

# **UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA**

# RURAL TOURISM DEMAND OF INTERNATIONAL VISITORS TO THE KILIM KARST GEOFOREST PARK, LANGKAWI, MALAYSIA

NITANAN KOSHY A/L MATTHEW

IPTPH 2014 7



# RURAL TOURISM DEMAND OF INTERNATIONAL VISITORS TO THE KILIM KARST GEOFOREST PARK, LANGKAWI, MALAYSIA



By

NITANAN KOSHY A/L MATTHEW

Thesis submitted to the School of Graduate Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia in Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Science

May 2014

# COPYRIGHT

All materials contained within the thesis, including without limitation text, logos, icons, photographs, and all other artwork, are copyright material of Universiti Putra Malaysia unless otherwise stated. Use may be made of any material contained within the thesis for non-commercial purposes from the copyright holder. Commercial use of material may only be made with the express, prior, written permission of Universiti Putra Malaysia.

Copyright© Universiti Putra Malaysia



Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Science

# RURAL TOURISM DEMAND OF INTERNATIONAL VISITORS TO THE KILIM KARST GEOFOREST PARK, LANGKAWI, MALAYSIA

By

### NITANAN KOSHY A/L MATTHEW

May 2014

Chair: Ahmad bin Shuib, PhD

### Institute: Agricultural and Food Policy Studies Institute (AFPSI)

Rural tourism provides opportunities for visitors to visit rural attractions available in a rural area. Kilim Karst Geoforest Park (KKGP) which is located in a rural setting offers rural tourism experience to visitors. It is chosen as the study site in the present study because it is one of the three parks located in the Langkawi Island that has been granted geopark status by the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization in 2007. The high number of international visitor arrivals to the park has induced the need to identify the factors influencing their visitations to the park. Besides that, whether the visitors to the park obtain benefits from their visit is unknown. And, the intangibility nature of the products and services offered at the park has necessitated the need to determine the economic value of the park.

C

The objective of the study is to identify the socio-demographic and characteristics of visits of international visitors. Besides, to identify the factors influencing the rural tourism demand of international visitors to the Kilim Karst Geoforest Park, Langkawi and to determine the economic value of the park. Rural tourism demand model for the park has been developed using one of the popular environmental valuation techniques which is the Travel Cost Method. Both types of TCM methods the zonal and individual travel cost (ZTCM, ITCM) have been utilized in the study. The differences between the two methods are, for ZTCM demand is based from the particular zones, whereas for ITCM, it is based from the individuals who have visited the site only.

The modification of the basic TCM model has taken into account other demand shifting variables besides the travel cost in the model. This is to overcome the problem of either underestimating or overestimating of the consumer surplus. The variables are onsite cost and time, cost to alternative site, quality of site, WTP and socio demographic variables constituting of age, gender, education level, and gross monthly income of the visitors. Structured questionnaire and face-to-face data collection method are employed to obtain the primary data from 330 international visitors for two weeks at the park and Langkawi international airport. The respondents are chosen based on the convenient sampling technique. However, only 300 samples are used for further analysis due to inadequate information accumulated from the respondents.

In terms of choosing appropriate individual as respondent, guidelines are adhered to. Firstly, international visitors are asked about their nationality. This is because there is a major confusion in identifying whether the visitors are local or international visitors particularly visitors from China, Korea, Japan, India, and Indonesia. Besides, only the head of the group is selected as the respondent to avoid double counting of respondents. Average time incurred for the survey is about 10 - 15 minutes. There are six main elements in the designed questionnaire namely the record item, travel information, travel and on-site cost, quality of the site, willingness to pay (WTP) and finally, socio – demographic information. The instrument of study; the questionnaire is designed only in the English language. The reason is that the English language is an internationally recognized language. Hence, it will be a good medium to obtain higher response rate from the respondents.

The Poisson regression analysis is conducted to estimate the ITCM model using the Limited Dependent models (LIMDEP) software, version 4. On the other hand, the Ordinary, Least Square (OLS) regression analysis is conducted for the ZTCM models using the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS), version 21. The findings show that for ZTCM, the economic value is estimated to be at €64 million using the Kilim hour's model. On the other hand, the economic value for the Langkawi and Kilim satisfaction model could not be determined because the travel cost variable is found to be insignificant. For ITCM, the economic value is estimated to be at €296 million, €82 million, and €27 million for Langkawi, Kilim satisfaction and hour's models respectively. The findings of the study will be useful for the management of the park to make any justifications regarding the spending for the park and in making appropriate decisions concerning to the development of the rural tourism in the park.

Abstrak tesis yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia sebagai memenuhi keperluan untuk Ijazah Master Sains

### PERMINTAAN BAGI PELANCONGAN DESA OLEH PELAWAT ANTARABANGSA KE KILIM KARST GEOFOREST PARK, LANGKAWI, MALAYSIA

Oleh

### NITANAN KOSHY A/L MATTHEW

Mei 2014

Pengerusi: Ahmad bin Shuib, PhD

### Institut: Institut Kajian Dasar Pertanian dan Makanan

Pelancongan desa memberi peluang pengunjung untuk melawat tarikan luar bandar di kawasan luar bandar. Kilim Karst Geoforest Park (KKGP) yang terletak di dalam persekitaran luar bandar menawarkan pengalaman pelancongan desa kepada pelawat. Ia telah dipilih sebagai tapak kajian kerana ia merupakan salah satu daripada tiga taman di Pulau Langkawi yang telah diwartakan sebagai tapak warisan dunia oleh Pertubuhan Pendidikan, Saintifik dan Kebudayaan Bangsa-Bangsa Bersatu atau *United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization* (UNESCO) pada tahun 2007. Jumlah bilangan kedatangan pelawat antarabangsa yang ramai ke taman tersebut telah mendorong kepada keperluan untuk mengenalpasti faktor – faktor yang mempengaruhi lawatan mereka ke taman tersebut. Selain itu, sama ada para pengunjung memperolehi manfaat dari lawatan mereka tidak diketahui. Dan, ciri-ciri 'intangibility' produk dan perkhidmatan yang ditawarkan di KKGP telah membawa kepada keperluan untuk mengenalpasti.

C

Objektif kajian adalah untuk mengenalpasti mengenalpasti sosiodemografi dan ciri-ciri lawatan pelawat antarabangsa. Selain itu, untuk mengenal pasti faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi permintaan pelancongan desa pengunjung antarabangsa ke Kilim Karst Geoforest Park, Langkawi (KKGP) dan untuk menentukan nilai ekonomi taman tersebut. Di dalam kajian ini, model permintaan pelancongan desa telah dibentuk dengan menggunakan salah satu daripada teknik-teknik penilaian alam sekitar yang popular iaitu kaedah kos perjalanan. Kedua-dua kaedah bagi kaedah kos perjalanan iaitu Kos Perjalanan berdasarkan Zon atau *Zonal Travel Cost Method (ZTCM)* dan kaedah Kos Perjalanan berdasarkan Individu atau *Individual Travel Cost Method (ITCM)* telah digunakan dalam kajian ini. Perbezaan antara kedua-dua kaedah ini adalah bagi kaedah *ZTCM*, permintaan adalah berasaskan kepada zon-zon tertentu,

manakala bagi kaedah *ITCM* permintaan adalah berasaskan individu yang khusus melawat KKGP sahaja. Pengubahsuaian model asas *TCM* turut mengambil kira pembolehubah-pembolehubah lain selain daripada kos perjalanan. Ini adalah untuk mengatasi masalah terlebih atau terkurang dalam penganggaran lebihan penggguna. Pembolehubah-pembolehubah yang lain adalah seperti perbelanjaan yang dilakukan serta jumlah masa yang dihabiskan di taman tersebut, kos untuk ke lokasi alternatif, kualiti taman, kesanggupan membayar, pembolehubah demografi seperti umur, jantina, tahap pendidikan, dan pendapatan kasar bulanan pengunjung.

Borang soal selidik berstruktur dan kaedah pengumpulan data bersemuka telah digunakan untuk mendapatkan data primer dari 330 pengunjung antarabangsa di KKGP dan lapangan terbang antarabangsa Langkawi selama dua minggu. Responden telah dipilih berdasarkan teknik persampelan mudah. Namun, hanya 300 sampel sahaja yang telah digunakan untuk dianalisis kerana maklumat yang diberikan oleh responden tidak lengkap. Beberapa kriteria tertentu telah digunakan dalam pemilihan responden dalam kajian ini. Pertama, pengunjung antarabangsa ditanya mengenai kewarganegaraan mereka. Ini adalah kerana terdapat kekeliruan utama dalam mengenal pasti sama ada mereka adalah pengunjung tempatan atau antarabangsa. Ini terutamanya, pengunjung daripada negara China, Korea, Japan, India, dan Indonesia. Selain itu,hanya ketua kumpulan sahaja yang dipilih sebagai responden untuk mengelak daripada mendapat data yang sama. Purata masa yang terlibat bagi kajian ini adalah kira-kira 10-15 minit. Borang soal selidik yang direka mengandungi 6 bahagian iaitu lokasi kajian, maklumat perjalanan, kos yang ditanggung untuk ke KKGP serta semasa berada di KKGP, kualiti taman, kesanggupan untuk membayar dan sosiodemografi.

Analisis regresi Poisson dijalankan untuk menganggarkan model *ITCM* dengan menggunakan perisian *Limited Dependent Model (LIMDEP)* versi ke-4. Sebaliknya, analisis *Ordinary Least Square Regression (OLS)* telah dijalankan bagi model *ZTCM* dengan menggunakan pakej statistik untuk sains sosial, *Statistical Package for Social Sciences* (SPSS) versi ke-21. Dapatan kajian menunjukkan bahawa, bagi *ZTCM*, nilai ekonomi yang dianggarkan ialah sebanyak €64 juta dengan menggunakan model masa Kilim. Sebaliknya, nilai ekonomi bagi model kepuasan Kilim dan model Langkawi tidak dapat ditentukan kerana pembolehubah kos perjalanan didapati adalah tidak penting atau tidak mempengaruhi lawatan ke taman tersebut. Seterusnya, bagi *ITCM* pula, nilai ekonomi yang dianggarkan ialah sebanyak €296 juta, €82 juta dan €27 juta bagi model Langkawi dan KKGP. Dapatan kajian ini amat berguna kepada pihak pengurusan taman untuk membuat sebarang justifikasi mengenai perbelanjaan serta pembangunan pelancongan desa di taman tersebut.

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to take this opportunity to thank God for granting me the strength to successfully complete this Master thesis. Despite facing many obstacles and challengers throughout this study, God has transformed all those into a lifelong learning experience and victory by showering his blessings on me. Next, I would like to thank my beloved parents, Matthew s/o M. J Joseph and Rachel d/o K. T Joseph for their endless support throughout this research to complete this project with a great success. Not forgotten, I would like to thank my loving brothers George, Philip, Jason and my loving sister Annie for their moral support and guidance.

Besides, it is an honor to be under the wings of my supervisor, Prof Dr. Ahmad bin Shuib, and I thank him for his great job in assisting and guiding me throughout this project. Your willingness to spend your golden time for discussions about the research and for checking both the content of the thesis and the papers for conference despite being busy is highly appreciated. I hope that God will bless him with abundance of mercy for undertaking your responsibilities successfully. Also not forgetting the respectful co- Supervisors, Associate Prof. Dr. Sridar Ramachandran and Dr Syamsul Herman bin Mohammad Afandi for their suggestions, fruitful ideas and guidance throughout the process of developing the thesis. My special thanks also go out to Associate Prof. Dr. Sridar Ramachandran for giving me the chance to enter the world of research.

Last but not least, special thanks to all of my friends particularly, Mohammad Safee bin Sapari for his guidance and support throughout this project. Besides, I would like to thank one of the researchers of IKDPM, Wani, for giving me useful guidelines on conducting the analyses in chapter 4. Furthermore, I would like to thank everyone who has directly or indirectly favored me in the preparation of the thesis. I certify that a Thesis Examination Committee has met on 22 April 2014 to conduct the final examination of Nitanan Koshy A/L Matthew on his thesis entitled "Rural Tourim Demand of International Visitors to the Kilim Karst Geoforest Park, Langkawi, Malaysia" in accordance with the Universities and University Colleges Act 1971 and the Constitution of the Universiti Putra Malaysia [P.U.(A) 106] 15 March 1998. The Committee recommends that the student be awarded the Master of Science.

Members of the Thesis Examination Committee were as follows:

### Serene Ng Siew Imm, PhD

Senior Lecturer Faculty of Economics and Management Universiti Putra Malaysia (Chairman)

Zaiton binti Samdin, PhD Associate Professor Faculty of Forestry Universiti Putra Malaysia (Internal Examiner)

# Mohd Rusli bin Yacob, PhD

Associate Professor Faculty of Environmental Studies Universiti Putra Malaysia (Internal Examiner)

# Puad Mat Som, PhD

Associate Professor Universiti Sains Malaysia Malaysia (External Examiner)

# NORITAH OMAR, PhD

Associate Professor and Deputy Dean School of Graduate Studies Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date: 23 June 2014

This thesis was submitted to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia and has been accepted as fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Science. The members of the Supervisory Committee were as follows:

### Ahmad bin Shuib, PhD

Professor Institute of Agricultural and Food Policy Studies Universiti Putra Malaysia (Chairman)

# Sridar a/l Ramachandran, PhD

Associate Professor Faculty of Forestry Universiti Putra Malaysia (Member)

# Syamsul Herman bin Mohammad Afandi, PhD

Senior Lecturer Faculty of Forestry Universiti Putra Malaysia (Member)

### NORITAH OMAR, PhD

Associate Professor and Deputy Dean School of Graduate Studies Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date: 23 June 2014

# **Declaration by graduate student**

I hereby confirm that:

- this thesis is my original work;
- quotations, illustrations and citations have been duly referenced;
- this thesis has not been submitted previously or concurrently for any other degree at any other institutions;
- intellectual property from the thesis and copyright of thesis are fully-owned by Universiti Putra Malaysia, as according to the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Research) Rules 2012;
- written permission must be owned from supervisor and the office of Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation) before thesis is published (in the form of written, printed or in electronic form) including books, journals, modules, proceedings, popular writings, seminar papers, manuscripts, posters, reports, lecture notes, learning modules or any other materials as stated in the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Research) Rules 2012;
- there is no plagiarism or data falsification/fabrication in the thesis, and scholarly integrity was upheld as according to the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Graduate Studies) Rules 2003 (Revision 2012-2013) and the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Research) Rules 2012. The thesis has undergone plagiarism detection software.

Signature:	Date:
Name and Matric No:	

# Declaration by Members of Supervisory committee

This is to confirm that:

- the research conducted and the writing of this thesis was under our supervision,
- supervision responsibilities as stated in Rule 41 in Rules 2003 (Revision 2012-2013) were adhered to.

Signature		Signature	
Name of	AHMAD BIN SHUIB	Name of	SRIDAR RAMACHANDRAN
Chairman of Supervisory		Member of Supervisory	
Committee:		Committee:	
Signature			
Name of	SYA <mark>MSUL HERMAN BIN</mark> MOHAMMAD AFANDI		
Member of			
Supervisory			
Committee:			

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
ABSTRAK	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vi
APPROVAL	vii
DECLARATION	ix
LIST OF TABLES	XV
LIST OF FIGURES	xvii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xviii

Chapter	
1	

6

2

INTRODUCTION	
1.0 General Background	1
1.1 Tourism	1
1.2 Tourism development in Langkawi	1
1.3 Rural tourism in the Kilim Karst Geoforest	3
Park, Langkawi	
1.4 Economic valuation	5
1.5 Problem statement	7
1.6 Objectives of the study	8
1.6.1 General objective	8
1.6.2 Specific objectives	8
1.7 Significance of the study	9
1.7.1 Federal Government and the Langkawi	9
Development Authority (LADA)	
1.7.2 Other stakeholders and conservation of the	9
resources in the park	
1.7.3 International visitors	9
1.7.4 Academic contribution	10
1.7.5 Literature	10
1.8 Organization of the thesis	10
LITERATURE REVIEW	
2.0 Introduction	11
2.1 Overview of tourism	11
2.2 Rural tourism	13
Fundamental theories to the study	
2.3 Utility	14
2.4 Law of Demand	16
2.4.1 The effect of price change on demand	19
(If there is a reduction in price of item	
X)	
2.4.2 The effect of price change on demand	20
(An increase in the price of goods)	
2.4.3 The effect of changes in income on	20
demand	
2.5 Consumer surplus	22

2.6 Total economic value	22
2.7 Non-market valuation methods	24
2.8 Basic TCM and gravity model	28
2.9 The issues in the Travel Cost Method (TCM)	32
2.9.1 Multiple Destination (MDT) visitors	33
2.9.2 Opportunity cost of travel time	37
2.9.3 International visitors or tourists	39
2.10 Modification of the basic TCM	39
2.10.1 Travel time	39
2.10.2 Effect of Alternative site	41
2.10.3 On-site time	41
2.10.4 On-site cost	42
2.10.5 Quality of the site	43
2.10.6 Socio-demographic variables	44
2.11 ZTCM and ITCM	45
2.11.1 Past studies using the ZTCM and ITCM conducted specifically in Malaysia	47
2 11.2 Studies conducted abroad using only the	50
local visitors or tourists	50
2.11.3 Past studies using the ITCM and ZTCM for	53
international tourists	
2.11.4 Studies that employ the number of days at	57
the site as the dependent variable in the	
ITCM model	
2.12 Contingent Valuation Method (CVM)	57
3 METHODOLOGY	
3 METHODOLOGY 3.0 Introduction	59
3 <b>METHODOLOGY</b> 3.0 Introduction 3.1 Background Information	59 59
3 <b>METHODOLOGY</b> 3.0 Introduction 3.1 Background Information 3.2 The case study area- Kilim Karst Geoforest Park.	59 59 61
3 <b>METHODOLOGY</b> 3.0 Introduction 3.1 Background Information 3.2 The case study area- Kilim Karst Geoforest Park, Langkawi	59 59 61
3 <b>METHODOLOGY</b> 3.0 Introduction 3.1 Background Information 3.2 The case study area- Kilim Karst Geoforest Park, Langkawi 3.3 Recreation demand modeling	59 59 61
<ul> <li>3 METHODOLOGY</li> <li>3.0 Introduction</li> <li>3.1 Background Information</li> <li>3.2 The case study area- Kilim Karst Geoforest Park, Langkawi</li> <li>3.3 Recreation demand modeling</li> <li>3.4 Model specification for ZTCM</li> </ul>	59 59 61 65 66
<ul> <li>3 METHODOLOGY</li> <li>3.0 Introduction</li> <li>3.1 Background Information</li> <li>3.2 The case study area- Kilim Karst Geoforest Park, Langkawi</li> <li>3.3 Recreation demand modeling</li> <li>3.4 Model specification for ZTCM</li> <li>3.4.1 Travel cost to Langkawi</li> </ul>	59 59 61 65 66 66
<ul> <li>3 METHODOLOGY</li> <li>3.0 Introduction</li> <li>3.1 Background Information</li> <li>3.2 The case study area- Kilim Karst Geoforest Park, Langkawi</li> <li>3.3 Recreation demand modeling</li> <li>3.4 Model specification for ZTCM</li> <li>3.4.1 Travel cost to Langkawi</li> <li>3.4.2 Travel cost to Kilim based on the satisfaction</li> </ul>	59 59 61 65 66 66 67
<ul> <li>3 METHODOLOGY</li> <li>3.0 Introduction</li> <li>3.1 Background Information</li> <li>3.2 The case study area- Kilim Karst Geoforest Park, Langkawi</li> <li>3.3 Recreation demand modeling</li> <li>3.4 Model specification for ZTCM</li> <li>3.4.1 Travel cost to Langkawi</li> <li>3.4.2 Travel cost to Kilim based on the satisfaction at the park</li> </ul>	59 59 61 65 66 66 67
<ul> <li>3 METHODOLOGY</li> <li>3.0 Introduction</li> <li>3.1 Background Information</li> <li>3.2 The case study area- Kilim Karst Geoforest Park, Langkawi</li> <li>3.3 Recreation demand modeling</li> <li>3.4 Model specification for ZTCM</li> <li>3.4.1 Travel cost to Langkawi</li> <li>3.4.2 Travel cost to Kilim based on the satisfaction at the park</li> <li>3.4.3 Travel cost to Kilim based on the number of</li> </ul>	59 59 61 65 66 66 67
<ul> <li>3 METHODOLOGY</li> <li>3.0 Introduction</li> <li>3.1 Background Information</li> <li>3.2 The case study area- Kilim Karst Geoforest Park, Langkawi</li> <li>3.3 Recreation demand modeling</li> <li>3.4 Model specification for ZTCM</li> <li>3.4.1 Travel cost to Langkawi</li> <li>3.4.2 Travel cost to Kilim based on the satisfaction at the park</li> <li>3.4.3 Travel cost to Kilim based on the number of hours at the park</li> </ul>	59 59 61 65 66 66 67 67
<ul> <li>3 METHODOLOGY</li> <li>3.0 Introduction</li> <li>3.1 Background Information</li> <li>3.2 The case study area- Kilim Karst Geoforest Park, Langkawi</li> <li>3.3 Recreation demand modeling</li> <li>3.4 Model specification for ZTCM</li> <li>3.4.1 Travel cost to Langkawi</li> <li>3.4.2 Travel cost to Langkawi</li> <li>3.4.3 Travel cost to Kilim based on the satisfaction at the park</li> <li>3.4.3 Travel cost to Kilim based on the number of hours at the park</li> <li>3.5 Heteroscedasticity</li> </ul>	59 59 61 65 66 66 67 67
<ul> <li>3 METHODOLOGY</li> <li>3.0 Introduction</li> <li>3.1 Background Information</li> <li>3.2 The case study area- Kilim Karst Geoforest Park, Langkawi</li> <li>3.3 Recreation demand modeling</li> <li>3.4 Model specification for ZTCM</li> <li>3.4.1 Travel cost to Langkawi</li> <li>3.4.2 Travel cost to Kilim based on the satisfaction at the park</li> <li>3.4.3 Travel cost to Kilim based on the number of hours at the park</li> <li>3.5 Heteroscedasticity</li> <li>3.5.1 Semi log model</li> </ul>	59 59 61 65 66 66 67 67 67
<ul> <li>3 METHODOLOGY <ul> <li>3.0 Introduction</li> <li>3.1 Background Information</li> <li>3.2 The case study area- Kilim Karst Geoforest Park, Langkawi</li> <li>3.3 Recreation demand modeling</li> <li>3.4 Model specification for ZTCM</li> <li>3.4.1 Travel cost to Langkawi</li> <li>3.4.2 Travel cost to Kilim based on the satisfaction at the park</li> <li>3.4.3 Travel cost to Kilim based on the number of hours at the park</li> </ul> </li> <li>3.5 Heteroscedasticity <ul> <li>3.5.1 Semi log model</li> <li>3.5.2 Double log model</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	59 59 61 65 66 66 67 67 67 67 68
<ul> <li>3 METHODOLOGY</li> <li>3.0 Introduction</li> <li>3.1 Background Information</li> <li>3.2 The case study area- Kilim Karst Geoforest Park, Langkawi</li> <li>3.3 Recreation demand modeling</li> <li>3.4 Model specification for ZTCM</li> <li>3.4.1 Travel cost to Langkawi</li> <li>3.4.2 Travel cost to Kilim based on the satisfaction at the park</li> <li>3.4.3 Travel cost to Kilim based on the number of hours at the park</li> <li>3.5 Heteroscedasticity</li> <li>3.5.1 Semi log model</li> <li>3.5.2 Double log model</li> <li>3.6 Estimation of consumer surplus of ZTCM</li> </ul>	59 59 61 65 66 66 67 67 67 67 68 68
<ul> <li>3 METHODOLOGY</li> <li>3.0 Introduction</li> <li>3.1 Background Information</li> <li>3.2 The case study area- Kilim Karst Geoforest Park, Langkawi</li> <li>3.3 Recreation demand modeling</li> <li>3.4 Model specification for ZTCM</li> <li>3.4.1 Travel cost to Langkawi</li> <li>3.4.2 Travel cost to Kilim based on the satisfaction at the park</li> <li>3.4.3 Travel cost to Kilim based on the number of hours at the park</li> <li>3.5 Heteroscedasticity</li> <li>3.5.1 Semi log model</li> <li>3.5.2 Double log model</li> <li>3.6 Estimation of consumer surplus of ZTCM</li> <li>3.7 Model specification for ITCM</li> </ul>	59 59 61 65 66 66 67 67 67 67 68 68 70
<ul> <li>3 METHODOLOGY</li> <li>3.0 Introduction</li> <li>3.1 Background Information</li> <li>3.2 The case study area- Kilim Karst Geoforest Park, Langkawi</li> <li>3.3 Recreation demand modeling</li> <li>3.4 Model specification for ZTCM</li> <li>3.4.1 Travel cost to Langkawi</li> <li>3.4.2 Travel cost to Kilim based on the satisfaction at the park</li> <li>3.4.3 Travel cost to Kilim based on the number of hours at the park</li> <li>3.5 Heteroscedasticity</li> <li>3.5.1 Semi log model</li> <li>3.5.2 Double log model</li> <li>3.6 Estimation of consumer surplus of ZTCM</li> <li>3.7 Model specification for ITCM</li> <li>3.7.1 Travel cost to Langkawi</li> </ul>	59 59 61 65 66 66 67 67 67 67 67 68 68 70 70
<ul> <li>3 METHODOLOGY</li> <li>3.0 Introduction</li> <li>3.1 Background Information</li> <li>3.2 The case study area- Kilim Karst Geoforest Park, Langkawi</li> <li>3.3 Recreation demand modeling</li> <li>3.4 Model specification for ZTCM</li> <li>3.4.1 Travel cost to Langkawi</li> <li>3.4.2 Travel cost to Kilim based on the satisfaction at the park</li> <li>3.4.3 Travel cost to Kilim based on the number of hours at the park</li> <li>3.5 Heteroscedasticity</li> <li>3.5.1 Semi log model</li> <li>3.6 Estimation of consumer surplus of ZTCM</li> <li>3.7 Model specification for ITCM</li> <li>3.7.1 Travel cost to Langkawi</li> <li>3.7.2 Travel cost to Kilim based on the satisfaction</li> </ul>	59 59 61 65 66 67 67 67 67 67 68 68 70 70 70
<ul> <li>3 METHODOLOGY</li> <li>3.0 Introduction</li> <li>3.1 Background Information</li> <li>3.2 The case study area- Kilim Karst Geoforest Park, Langkawi</li> <li>3.3 Recreation demand modeling</li> <li>3.4 Model specification for ZTCM</li> <li>3.4.1 Travel cost to Langkawi</li> <li>3.4.2 Travel cost to Kilim based on the satisfaction at the park</li> <li>3.4.3 Travel cost to Kilim based on the number of hours at the park</li> <li>3.5 Heteroscedasticity</li> <li>3.5.1 Semi log model</li> <li>3.6 Estimation of consumer surplus of ZTCM</li> <li>3.7 Model specification for ITCM</li> <li>3.7.1 Travel cost to Langkawi</li> <li>3.7.2 Travel cost to Kilim based on the satisfaction at the park</li> </ul>	59 59 61 65 66 66 67 67 67 67 67 68 68 70 70 70
<ul> <li>3 METHODOLOGY <ul> <li>3.0 Introduction</li> <li>3.1 Background Information</li> <li>3.2 The case study area- Kilim Karst Geoforest Park, Langkawi</li> <li>3.3 Recreation demand modeling</li> <li>3.4 Model specification for ZTCM</li> <li>3.4.1 Travel cost to Langkawi</li> <li>3.4.2 Travel cost to Kilim based on the satisfaction at the park</li> <li>3.5 Heteroscedasticity</li> <li>3.5.1 Semi log model</li> <li>3.6 Estimation of consumer surplus of ZTCM</li> <li>3.7 Model specification for ITCM</li> <li>3.7.1 Travel cost to Kilim based on the satisfaction at the park</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	59 59 61 65 66 66 67 67 67 67 67 67 68 68 70 70 70 70
<ul> <li>3 METHODOLOGY <ul> <li>3.0 Introduction</li> <li>3.1 Background Information</li> <li>3.2 The case study area- Kilim Karst Geoforest Park, Langkawi</li> <li>3.3 Recreation demand modeling</li> <li>3.4 Model specification for ZTCM</li> <li>3.4.1 Travel cost to Langkawi</li> <li>3.4.2 Travel cost to Kilim based on the satisfaction at the park</li> <li>3.5 Heteroscedasticity</li> <li>3.5.1 Semi log model</li> <li>3.6 Estimation of consumer surplus of ZTCM</li> <li>3.7 Model specification for ITCM</li> <li>3.7.1 Travel cost to Langkawi</li> <li>3.7.2 Travel cost to Kilim based on the satisfaction at the park</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	59 59 61 65 66 67 67 67 67 67 67 68 68 68 70 70 70 70 71 71
<ul> <li>3 METHODOLOGY <ol> <li>3.0 Introduction</li> <li>3.1 Background Information</li> <li>3.2 The case study area- Kilim Karst Geoforest Park, Langkawi</li> <li>3.3 Recreation demand modeling</li> <li>3.4 Model specification for ZTCM</li> <li>3.4.1 Travel cost to Langkawi</li> <li>3.4.2 Travel cost to Kilim based on the satisfaction at the park</li> <li>3.5 Heteroscedasticity</li> <li>3.5.1 Semi log model</li> <li>3.5.2 Double log model</li> <li>3.5 Heteroscedasticiton for ITCM</li> <li>3.7 Model specification for ITCM</li> <li>3.7.1 Travel cost to Kilim based on the satisfaction at the park</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	59 59 61 65 66 66 67 67 67 67 67 67 68 68 70 70 70 70 70 70

models	
3.9.1 Dependent variable (DV) for ZTCM	73
3.9.2 Dependent variable for ITCM	73
3.9.3 Travel cost	73
3.9.4 Alternative site	76
3.9.5 Travel time and opportunity cost of time	77
3.9.6 On-site time at the Kilim Karst Geoforest	78
Park, Langkawi	
3.9.7 On-site cost at the Kilim Karst Geoforest	79
Park	
3.9.8 Gender	79
3.9.9 Age	80
3.9.10 Education Level	80
3.9.11 Income	81
3.9.12 Quality of the site	81
3.9.13 Willingness To Pay (WTP)	81
3.10 Design of the questionnaire	82
3.10.1 Questionnaire structure	82
3.10.2 Questionnaire version	82
3.11 Fieldwork	83
3.11.1 Pretesting and pilot study	83
3.11.2 Sampling procedures	83
3.11.3 Survey methods	84
3.11.4 Sample size	84
3.12 Data analysis	85
RESULT AND DISCUSSION	
4.0 Introduction	87
4.1 Socio-demographic information of the respondents	87
4.1.1 Gender	87
4.1.2 Age	88
4.1.3 Income	88
4.1.4 Education level	89
4.1.5 Occupation	90
4.2 Information of visit	90
4.2.1 Origin of respondents	90
4.2.2 Tour Package	91
4.2.3 Purpose of visit	92
4.2.4 Multiple destinations	92
4.2.5 Travel companions	92
4.2.6 Frequency of visits	93
4.2.7 On-site time	94
4.2.8 On-site cost	95
4.2.9 Travel time	95
4.2.10 Travel cost	97
4.3 Quality of the site	98
4.4 Willingness to pay (WTP)	99
4.5 Multicollinearity	100
	100
4.6 Individual travel cost method (ITCM)	100

4

C

4.7.1 Travel cost	103
4.7.2 The quality of the site measured by the	104
satisfaction gained from the resources	
4.7.3 Age	104
4.7.4 Education	105
4.7.5 Income	105
4.7.6 Time cost	105
4.7.7 Willingness to pay	106
4.8 Consumer surplus estimation	106
4.9 Ordinary Least Square regression output of (ZTCM)	108
4.10 Consumer surplus estimation for ZTCM	110
4.11 Summary of the findings of both the ITCM and ZTCM	110
4.11.1 Travel cost adjustment vs consumer surplus	111
CONCLUSION	
5.0 Introduction	113
5.1 Summary of the thesis	113
5.2 Conclusion of study	115
5.3 Implication to the management/Recommendations	117
5.3.1 The implications of the socio-demographic	117
variables	
5.3.2 Implications of visit and travel characteristics	118
5.3.3 Days, the quality of the site and willingness to	119
pay	
5.4 Contribution of the study	120
5.5 Suggestion for future study	122
5.6 Limitations of the study	123
5.6.1 Language	123
5.6.2. Seasonality of visitor arrivals	123
5.6.3. Modification of the TCM	123
5.6.4. Methodology limitation	124
5.6.5. Model estimation	124

	J.J.H. Wiethodology minitation	147
	5.6.5. Model estimation	124
1	REFERENCES	125
	APPENDICES	137
]	BIODATA OF STUDENT	163

5

# LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page	
1.1	Evolution of Tourism Development in Langkawi	3	
1.2	Visitor Arrivals (million) to Langkawi from (2006-2012)		
1.3	Total visitor arrivals to the KKGP from $(2006 - 2012)$		
1.4	International Visitor Arrivals to the KKGP from (2006-2012)		
2.1	Types of Environmental Valuation Techniques		
2.2	Strength and Weakness of Economic Valuation Techniques	24	
2.3	Weakness of TCM	26	
2.4	Drawbacks of CVM	27	
2.5	Determination of the Demand Curve for the ZTCM	29	
2.6	Demand for the Recreation Resources at the Site	31	
2.7	Parameters estimated for Basic TCM	32	
2.8	Opportunity cost of time	38	
2.9	Determination of Transportation Costs	39	
2.10	Functional Forms for ZTCM and ITCM	56	
2.11	Contingent Valuation Studies in Malaysia	58	
3.1	Three Approaches to Achieve the Goals of a Geopark	60	
3.2	Descriptions of the Geoparks in Langkawi	61	
3.3	Mangrove Tour Package at the Kilim Karst Geoforest Park	63	
3.4	Determination of Transportation Cost	74	
3.5	Education Level of the Visitors	80	
4.1	Gender of Respondents	88	
4.2	Age of Respondents	88	
4.3	Monthly Income Level of Respondents	89	
4.4	Education Level of Respondents	90	
4.5	Occupation of Respondents	90	
4.6	Origin of Respondents Based on World Continents	91	
4.7	Tour package	92	
4.8	Main Purpose of Visit to Langkawi	92	
4.9	Multiple Destinations by Respondents	93	
4.10	Travel Companions of Respondents to the Kilim Karst Geoforest	93	
	Park		
4.11	Total Number of Visits to the Kilim Karst Geoforest Park	94	
4.12	On-site Time at the Kilim Karst Geoforest Park	95	
4.13	On-site Cost at the Kilim Karst Geoforest Park	95	
4.14	Adjusted Round Trip Travel Time to Langkawi	96	
4.15	Travel Time Attributable to Kilim Based on the Satisfaction	96	
	Attained		
4.16	Travel Time Attributable to Kilim Based on the Number of Hours	96	
4.17	Adjusted Round Trip Travel Cost to Langkawi	96	
4.18	Travel Cost to Kilim Based on Satisfaction at the Park	98	
4.19	Travel Cost to Kilim Based on Hours at the Park	98	
4.20	Evaluation of Facilities and Resources	99	
4.21	Willingness and Reasons to Pay for an Entrance Fee	100	
4.22	Descriptive Statistics of the Variables 1		
4.23	Poisson Regression Output	102	

- 4.24 Consumer Surplus Estimation for ITCM and the DPV 107
- 4.25 Ordinary Least Square Regression Output (ZTCM) 109
- 4.26 Economic Value of the Kilim Karst Geoforest Park (2012) 111
- 4.27 Economic Value of the Kilim Karst Geoforest Park, Langkawi 112 (ITCM)



# LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
2.1	Tourism Ecology	12
2.2	Types of tourism	12
2.3	Rural Tourism Classifications	14
2.4	Utility	15
2.5	Demand curve	17
2.6	Reduction in Price of Item X	19
2.7	Increase in Price of Item X	20
2.8	Utility Maximization for Two Goods	21
2.9	Marshallian Demand Curve and the Consumer Surplus	22
2.10	Total Economic Value	23
2.11	Concept of Gravity Model	28
2.12	Travel Cost from the Origin Location to the Site and Number of	30
	Visits Per Capita	
2.13	Demand for Recreation Resources	31
3.1	Location Map of the Kilim Karst Geoforest Park	62

# LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CS	Consumer surplus
CVM	Contingent Valuation Method
EUR	Euro
ITCM	Individual Travel Cost Method
KKGP	Kilim Karst Geoforest Park
KLIA	Kuala Lumpur International Airport
LIMDEP	Limited Dependent Model
LM	Linear model
MDT	Multi-destination trip
MYR	Malaysian ringgit
OLS	Ordinary Least Square
RP	Revealed preferences
SP	Stated preferences
SPSS	Statistical Package for Social Sciences
TCM	Travel Cost Method
TEV	Total economic value
US	United States
WTO	World Tourism Organization
WTP	Willingness to pay
WTTC	World Travel and Tourism Council
ZTCM	Zonal Travel Cost Method

### **CHAPTER ONE**

#### **INTRODUCTION**

#### 1.0 General background

The first part of this chapter discusses tourism development in Malaysia, the island of Langkawi and rural tourism development in Kilim Karst Geoforest Park. Next, the various purposes of economic valuation based on past literatures are explored. The specific problems in the park related to economic valuation at a micro level that focuses on the benefits obtained by the visitors at the park are discussed exhaustively. Later, the objectives are drafted based on the problem statement as shown. Finally, the importance of the study is discussed in the final part of the chapter.

### 1.1 Tourism

According to the World Travel and Tourism Council (2011), tourism is one of the world's largest economic sectors. It contributes trillions of dollars annually to the world's Gross Domestic Product (GDP). The tourism sector generates job opportunities and wealth, increases exports, boosts tax revenue and attracts capital investment. The World Travel and Tourism Council (2011) claims that travel and tourism sector supplies more than 260 million jobs worldwide. Furthermore, it is estimated that the industry contributed almost US\$6 trillion or 9% of the world's Gross Domestic Product (GDP) in 2011. The tourism sector in Malaysia emerged in the late 1960s, (World Travel and Tourism Council, 2002). It was developed by the federal government of Malaysia in 1987 as a major economic sector to stimulate economic growth and employment, particularly in rural areas (Hjulmand, Nielsen, Vesterlokke, Busk, & Erichsen, 2003). At present, Malaysia is among the top most demanded tourism destination in the world. Malaysia is ranked 10<sup>th</sup> in tourist arrivals and 15<sup>th</sup> in terms of world tourism receipts (Economic Transformation Program, 2011). More specifically, the Malaysian tourism sector stands as the seventh largest contributor to the nation's Gross Domestic Product. International tourist arrivals to Malaysia increased from 16.4 million in 2005 to 25.03 million in 2012 followed by an increase in tourism receipts from RM 32 billion in 2005 to RM 61 billion in 2012.

### 1.2 Tourism development in Langkawi

Table 1.1 below shows the chronology of tourism development in Langkawi beginning from 1987 until 2007. Before 1987, the local community in Langkawi relied predominantly on the agriculture and fishery industries as their primary source of income, despite some of them being involved in tourism activities (Sharina et al., 2011).

The development of tourism in Langkawi began after the declaration of Langkawi as a duty free Island in 1987. Following the declaration, there was a huge increase in the number of visitors arriving in Langkawi, from 310,004 in 1987 to 1.8 million arrivals in 2005 (Langkawi Development Authority, 2012). Moreover, it was found that from 1988 – 1992 the private sector had invested in 106 tourism projects in Langkawi that amounted to RM 1 billion, (Marzuki, 2011). Consequently, there was an increase in the number of hotel rooms in Langkawi from 859 in 1988 to 7072 in 2005 (Marzuki, 2011). Tourism development in Langkawi was further enhanced through the formation of the Langkawi Development Authority (LADA) on 15 March 1990 by the federal government (Ibrahim & Ahmad, 2011). The roles of LADA (as obtained from the official website of LADA, 2012) are as follows:

- To encourage, stimulate, accelerate, and implement socioeconomic development in areas under the auspices of LADA.
- To promote and develop the tourist destinations and tax-free zones in Langkawi
- To stimulate, implement and accelerate the development of tourism, infrastructure, accommodation, agriculture, trade and industry
- To co-ordinate the performance of development activities

Finally, there is a move towards ecotourism and knowledge based tourism in Langkawi following the declaration of Langkawi as the 52nd Global Network Geopark member by the United Nations Educational and Scientific Organizations (UNESCO) in 2007. Langkawi is the only listed Geopark in Malaysia and one of 89 global Geoparks across 27 countries in the world (UNESCO, 2012). The three Geoparks in Langkawi comprises the Kilim Karst, Dayang Bunting Marble and the Machinchang Cambrian Geoforest parks. The Global Geoparks Network (GGN) (2009) defines geoparks as a nationally protected area containing a number of geological heritage sites of particular importance, rarity, or aesthetic appeal. These earth heritage sites are part of an integrated concept of protection, education, and sustainable development.

The federal government has recently decided to upgrade the tourist infrastructures in Langkawi after a lapse of several years. The government has allocated approximately RM 420 million to redevelop the infrastructure in Langkawi under the Langkawi Five Year Tourism Development Master Plan (2011 - 2015).

Year	Socio-economy	Descriptions					
Before 1987	Agriculture and Fisheries	Before the declaration by the federal					
		government as a tax-free zone					
1987	Local entrepreneurship and	Declaration by the federal government					
	tourism	as a tax-free zone					
2007	Ecotourism and knowledge	Declared as a Geopark (Machinchang					
	based tourism	Cambrian, Kilim Karst and Dayang					
		Bunting Marble Geoforest Parks)					

<b>Table 1.1: Evolution of Tourism</b>	Development	t <b>in Langkaw</b> i
--	-------------	-----------------------

Sources: Adapted from Sharina, Ibrahim, Hood, and Mustaffa (2011)

Table 1.2 below shows continued increase in visitor arrivals to Langkawi from 2006 – 2012. The total arrivals had increased from 17.55 million in 2006 to 25.03 in 2012. This shows an increase of arrivals of 7.8 million or (30%).

Year	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	
Visitor	17.55	20.97	22.05	23.65	24.58	24.71	25.03	
arrivals								

### 1.3 Rural tourism in the Kilim Karst Geoforest Park, Langkawi

The definition of rural tourism within the context of the KKGP is as follows:

Rural tourism in Kilim takes place in a rural setting surrounded by ancient limestone formed millions of years ago. The availability of pristine resources such as the mangrove swamps and limestones in Kilim enhances the potential of developing tourism in the park. The rural fishing community in Kilim headed by the *Koperasi Komuniti Kampung Kilim Langkawi Berhad* helps manage the rural tourism activity in the park. The development of rural tourism in Kilim gives the visitors an opportunity to view the resources available in the rural area. More crucially, the development of rural tourism is seen as a potential tool to enhance the standard of living of the local community in Kilim village. From an economic perspective, the development of rural tourism offers, both, full time and part time employment for the rural population there. The fishermen who are registered with the cooperative can bring along their own boats and ferry visitors around the park for a fee. Some of the men from the village work as tour agents, while, the women folk are also involved in rural tourism as staff of the Kilim cooperative, tour agents and small-time entrepreneurs running small cafes and souvenir shop businesses.



Meanwhile, this venture provides additional income for the rural local community in Kilim. Referring to Utusan Malaysia (2012), tourism development in Kilim began in 2010 with the formation of *Koperasi Komuniti Kampung Kilim Langkawi Berhad* with 53 members comprising mainly fishermen. The cooperative manages and runs the rural tourism business under the direct supervision of LADA. Thus, the cooperative is responsible for submitting all pertinent reports and data such as visitor's arrival data, number of cooperative members involved in tourism activity, income generated from tourism, discussion of issues pertaining to rural tourism development at the park etc.

The role of LADA in rural tourism development at the park is as follows. In a conversation with M.Zuhri, head of the monitoring and enforcement unit of the Geopark Division on 29 June 2012, he has mentioned that LADA is responsible for remunerating allocations from the federal government for the development of infrastructure and signage in the park. LADA is also responsible for promoting the KKGP, both locally and abroad. In addition, LADA also organizes familiarity trips, where travel agents from around the world are given an opportunity to visit KKGP at a very low cost in a hope that the agents would promote the beauty and pristine resources available at the park to their respective countries.

The next section discusses the role of the federal government. Recently, the Prime Minister launched both the Geopark Discovery Centre and the Kilim project, which was expected to cost more than RM 20 million, (New Straits Times, 2012). Apart from that, RM 13 million is allocated for the discovery center. The discovery centre functions as an archive and reference center that provides information on geology, flora and fauna, socio-cultural and international aspects about geoparks in Langkawi. Among the plans under the Kilim project is the upgrading of the visitor's facilities in Kilim jetty and the mangrove swamp areas and to relocate the facilities for fishermen at the jetty (New Straits Times, 2012). Both projects are expected to begin on February 2013 and be completed by 2015.

Table 1.3 below shows an increase in the total number of visitors arriving in 2006, from 42,375 to 273,450 in 2012. Nonetheless, the accuracy of the data shown in the table is questionable because the visitor arrivals data was only properly recorded beginning from 2011 (S. Siti, personnal communication, March 29, 2012). In 2011, out of 321,325 visitors to the park, 168,528 were international visitors whereas 152,797 were local visitors. Next, in 2012, out of 273,450 visitors to the park 126,982 were international visitors whereas 146,468 were local visitors.

 Table 1.3: Total Visitor Arrivals to the KKGP from (2006 – 2012)

Year	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	
Visitors	42,375	78,145	167,142	115,660	117, 931	321, 325	273, 450	
Source: Langkawi Development Authority LADA (2012)								

Hence, since specific information on the number of international visitor arrivals to the park from 2006 to 2010 is unknown, therefore, based on the proportion in 2011 and 2012, an assumption is made that they constitute 50% of the total visitor arrivals recorded. Table 1.4 shows the trend of international visitor arrivals to the park. There is an increasing trend from 2006 to 2008, followed by a drop in arrivals in 2009 by 25,741. Later, the arrivals increased by 110,698 from 2009 until 2011 followed by a decrease in arrivals in 2012 by 41,546. An increase in arrivals of international visitors from 2006 to 2012 (83%), necessitates the need to identify factors influencing the demand of international visitors to KKGP. Moreover, based on the demand curve, the monetary value of the benefits gained by international visitors to the park will be determined using the concept of consumer surplus to imply the importance of the park to the users.

 Table 1.4: International Visitor Arrivals to the KKGP from (2006-2012)

Year	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
International	21,188	39,073	83,571	57,830	58,96 <mark>6</mark>	168,528	126, 982
Visitors							

### **1.4 Economic valuation**

Economic valuation of tourism can be done at two levels - the macro and micro levels. At the macro level, studies will focus on the economic impact of tourism development in terms of employment creation, income effects, business opportunities etc. Analyses focusing on the micro effects will determine the values or the satisfaction of the tourists when visiting and using the facilities at the destination. Ahmad (2011) who did a study on the value of outdoor recreation in Langkawi pointed out the various usefulness of economic valuation. Firstly, it could be used to determine an appropriate fee (entrance fee) for the usage of recreational facilities as the proxy for the price of goods due to the public good nature of the non-market goods. Secondly, the valuation could be used to determine the value of the facilities available at the destination. That information would be beneficial for facility planning purposes by the state government.



Besides, the quantitative value could be used to justify investment worthiness of public funds for tourism development in a destination. For instance, Gurluk and Rehber (2008), in their study found that the economic value of the Kuscenneti National Park (KNP) located in Turkey (US\$ 103,320,074) was higher than the cost of the annual operating expenditures and investments in KNP. Thus, government spending towards Kuscenneti National Park (KNP) was worthwhile. Next, the quantitative value can be used to highlight the role and benefits of a particular tourism site instead of introducing some other forms of alternative developments. Furthermore, the quantitative estimates of a particular tourism destination can be used to implement pricing schemes and management decision-making, which in turn can efficiently allocate the resources available at a particular site.

Apart from all the usefulness of economic valuation indicated by Ahmad (2011), the quantitative value can also be used to justify the need to protect the wildlife and marine life. Becker, Inbar, Bahat, Choresh, Ben and Yaffe (2005) in a study to estimate the economic value of viewing griffon vultures at Gamla Nature Reserve in Israel indicates that the quantitative value of the reserve can be used to convince policy makers regarding the necessity for further investment to protect the Eurasian griffon vulture species. On a similar note, Chae, Wattage, and Pascoe (2012) states that the findings of the quantitative value of a marine protected area in Lundy (England) will be useful to convey a strong economic justification for the designation of Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) and the conservation of the area.

The present study focuses specifically on the determination of benefits gained (consumer surplus) by international visitors using the travel cost method (TCM), which is one of the popular environmental valuation techniques. Predominantly, most applications using the TCM entail domestic visits whereby the mode of travel is predominantly by car. Limited studies have extended the method to determine the benefits gained by the international visitors, who mostly travel by plane. The possible challenges when determining benefits obtained by international tourists as pointed out by Carr and Mendelsohn (2003) are as follows. Firstly, the underlying assumption in most of the travel cost literatures that the cost per mile is constant is not applicable for visitors using flights as the mode of travel. Next, many of the international tourists who visited the site had subscribed to tour packages. Consequently, the travel cost incurred by them could not be accurately identified. Therefore, some of them might have visited using promotional fares, which do not have a standardized fare for visitors who might have a similar holiday itinerary. Finally, there is no information available on the actual fare from countries with zero observed visitors.

Menkaus and Lober (1996) highlighted the importance of determining the benefits gained by international visitors who had the chance to view valuable and scarce natural

resources at the park. Carr and Mendelsohn (2003) who studied the Great Barrier Reef in Australia pointed out that the willingness of international tourist to travel great distances to international sites reflects that the site is highly valued by them.

### **1.5 Problem statement**

International visitors' arriving at KKGP had reduced by 25% from 168,528 in 2011 to 126, 982 in 2012. In 2011, the number of international visitor arrivals exceeded the arrival of local visitors (152,797). However, in 2012, the arrival of international visitors was lower than the arrival of local visitors (146,468). Furthermore, an increase in arrivals of international visitors from 2006 (21,188) to 2012 (126,982) was about (83%), thus necessitating the need to identify factors influencing the demand of international visitors to KKGP. Pertaining to this, very few studies have been conducted to determine the demand of international visitors to the park.

Thus, whether the visitors to the park obtain benefits from their visit is unknown. This necessitates the need to determine the benefits gained by the international visitors, who usually incur more travelling expenses as compared to the locals going to the park. A. N. Hanapiah (personal communication, July 27, 2012), the chairperson of *Koperasi Komuniti Kampung Kilim Berhad*, said that generally, international visitors were satisfied with their rural tourism experiences at the park. Nevertheless, the benefits gained by international visitors have not been shown quantitatively. M. Zuhri the manager of the forestry conservation unit in Lada has also indicated that limited studies have been done to determine the benefits acquired, specifically from international visitors, based on a proper economic analysis.

The estimation of the value of the park, which is a protected area, is crucial to politicians, public and policy makers. Our government has decided to spend RM 7 million for the tourism development of the park (New Straits Times, 2012). Thus, justification on the worthiness of government investment is crucial.

Preservation of resources is carried out in the park, particularly the limestone and mangrove swamps, through rural tourism businesses instead of some other development alternatives, such as industrial development or timber industries. For example, the limestone available in the park can be used as building material, cement, or mortar used in the manufacture of ceramics, as cheap fillers used as fillers in some plastics and in the construction of roads. Since products and services offered at KKGP are intangible by nature the monetary value of the park is unknown for any justification to be made.

Limited studies have been conducted to determine the economic value of the park and one of these studies had determined the economic value of the park (Faizah, 2011). The study found the economic value of the park to be RM 2, 886, 542 in 2008, using the Contingent Valuation Method (CVM).

In terms of the methodological gap in Malaysia and based on past literature, limited studies have employed the TCM to determine the benefits obtained by international visitors. The only study that employs the ZTCM to determine the benefit obtained by international visitors is by Siti (2009). On the other hand, only two researchers employ the ITCM (Siti, 2009 & Suryani, Sanusi, & Kamil, 2012). This shows that the utilization of both models to determine the benefit obtained by international visitors to Malaysia is still very limited. Therefore, this study will add to the present literature by employing both methods to bridge the gap between those methods despite having different implications.

In order to determine benefits of the park, a demand function must be estimated for which the consumer surplus is derived to indicate the benefit.

### 1.6 Objectives of the study

### 1.6.1 General objective

The study intends to determine the rural tourism demand of international visitors to KKGP and the economic value of the park. Hence, in order to fulfill the general objectives, specific objectives have to be achieved initially.

### 1.6.2 Specific objectives

1. To identify the socio-demographic and characteristics of the visits of international visitors to the Kilim Karst Geoforest Park.

2. To determine the factors influencing the rural tourism demand of international visitors to Kilim Karst Geoforest Park.

3. To determine the economic value of Kilim Karst Geoforest Park.

### 1.7 Significance of the study

### 1.7.1 Federal Government and the Langkawi Development Authority (LADA)

The findings pertaining to the economic value of KKGP will be useful for the federal government to justify the allocations given for rural tourism development for the park under the Langkawi Five Year Tourism Development Master Plan (2011 – 2015) to the opposition party, politicians, and the community. The findings from the study will also be useful for LADA in making appropriate decisions concerning rural tourism development in Kilim. For instance, the findings about the characteristics of the visit, the visit pattern, the proportion of visitors from the main cities around the world, etc, will be useful for LADA when marketing the park to the international market. Furthermore, the present study will give an indication to LADA on the benefits obtained by international visitors to the park using the concept of consumer surplus. If the benefits gained are high, the influential factors on the demand for the park should be identified to further enhance those factors and likewise, if the benefits are low, the contributing factors should be identified, remedied, and rectified to further enhance the benefits and perceptions of the visitors on the park.

#### 1.7.2 Other stakeholders and conservation of resources in the park

The findings of the study, specifically pertaining to the economic value of the park, will alert the community regarding the importance of conserving the natural resources available at the park. Any failure to conserve the natural resources will lead to depletion and eventual destruction of these resources, consequently, jeopardizing rural tourism in the park. Besides, these findings will help in justifying the utilization of park land for rural tourism development purposes that indirectly ensures the continued existence of the resources available at the site instead of utilizing it for any other form of alternative development that will eventually lead towards the damage and destruction of the natural resources available at the KKGP.

### **1.7.3 International visitors**

The utilization of the findings of the study by Federal Government and LADA would capture the need of international visitors visiting the park. Consequently, it is hoped that upcoming visitors obtain more satisfaction from the visit.

### 1.7.4 Academic contribution

Very few studies have utilized the Travel Cost Method to develop the demand model of international visitors to the park. This relates to many issues in TCM concerning international visitors and the underlying assumptions in most of the travel cost literature such as cost per kilometre is a random variable, use of tour packages and promotional fares.

### 1.7.5 Literature

This study will add on to the present literature on developing the demand model specifically for international visitors. Besides, the present study contributes towards the determination of the economic value of a specific site. For example, KKGP is one of the many attractions in Langkawi. Therefore, the travel cost attritutable to KKGP is determined through apportionate of time and satisfaction. Finally, an inclusion of the willingness to pay as an independent variable in the demand model results in the derrivation of the true or actual demand curve of the park.

### **1.8 Organization of the thesis**

The first half of the study consists of three chapters, which provide a framework to understand, identify, and determine the economic value of KKGP. Chapter 1 introduces an overview about the tourism development in Malaysia, Langkawi and specifically the rural tourism development at KKGP. Later, the statements of problem and the objective of study that is developed based on the problem are shown. The chapter ends with some discussions about the significance of the study to the relevant authorities.

Chapter 2 discusses the literature rewiew. The chapter begins with the discussions about the theoretical framework of the study. The chapter reviews the literatures on valuation of resources at a particular site. A discussion in chapter 3 begins with the backgrounds of the KKGP. Later, the demand model for the KKGP would be shown, followed by the explanations about each of the variables used in the model. The chapter ends with the discussion about the sampling and survey procedures.

The remaining are chapters 4 and 5. Chapter 4 covers data analysis and discussion. The final chapter of the thesis discusses about the summary of findings and recommendations.



### REFERENCES

- Acharya, R. N., Hatch, L. U., & Clonts, H. A. (2003). The role of on-site time in recreational demand for wilderness. *Journal of Agriculture and Applied Economics*, 35(1), 159-169.
- Ahmad, S. (1991). Pengaruh Kos masa dalam permintaan rekreasi luar. Malaysian Journal of Agriculture Economics, 8, 44-51.
- Ahmad, S. (1993). Faktor pesaing di dalam permintaan rekreasi luar. Pertanika. Journal of Social Science and Humanity, 1(2), 199-204.
- Ahmad, S. (1994). Demand for and value of outdoor recreation in Langkawi by domestic visitors. (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation), Universiti Putra Malaysia, Selangor.
- Ahmad, S. (1995). Tourism in Taman Negara Malaysia its contribution as perceived by residents of Ulu Tembeling. *Akademika*, 47, 37-48.
- Ahmad, S. (2009). Recreational values of Mangrove Forest in Larut Matang, Perak. Journal of Tropical Forest Science, 21(2), 81-87.
- Ahmad, S. (2011, July). Value of outdoor recreation. Paper presented in Faculty of Economics and Business, Universiti Malaysia, Sarawak. Number 1102 March 2011. Retrieved from, <u>http://www.feb.unimas.my/images/feb/wps1102.pdf</u>.
- Alias, R., & Shazali, A. M. (2005). Use of Dichotomous Choice. A Contingent Valuation Method to value the Manukan Island, Sabah. *Pertanika Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, 13(1), 1-8.
- Alvarez, S., & Larkin, S. L. (2008, February). Valuing recreational benefits of a National Park in Andean Columbia. Selected paper prepared for presentation at the Southern Agricultural Economics Association Annual Meetings Dallas, United States.
- Anne, C. S., William, C. A., & James Brown, H. (2005). *Microeconomics for public decisions*. Ohio: Thomson South Western.
- Asia Web Direct. (2012). Sungai Kilim Nature Park in Langkawi. Retrieved from <u>http://www.langkawi-info.com</u>.
- Awang Noor, A. G., Mohd Shahwahid, H. O., Mohd Rusli., Mohd Shukri., Faridah, H., & Mohamed, Z. (1999). Economic valuation of Forest Good and Services of

Ayer Hitam Forest, Puchong, Selangor. *Pertanika, Journal of Tropical and Agricultural Science*, 22 (2), 147-160.

- Awang Noor, M. Y. H., Tuan Marina, T. I., & Mohd Syauki, M. S. (2009). Economic valuation of recreational benefits in Chamang Forest Recreation Area, Pahang, Peninsular Malaysia. *The Malaysian Forester*, 72(1), 69-86.
- Ayob, Z. M., Saman, M. F., & Hussin, Z. (2009). Tourist's satisfaction on Kilim River Mangrove Forest Ecotourism Services. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 4(7), 1-9.
- Barton, D. N. (1994). Economic valuation of Tropical Coastal Resources (SMR- report 14/94). University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway.
- Beardsley, W. (1971). Bias and non-comparability in recreation evaluation models. *Land* economics, 47(2), 175-180.
- Becker, N., Inbar, M., Bahat, O., Choresh, Y., Ben-Noon, G., & Yaffe, O. (2005). Estimating the economic value of viewing griffon vultures Gyps fulvus: a Travel Cost Model study at Gamla Nature Reserve, Israel. *Oryx*, 39(4), 1-6.
- Bell, F. W., & Leeworthy, V. R. (1990). Recreational demand by tourist for saltwater beach days. *Journal of environmental economics and management*, 18, 189-205.
- Bernama. (2012, December 8). Langkawi Tourism Blueprint set to bring transformations to islanders. *New Straits Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nst.com.my/latest/Langkawi/tourism-blueprint.
- Birol, E., Karaousakis, K., & Koundouri, P. (2006). Using economic valuation techniques to inform water resources management: A survey and critical appraisal of available techniques and an application. *Science of the total environment*, 365, 105-122.
- Blackwell, B. (2007). The value of a recreational beach visit. An application to Mooloolaba beach and comparisons with other outdoor recreation sites. *Economic Analysis and Policy*, 32(1), 1-22.
- Briedenhann, J., & Wickens, E. (2004). Rural Tourism- Meeting the challenges of the New South Africa. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 6, 189-203.
- Brown, W. G., & Nawas, F. (1973). Impact of Aggregation on the Estimation of Outdoor Recreation Demand Functions. *Journal of agricultural economics*, *50*, 246-249.
- Brown, W. G., Sorhus, C., Chou Yang, B. L., & Richards, J. A. (1983). Using Individual Observations to Estimate Recreation Demand Functions: A Caution. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 65, 154-157.

- Burt, O. R., & Brewer, D. (1971). Estimation of net social benefits from outdoor recreation. *Econometrica*, 30(5), 813-827.
- Carr, L., & Mendelsohn, R. (2003). Valuing coral reefs: A travel cost analysis of the Great Barrier Reef. *Ambio*, 32(5), 1-5.
- Caulkins, P. P., Bishops, R. C., & Bouwes, N. W. (1985). Omitted cross- price variables biases in the linear travel cost model: Correcting common misperceptions. *Land Economics*, *61*(2), 182-187.
- Cesario, F. J. (1976). Value of time in recreation benefits studies. Land economics, 51(1), 1-10.
- Chae, D. R., Wattage, P., & Pascoe, S. (2012). Recreational benefits from a marine protected areas: A travel cost analysis of Lundy. *Tourism management*, 33, 971-977.
- Chakraborty, K., & Keith, J. E. (2000). Estimating the recreation demand and economic value of mountain biking in Moab, Utah: An application of count data models. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, *43*(4), 461-469.
- Chaudry, P., & Tewari, V. P. (2006). A comparison between TCM and CVM in assessing the recreational use value of Urban Forestry. *International Forestry Review*, 8(4), 439-448.
- Chen, W., Hong, H., Liu, Y., Zhang, L., Hou, X., & Raymond, M. (2004). Recreation demand and economic value: An application of travel cost method for Xiamen Island. *China Economic Review* 15: 398-406.
- Chubb, M., & Chubb, H. (1981). One third of our time? An introduction to recreation behavior and Resources. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- City Mayors Statistics. (2011). *The largest cities in the world and their mayor*. Retrieved from <u>http://www.citymayors.com/statistics/largest-cities-mayors-1.html</u>.
- Clawson, M., & Knetsch, J. L. (1966). *Economics of Outdoor Recreation*. Baltimore: John Hopkins Press.
- Clough, P. W. J., & Meister, A. D. (1991). Allowing for multiple-site visitors in travel cost analysis. *Journal of environment management*, 32, 115-125.
- Committee on valuing ground water, National Research Council. (1997). Valuing ground water. Economics concepts and approaches. Retrieved from http://www.sharingmatrix.com/file/11908929/0309056403.pdf.

- Creel, M. D., & Loomis, B. J. (1990). Theoretical and empirical advantages of truncated count estimators of deer hunting in California. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 72, 434-441.
- David, L. (2011). Tourism ecology: towards the responsible, sustainable tourism future. *Worldwide Hospitality and Tourism Themes*, *3*(3), 210-216.
- Davis, R. K. (1963). Recreational planning as an ecotourism problem. *Natural Resources Journal*, *3*, 239-249.
- Dayang Hafizzah, A. M., Alias, R., & Siti Baizura, J. Z. (2006). *The Economics of Recreational Park Conservation: A case study of Bako National Park*. Staff paper, Universiti Putra Malaysia.
- Dee, U. K., & Devi, A. (2011). Valuing recreational and conservational benefits of a natural tourist's site: case of Cherrapunjee. *Journal of Quantitative Economics*, 9(2), 154 172.
- Dharmaratne, Gerard, S., & Brathwaite, Alwayn E. (1998). "Economic valuation of the coastline for Tourism in Barbados". *Journal of Travel Research*, 37(2), 138-144.
- Donavan, G., & Champ, P. (2009). The economic benefits of elk viewing at the Jewell Meadows Wildlife area in Oregon. *Human dimensions of wildlife, 14*, 51-60.
- Douglas, A, A. J., & Taylor, J. G. (1999). A new model for the travel cost method: a total expenses approach. *Journal of Environmental Modelling and Software, 14*, 81 92.
- Driml, S. (2002). Travel cost analysis of recreation value in the wet tropics world heritage area. *Economic Analysis and Policy*, 32(2), 1-16.
- Economic Transformation Programme. (2011). Annual report. Retrieved from <u>http://www</u>. etp. pemandu.gov.my/annualreport/12\_National Key\_Economic\_Areas-@-Tourism.Aspx.
- Edwards, P. T., Parsons, G.R., & Myers, K. H. (2011). The economic value of viewing migratory on the Delware Bay: An application of the single travel cost model using on-site data. *Human dimensions of wildlife, 16*, 435-444.
- Englin, J., & Shonkwiler, J. S. (1995). Estimating social welfare using count data models: An application to long-run recreation demand under conditions of endogenous stratification and Truncation. *The review of economics and statistics*, 77(1), 104-112.

- Enyew, S. (2003). Valuation of the benefits of outdoor recreation using the Travel Cost Method: The case of Wabi- Shebelle Langano Recreation Site. (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <u>http://etd.aau.edu.et/dspace/handle/123456789/1044</u>.
- Eruera, A. (2008). *Rural tourism development in the Eastern Hokianga Area* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Technology, Auckland.
- Espineira, R. M., & Tuffour, J. A. (2008). Recreation demand analysis under truncation, overdispersion, and endogenous stratification: An application to Gros Morne National Park. *Journal of environmental management*, 88, 1320-1332.
- Everitt, A. S. (1983). A valuation of recreational benefits. *NZ Journal of Forestry*, 28, 176-183.
- Feather, P., & Shaw, W. D. (1999). Estimating the cost of leisure time for recreation demand models. *Journal of environmental economics and managements*, *38*, 49-65.
- Fix, P., & Loomis, J. (1998). Comparing the economic value of mountain biking estimated using revealed and stated preferences. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 41 (2), 227 236.
- Fleming, C. M., & Cook, A. (2007, February). The recreational value of Lake McKenzie: An application of the Travel Cost Method. Paper presented at the 51<sup>st</sup> Annual Conference of the Australian Agricultural and Resource Economics Society, Queenstown, New Zealand.
- Fleming, C. M., & Cook, A. (2008). The recreational value of Lake McKenzie, Fraser Island: An application of the travel cost method. *Tourism Management*, 29, 1197-1205.
- Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2012). Retrieved from <u>http://www</u>. fao.org/docrep.
- Garrod, G. D., & Willis, K. G. (1999). Methodological issues in valuing the benefits of environmentally sensitive areas. *Journal of rural studies*, 15(1), 111-117.
- Ghani, A. N. A., Shahwahid, M., Mohd, R., Mohd, S., Hanum, F., & Zakaria, M. (1999). Economic valuation of Forest Good and Services of Ayer Hitam Forest, Puchong, Selangor. *Pertanika, Journal of Tropical and Agricultural Science*, 22 (2), 147-160.
- Global Geoparks Network. (2009). What is a Geopark?. Retrieved from <u>http://unesdoc.unesco.org</u>.

Graham – Tomasi, T., Adamowicz, W. L., & Fletcher, J. J. (1990). Errors of truncation in approximations to expected consumer surplus. *Land Economics*, 66(1), 50-55.

Greene, W.H. (1997). Econometric Analysis. Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

- Grogger, J. T., & Carson, R. T. (1991). Models for truncated counts. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 6(3), 225 – 238.
- Gurluk, S., & Rehbar, E. (2008). A travel cost study to estimate the recreational value for a bird refuge at Lake Manya's Turkey. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 88, 1350-1360.
- Hafizah, A. (1995). The economics of forest recreation: Sungai Chongkak, Hulu Langat.
   BSc (Forestry), Project Paper, Faculty of Economics, and management, Universiti Pertanian Malaysia, Selangor.
- Hajkowicz, S. A., McDonald, G. T., & Smith, P. N. (2000). An evaluation of multiple objective decision support weighting techniques in natural resource management. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 43(4), 505 – 518.
- Hanley, N., & Spash, C. (1993). *Cost-Benefit Analysis and the Environment*, Aldershot, UK and Brookfield, US: Edward Elgar.
- Herath, G., & Kennedy, J. (2004). Estimating the economic value of Mount Buffalo National Park with the travel cost and contingent valuation models. *Tourism* economics, 10(1), 63-78.
- Heyes, L. C., & Heyes, A. (1999). Recreational benefits from the Dartmoor National Park. *Journal of environmental management*, 55, 69- 80.
- Hjulmand, G. L., Nielsen, U., Vesterlokke, P., Busk, J. R., & Erichsen, E. (2003).
  Tourism as a development strategy in rural areas adjacent to the Crocker National Park, Sabah, Malaysia. ASEAN Review of Biodiversity and Environmental Conservation (ARBEC). Retrieved from http://www.arbec.com.my/pdf/art8janmar03.pdf.
- John Asafu, A. (2005). Environmental Economics for Non-Economists: Techniques and Policies for Sustainable Development (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition). Retrieved from <u>http://books.google.com.my/books</u>.
- Juan, M. G., John, B. L., & Armando, G. C. (2008). A joint estimation method to combine dichotomous choice CVM models with count data TCM models corrected for truncation and endogenous stratification. *Journal of Agricultural* and Applied Economics, 40 (2), 681-695.

- Kling, C. L. (1988). Comparing welfare estimates of environmental quality changes from recreation demand models. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, 15(3), 331-340.
- Koperasi Komuniti Kampung Kilim Berhad. (2012). Jumlah kemasukan pelancong ke jeti Kilim pada Januari 2011 hingga December 2011.
- Koperasi Komuniti Kampung Kilim Langkawi Berhad. (2012). Profil Kampung Kilim.
- Kuosmanen, T., Nillesen, E., & Weseller, J. (2003). Ignoring multi-destination trips in the travel cost method cause a systematic bias. *The Australian Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics*, 48(4), 629-651.
- Landry, C. E., & McConell, K. E. (2007). Hedonic on-site cost model of recreation demand. *Land economics*, 83(2), 253 267.
- Langkawi Development Authority Official Website (2012). Latar belakang LADA. Retrieved from <u>http://www.lada.gov.my/v2/maklumat</u> korporat/profil/latarbelakang-lada.
- Langkawi Geopark Official Website. (2012). Kilim Karst Geoforest Park. Retrieved from <u>http://www.langkawigeopark.com.my</u>.
- Mankiw N.G (2012). *Principles of microeconomics*. Canada: South-Western Cengage Learning.
- Mc Conell, C. R., Brue, S. L., Flynn, S. M., & Grant, R. (2012). *Microeconomics, global edition: Principles, problems and policies.* New York: Mc Graw-Hill Irwin.
- Mohd Shafeea, L. (2010). Geoheritage conservation in Langkawi Geopark, Malaysia. *Akademika*, 80, 19 – 30.
- Liu, A. (2006). Tourism in rural areas: Kedah, Malaysia. *Tourism Management*, 27, 878-889.
- Lo, M. C., Mohamad, A. A., Songan, P., & Yeo, A. W. (2012) Positioning Rural Tourism: Perspectives from the Local Communities. *International Journal of Trade, Economics, and Finance, 3*(1), 1-7.
- Lu, T. K. (2006). Principles of microeconomics made simple. Malaysia: Perintice Hall.
- Mahmud, Z. (2009). *Handbook of research methodology: A simplified version*. Selangor, Malaysia: University Publication Centre (UPENA).
- Maille, P., & Mendelsohn, R. (1993). Valuing ecotourism in Madagaskar. *Journal of* environmental management, 38, 213-218.

- Marzuki, A. (2011). Resident attitudes towards impact from tourism development in Langkawi Islands, Malaysia. World Applies Sciences Journal 12 (Special issue of Tourism & Hospitality), 25-34.
- McConnell, K. E. (1992). On-site time in the demand for recreation. American Journal of Agricultural Economics, 74(4), 918-925.
- Mendelsohn, R., Hof, J., Peterson, G., & Johnson, R. (1992). Measuring recreational values with multiple destination trips. *Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 74(4), 926-933.
- Mendes, I. (2002, October). *Travel and on site recreation time: An empirical approach to value the recreation benefits of Peneda-Geres National Park.* Paper presented at the IATUR Conference, Lisbon, Portugal.
- Menkhaus, S., & Lober, D. J., (1996). International ecotourism and the valuation of tropical rainforests in Costa Rica. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 1-10.
- Mercer, E., Kramer, R., & Sharma, N. (1995). Estimating the benefits of tourism development in a new national park in Madagascar. *Journal of Forest Economics*, 1(2), 1 31.
- Miecwkowski, Z. (1995). "Environmental issues of tourism and recreation". Maryland: Universiti of America Press:
- Mohd Aswad, R., Alias, R., Mohd Rusli, Y., & Noor Azlin, Y. (2011). Willingness to pay towards the sustainability of Forest Research Institute Malaysia's (FRIM'S) canopy walkway. *International Journal of Business, Management and Social Sciences, 2*(3), 85-92.
- Mohd Rusli, Y., Ahmad, S., Mamat, F. M., & Alias, R. (2007). Local economic benefits of ecotourism development in Malaysia: the case of Redang Island Marine Park. *International Journal of Economics and Management* 1(3): 365-386.
- Mohd Rusli, Y., Alias, R., & Khairil, W. A. (2008). *Economic valuation of marine parks* ecotourism Malaysia. Serdang, Selangor: Universiti Putra Malaysia Press.
- Mohd, Rusli, Y., Alias, R., & Ahmad, S. (2009). A Contingent Valuation Study of Marine Parks Ecotourism: The case of Pulau Payar and Pulau Redang in Malaysia. *Journal of Sustainable Development*, 2(2), 1 11.
- Mohd Shawahid, H. O., Jamal, O., Othman, R., Awang Noor, A. G., & Nik Musthapha, N. H. (1999). The economic value of sport fishing recreation at the Matang Mangrove Wetlands: Application of the Travel Cost Method (Report No. 1 UNEP/ROAP, Project No. CP/5220-97-03). Serdang, Selangor: Universiti Putra Malaysia.

- Muhi, B., & Jovanovic, D. V. (2012). Rural tourism as a factor of integral and sustainable development of rural areas and Villages of Serbia and Viovodina. *Herald Journal of Geography and Regional Planning*, *1* (2), 014-018.
- Nde, T. P. (2011). Non market valuation of beach recreation using the travel cost method (TCM) in the context of the developing world. An application to visitors of the Ngoe Beach in Kribi, Cameroon. (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Swedish Agricultural Sciences, Sweeden.
- Ndebele, T. (2009). Economic Non-Market Valuation Techniques: Theory and Application to Ecosystems and Ecosystem Services. A Case Study of the Restoration and Preservation of Pekapeka Swamp in an impaired wetland: An application of the Contingent Valuation Method. (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Massey Palmerston North, New Zealand.
- Negrusa, A. L., Cosma, S. A., & Bota, M. (2007). Romanian rural tourism development a case study: rural tourism in Maramures. *International Journal of Business Research, July*.
- Nijkamp, P., Vindigni, G., & Nunes, P. (2008). Economic valuation of biodiversity: A comparative study. *Ecological economics*, 67, 217-231.
- Nik Azyyati, A. K., Syamsul, H. M. A., & Shuib, A. (2008, January). *Economic value of Perlis State Park as a recreational area.* Paper presented at FRIM evaluation Meeting, Melaka.
- Nik Mustapha, R. A. (1995). Estimating the benefits of beach recreation: An application of the Contingent Valuation Method. *Pertanika Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, 3(2), 155-162.
- Nillesen, E., Weseller, J., & Cook, A. (2005). Estimating the recreational use value for hiking in Bellenden Ker National Park, Australia. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 36(2), 311-316.
- Norlida H. M. S. (1999). Valuing outdoor recreational resources. A case study at Taman Negara Pahang Darul Makmur (Unpublished master's thesis). Universiti Putra Malaysia, Selangor.
- Okojie, L. O., & Orisajimi, O. J. (2011). Valuation of the recreational benefits of Old Oyo National Park, Nigeria: A travel cost method analysis. *Journal of Food Agriculture & Environment*, 9(1), 521-525.
- Opperman, M. (1996). Rural tourism in Southern Germany. Annals of tourism research, 23(1), 86-102.

- Ortacesme, V., Ozkan, B., & Karuguzel, O. (2002). An estimation of recreational value of Kursunlu Waterfall Nature Park by the individual travel cost method. *Turkey Journal of Agriculture Forestry*, 26, 57-62.
- Othman, P., & Rosli, M. M. (2011). The impact of tourism on small business performance: Empirical evidence from Malaysian Islands. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2(1), 1-11.
- Parsons, G. R. (2003). The travel cost model. In Champ, Patricia, A.; Boyle, Kevin, J., & Brown, Thomas, C. (Eds.): A Primer on Nonmarket Valuation.p.269-329.
- Perales, R. M. Y. (2002). Rural tourism in Spain. Annals of tourism research, 29(4), 1101-1110.
- Poor, P. J., & Smith, J. M. (2004). Travel cost analysis of a cultural heritage site: The case of historic ST. Mar's city of Maryland. *Journal of cultural economics*, 28, 217 229.
- Prayaga, P., Rolfe, J., & Sinden, J. (2006). A travel cost analysis of special events: Gemfest in Central Quensland. *Tourism economics*, 12(3), 403-420.
- Rosenthal, D. H. (1987). The necessity for substitute prices in recreation demand analyses. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 69, 827 837.
- Sanusi, J. (1994). Album of Langkawi. Kuala Lumpur: ENSIMAL (M) Sdn. Bhd.
- Seddigheh, A. A., Mohd Rusli, Y., Alias, R., Zaiton, S., & Ahmad, S. (2009). Recreational demand in Bird Sanctuary: The case of Kapar Bird Sanctuary, Kelang, Malaysia. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 4(12), 1-13.
- Sharina, A. H., Ibrahim, K., Hood, S., & Mustaffa, O. (2011). The Geopark as a potential tool for alleviating community marginality. *The International Journal into Island Cultures*, 5(1), 94-113.
- Shaharuddin, M. I., Komoo, I., & Mohd Shafee, L. (2004). Geo-forest Park: An Innovative Approach towards Geological Heritage Conservation within Permanent Reserved Forest of Malaysia. Dalam Warisan Geologi Malaysia. Kerangka Teori dan Penilaian Geowarisan. (Eds.). 243-250: Bangi LESTARI UKM.
- Shan, T. S. (2002). Economic Valuation of Forest Recreation Benefit of Sungai Chongkak Recreation Forest, Selangor using travel cost method. (Unpublished B.Sc. Dissertation) Universiti Putra Malaysia, Selangor.

- Shaw, D. (1988). On-site samples` regression: problems of non-negative integers, truncation, and endogenous stratification. *Journal of Econometrics*, 37, 211 223.
- Shiferaw, G., & Pravin, K. T. (1996). Excess Zeros in Count Models for recreational trips. *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*, 14(4), 469 477.
- Shrestha, R. K., Seidl, A. F., & Moraes, A. S. (2002). Value of recreational fishing in the Brazilian Pantanal: a travel cost analysis using count data models. *Ecological economics*, 42, 289-299.
- Siderelis, C., Moore, R., & Lee, J. H. (2000). 'Incorporating users perceptions of site quality in a recreation travel cost model', *Journal of Leisure Research*, 32(4), 406.
- Simkova, E. (2007). Strategic approaches to rural tourism and sustainable development of rural areas. *Agricultural Economics*, *53* (6), 263-270.
- Siti, A. A. (2009). Visitor's willingness to pay for an entrance fee: A case study of marine parks in Malaysia. (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation). University of Glasgow, Scotland.
- Smith V., & Eadington W. (1992). "Tourism alternatives, potentials, and problems in the development of tourism ", Wiley, Chichester.
- Stoeckl, N., & Mules, T. (2006). A travel cost analysis of the Australian Alps. *Tourism* economics, 12(4), 495-518.
- Suryani, M. S., Sanusi, N. A., & Kamil, N. F. N. M. (2012). *Recreation demand and economic value of Redang Island*. Paper presented at the, the 2nd Congress of the East Asian Association of Environmental and Resources Economics, Bandung, Indonesia.
- Syamsul Herman, Ahmad, S., M. Rusli Y., & Azyyati, A. K., (2008). Demand and recreational value of Gua Kelam: An application of the Travel Cost Method. In Mohd. Parid, M., Yap, B.W., Lim, H. F., Norini, H. Forestry and Economic Research using SPSS (pp189-196). Kepong, Selangor: FRIM Publication.
- Syamsul Herman, H. M. A. (2010). Valuing recreational benefits of Perlis State Park, Malaysia using travel cost method. (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation). Universiti Putra Malaysia, Selangor.
- Tang, T. (2009). An application of travel cost method to Yuelu Mountain Park in Changsha, China. (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Helsinki, Finland.

- Tee, T. S. (2002). Economic Valuation of Forest Recreation Benefit of Sungai Chongkak Recreation Forest, Selangor using travel cost method. (Unpublished degree thesis). Universiti Putra Malaysia, Selangor.
- Timothy, C. H., & Kenneth, E. M. (1996). Count data models and the problem of zeros in recreation demand analysis. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 78, 89 – 102.
- Tobias, D., & Mendelhsohn, R. (1991). Valuing ecotourism in a Tropical Rain-Forest Reserve. *Ambio*, 20(2), 91-93.
- Twerefou, D. K., & Ababio, D. K. A. (2012). An economic valuation of the Kakum National Park: An individual travel cost approach. African Journal of Environmental Science and Technology, 6(4), 199 – 207.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. (2010). Guidelines and criteria for National Geoparks seeking UNESCO's assistance to join the Global Geoparks Network. Retrieved from http://www.unesco.org.
- United Nations International Labor Organization (2013). Wages and equitable growth: Global Wage Report 2012/2013. Retrieved from <u>http://www.ilo.org</u>.
- Venkatachalam, L. (2004). The contingent valuation method: a review. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*, 24, 89 – 124.
- Wan Sabri, W. M. (1987). Forest Recreational Use Patterns, User Behaviour and Recreational Value in Malaysia. (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation), University of Wales, Bangor.
- Ward, F. A., & Beal, D. (2000). Valuing nature with Travel Cost Models. Massachussetts: Edward Elgar. 255pp.
- World Travel and Tourism Council. (2011). *The Authority on World Travel and Tourism*. Retrieved from <u>http://www.wttc.org/</u>.
- Zaiton, S. 2008. Willingness to pay in Taman Negara: A contingent valuation method. *International Journal of Economics and Management* 2(1): 81-94.

Zikmund (2010). *Business research methods, eight editions*. Canada: South Western Cengage Learning.674pp.