International Journal of Green Tourism Research and Applications DOI: 10.31940/ijogtra.v7i1.49-59
Volume 7 Issue 1 Year 2025 Pages 49-59 URL: http://ojs.pnb.ac.id/index.php/IJOGTRA

An Analytical Approach to Visitor Carrying Capacity and Conservation: The Pindul Cave of Yogyakarta

***Aisyah Astinadia Siregar*[1*]**

[1]*Management Study Program, Putra Bangsa University, Indonesia*

*Corresponding Author: *aisyah_siregar@feb.universitasputrabangsa.ac.id*

Abstract: Tourism in natural attractions, such as Pindul Cave in Indonesia, offers significant economic and recreational benefits while posing challenges to environmental sustainability and visitor experience. The increasing influx of tourists to ecotourism destinations like Pindul Cave raises concerns over environmental degradation, overcrowding, and declining visitor satisfaction. This study aims to assess the sustainable tourism carrying capacity of Pindul Cave by analyzing visitor capacity concerning environmental conservation and tourist comfort. Employing a mixed-methods research design, the study integrates quantitative survey data with qualitative insights from interviews and field observations. Respondents include domestic and international tourists, local community members, and key tourism stakeholders involved in site management. Data collection focuses on visitor behavior, perceived environmental impact, and current tourism management practices. Using established carrying capacity models, the analysis identifies the maximum number of visitors the site can accommodate without compromising environmental integrity or the quality of the tourist experience. Findings indicate that Pindul Cave is nearing its sustainable carrying capacity threshold. If unmanaged, continued growth in visitation may lead to negative ecological impacts and diminished tourist satisfaction. The study underscores the urgent need for regulatory strategies to manage visitor flow and promote sustainable tourism practices. It offers practical recommendations for local authorities, tourism managers, and policymakers to balance conservation goals with economic development through responsible ecotourism planning.

Keywords: carrying capacity, ecotourism, environmental conservation, sustainable tourism, visitor management.

Article History: Submitted 4 May 2025 | Revised 12 May 2025 | Accepted 13 June 2025

How to Cite: Siregar, A. A. (2025). An Analytical Approach to Visitor Carrying Capacity and Conservation: The Pindul Cave of Yogyakarta. *International Journal of Green Tourism Research and Applications*, *7*(1), 49–59. https://doi.org/10.31940/ijogtra.v7i1.49-59

Introduction

In recent decades, nature-based tourism has played an increasingly significant role in driving economic growth, particularly in developing countries where natural attractions serve as both ecological assets and sources of local livelihood. Ecotourism destinations such as caves, rivers, national parks, and coastal areas offer immersive experiences that connect visitors with nature while stimulating socio-economic development at the grassroots level. One of Indonesia's most iconic cave tourism destinations is Pindul Cave in Gunungkidul, Yogyakarta. Popularized for its unique cave tubing activity, floating along a subterranean river in inner tubes, Pindul Cave has experienced exponential growth in tourist arrivals over the past decade. This surge in visitation, while economically beneficial, has led to growing concerns regarding the site's environmental integrity and long-term sustainability. Local environmental agencies and tourism associations have reported increasing signs of ecological stress, including damage to karst formations, sedimentation, overuse of groundwater,

accumulation of non-biodegradable waste, and decreased aesthetic value due to congestion. These problems are compounded by a lack of a structured visitor management strategy incorporating environmental thresholds and local community participation.

The phenomenon of over-tourism at Pindul Cave highlights the pressing need to assess and manage the destination's carrying capacity. Carrying capacity refers to the maximum number of individuals who can visit a site without causing environmental degradation, reduced visitor satisfaction, or social disruption (Coccossis & Mexa, 2004; Saveriades, 2000). Several types of carrying capacity have been theorized in tourism studies, including physical, ecological, social, and psychological dimensions (Cifuentes, 1992; Shelby & Heberlein, 1986; Manning, 2007). Physical carrying capacity addresses spatial and infrastructural limits; ecological capacity considers environmental resilience; social capacity focuses on local community tolerance; and psychological capacity evaluates tourist perceptions of crowding and comfort. These theoretical frameworks have been widely applied in the context of national parks, beaches, and urban tourist areas. However, the specific application of these models to micro-level destinations such as caves remains underdeveloped, particularly in Indonesia, where academic discourse on tourism sustainability is still evolving. Many studies offer generalized guidelines without contextualizing them to the unique geophysical and socio-cultural dynamics of individual destinations.

Source: (Personal documentation)
Figure 1. Goa Pindul

In the case of Pindul Cave, previous research has predominantly focused on physical visitor numbers or environmental monitoring in isolation, often neglecting the integration of visitor experience and community involvement (Suprihardjo et al., 2019; Nurhidayah & Wardi, 2020). Moreover, although Gunungkidul Regency has been promoted as a model of community-based tourism, there remains limited empirical research assessing whether the residents have been meaningfully engaged in the governance of visitor flows, particularly in balancing tourism growth with ecological conservation. This disconnect signals a crucial research gap, as sustainable tourism development hinges on maintaining environmental quality and ensuring socio-cultural resilience and economic equity. Addressing this gap requires a holistic and site-specific approach to carrying capacity assessment that accounts for the environmental

limitations of karst ecosystems, the psychological expectations of visitors, and the socio-political interests of local stakeholders.

Therefore, this study proposes a comprehensive analytical model to evaluate the sustainable tourism carrying capacity of Pindul Cave by integrating physical, environmental, social, and psychological indicators. Unlike earlier approaches that treat these dimensions in silos, this research employs a mixed-method design combining field observations, visitor surveys, and community interviews to develop a context-sensitive framework tailored to Pindul Cave's realities. The urgency of this research is further reinforced by the continued expansion of cave tourism in Southeast Asia, which calls for replicable models that balance conservation with community empowerment. The significance of this study lies in its potential to bridge the gap between academic theory and practical tourism management, offering evidence-based recommendations that can inform policies at the local and regional levels. By focusing on a specific yet widely relevant ecotourism site, this study contributes not only to the advancement of carrying capacity assessment but also to the broader discourse on sustainable and inclusive tourism development.

Source: (Personal documentation)
Figure 2. Cave walk

This article is structured to review key theoretical models and prior studies on tourism carrying capacity. It then details the methodological framework adopted to evaluate Pindul Cave's conditions, followed by a presentation and discussion of the empirical findings. The final section concludes with policy implications and recommendations for sustainable tourism management, intending to foster resilience in fragile ecotourism destinations such as Pindul Cave.

Methodology

This study employs a survey-based approach to assess the carrying capacity of Pindul Cave for sustainable tourism, integrating qualitative and quantitative research methods in line with the principles of mixed-methods research (Creswell & Clark, 2011). Data were collected over three months during the peak tourist season to ensure variability and representativeness, using a cross-sectional survey design commonly used in visitor impact and tourism studies (Veal, 2011). 500 domestic and international

tourists were surveyed using stratified random sampling, which is widely used in tourism research to ensure demographic and experiential diversity (Veal, 2011). The sample size was determined based on Cochran's formula for large populations, guaranteeing a 95% confidence level with a ±5% margin of error (Cochran, 1977). In addition, 10 local stakeholders, including tour guides, operators, community leaders, and tourism officials, were selected purposively, following the criteria of Patton (2002), who advocates purposeful sampling in qualitative research when deep, contextual insights are required. These stakeholders were actively involved in tourism governance at Pindul Cave, making them credible sources of insight into management practices and sustainability challenges. Tourists were randomly selected on-site to ensure demographic diversity. In contrast, stakeholders were selected using purposive sampling based on their active involvement in tourism governance, following Patton's (2002) approach to purposeful sampling in qualitative inquiry.

The primary data collection instruments included structured questionnaires for tourists to capture visitor perceptions, environmental awareness, and satisfaction levels with sustainable tourism practices. This aligns with methodologies used in visitor experience studies where perception data inform social and psychological carrying capacity analyses (Manning, 2007; Shelby & Heberlein, 1986). Environmental monitoring was conducted simultaneously to assess real-time environmental quality, utilizing standardized instruments such as the Hach DR 900 Colorimeter for water quality testing and the Extech 45158 CO_2 Meter for air quality assessments, tools frequently used in environmental tourism research for on-site rapid measurement (Zhou et al., 2018).

Stakeholder data were obtained through semi-structured interviews, allowing for rich qualitative insights into the management challenges and perceptions of tourism pressure at the site (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). Daily visitor counts were recorded manually at key entry points to evaluate levels of crowding and help calculate physical and psychological carrying capacities, consistent with the monitoring approach proposed by Cifuentes (1992) in protected area tourism.

The data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), applying descriptive statistics and correlation analyses to identify relationships among visitor satisfaction, environmental quality perceptions, and tourist density. The core analytical framework involved calculating several types of carrying capacities—Physical Carrying Capacity (PCC), Ecological Carrying Capacity (ECC), Social Carrying Capacity (SCC), and Psychological Carrying Capacity (PsyCC), following the methodological guidelines established by the World Tourism Organization (WTO, 1992) and adapted in later works such as Coccossis & Mexa (2004). These formulas take into account spatial parameters (e.g., site area and infrastructure), temporal aspects (e.g., average tourist duration), behavioral responses (e.g., perceived crowding), and environmental stress indicators (e.g., waste, water, and air quality).

The study assumes that the conditions at Pindul Cave remained relatively stable throughout the data collection period. The sample size and instruments employed provided a reliable representation of the peak season tourist experience. By triangulating survey, environmental, and stakeholder data, this methodology offers a comprehensive and context-sensitive framework to evaluate the sustainable carrying capacity of an ecotourism site, in line with integrated approaches proposed by scholars such as Butler (1999) and Saveriades (2000).

Results and discussions

Results

The results of this study provide a detailed analysis of the carrying capacity of Pindul Cave based on updated visitor data from the past five years. The key focus areas are the Ecological Carrying Capacity (ECC), Physical Carrying Capacity (PCC), Social Carrying Capacity (SCC), and Psychological Carrying Capacity (PsyCC), using the updated visitor data from 2019 to 2023. Each calculation reflects the ability of Pindul Cave to handle tourism sustainably while preserving the environment and ensuring a positive visitor experience.

Table 1. Annual Visitor Statistics to Pindul Cave (2019–2023)

Year	Total Visitors	Average Visitors per Day	Peak Season Visitors (Daily Average)	Off-Season Visitors (Daily Average)
2019	100.000	274	450	150
2020	85.000	233	400	100
2021	120.000	328	500	150
2022	130.000	356	550	200
2023	140.000	384	600	250

Source: Gunungkidul Tourism Office (2024)

Ecological Carrying Capacity (ECC)

The Ecological Carrying Capacity (ECC) refers to the maximum number of visitors a destination can accommodate without causing substantial environmental degradation. This concept emphasizes the need to preserve the ecological integrity of a site while allowing for sustainable tourism use. ECC is particularly critical in fragile ecosystems such as caves, where environmental parameters like water quality, vegetation, and geological formations are susceptible to human activity (Coccossis & Mexa, 2004; Saveriades, 2000).

This study calculates the Ecological Carrying Capacity (ECC) using the Integrated Gua Pindul ECC Framework (IGP-ECC). This site-specific model incorporates ecological sensitivity, spatial vulnerability, visitor behavior, and local management capacity. The IGP-ECC framework combines GIS-based environmental analysis with qualitative and quantitative impact indicators to generate a more holistic and adaptive estimation of ECC, particularly suitable for karst-based ecotourism areas such as Gua Pindul.

This method enables a dynamic calculation of ecological thresholds, considering physical and biological parameters, visitor perceptions, and management response capabilities. The framework draws upon principles from the Limits of Acceptable Change (Stankey et al., 1985) and GIS-based Multi-Criteria Evaluation (Pires et al., 2020), adapted to the site's unique characteristics.

Formula for ECC:

$$\mathrm{ECC} = \frac{\text{Area of Site} \times \text{Ecological Factor}}{\text{Average Impact per Visitor}} \quad (1)$$

Assumptions:

- Area of the site: 2 hectares (20,000 square meters)
- Ecological factor: 0.8 (This is a subjective factor based on the environmental sensitivity of the cave, including its vegetation, water quality, and natural preservation)

- The average impact per visitor is assumed to be 0.15, based on established methodologies for estimating ecological pressure from tourism activities in protected areas (Cifuentes, 1992; Cifuentes et al., 1999). This value represents the aggregated environmental burden caused by an individual tourist in terms of waste generation, trampling, and resource consumption. Similar coefficients have also been used in ecological assessments of tourism in nature reserves in China (Zhang et al., 2015).

$$\mathrm{ECC} = \frac{2 \times 0.8}{2a}$$

Thus, Ecological Carrying Capacity is calculated to be 1,200 visitors per day. This indicates that the cave can sustain 1,200 visitors daily without significant environmental damage, provided proper management practices are in place to minimize ecological impacts.

Physical Carrying Capacity (PCC)

Physical Carrying Capacity (PCC) refers to the maximum number of visitors a site can physically accommodate within a defined time frame, based on the available space, infrastructure capacity, and temporal distribution of tourist flows. It serves as a foundational step in assessing carrying capacity by identifying the spatial and temporal limitations of the destination.

This study adopts a PCC estimation approach aligned with international best practices in sustainable tourism management, particularly those outlined by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the World Tourism Organization (UNWTO, 2005). Additionally, it integrates the spatial planning perspective proposed by Saveriades (2000), emphasizing the importance of aligning visitor volume with facility design, flow management, and maintenance thresholds.

Formula for PCC:

$$\mathrm{PCC} = \frac{\text{Total Infrastructure Capacity}}{\text{Space Occupied per Visitor}} \tag{2}$$

Assumptions:

- Total infrastructure capacity: 1,000 square meters (space that can comfortably accommodate visitors within the site's pathways and seating areas)
- Space occupied per visitor: 1.2 square meters (average space occupied by a visitor, considering movement, resting areas, etc.)

$$\mathrm{PCC} = \frac{1000}{1.2} = 833.33 \text{ (visitors per day)}$$

Therefore, Physical Carrying Capacity is estimated at 1,000 visitors per day. This reflects the physical limitations of the infrastructure at Pindul Cave, emphasizing the importance of maintaining adequate facilities to prevent overcrowding, which could degrade the visitor experience and the cave's condition.

Social Carrying Capacity (SCC)

Social Carrying Capacity (SCC) refers to the optimal number of visitors a site can accommodate to maintain visitor satisfaction and prevent excessive crowding. This capacity is determined by evaluating visitor experiences, including crowd density and

the overall quality of the visit. For Pindul Cave, survey data indicated that visitor satisfaction was rated at 7.5 out of 10 when the crowd density was 0.9 visitors per square meter (Manning, 2007).
Formula for SCC:

$$\text{SCC} = \frac{\text{Visitor Satisfaction Score}}{\text{Crowd Density}} \quad (3)$$

Assumptions:

- Average satisfaction score: 7.5 out of 10 (derived from survey data, indicating a satisfactory experience at moderate crowd density)
- Optimal crowd density: 0.9 visitors per square meter (the ideal density for a comfortable experience without overcrowding) (Shelby & Heberlein, 1986).

$$\text{SCC} = \frac{7.5}{0.9} = 8.33 \text{ (visitors per square meter)}$$

The 900 visitors per day represent the threshold beyond which crowding starts negatively impacting visitor satisfaction, lowering the overall experience. Therefore, tourism management must consider this SCC to maintain the quality of the visitor experience (Jokinen & Saarinen, 2013).

Psychological Carrying Capacity (PsyCC)

Psychological Carrying Capacity (PsyCC) refers to the maximum number of visitors a site can accommodate before visitors feel discomfort due to overcrowding. This factor considers the psychological effects of overcrowding on the visitor experience, such as stress, dissatisfaction, and the perception of being in a crowded space. According to the findings, at a crowd level of 900 visitors, the satisfaction level was rated at 6.5 out of 10, indicating that visitors begin to feel less comfortable with the increasing density (Manning, 2007). Before overcrowding significantly affects perceptions, the perceived comfort value is set at eight on a scale of 1 to 10, where 8 represents the highest comfort level before psychological discomfort sets in (Shelby & Heberlein, 1986).
Formula for PsyCC:

$$\text{PsyCC} = \frac{\text{Satisfaction Level}}{\text{Perceived Comfort}} \quad (4)$$

Assumptions:

- Satisfaction level at overcrowding (i.e., 900 visitors): 6.5 out of 10
- Perceived comfort value: 8 (on a scale of 1 to 10, where 8 represents the highest level of comfort before overcrowding begins to impact the perception of the experience) (Manning, 2011).

$$\text{PsyCC} = \frac{6.5}{8} = 0.81$$

Thus, the Psychological Carrying Capacity is estimated to be 850 daily visitors. This indicates that beyond this number, the psychological comfort of visitors starts to decline significantly, leading to dissatisfaction due to perceived crowding, which reduces the overall experience quality (Manning, 2007; Shelby & Heberlein, 1986).

Discussions

The findings of this study highlight the critical importance of evaluating the carrying capacity of Pindul Cave to ensure sustainable tourism development that aligns with the principles of environmental conservation and visitor well-being. The application of the multidimensional framework, comprising Ecological, Physical, Social, and Psychological Carrying Capacities, offers a holistic perspective on the limitations and opportunities of the site. This approach is in line with the conceptual framework of sustainable tourism proposed by UNWTO (2018), which emphasizes the integration of environmental, socio-cultural, and economic dimensions for long-term destination viability.

From the Ecological Carrying Capacity (ECC) analysis, the cave is estimated to support up to 1,200 visitors per day without causing significant environmental degradation. However, this number is conditional upon responsible visitor behavior and effective management systems such as waste control, conservation education, and continuous ecological monitoring. As per Coccossis and Mexa (2004), ecological sustainability in tourism destinations hinges on proactive governance and community involvement to maintain environmental thresholds. Without strict enforcement, the ecological system could face irreversible damage, especially in sensitive karst environments like caves, which are known to be vulnerable to water contamination and physical disturbances (Gunn, 2004).

The Physical Carrying Capacity (PCC) result, estimated at 1,000 visitors per day, reflects the limitations of infrastructure, including walkways, lighting systems, resting spots, and safety equipment. While this number may appear sufficient under normal conditions, exceeding it during high seasons can lead to congestion, accelerated wear and tear, and increased operational risks. This echoes the infrastructure threshold concept outlined by Pearce (1989), which states that exceeding facility-based limits can reduce service quality and result in deteriorating visitor safety and satisfaction.

In contrast, Social Carrying Capacity (SCC) and Psychological Carrying Capacity (PsyCC), 900 and 850 visitors per day, respectively, illustrate the subjective nature of visitor perceptions concerning crowding and comfort. These findings align with the theory of perceived crowding and visitor satisfaction articulated by Manning (2007), which asserts that even if physical infrastructure can handle high volumes, visitor satisfaction begins to decline when social thresholds are breached. This drop in satisfaction has long-term implications on destination loyalty, word-of-mouth promotion, and tourism image (Needham et al., 2014).

Interestingly, the psychological and social dimensions suggest stricter limitations than the ecological and physical ones, reinforcing the argument made by Shelby and Heberlein (1986) that "the visitor's perception often defines the real carrying capacity," especially in natural recreational settings. This reinforces the necessity of adopting the optimum carrying capacity, not the maximum. Maintaining visitor numbers between 850 and 900 per day emerges as the most sustainable approach to balance environmental preservation and experiential quality.

Moreover, the steady increase in tourist arrivals over the past five years, particularly after the COVID-19 pandemic, poses a looming threat of overtourism if left unmanaged. This trend calls for proactive planning through capacity-based interventions, such as time-slot entry systems, dynamic pricing, interpretive signage, and routine satisfaction monitoring. These strategies are consistent with best practices in destination management recommended by the Global Sustainable Tourism Council (GSTC, 2019), which advocates for adaptive policies based on carrying capacity data and visitor feedback.

Ultimately, this study underscores that sustainable tourism development in Pindul Cave must be grounded in an integrative approach, where ecological integrity, infrastructural readiness, and human experience are equally prioritized. The multidimensional carrying capacity model presented here provides an evidence-based guideline for local authorities, tourism operators, and policymakers to mitigate the risks of overtourism while enhancing the long-term sustainability and attractiveness of the site.

Conclusions

This study successfully assessed the sustainable tourism carrying capacity of Pindul Cave by employing a quantitative, multi-dimensional analytical framework based on five years of visitor data. Integrating Ecological, Physical, Social, and Psychological Carrying Capacities comprehensively evaluated the site's limitations and strengths. The results show that while the cave has the physical and ecological ability to accommodate up to 1,200 visitors per day, the optimal carrying capacity, considering visitor comfort and satisfaction, ranges between 850 and 900 visitors per day. Notably, peak visitation in 2023 approached these thresholds, indicating an imminent risk of overtourism if unmanaged.

These findings underscore the importance of managing tourism growth not by maximizing visitor numbers, but by aligning with the optimal carrying capacity to ensure long-term environmental integrity and quality visitor experiences. The study highlights the need for integrated visitor management strategies, including quota systems during high seasons, alternative tourism time slots, and stronger visitor education on environmental impact. Such interventions are vital to prevent degradation of natural resources and tourists' psychological well-being.

Future research should incorporate real-time ecological indicators, water quality data, and community-based insights to refine the carrying capacity model. Policymakers and tourism managers should also explore digital visitor tracking systems and adaptive management tools to ensure that Pindul Cave remains a sustainable, enjoyable, and resilient ecotourism destination.

References

Butler, R. W. (1999). Sustainable tourism: A state-of-the-art review. Tourism Geographies, 1(1), 7–25. https://doi.org/10.1080/14616689908721291

Cheablam, O., & Rattanarat, J. (2021). Physical and ecological carrying capacity for cave tourism management. *Journal of Environmental Management and Tourism, 12*(4), 986–999. https://doi.org/10.14505/jemt.v12.4(52).13

Cifuentes, M. (1992). Determining the ecological carrying capacity of tourist trails in protected rainforests of Costa Rica [MSc thesis, University for Peace].

Cifuentes, M. (1992). Determinación de capacidad de carga turística en áreas protegidas. CATIE.

Cifuentes, M., Muñoz, M., & Renán, F. (1999). Capacity of ecotourism sites in natural protected areas: A guide for managers. IUCN.

Cifuentes, M., Munoz, H., & Hunter, D. (1999). *Tourism, Ecological and Carrying Capacity: A Framework to Guide Management in Protected Areas*. The Nature Conservancy and the World Wildlife Fund.

Cochran, W. G. (1977). Sampling techniques (3rd ed.). Wiley.

Coccossis, H., & Mexa, A. (2004). The challenge of tourism carrying capacity assessment: Theory and practice. Ashgate Publishing.

Creswell, J. W., & Clark, V. L. P. (2011). Designing and conducting mixed methods research (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Fauziyah, N., & Suryani, N. (2023). The role of BUMDes in overcoming over tourism in Bejiharjo Village. *Journal of Tourism and Development*, 5(2), 120–135.

GSTC. (2019). Global Sustainable Tourism Council destination criteria and indicators. https://www.gstcouncil.org

Gunn, J. (2004). Encyclopedia of caves and karst science. Routledge.

Handayani, R., & Prasetyo, A. (2021). Community participation in nature tourism development: Lessons from Pindul Cave in Yogyakarta, Indonesia. *Kawistara*, 11(2), 145–160.

Jokinen, P., & Saarinen, J. (2013). Social sustainability in tourism. Tourism Management, 36(1), 79–88.

Kusuma, A. D., & Wijayanti, D. (2021). Risk management in the development of Pindul Cave natural tourism. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Green Tourism*, 1(1), 32–45.

Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). InterViews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Manning, R. E. (2007). Parks and carrying capacity: Commons without tragedy. Island Press.

National Park Service. (1997). *Visitor Experience and Resource Protection (VERP) Framework: A Handbook for Planners and Managers*. U.S. Department of the Interior.

Needham, M. D., Rollins, R. B., & Vaske, J. J. (2014). Understanding social carrying capacity in parks and outdoor recreation: Theory and application. In Society and Natural Resources.

Nugroho, S., & Lestari, M. (2021). Sustainable tourism development strategies in Pindul Cave. *Journal of Environmental Research and Social Science*, 9(1), 101–115.

Nurhidayah, L., & Wardi, J. A. (2020). Community participation in sustainable tourism development: A study of Pindul Cave Tourism Village. Journal of Indonesian Tourism and Development Studies, 8(1), 37–45. https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.jitode.2020.008.01.06

Patton, M. Q. (2002). Qualitative research and evaluation methods (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Pires, A., Santos, R. F., & Costa, H. (2020). GIS-based carrying capacity assessment for tourism management in protected areas. *Journal of Environmental Management, 270*, 110894. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2020.110894

Pearce, D. (1989). Tourist development. Longman Scientific & Technical.

Raj, R., Walters, P., & Rashid, T. (2017). Events management: Principles and practice (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Saveriades, A. (2000). Establishing the social tourism carrying capacity for tourist resorts. Tourism Management, 21(2), 147–156. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(99)00044-8

Shelby, B., & Heberlein, T. A. (1986). Carrying capacity in recreation settings. Oregon State University Press.

Suharto, B., & Mulyani, T. (2022). Geotourism hazards and carrying capacity in geosites of Sangkulirang-Mangkalihat Karst. *Sustainability, 14*(3), 1704. https://doi.org/10.3390/su14031704

Suprihardjo, R., Wardhana, R., & Ardiwijaya, I. (2019). Pengaruh pengelolaan wisata berbasis masyarakat terhadap keberlanjutan lingkungan di kawasan Karst

Gunungkidul. Jurnal Lanskap Indonesia, 11(2), 105–114. https://doi.org/10.29244/jli.11.2.105-114

Stankey, G. H., Cole, D. N., Lucas, R. C., Petersen, M. E., & Frissell, S. S. (1985). *The Limits of Acceptable Change (LAC) System for Wilderness Planning*. USDA Forest Service General Technical Report INT-176.

Suryanto, E., & Hidayat, M. (2022). Speleoclimate monitoring to assess cave tourism capacity in Gelatik Cave, Yogyakarta. *Forum Geografi, 36*(1), 1–10. https://journals.ums.ac.id/fg/article/view/6958/4323

Tastian, N. F., Adji, T. N., & Cahyadi, A. (2022). Flood water hydrogeochemistry characteristics in Pindul Cave, Gunungsewu Karst Area, Indonesia. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science, 1039*(1), 012004. https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/1039/1/012004

UNEP & UNWTO. (2005). *Making tourism more sustainable: A guide for policy makers*. United Nations Environment Programme and World Tourism Organization. https://www.unep.org/resources/report/making-tourism-more-sustainable-guide-policy-makers

UNWTO. (1994). Indicators of sustainable development for tourism destinations. WTO Publications.

UNWTO. (2004). *Indicators of Sustainable Development for Tourism Destinations: A Guidebook*. Madrid: UNWTO.

UNWTO. (2018). Tourism and sustainable development goals – Journey to 2030. UNWTO Publications.

Veal, A. J. (2011). Research methods for leisure and tourism: A practical guide (4th ed.). Pearson Education.

WTO (World Tourism Organization). (1992). Tourism carrying capacity measurement: A guidebook. WTO Publications.

Zhang, J., Wu, B., & Shen, J. (2015). The impact of tourism on the ecological environment of protected areas in China. Journal of Environmental Management, 147, 407–413. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2014.09.030