $i = r + r_t$ and $E_t (R_t + i) = E_t (R)$ for all $i = 1,2, .. n$. Therefore, the discount rate is constant in all periods

n. Explain $b_i = (1 + r)^i$ corresponding rules.

$$L_t = \sum_{i=1}^N E_t(R) \dots(2.2)$$

Furthermore, assuming the land is up to the time horizon is infinite or the value ($n = \infty$) and land rental increases (decreases) at fixed growth rate (g) and therefore $R_t = R_t + i * (1 + g) I$, in accordance provision.

$$L_t = \frac{E_t(R_t + 1)}{r - g} = \beta E_t R_t + 1 \dots(2.3)$$

Where $\beta = 1 / r - g, 1 / r g$, the interest capitalization of leases of land in land values. Besides the land lease, which naturally makes the decline of land forces, is another possible relationship of income to capitalization into land prices. Provision herein to protect the agricultural program. Masyarakat participate in supporting land conservation program to apply the WTP. Here reveal the most low-cost farming. Capitalization of payment may differ for the value of land for a model of NPV.

$$P_t = \frac{E_t(CF_1)}{(1+k)^1} + \frac{E_t(CF_2)}{(1+k)^2} + \dots + \frac{E_t(CF_n)}{(1+k)^n} \dots(2.4)$$

Implementasi the NPV models require estimates of expectations of a revenue stream (CF) in the future and the appropriate discount rate for CF at this time. The next time the basic expectations of CF is limited to information when melakukan forecast. Discount imagine the interest rate risk and the risk of requiring payment on the basis of payment to the risk of CF is not limited.

$$P_t = \frac{E_t (CF_{1+n})}{(k+g)} \dots(2.5)$$

Where $k = r + g$

**WILLINGNESS TO ACCEPT VALUE OF LAND DEVELOPMENT VALUE AS A BASIS FOR
CONSERVATION PROGRAM PADDY FIELDS SEKARSULI SUB
IN VILLAGE DISTRICT BERBAH SLEMAN**

Land asset is an investment that its income is not limited to $(n-\infty)$. In the case of the model (2.4) and or (2.5) becomes difficult to be calculated and steady flow of CF in the future. To be emulated if the flow of the flowers grow CF harapanya $k > g$, which is better discount rate increases (ie, $k > g$), then on the model (2.5) simple (Ross et. Al. In Hanson, 1999:2-3) for CF believed to grow at a constant rate, then the value of agricultural land can be determined early next year estimate of CF, CF flowers grow in the coming future (harizo value).

Analysis Tools

Analysis tools used to determine the estimated response to the landowner is a conservation program that giving ratio logit test procedure and the econometric analysis of logit equations, there are 4(four) test, which:

1. Wald Test / Test Z. At the same regression with the MLE method to test the function of t on the OLS regression method. Wald test / Z test used to determine the effect of partially independent variable on the dependent variable.
2. Likelihood ratio test (LR). In the regression with the MLE method to test the same function F at OLS regression method. LR test is intended to measure the overall significance of the independent variable (x) can explain the dependent variable (y).
3. McFadden R2 test. In the regression with the same function with the MLE method R2 test on OLS regression. McFadden R2 test intended to measure how much the dependent variable the proportion of variance could be explained all the independent variables.

4. Logit ratio. Interpretation of the coefficient - the coefficient in the logit regression model takes the form logit ratio (the ratio of trend), written with the symbol B or Exp (B). Logit ratio used to determine the chances of a trend variable. Ratio logit variables used for interpreting the relationship of each variable with all variables dependent variable.

Research Methods

Types and data sources

Data used in this study consists of two types, according to acquiring it, is the primary data and secondary data. Qualitative data includes working on the pattern of land, education, irrigation systems and land tenure. Quantitative data that is broad, the distance, the value of the harvest, the harvest, production costs, and value (price) of land market, while secondary data are all quantitative data. All primary data which are quantitative cross section in 2010, while secondary data is the data time series that began in 2010.

The data was collected through direct observation and interviews with a questionnaire instrument that contains an open question to the respondents in the study area, a live interview to get information that is relevant. Validation is performed to ensure the accuracy of the data according to conditions and availability of information in 2010. Cross check is done mainly for the market data that occurred in the object of research, such as the optimal amount of the estimated land value, productivity and production costs. Validation conducted in farmers' groups in which respondents were ruled as members. Validation of the primary data are available also in the form of secondary data such as the productivity of land,

**WILLINGNESS TO ACCEPT VALUE OF LAND DEVELOPMENT VALUE AS A BASIS FOR
CONSERVATION PROGRAM PADDY FIELDS SEKARSULI SUB
IN VILLAGE DISTRICT BERBAH SLEMAN**

price Dried Grain Harvest and index BPPBM taken from BPS.

Analysis and Discussion

Revenue projections.

Projected income is income that dihasilkan farmers from each harvest season of agricultural land owned.. Large annual income influenced the production of components and costs, the price of unhusked rice in the hands of farmers and increase the index of capital goods (BPPBM) in Appendix:4.

Forecast price of unhusked rice harvest. Determination of Projected price of unhusked rice harvest at the farm level is an input variable revenue projections. The data available are data from the secondary BPS began in January 2009 to December 2010 (BPS Sleman in Figures, 2010-2009). Projection is then performed by using an application program QM For Windows version 2.

The value of production per harvest season. The value of production is the result received by farmers from each harvest season with mengkalkulasikan all earnings components. Dikalkulasikan components into a total production value is multiplied by the price of unhusked rice crop productivity multiplied by the breadth of the land and land owned by farmers. Dried Grain prices at the farm level yields are monthly data price Dried Grain Harvest BPS output from January 2009 until December 2010.

Productivity is the ability of a factor of production, such as land area for the fare yield per square meter. Production is determined by many factors, such as fertility, seed varieties planted, adequate use of fertilizers, both in types and doses, the availability of adequate amounts of water, proper planting techniques, use of the means of agricultural production

is adequate, and tersediannya labor. Effect of different values dihasilkan production. Assumed that the land is owned not changed, the level of productivity according to the District Agriculture Office Sleman land produced an average volume of unhusked rice production per square meter according to tile (1 tile = 2.5 mx 2.5 m) was relatively constant at 0.6 pounds per square meter (see table 2.3). Varieties of seeds used was IR 64, the harvest is 3 (three) times in 1 (one) year and no experience crop failure due to pests or weather (Goddess, 2008:135-136).

Projection of production costs. Production costs are incurred to finance capital every permusim harvest agricultural activities. Permudim huge production costs can be planted in the Index of Production Costs and the addition of Capital Goods (BPPBM) which is the secondary of data from BPS (BPS DIY Province in Figures, 2009-2010). Furthermore BPPBM Index on estimates by the application program QM For Windows version 2 in the appendix:2.

Value of crop production permusim further reduced by the total cost of production to generate gross revenues permusi agricultural crops (gross income). Gross income is gross farm income for not reducing the tax burden farmers. (David, 2008:135-136). Once the component input is needed in calculating income are met. From the start of the projected price of unhusked rice farmer level, the value of production, and the production costs of data processing performed by the process:

**WILLINGNESS TO ACCEPT VALUE OF LAND DEVELOPMENT VALUE AS A BASIS FOR
CONSERVATION PROGRAM PADDY FIELDS SEKARSULI SUB
IN VILLAGE DISTRICT BERBAH SLEMAN**

**Table 5
Scenario Calculation Of Income**

| No | Name | Total area | year | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------|------------|------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| | | | 2012 | | | |
| 1 | Priyanto | 400 | Harvest month | 4 | 8 | 12 |
| | | | Price | 3,265 | 3,363 | 3,461 |
| | | | forecast | .36 | .25 | .15 |
| | | | Average harvest-2 Production | 0,6 | 0,6 | 0,6 |
| | | | Cost per-meter | 472 | 482 | 492 |
| | | | Value/harvest | 783,6 | 807,1 | 830,6 |
| | | | | 86 | 80 | 76 |
| | | | Cost | 188,8 | 192,8 | 196,8 |
| | | | | 00 | 00 | 00 |
| | | | Revenue Projections | 594,8 | 614,3 | 633,8 |
| | | | | 86 | 80 | 76 |
| Projection of Income Per-year | 1,843,142 | | | | | |

Table 5, shows one example of a scenario for which data is processed by the calculation of earnings per year of one of the respondents. Calculations starting from 2012, which had three-month harvest season, namely 4 (April), month 8 (August), and month 12 (December). Grain price predictions in dry farm (HGKP) obtained from data BPS monthly price forecast in April, August and December 2012, then the data HGKP on projections by the application program two QM For Windows version Multiplicative Decomposition Method for Forecasting. The same is done for the projected cost of the index BPPBM produk (BPS, and BPS Sleman 2010:72, 2010:56).

Productivity is the average volume of unhusked rice production per square meter according to hectare in Sleman is a data file

The Value of production = Total Area x HGKP x Productivity per-meter ..(3.1)

Cost of value of production = Total area x Production costs(3.2)

Revenue = Value of production - Production costs.....(3.3)

Revenue projections made on the 35 respondents, with a 10-year projection period. Preodi projection starts from 2012 until 2022 .. The concept of income in this study is the income before deducting taxes (gross income) (Hanson, 1999:2 and Chiueh and Chen,2008:229-234).

Analysis of revenue projections.

After the projected income earned during the period of 10 years, the next step is to estimate the value of land use conversion process NPV method / capitalization to present value. . Value of land is the period of a stream of income for 10 years plus 1 year the horizon value (Hanson, 1999:2-3 and Fiechtiger and Salhofer, 2011: 1-3). Flow projections made to the opinion of 35 respondents. Rate discount factor follows the formula (Jefferies, 2009:20) are: $k = (1 + R) (1 + i) - 1$. Where R = the average interest rate on bank deposits by conventional bank group that is equal to 0.12 or 12 percent. While i is a symbol of the average inflation rate last year from January 2011 until January 2012 that is equal to six percent (www.tribunnews.com, 2011:1). Thus the discount rate is equal to 0.18 or 18 percent per year. Notation estimate land value by the method of revenue stream (I) can be expressed as follows discounted.

$$\text{Value of Land uses } 2012 = \frac{Et_{2012}}{(1+0,18)^1} + \frac{Et_{2013}}{(1+0,18)^2} + \dots + \frac{Et_{2022}}{(1+0,18)^n} \dots\dots\dots(2.1)$$

Another element that must be met is the projection of revenues after the 10th year, this projection is used to estimate the land value after year 10 to infinity (horizon value). On the estimation of these data required is the average rate of income growth per

**WILLINGNESS TO ACCEPT VALUE OF LAND DEVELOPMENT VALUE AS A BASIS FOR
CONSERVATION PROGRAM PADDY FIELDS SEKARSULI SUB
IN VILLAGE DISTRICT BERBAH SLEMAN**

season for 1 year (g) to determine the amount of revenue in the year-11. The average rate of income growth per season for 10 years from 35 respondents gained 0.03, or 3 percent, and assumed to be constant forever. Formula to estimate the income year is the 11th year of income during the 10 plus 3 percent divided by 18 percent - 3 percent of the result is discounted by 18 percent or divided $(1 + .18)$. If the notation is declared with:

$$\text{Horizon value (n=\&) = } Et2022 / (0,18 - 0,03) \dots\dots\dots (2.2)$$

The above process carried out in 35 respondents to note the estimated value of land (Agriculture Use Value) of each respondent.

The value of land development rights

Here is a recapitulation of the portion of the value of land use and land development rights value of the estimated optimal value of the land.

**Table 6
Recapitulation of the Land
Development Value Calculation and
Land Use Value**

| No | Name | Average of Land Use Value (%) | Average VDR | Land uses value optimal |
|----|-------------|-------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|
| 1 | Pujasukarto | 62 | 38 | 100 |
| 2 | Yusmano | 92 | 8 | 100 |

Here we can see that the land value of the 35 respondents to the optimal proportion of land value relative safety of the construction of the expansion of urban disorder. In contrast the low proportion of the value of land development rights to the optimal value of the land in that area suggests that people's expectations of the rice land is not so low. Rice fields with land development rights value is low, would require compensation fund smaller when compared with that of rice cultivation land development rights value is higher. However, the response

to the offer of land owners need to know the value of conservation programs directly to verify whether the theoretical calculation of the value of the program in line with expectations and perceptions of landowners.

Kesediaan menerima nilai program konservasi

Of the 35 respondents found the respondent to agree and accept the value of land development rights as a basis the value of rice land conservation program by 24 respondents, was that as many as 11 respondents disagreed.

Logit regression analysis is used to identify the model of the logit regression responden. Model used to identify factors that influence and how likely respondents to receive (1) or reject the offer of the program (0). Once the response data obtained by the landowner acceptability on the second survey, completed the data characteristics of the land and the personal characteristics of respondents obtained during the first survey, the data is then estimated by the regression equation as follows.

$\ln [P_i / (1-P_i)] = \alpha + \beta_1 \text{Luas} + \beta_2 \text{Jarak} + \beta_3 \text{Usia} + \beta_4 \text{Pendidikan} + \beta_5 \text{Garapan} + \epsilon$ Given the estimated logit model using the method of MLE (Maximum Likelihood Estimation) that do not require the assumption of normality, linearity in the variables penjelasnya methods like OLS (Ordinary Least Square), the estimation results of the above model can be analyzed directly. The following table summarizes the estimates of the program Eviews:

**WILLINGNESS TO ACCEPT VALUE OF LAND DEVELOPMENT VALUE AS A BASIS FOR
CONSERVATION PROGRAM PADDY FIELDS SEKARSULI SUB
IN VILLAGE DISTRICT BERBAH SLEMAN**

Table 7
Hasil Regresi Model Kesiediaan
Menerima Nilai Program Konservasi

| Variable | Coefficient | Std. Error | Z-Statistic | Prob |
|--------------------|-------------|------------|-------------|--------|
| C | -6.7825 | 3.6908 | -1.8376 | 0.0661 |
| LUAS | 0.0032 | 0.0013 | 2.5032 | 0.0123 |
| JARAK | 0.001 | 0.0004 | 2.092 | 0.0364 |
| USIA | 0.0157 | 0.0479 | 0.328 | 0.742 |
| PENDIDIKAN | -0.219 | 0.212 | -1.034 | 0.3009 |
| GARAPAN | 2.634 | 1.574 | 1.6731 | 0.094 |
| McFadden R-square | 0.395 | | | |
| LR statistic | 17.224 | | | |
| Prob(LR statistic) | 0.004 | | | |

Here is a representation of the model of willingness to accept the offer of land development rights as a basis the value of rice land conservation program in the Village District Sekarsuli Berbah Sleman district.

$$\ln [P_i / (1 - P_i)] = -6.782507 + 0.003282Luas - 0.001043Jarak + 0.015738Usia - 0.219704 pendidikan + 2.6342 garapan$$

Analysis and interpretation.

Analysis phase involves testing the significance of independent variables on the dependent variable and test Goodness Of Fit model.

Tests of significance. Of the five independent variables, including constants, variables that have a significant effect on the Log Odds Ratio at level $\alpha = 0.05$ is the (area) of land with a value of 2.50 Z statistic with p value of 0.012. The second variable that significantly affect the value of Z is the distance statistic of 2.09 at $\alpha = 0.05$ level.

Thus of the five independent variables, the variables that affect the Log Odds Ratio willingness to accept the offer value of the conservation program, only two variables, namely land area and distance. However, overall all the variables simultaneously have an

influence on the dependent variable is evident from the LR value of 17.224 with a probability of 0.0041 is significant both at the level $\alpha = 0.01$.

Goodness of fit test. Goodness Of Fit Test covers include Hosmer Lemeshow test (HL) and Mc Fadden R2. HL test measures the difference between the estimated (fitted) with the actual value, the model said to be good when the difference between the estimated value with the actual value is small. Given the value of each variable consists of continuous variables, discrete and dichotomous grouping basis then the procedure is Randomize Ties HL test. The test results are summarized in the following table:

Table 8
Hasil Uji HL Randomize Ties

| | Quantile of Risk | | | Dep=0 | | Dep=1 | Total | H-L |
|-------------------|------------------|-------|--------|----------|------------------|----------|-------|-------|
| | Low | High | Actual | Expected | Actual | Expected | | |
| 1 | 0.054 | 0.111 | 3 | 2.762 | 0 | 0.237 | 3 | 0.257 |
| 2 | 0.226 | 0.326 | 3 | 2.958 | 1 | 1.041 | 4 | 0.002 |
| 3 | 0.348 | 0.517 | 2 | 1.631 | 1 | 1.368 | 3 | 0.182 |
| 4 | 0.526 | 0.606 | 0 | 1.7104 | 4 | 2.289 | 4 | 2.988 |
| 5 | 0.716 | 0.754 | 1 | 0.779 | 2 | 2.22 | 3 | 0.084 |
| 6 | 0.783 | 0.875 | 1 | 0.636 | 3 | 3.363 | 4 | 0.247 |
| 7 | 0.876 | 0.896 | 1 | 0.348 | 2 | 2.651 | 3 | 1.379 |
| 8 | 0.943 | 0.979 | 0 | 0.131 | 4 | 3.868 | 4 | 0.135 |
| 9 | 0.981 | 0.995 | 0 | 0.032 | 3 | 2.967 | 3 | 0.032 |
| 10 | 0.981 | 0.999 | 0 | 0.008 | 4 | 3.991 | 4 | 0.008 |
| | | Total | 11 | 11.000 | 24 | 24.000 | 35 | 5.318 |
| H-L Statistic | | | 5,318 | | Porb.Chi-Sq (8) | | 0.723 | |
| Andrews Statistic | | | 19,771 | | Porb.Chi-Sq (10) | | 0.031 | |

1. Based on the above table obtained statistical value of 5.3187 HL Chi Square value of 0.723. Since the chi square value greater than 0.05 and even 0.10 can mean there is no significant difference between

**WILLINGNESS TO ACCEPT VALUE OF LAND DEVELOPMENT VALUE AS A BASIS FOR
CONSERVATION PROGRAM PADDY FIELDS SEKARSULI SUB
IN VILLAGE DISTRICT BERBAH SLEMAN**

the estimated value (Fitted) with the actual value.

2. Rate of 0.395 Mc Fadden R2 can be interpreted as variations in the value of the dependent variable can be explained by the independent variable of 39.5 percent. Test based on HL and Mc Fadden R2 can be inferred probability estimation model landowners accept the conservation program is pretty good (good).

Interpretation of the coefficient signs.

Widely variable coefficient of 0.003 can be interpreted any change in the extent of land one meter wider than the respondent's breadth of causing the value of logg odds ratio changed (direction) of 0.003. Great opportunity to receive the value of a conservation program respondents than other respondents are more narrow land of $e^{0,003} = 1.003$ times larger. In general it can also be concluded that the respondents who have more land area, the greater the opportunity to receive the value of land development rights if used as a base value of the conservation program. Distance variable coefficients of 0.001 to mean any reduction in the portion of farm income to total income by 1 percent will lead to increased value of the log odds ratio of 0.001 or each additional 1 percent probability range of respondents accept the offer of the conservation program $e^{0,001} = 1.001$ times larger from the farthest distance. Literal meaning is a landowner who has a close proximity to roads or easy access public tend not to accept the offer of the conservation program. Conversely the greater the distance of land with public access to the greater chance of receiving an offer value of the conservation program.

Conclusion

Conclusions can be drawn from the study's willingness to receive the value of rice land conservation program by the owners of agricultural land in the Village District Sekarsuli Berbah Sleman district is.

1. Based on the estimated present value of projected revenue stream per year for ten years on a sample of paddy fields in the village Sekarsuli found the concept of value to the land (Agriculture Use Value). Based on estimates obtained by the average land value by 55 (fifty five) per cent of the estimated optimal value of the land. The amount of expected value of the land use is not agricultural (Non-Agriculture Use) is an average of 45 (forty five) per cent, hereinafter referred to as the value of land development rights (Value Development Right).
2. Respondents agreed with the rice fields of conservation programs offered are as many as 24 people. 11 (eleven) respondents disagreed with the programs offered from the 35 (thirty five). However, all respondents did not approve the amount of compensation offered.
3. Land area and distance to public facilities is a factor that affects the landowner's decision to accept or reject the offered programs. Because the respondents think the area is the portion of farm income earned compensation greater acceptance of the value of development land. The distance effect on the threat from the expansion of urban development, because the closer to the roads program in danger and the further conservation of land within the conservation program can survive.

**WILLINGNESS TO ACCEPT VALUE OF LAND DEVELOPMENT VALUE AS A BASIS FOR
CONSERVATION PROGRAM PADDY FIELDS SEKARSULI SUB
IN VILLAGE DISTRICT BERBAH SLEMAN**

REFERENSI

- Abdurachman, Adimihardja. 2010. "Siapakah Kita Menghadapi Eskalasi Tantangan Konservasi Lahan Pertanian Di Indonesia" *Jurnal Litbang Pertanian*, hal:78.
- Agus, Fahmuddin dan Irawan. 2006, "Agricultural Land Conversion As A Thread To Food Secirity And Environmental Quality", *Jurnal Litbang Pertanian*, 25(3) *Indonesian Soil Research Institute*.hal: 312-313.
- Aizaki, Hideo., Sato, Kazuo and Osari, Hiroshi. 2006, "Contingent Valuation Approach In Measuring The Multifunctionality Of Agriculture and Rural Areas In Japan" *Paddy Water Environ* 4: 217-222.
- Azwar, M.A, Saifuddin.1997,"*Metode Penelitian*", Pustaka Pelajar.
- Ashshofa, S.H.Burhan.1996,"*Metode Penelitian Hukum*",Rineka Cipta.
- BPS Sleman 2009,"Sleman Dalam Angka 2009".
- BPS Sleman 2009," PDRB Menurut Lapangan Usaha Kab. Sleman.
- BPS Sleman 2010,"PDRB Menurut Lapangan Usaha Kab. Sleman.
- BPS Sleman 2010,"Sleman Dalam Angka 2010".
- BPS D.I. Yogyakarta 2010, "D.I. Yogyakarta Dalam Angka 2010".
- BPS D.I.Yogyakarta 2010, "D.I. Yogyakarta Dalam Angka 2010"
- Chang, Hung-Hoa and Boisvert, N. Richard. 2009," Distinguishing between Whole-Farm vs.Partial-Farm Participation in the Conservation Reserve Program " *Land Economics*. 85 (1).
- Chiueh, Ya Wen and Chen, Ming Chien. 2008, "Environmental Multifunctionality Of Paddy Fields In Taiwan An Application Of Contingent Valuation Method " *Paddy Water Environ* 6, hal: 229-236.
- Dewi, N.P.M.2008,"Pengaruh Alih Fungsi Lahan Sawah Terhadap Produksi Tananaman Pangan di Kabupaten Bandung", *Bulentin Studi Ekonomi Volume 13 nomor 2*, hal:135-136.
- Fadli, Nur.2006,"Konversi Lahan Pertanian Di Lahan Kering Desa Gedangan Kecamatan Gedangan Kabupaten Malang" *Department Of Agribisnis*, hal:1.
http://student-research.umm.ac.id/index.php/dept_of_agribisnis/article/view/2289.
- Feichtinger, P., and Salhofer, K. 2011, "The Valuation of Agricultural Land and the Influence of Government Payments" *Factor Markets Working Papert, No.10*. Hal: 1-3.
- Harahap, Poltak.2011,"Modul Lab XI Analisis Kualitatif dengan Regresi Logit", Tutorial Ekonometri UGM, hal:1.
- Hanson, Steven D.1999,"A Simple Framework For Determining The Funadamental Agricultural-Use Value Of Michigan Farmland" Departement Of Agricultural Economics Michigan State University. Hal: 2-5.
- Hidayati, Wahyu dan Hardjanto, Budi. 2003,"*Konsep Dasar Penilaian Properti*", BPFU Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta.
- Hailu, Yohannes.G and Brown, Cheryl.2007,"Regional Growth Impacts On Agricultural Development: A Spatial For Three States"*Agricultural And Resource Economic Review*.
- Irawan, B., 2005, "Konversi Lahan Sawah: Potensi Dampak, Pola Pemanfaatannya, Dan Faktor Determinan" Forum Penelitian Agro Ekonomi. Vol.23 No.1, hal:2 -4.
- Irawan, Bambang, dan Friyatno, Supena. 2005, "Dampak Konversi

**WILLINGNESS TO ACCEPT VALUE OF LAND DEVELOPMENT VALUE AS A BASIS FOR
CONSERVATION PROGRAM PADDY FIELDS SEKARSULI SUB
IN VILLAGE DISTRICT BERBAH SLEMAN**

- Lahan Sawah di Jawa Terhadap Produksi Beras dan Kebijakan Pengendaliannya” Pusat Penelitian dan Pengembangan Sosial Ekonomi Pertanian. Balitbang Deptan RI, hal: 2-4.
- Jefferies, Rodney L. 2009, "A Brief History And Development Of Real Value Valuation Models The For Decades" Farm Management And Property Department, Commerce Division Lincoln University New Zealand. Hal: 20.
- Kuncoro, M., 2009, "Metode Riset untuk Bisnis dan Ekonomi", Erlangga Edisi 3.
- Lichtenberg, Erik. 2007, "Public Access to U.S. Conservation Land Trust Properties" American Agricultural Economics Association.
- Licberknecht, Katherine. 2009, "Tenants, Landlords, and Soil Conservation" *Journal of the America Planning Association*.
- Lynch, Lori. 2009, "Land Preservation Programs Achieve High Levels of Efficiency", *Agricultur and Applied Economics Association*.
- Maulana, Achmad. 2003, "Kamus Ilmiah Populer", Absolut.
- Manski, F.C. 2005, "Random Utility Models with Bounded Ambiguity", *Departement of Economics and Institute for Policy Research*, Northwestern University.
- Nougroho, Dwi. 2010, "Analisis Kesiediaan Menerima Nilai Hak Pengembangan Lahan Sebagai Dasar Nilai Program Konservasi Lahan Persawahan Di Kecamatan Moyudan Kabupaten Sleman," *Tesis S-2*, hal:8-34.
- Plantinga, Andrew J and Miller, Douglas J. 2001, "Agricultural Land Values And The Value Of Right To Future Land Development" *Land Economics*. 77(1).
- Pasandaran, Effendi. 2005, "Reformasi Irigasi dalam Kerangka Pengelolaan Terpadu Sumber Daya Air", *Pusat Analisis Sosial Ekonomi dan Kebijakan Pertanian. Volume 3 No.3*. Hal: 217-235.
- Plimmer, Frances and Sarah Sayce. 2006, "Depreciated Replacement Cost-Consistent Methodology?", *Journal Valuation Methods*, TS 86, Munich, Germany. Hal: 1.
- Posthumus, H., Gardebroek C., and Ruben, Rued. 2010, "From Participation to Adoptin: Comparing the Effectiveness of Soil Conservation Programs in the Peruvia Andes" *Land Economics*, 86 (4). hal: 645-667.
- Sugiyanto, C. and N., Dwi. 2011, "Land Conversion And Farmers Preference", *This paper was presented at the RCE Conference in UGM, February 2011*. Hal: 5.
- Siswomartono, H., dan Habibie, A. 2011, "Kebijakan Alokasi Penggunaan Sumber Daya Lahan Secara Berkeadilan Dalam Reformasi Pembangunan Pertanian", *Litbang Deptan RI*, hal: 7.
- Widarjono, Agus. 2005, "Ekonometrik Teori dan Terapan Aplikasi", Ekonisia, Edisi kedua. Hal: 218.
- Widjanarko, B.S., Pakpahan, M., Rahardjono, B., dan Suweken, P. 2006, "Aspek Pertanahan Dalam Pengendalian Alih Fungsi Lahan Pertanian (Sawah)", *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Multifungsi Lahan Sawah*. Hal:21-23.
- Wu, J., and Lin, Haixia. 2010, "The Effect Of the Conservation Reserve Program on Land Values", *Land Economics*.
- Yusran, Aulia. 2006, "Kajian Perubahan Tata Guna Lahan Pada Pusat Kota Cilegon", *Tesis*, UNDIP. Hal: 4-5