



UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA

**WILLINGNESS TO PAY FOR TURTLE CONSERVATION AND THE
FINANCIAL VIABILITY OF RANTAU ABANG TURTLE SANCTUARY,
TERENGGANU**

ZAITON SAMDIN

FEP 2002 3

**WILLINGNESS TO PAY FOR TURTLE CONSERVATION AND THE FINANCIAL
VIABILITY OF RANTAU ABANG TURTLE SANCTUARY, TERENGGANU**

By

ZAITON SAMDIN

**Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia,
in Fulfilment of the Partial Requirement for the Degree of Master of Science**

March 2002

Untuk mak, abah, taufik, ika

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

**Willingness to Pay for Turtle Conservation and the Financial Viability of Rantau
Abang Turtle Sanctuary, Terengganu**

By

ZAITON SAMDIN

March 2002

Chairman : Associate Professor Khalid Abd Rahim, Ph.D.

Faculty : Economics and Management

Conservation is an important measure to ensure that the endangered turtles will be able to survive for the benefit of future generations. Cardinal approach i.e. Contingent Valuation Method was used in this study to evaluate the willingness to pay for conservation of turtles in Rantau Abang, Terengganu. The study also estimated the benefits of turtle conservation, evaluated the viability of the existing Turtle Sanctuary and identified the factors that influenced society's willingness to pay for turtle conservation based on a survey of different groups of respondents.

Three different groups of respondents i.e. group A (residents), group B (visitors to Rantau Abang Turtle Sanctuary) and group C (tourists) were classified in this study. Each group consists of a different number of sample sizes i.e. 110 for group A, 100 and 130 for groups B and C respectively. In the estimation of benefits for each group of respondents, the Contingent Valuation Method yielded mean values of RM10.02, RM107.11 and RM61.93 using the Logit technique.

It is also found that among the factors that influenced willingness to pay for turtle conservation for groups A and B were bid, monthly income and age. For group C, bid, monthly income and membership in some environmental organisations were the main factors influencing peoples' willingness to pay.

The study also evaluated the role of government contribution to the viability of the project. Using RM10 as the ticket price and with the government allocation of RM150,000, the financial analysis showed that the Net Present Value (NPV) was RM1,327,603.45. However, without government allocation, the NPV was negative RM6,229.77. This infers that the government contribution is essential to ensure the viability of the project. In fact, with the current contribution of RM150,000, the ticket price could be reduced to RM5 and the project would still be viable. At this ticket price, the NPV was RM263,649.15.

A sensitivity analysis showed that the project was still viable even with a 10% decrease in total cash inflow or with a 10% increase in total cash outflow. Further analysis was carried out to determine the amount of government allocation needed for the project to reach break-even point only. At the ticket price of RM10, the amount of government allocation that made the NPV equaled zero was RM700.59 per year. At the price of RM5, the amount of government allocation was RM120,350.59 per year.

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

**Kesanggupan Membayar untuk Pemuliharaan Penyu dan Analisis Kewangan
Santuari Penyu Rantau Abang, Terengganu**

Oleh

ZAITON SAMDIN

Mac 2002

Pengerusi : Profesor Madya Khalid Abd Rahim, Ph.D

Fakulti : Ekonomi dan Pengurusan

Pemuliharaan adalah penting bagi memastikan penyu akan terus hidup untuk generasi akan datang. Tujuan kajian ini dijalankan adalah untuk menganggar kesanggupan membayar untuk pemuliharaan penyu di Rantau Abang, Terengganu. Di samping itu, ia juga menganggar faedah daripada pemuliharaan penyu, menilai sama ada Santuari Penyu yang ada sekarang berdaya maju atau tidak dan mengenalpasti faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi kesanggupan membayar untuk pemuliharaan penyu di Rantau Abang, Terengganu berdasarkan kumpulan responden yang berlainan.

Tiga kumpulan responden telah diklasifikasikan kepada kumpulan A (penduduk tempatan), kumpulan B (pelawat Santuari Penyu) dan kumpulan C (pelancong). Setiap kumpulan merangkumi bilangan sampel yang berbeza iaitu 110 untuk kumpulan A manakala 100 dan 130 untuk kumpulan B dan C. Faedah yang dianggarkan dengan adanya pemuliharaan penyu untuk setiap kumpulan berdasarkan Kaedah Penilaian Kontingen adalah RM10.02, RM107.11 dan RM61.93.

Bagi kumpulan A dan B, analisis logit menunjukkan di antara faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi kesanggupan membayar adalah bida, pendapatan bulanan dan umur. Sementara itu, bagi kumpulan C, faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi kesanggupan membayar adalah bida, pendapatan bulanan dan keanggotaan dalam organisasi alam sekitar.

Kajian juga menilai peranan peruntukan kerajaan dalam menentukan sama ada projek ini berdaya maju atau tidak. Dengan menggunakan harga tiket RM10 dan peruntukan kerajaan sebanyak RM150,000, analisis kewangan menunjukkan Nilai Kini Bersih (NKB) adalah RM1,327,603.45. Namun, tanpa peruntukan kerajaan NKB adalah negatif iaitu RM6,229.77. Ini menunjukkan bahawa perlunya peruntukan kerajaan dalam memastikan projek ini berdaya maju. Dengan peruntukan kerajaan sebanyak RM150,000 dan harga tiket diturunkan ke RM5, analisis kewangan menunjukkan projek ini masih berdaya maju. Dengan harga tiket ini, NKB adalah RM263,649.15.

Analisis Kepekaan menunjukkan projek ini masih berdaya maju walaupun dengan penurunan sebanyak 10% dalam aliran tunai masuk atau pun peningkatan 10% dalam aliran tunai keluar. Analisis selanjutnya adalah menentukan amaun peruntukan kerajaan bagi memastikan titik pulang modal bagi projek ini. Dengan harga tiket RM10, amaun peruntukan kerajaan yang diperlukan untuk menjadikan NKB bersamaan dengan sifar adalah RM700.59 setahun manakala pada harga tiket RM5 adalah RM120,350.59 setahun.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, praise be to Allah the cherisher and the sustainer of the world, for giving me strengths, will and determination throughout the way in finishing my thesis.

I would also like to take this opportunity to express my sincere gratitude and appreciation to my supervisor, Associate Professor Dr. Khalid Abdul Rahim. Furthermore, my indebtedness goes to my committee members, En. Kusairi Md. Noh and En. Mohammad Salleh for their assistance and guidance.

Special thanks goes to En. Abdul Rahman Kassim and Cik Salini from Rantau Abang Turtle Sanctuary, Encik Alias Radam, Dr. Tai Shzee Yew, staff of Faculty of Economics and Management (UPM) and the library of Universiti Putra Malaysia.

My special appreciation is also extended to my parents, my husband, my daughter, and other family members. Finally thanks to Ella, Nitti, Nina, Juliana, Linda, Melissa, Anne, Ikin, Ida, Kak Yuhanis, Wani, Dahlia, and Nawal for the support, enjoyable and memorable time spent together.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
ABSTRAK	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vii
APPROVAL	viii
DECLARATION	x
LIST OF TABLES	xiv
LIST OF FIGURES	xvii
LIST OF BOXES	xviii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xix

CHAPTER

I	INTRODUCTION	1
	Coastal Setting	1
	Tourist Arrival and Receipts	2
	Impacts of Tourism	3
	Economic Impacts	4
	Environmental Impacts	4
	Socio-cultural Impacts	5
	Tourism and Sustainable Development	6
	Status of Major Sea Turtle Populations in Terengganu ..	7
	Turtle Conservation in Malaysia	9
	Legislation	
	Hatchery Programme	10
	Turtle Sanctuary	11
	Conservation - Oriented Research	11
	Turtle Conservation in Terengganu	12
	Legislation : Turtle Enactment 1951(Amendment) 1987	12
	Turtle Sanctuary	12
	Hatchery Centers	12
	Hatchery Programme	13
	Problem Statement	15
	Objective	17
	General Objective	17
	Specific Objectives	17
II	LITERATURE REVIEW	18
	Malaysian Sea Turtles	18
	Leatherback Turtle	18
	Green Turtle	19
	Hawksbill Turtle	19
	Olive-Ridley Turtle	19
	Distribution of Malaysian Sea Turtle	20
	Biotic Sources of Mortality	20

	Predation	20
	Diseases and Parasites	21
	Other Nesting Turtles	22
	Vegetation	22
	Abiotic Sources of Mortality	22
	Erosion, Accretion and Tidal Inundation	22
	Heavy Rains	23
	Thermal Stress	23
	Anthropogenic Sea Turtle Mortality	23
	Beach Erosion and Accretion	23
	Beach Amoring	23
	Beach Nourishment	24
	Artificial Light	24
	Recreational Beach Equipment	24
	Beach Vehicles	24
	Shrimp Trawls	25
	Other Trawls	25
	Dredging	25
	Ingestion of Plastics and other Debris	26
	Contingent Valuation Method (CVM)	26
	CVM Studies Done Locally	31
	CVM Studies Done Abroad	35
	Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	37
	Past Studies on CBA	39
	Korup National Park	39
	Kangaroo Island	42
	Khao Yai National Park	44
	Discount Rates	45
III	METHODOLOGY	47
	Location of Study	47
	Questionnaire Design	48
	Sampling Procedure and Size	49
	Conceptual Model and Approach	51
	Descriptive Analysis	51
	Welfare Economics and Welfare Measurements... ..	51
	Contingent Valuation Method	55
	Cost Benefit Analysis	61
IV	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	63
	Introduction	63
	Socio Demographic Profile of Respondents	64
	Gender	64
	Age	64
	Marital Status	64
	Nationality	64
	Educational Level	66
	Type of Profession	66
	Monthly Gross Income	67
	Membership of Environmental Organisation.....	67

	Interest in Travelling	68
	Sources of Knowledge about Rantau Abang.	68
	Reasons for Visiting Rantau Abang.....	69
	Respondents Opinion	70
	Identity of Rantau Abang.....	70
	Status of Turtles in Rantau Abang	70
	Perception of Residents	71
	Length of Residency	71
	Number of Tourists	71
	Conservation of Turtles	72
	CVM Model Estimation	74
	Distribution of Willingness to Pay for the Proposed Conservation Fee	76
	Socio Economic Factors Influencing Willingness to Pay.	76
	Monthly Income.....	78
	Age	82
	Education Level	86
	Membership in Environmental Associations	90
	Marital Status	93
	Logit Models Estimation Results	97
	Estimation of Benefits	97
	Factors Influencing WTP	100
	Financial Analysis	102
	Development Cost	102
	Operating Expenses	103
	Estimated Revenue	105
	Financial Returns.....	106
V	SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION	109
	Summary	109
	Conclusion	111
	Limitations of the Study	114
	Recommendations for Future Research	115
	REFERENCES	116
	APPENDICES	122
	Appendix A – Questionnaire.....	123
	Appendix B – Estimation of Benefits.....	139
	Appendix C – Factors Influencing WTP.....	160
	Appendix D – Financial Analysis.....	164
	BIODATA OF THE AUTHOR	185

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.1	Tourist Arrival and Receipts, 1995 – 2000	2
1.2	Tourist Arrival and Receipts in Terengganu, 1995-2000	3
1.3	Number of Nestings and Eggs in Terengganu by Species, 1999	7
1.4	Number of Nestings in Terengganu by Species, 1995 – 1999.	8
1.5	Number of Turtle Deaths in Terengganu by Species, 1995 - 1999	9
1.6	Number of Eggs Hatched and Released in Terengganu, 1996 – 1999	14
1.7	Number of Eggs Hatched and Released in Rantau Abang, Terengganu, 1996 – 2000	14
3.1	Visitor Arrivals to Turtle Sanctuary, Rantau Abang, February, 1996 – 2000	50
4.1	Socio Demographic Profile of Respondents	65
4.2	Respondents Membership in Environmental Organisations...	67
4.3	Respondents Interest in Travelling	68
4.4	Frequency of Respondents Travelling in a Year	68
4.5	Respondents Sources of Knowledge about Rantau Abang	69
4.6	Respondents Reasons for Visiting Rantau Abang	69
4.7	Respondents Opinion on Identity of Rantau Abang	70
4.8	Status of Turtles in Rantau Abang, Terengganu	71
4.9	Local Respondents Length of Residency	71
4.10	Opinion of Local Respondent on Current Number of Tourists	72
4.11	Opinion of Local Respondent on Conservation of Turtles.....	72

4.12	Opinion of Local Respondent on Positive Impact of Turtle Conservation in Rantau Abang	73
4.13	Opinion of Local Respondent on Negative Impact of Turtle Conservation in Rantau Abang	73
4.14	Bid and WTP of Respondents	77
4.15	Income and WTP of Respondents (Group A).....	79
4.16	Income and WTP of Respondents (Group B).....	80
4.17	Income and WTP of Respondents (Group C).....	81
4.18	Age and WTP of Respondents (Group A).....	83
4.19	Age and WTP of Respondents (Group B).....	84
4.20	Age and WTP of Respondents (Group C).....	85
4.21	Education Level and WTP of Respondents (Group A).....	87
4.22	Education Level and WTP of Respondents (Group B).....	88
4.23	Education Level and WTP of Respondents (Group C).....	89
4.24	Membership in Environmental Associations and WTP of Respondents (Group A).....	90
4.25	Membership in Environmental Associations and WTP of Respondents (Group B).....	91
4.26	Membership in Environmental Associations and WTP of Respondents (Group C).....	92
4.27	Marital Status and WTP of Respondents (Group A).....	94
4.28	Marital Status and WTP of Respondents (Group B).....	95
4.29	Marital Status and WTP of Respondents (Group C).....	96
4.30	The Estimated Parameters of the Dichotomous Choice Models for Conservation of Turtles in Rantau Abang, Terengganu	98
4.31	Estimated Mean and Median Willingness to Pay for Conservation of Turtles in Rantau Abang, Terengganu	99
4.32	Estimated Benefits of Conservation of Turtles in Rantau Abang, Terengganu	100

4.33	The Expected Benefits of Rantau Abang Turtle Sanctuary Based on Median for Logit Analysis	100
4.34	Logit Estimation for Groups A, B and C.....	101
4.35	Sensitivity Analysis of the Rantau Abang Turtle Sanctuary (Case 3)	108
D.1	Sensitivity Analysis of the Rantau Abang Turtle Sanctuary (Case 1)	165
D.2	Sensitivity Analysis of the Rantau Abang Turtle Sanctuary (Case 2)	169
D.3	Sensitivity Analysis of the Rantau Abang Turtle Sanctuary (Case 3)	173
D.4	Sensitivity Analysis of the Rantau Abang Turtle Sanctuary (Case 4)	177
D.5	Sensitivity Analysis of the Rantau Abang Turtle Sanctuary (Case 5)	181

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
1.1	Leatherback turtle nestings in Terengganu State, 1984 – 1998	16
3.1	Four measures of the welfare gain from a price decrease	54
4.1	WTP of respondents by conservation fee (group A)	74
4.2	WTP of respondents by conservation fee (group B)	75
4.3	WTP of respondents by conservation fee (group C)	75

LIST OF BOXES

Box		Page
3.1	Costs and Benefits of the Korup National Park, Ruiteenbeek (1989).....	40
3.2	Costs and Benefits of the Kangaroo Island, Touche Ross (1994).....	42
3.3	Costs and Benefits of the Khao Yai National Park, Dixon and Sherman (1990).....	44

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

WTP	Willingness to Pay
CVM	Contingent Valuation Method
CBA	Cost Benefit Analysis
NPV	Net Present Value
IRR	Internal Rate of Return
BCR	Benefit Cost Ratio

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Coastal Setting

Malaysia lies on the Malay Peninsula (West Malaysia) in tropical Southeast Asia, with Thailand bordering to the north, the Straits of Malacca to the west, the South China Sea to the east, and the island of Singapore to the south. The country also occupies the northern one-third of the island of Borneo (East Malaysia), with Indonesia to the south, the South China Sea to the north, and the Sulu Sea and Celebes Sea to the east.

Malaysia has a long coastline. The total length is approximately 4,800 km, with 1,963 km in Peninsular Malaysia, 1,802 km in Sabah and 1,035 km in Sarawak. The status of these coastlines is determined by the influence of the natural forces of sun, wind, rain, storms and waves and the impact of man's activities.

The coasts of Malaysia are of vital economic importance. They support the livelihood of thousands of fisherfolks who go out to sea daily and bring in their harvest of

fish, prawns and squids which are essential food for the population. Any damage to the coast, natural or anthropogenic, will have negative implications.

Tourist Arrival and Receipts

Tourism in Malaysia has become an important industry since 1980's. In 1959, the national government income from tourism industry was only RM 3 million; but since 1990, tourism industry has become one of the main contributors to Malaysian foreign exchange earnings (Tourism Malaysia, 1995). In 1985, income from tourism industry was RM 1.73 billion putting it at sixth place in foreign exchange earnings. While in 1990, the contribution of this industry had increased to RM 4.41 billion and tourism became the third biggest contributor to the foreign exchange earnings.

In 1990's, the growth of the tourism industry was quite favourable. Total tourist arrival had reached more than 7 million in 1994, the highest tourist arrival destination in the ASEAN region. Table 1.1 shows tourist arrivals and receipts from 1995 to 2000. In 1995, tourism industry was moderate compared to 1994 figure. Tourist arrivals were 7.5 million and total income via tourist receipts were RM 9.175 billion, a growth of 3.8% and 10.6% respectively (Tourism Malaysia, 1995).

Table 1.1 : Tourist Arrival and Receipts , 1995 - 2000

	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
<i>Tourist Arrival (million)</i>	7.5	7.1	6.2	5.6	7.9	10.2
<i>Tourist Receipts (RM billion)</i>	9.175	10.354	9.669	8.580	12.321	17.3

Sources: Tourism Malaysia, various years

Tourist arrivals however declined from 6.2 million to 5.6 million from 1997 to 1998 because of the economic crisis. But based on statistics from Tourism Malaysia (1999), tourist arrival increased by 43.8% to 7.9 million while total income via tourist receipts increased to RM12.321 billion in 1999. In the year 2000, tourist arrivals increased further by 28.9% to 10.2 million while tourists receipts increased to RM 17.3 billion (Tourism Malaysia, 2000). From January to March 2001, tourists arrivals were 4.9 million compared to 3.2 million in the same period in 2000, an increase of 54.3% (Tourism Malaysia, 2001).

Table 1.2 shows tourist arrivals in Terengganu from 1995 to 2000. It shows that both the domestic and foreign tourists have been increasing year by year. The highest tourist arrivals were in 1997, i.e. 1.6 million domestic and 2.3 million foreign tourists. Similar to national trend, tourist arrivals declined from 1997 to 1998 due to economic crisis from 1.6 million to 0.9 million for domestic tourists while 2.3 million to 0.1 million for foreign tourist due to the economic crisis.

Table 1.2 : Tourist Arrival in Terengganu, 1995 - 2000

	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
<i>Domestic Tourist (million)</i>	0.7	1.1	1.6	0.9	1.0	1.2
<i>Foreign Tourist (million)</i>	0.1	1.7	2.3	0.1	0.1	1.6

Sources: Unit Perancang Ekonomi Negeri Terengganu, 2001

Impacts of Tourism

In order to develop and manage tourism industry successfully in the country, consideration of economic, environmental and socio-cultural impacts must be well

understood. The concept of sustainable development will be achieved if economic, environmental and socio-cultural impact are weighed together.

Economic Impacts

Possible economic impacts of tourism are:

- (a) Income generated and its contribution to Gross National or Domestic Product
- (b) Foreign exchange from international tourism
- (c) Generation of local employment through direct and indirect employment
- (d) As a catalyst for other economic activities using tourist expenditure
- (e) Contribution to government revenues e.g. airport departure taxes

Tourism will generate some economic problems if not properly controlled. High imports on goods and services used in tourism and tourist facilities owned and managed by outsiders will cause economic losses. To enhance the economic benefits of tourism, linkages between tourism and other economic sectors should be strengthened. It can be achieved through the reduction in import content of tourism and by using more employment of local resources. Tourist expenditure and tourist activities also will enhance economic benefits. Tourist expenditure will be increased through the provision of more shopping opportunities especially local crafts and arts. Expansion in tourist activities such as organising more attraction and tours will influence tourists to stay longer.

Environmental Impacts

Tourism can generate both positive and negative impacts to the environment. The relationship of tourism and environment is one of inter-dependence because the environment provides resources which form the major attraction for tourists. And a sustainable tourism will enhance environmental protection.

Positive environmental impacts can be generated if tourism is well planned, developed and managed. These positive impacts include:

- (a) conservation of wildlife and natural areas including marine environments, national parks and reserved parks
- (b) conservation of archaeological and historic sites
- (c) improvement of environmental quality

Without proper planning, development and management, tourism can generate negative environmental impacts such as:

- (a) water pollution e.g. sewage and solid waste disposal for hotels
- (b) air pollution e.g. cars and buses
- (c) noise pollution
- (d) visual pollution e.g. poorly designed hotels and other tourist facilities
- (e) waste disposal problems by tourist e.g. littering
- (f) overuse and misuse of natural areas by tourist which will affect ecological disruption.

Socio-cultural Impacts

Tourism can bring both benefits and problems to the local societies. These impacts can be critical especially in the country where the traditional culture holds strongly.

Positive socio-cultural impacts from well planned, developed and managed tourism are:

- (a) improvement of living standards of people
- (b) conservation of the cultural heritage