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Abstract. Agrotourism is a product in which its development needs to be accelerated because mostly located in rural areas, therefore, positive impacts are expected to emerge for the growth and development of rural economy. This research was aimed to know the market position and to formulate the community-based Salak Agrotourism development strategy in Yogyakarta Province. A descriptive qualitative method was used as the research method by implementing Boston Consulting Group (BCG) as the analysis instrument. It measured the rate of market growth and relative market share of the community-based ‘Salak’ Agrotourism toward non-community-based ‘Salak’ agrotourism in Yogyakarta Province. According to the results of BCG analysis, the market position of community-based ‘Salak’ Agrotourism in 2014 was in Question Mark position and in 2015 was in the Star position. Furthermore, in 2016 and 2017, the market position of community-based ‘Salak’ Agrotourism was in Cash Cow position. The Agrotourism development strategy that can be conducted is the concentric diversification strategy by developing and focusing on the Unique Selling Proposition (USP) in each agrotourism.

1. Introduction
Tourism is an industry that is widely developed by developed countries and developing countries to increase state revenue in the form of currency exchange. There are some reasons why the tourism industry is widely developed by many countries. They are: 1) traveling has become the human basic needs, 2) tourism is considered as a low-waste industry and relatively clean compared to other industries, 3) a tourism gives a positive impact for the expansion of employment opportunities in business so that it can increase the community income, 4) tourism is a place for socio-cultural interaction, both national level and international level [1]. The tourism development also contributes to the local economy development, creates tourism entrepreneurial activity and generates tourism employment among the local communities’ in increasing the household income [2].

One of the tourism sectors in Indonesia that has a potency to be developed is agritourism. Agritourism is a business that develops agriculture as the destination for educational activity and recreational activity [3]. As regards agritourism, it offers an opportunity to experience the rural lifestyle, to be in close contact with nature and directly to be involved in agricultural activities such as animal feeding, pick-your-own, participation in manufacturing process [4]. Zarenthung et al. (2009) emphasized that agritourism gives an opportunity to the tourists to be involved in a recreational activity in the rural area to extend their knowledge, to get a recreational experience, and a business relationship in the agricultural sector [5]. Past studies have shown that agritourism was an efficient economic driver against rural underdevelopment and depopulation which was used as an important element of regional development strategy [6] [7] [8].
In practice, the development of agrotourism cannot be separated from the community around the agrotourism area. Local communities play a major role in the success of an agrotourism. An effort to involve the community in developing agrotourism, there was an idea to develop tourism that pro-community, known as Community-Based Tourism (CBT). Community-Based Tourism (CBT) can be identified as a community development strategy through self-reliance, empowerment, sustainability, and conservation, and cultural development to improve livelihoods in the community [7]. Society occupies a position as an integral part that participates, both subject and object. Community participation is the main instrument because it provides the potential for the development of tourism businesses, especially in developing agrotourism.

Salak fruit, especially Salak Pondoh is a tropical fruit which commonly grows in the northern area of Yogyakarta Province, namely Sleman Regency. Supported by the availability of land and the potentials of demographic advantage, Salak Pondoh has become the favorite in national scale and some have been exported abroad. This condition is surely providing financial income as well as characterized the region as the typical salak producer in Indonesia. Even though, salak pondoh is experiencing a fluctuation of selling which caused by numerous quantity of salak developed in the other regions. One of the marketing strategies of salak commodity that able to improve the sale value of salak pondoh is by developing a salak Agrotourism. Salak Agrotourism which located in Yogyakarta Province is managed by the community and individuals as well. In its development, community-based salak Agrotourism has experienced a fluctuation because it has to compete with another tourism object. In that order, the development strategy of community-based salak Agrotourism for it to be sustainable is required. One of the successful keys of strategy formulation is on the determination of market and competition between the existing rivalry [10] [11]. In order to compete in a market, community-based Salak Agrotourism has to maintain and improve the controlled market share by knowing its position in the industry. The aim of this research was to formulate the community-based Salak Agrotourism development strategy in Yogyakarta Province by seeing the position of the business market. When we know the market position of a business, we will find out how competitive the business is with similar businesses.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Community-Based Tourism (CBT)

In the development of tourism especially for agrotourism, it cannot be separated from the role and the participation of the local community. Murphy (1983) is the pioneer who specifically brings the topic about the relevancy between the tourism industry and the community around the tourism destination [12]. According to Murphy, community (society) has a function as resources that can be sold as a product (tourism). In the development process of the tourism industry, it can influence each person in the community. In addition, a community is a comprehensive part and it should be an orientation in the development of a tourism product. Each tourism development should be connected to the local community needs.

Mill and Marrison (1985) reinforced Murphy’s opinion about the role of local community related to the component of tourism destination that consists of tourism attraction and tourism services [13]. The community becomes the attraction support and the executor of services in the tourism destination. As a part of tourism destination, the community will interact with the tourists in providing services or as a part of tourism attraction.

The management using community-based Management is “a strategy to achieve the development that focuses on the human, where the decision-making on the use of resources sustainably in an area is at the organizations in the community of the area” [14]. This kind of management is done to provide an opportunity for the local community in managing and taking responsibility for the available resources, starting from planning to the utilization of the products on behalf of the local community welfare.

The long-term success of the tourism industry depends on the acceptance level and the support from the local community [15]. Therefore, to ensure if the tourism development in a certain place can be well managed and sustainable, the essential thing is that facilitating the local community involvement in the development process and maximizing the socio-economic value of tourism activity.
2.2. The Market Position

In order to discover the market position of community-based Salak Agrotourism, Boston Consulting Group (BCG) was used. The Boston Consulting Group (BCG) is a management consultant company which develop and popularize an approach known as a growth-share matrix that can be seen in Figure 1. The location of each business shows the rate of market growth and relative market share [16].

![The BCG Growth-Share Matrix][1]

The rate of market growth is positioned as the vertical axis in market growth matrix which used as the only indicator of industrial attractiveness that reflects the size of available business opportunities [17]. For that requirement, the rate of market growth was measured through historical data by inspecting the level of the previous industrial sales. In order to eliminate the impact of inflation and the increasing price of goods, the measurement unit of sold goods has to be used, not the received number in rupiah. The measurement of market share is measured through the fluctuation of relative market conceived by the company. Relative market share is the comparison between the sales volume controlled by a certain company and the sales volume controlled by the main rival. Therefore, the amount of relative market share is manifested in absolute numbers, not in percentages. The values can be higher than one or lower than one. Thus, the meaning of relative market share is different from market share. Market share is leading to the part of the entire markets which controlled by a certain company. Due to that matter, the rate of market share is generally measured through percentage.

If the rate of relative market share is higher than one, it means that the volume of company sales is higher than the volume of the main competitor volume sale, therefore, the company is valued as having superiority/advantages, regardless the rate of market share conceived, so thus the opposite. If the relative market share which controlled by a certain company is lower than one, the company is determined as the weaker company compared to the competitor, regardless how big the controlled market share.

The matrix of market share growth is divided into four boxes, each of them shows a different type of business [16] [18]:

a. Question Mark type is the business type which moves in the markets that have high growth but have low relative market share. This Question Mark type requires an amount of cash because the company still has to add more factories, equipment, and staffs to adjust itself with the market which has high growth because that company wants to take over the market lead.

b. Star type is the type of business which works as a market leader in a high growth market. Star type provides a massive amount of cash to be used in a company. The company has to activate its amount of money to maintain itself in the condition of growth market rate and overcome the attack from its competitors.

c. Cash cow type is a business which positioned on the market growth rate that decreased under 10 percent annually, the business which at first is Stars has turned into cash cow but has the biggest relative market share. Called as a cash cow because it produces a massive amount of cash for the company. The company does not require an expansion because the market growth rate is low.

d. Pet type is the type of business that has a weak market share in the lowest market growth. This type is usually producing low profit or loss, although given with big amount of cash. A weaker company is frequently spending more managerial time and better be closed.

The method used in this research was a qualitative research method which aimed to describe characteristics of a condition during the research is conducted as well as to inspect the causes from a certain symptom occurs in the research location.
The sampling method of business was conducted through purposive samplings, such as the sampling techniques which determined purposively based on the certain criteria or considerations. The sample that being taken was community-based Salak Agrotourism (tourist village which runs Salak farm), namely Pulesari Tourist village, Kelor Tourist Village, Pancoh Tourist Village, Tunggularum Tourist Village, Gabugan Tourist Village, and Ledok Nongko Tourist Village, as well as non-community-based Salak Agrotourism, namely Salak Agrotourism of Bangunkerto Turi and Kembangarum Tourist Village. The data used were secondary data of the visitor numbers of community-based Salak Agrotourism and non-community-based Salak Agrotourism from 2013 to 2017.

In this research, the rate of market growth was measured through recent available historical data of annual visitor of community-based Agrotourism from 2013 to 2017. Relative market share was the comparison between the annual average number of community-based Salak Agrotourism and the annual average number of non-community-based Salak Agrotourism.

3. Results and Discussion
Community-based Salak Agribusiness in Sleman Regency has experienced fluctuation in business development. There is a lot of Agrotourism which closes their businesses. This condition is caused by the competition that has to be faced by that Agrotourism with the other tourism objects that offer more interesting attractions, especially with the tourism objects that also manage Salak Agrotourism. The annual average numbers of the visitor of community-based Salak Agrotourism can be seen in Table 1.

| No. | Tourist Villages | Classes  | 2013  | 2014  | 2015  | 2016  | 2017  |
|-----|------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 1   | Ledoknongko      | Growth   | 1,870 | 2,511 | 3,493 | 2,166 | 1,278 |
| 2   | Gabugan          | Growth   | 745   | 2,255 | 1,084 | 853   | 1,628 |
| 3   | Tunggularum      | Developing | 1,275 | 5,073 | 4,365 | 5,160 | 3,975 |
| 4   | Pancoh           | Developing | 105  | 472   | 829   | 3,000 | 7,360 |
| 5   | Pulesari         | Independent | 6,035 | 23,833 | 56,665 | 52,994 | 63,974 |
| 6   | Kelor            | Independent | 11,239 | 7,890 | 8,822 | 13,519 | 18,627 |
| Total Visitor                  |          | 21,269 | 42,034 | 75,258 | 77,692 | 96,842 |
| Annual Average Visitor               |          | 3,545 | 7,006 | 12,543 | 12,949 | 16,140 |

Community-based Salak Agrotourism in Sleman Regency has to compete with non-community-based Salak Agrotourism, namely Kembangarum Tourist Village and Bangunkerto Turi Salak Agrotourism. Both tourism objects are managed by the private sector or by the individual. The annual average numbers of the visitor of non-community-based Salak Agrotourism can be seen in Table 2.

| No. | Tourism Objects          | Visitor Number (People) |
|-----|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1   | Kembang Arum Tourist Village | 21,146, 21,914, 22,122, 24,016, 22,068 |
| 2   | Bangunkerto Turi Salak Agrotourism | 1.395, 1.557, 1.431, 1.451, 1.586 |
| Total Visitor                  | 22,541, 23,471, 23,553, 25,467, 23,654 |
| Annual Average Visitor               | 11,271, 11,736, 11,777, 12,734, 11,827 |

Comprehensively, the number of visitor of community-based Salak Agrotourism has experienced increases from year to year, while the number of the visitor of non-community-based Salak Agrotourism has experienced decreases. This condition has influenced the position of the business market. The results of BCGi analysis which based on the relative market share of community-based Salak Agrotourism and the rate of market growth can be seen in Table 3.
Table 3. BCG Analysis of Community-Based Salak Agrotourism

| Years | Salak Agrotourism | CBT Salak Agrotourism | Non-CBT Salak Agrotourism | Relative Market Share | Market Growth Rate (%) |
|-------|-------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| 2013  | 14,815            | 3,545                 | 11,271                    | 0.31                  | 26.50                  |
| 2014  | 18,741            | 7,006                 | 11,736                    | 0.60                  | 29.77                  |
| 2015  | 24,320            | 12,543                | 11,777                    | 1.07                  | 5.60                   |
| 2016  | 25,682            | 12,949                | 12,734                    | 1.02                  | 8.90                   |
| 2017  | 27,967            | 16,140                | 11,827                    | 1.36                  |                        |

The position of community-based Salak Agrotourism based on BCG analysis can be seen in Figure 2. According to the results of Boston Consulting Group (BCG) analysis presented in Table 3, the market position of community-based Salak Agrotourism in 2014 was in the Question Mark position in which the relative market share of community-based Agrotourism at that time was low with a high rate of business market growth. In 2015, community-based salak Agrotourism was in Star position in which the relative market share of community-based Agrotourism was starting to increase on the high rate of business market growth. Furthermore, in 2016 and 2017, the position of community-based salak Agrotourism was on the Cash Cow position. This condition shows that the market share of community-based salak Agrotourism in 2015 was starting to improve compared to the main competitor, namely non-community-based Salak Agrotourism (Kembangarum Tourist Village and Bangunkerto Turi Salak Agrotourism) which on a low rate of business growth. The average growth of the annual visitor number of non-community-based salak Agrotourism from 2015 to 2017 has experienced a slow development because it lost the competition with community-based Agrotourism.

One of the reasons of the slow growth of average visitor number on non-community-based salak Agrotourism is the low community participation in managing agrotourism. Tourism in Kembangarum Village is managed by individuals and the price of tour packages is offered higher than the price of community-based salak Agrotourism, so the visitors preferring community-based salak agrowisata which provides cheap tour packages. While Bangunkerto Turi Salak Agrotourism, business management is carried out by a group of people who have poor managerial skills.

Since 2015, The community-based salak Agrotourism is starting to improve its business due to the guidance and support from Tourism Department of Sleman Regency as well as the surrounding community, therefore, until the present, it categorized on Cash Cow position. According to David (2009), the business which categorized in Cash Cow position has to be managed to maintain its strong...
position as long as possible [19]. One of the development strategies that can be conducted is a product development strategy or concentric diversification (focused) by focusing on a developing Unique Selling Proposition (USP) on each tourist village in the form of unique product or slogan which differs it to the competitor's products. Natural resources, cultural heritage, and special events are significantly and positively correlated to tourism destination competitiveness from tourists’ perspective [20]. The special events as one of the key determinants to enhance tourism destination’s appeal [21], and to motivate tourists in making choice of tourism destinations [22]. Events provide the opportunities for tourists to experience the uniqueness of the local cultural and heritage besides the joyfulness [23]. This is further supported by Kim and Damhorst (2010) that one of the objectives in organising events is to provide the opportunities for tourists to experience the local culture [24].

Unique Selling Proposition (USP) which developed by Rosser Reeves from the Ted Bates Agent is inviting the promoter/advertiser, namely producer to “create claim/slogan of the advantages based on the unique characteristics that provide particular benefits and meaningful for the consumer” [25]. According to previous researcher, a tourism slogan as the key component of a marketing campaign is depending on its capability to create awareness, intention, and willingness to maintain impression and memory [26]. In addition, Unique Selling Proposition is always “prioritizing performances and features of the product” [27].

The Unique Selling Proposition is usually illustrating and distinguishing the brands with their competitors [28]. Unique Selling Proposition as the central concept that has a significant impact on advertisement philosophy. The concept of unique selling proposition in the advertisement is only emphasizing that the message from the company is providing typical quality of a brand from its competitors in aims to ensure and persuade the consumers to be a regular customer. Implementing Unique Selling Proposition will improve the company position and marketing by conducting three things, namely Unique: create a different product with the other competitors, selling: persuade the consumer to purchase the offered product, exchanging money for product or service, Proposition: offer or recommendation which suggested to be accepted.

In principle, the Unique Selling Proposition is a creative strategy which highly important to be performed on the current marketing strategy. Unique Selling Proposition is orientating on the advantages or superiorities of a product which do not own by competitor product, and those advantages which made as differentiation of a product. According to previous researcher, USP has to fulfill these certain criteria: worthy for visitor (not only different, but has to be valuable for the visitor), rare compared to the other tourist destinations at present, and has potential, imperfectly imitable, there are no strategic replacements which equal to the asset or skill [29].

4. Conclusion

The results of this research are the market position of community-based salak Agrotourism from 2014 to 2017. By knowing the market position of a business, thus, the business owner will be able to determine the strategy that can be conducted to compete with similar businesses. The market position of community-based salak Agrotourism has experienced increases from 2014 to 2017 which is 2014 was in Question Mark position and in 2015 was in Star Position. Moreover, in 2016 and 2017, the position of community-based salak Agrotourism was in Cash Cow position. The development strategy that can be performed on community-based Agrotourism is concentric diversification strategy by focusing and developing Unique Selling Proposition (USP) on each tourist village in the form of unique product or slogan which differs it to the competitor’s products.
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