

Tourist's attitude towards cultural heritage and their willingness to pay for visitation; a Case Study of Lahore-Pakistan

Muhammad Hassan Mahboob

m.hassan1695@gmail.com

Muhammad Ashfaq

mashfaq@uaf.edu.pk

Institute of agriculture and resource economics, University of agriculture Faisalabad

Abstract

Tourists' interest traveling to Lahore (Badshahi mosque & Royal fort) have been increased after worst terrorism situation in Pakistan and expected to continue. Despite this fact, very little facts are known about individual's attitude towards cultural heritage. This study makes a tour on factors which encouraged tourists to visit cultural heritage sites (pre-post visit) and also identify variables that help to estimate their willingness to pay (WTP) for cultural heritage sites. Data of 200 tourists were collected through well pre paired questionnaire and this data were used in the final analysis. The most useful technique contingent valuation method (CVM) with dichotomous choice question was used to estimate the WTP. Two models were used in the estimation of WTP binary regression and ordinary least square (OLS). The findings acknowledged that tourists were interested to get good memories, experience and knowledge through this visit; more than 75% tourists were WTP for cultural heritage due to their positive attitude and would prefer to visit again these destinations. Tourist's income was positive and significant determinant factor of WTP, total cost and environmental concern were negatively related with WTP. Findings of this study recommended practical implications for authorities.

Key words; Cultural heritage, tourism, willingness to pay, Lahore

1. Introduction

The history of the Lahore covers thousands of years; it is the second largest city and also the second largest district of Pakistan. Over the period of time, many rulers changed its creation from "Jain, Hindu, Buddhist, Greek, Muslim, Afghan, Sikh and the British." Therefore Lahore become the cultural capital and is the heart of the recent-days Pakistan. During the rule of the Mughals Empire (1524 to 1752) Lahore reached at its peak of architectural glory, because the Mughals were well reputed builders and gave many finest architectural monuments many of them are extant today including (Badshahi Mosque or "Emperor's Mosque" and Royal fort). Emperor's Mosque" and Royal fort were officially listed by United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) as one of the world heritage sites (WHS) on 14 December 1993. Over the past two decades Pakistan faced many terrible terrorism attacks in all over the cities but Lahore was the most victimized city, therefore tourists' appearance in Pakistan decreased by large numbers as compare to past. Now, Pakistan has been much in the safe zone and government focusing to promote tourism through several changing in visa policy and as concern to security issues.

Culture shows how nations act together (i.e. Traditions, folklore, knowledge and language), heritages concern our past history, present and future (i.e. buildings, historical structure, monuments, landscapes, artifacts, books and documentation; [Hardy 1988 and Millar \(1989\)](#)). Cultural heritages have a significant inspiration on people's attitude, actions at the level of the both the individual and society ([Mokhlis, 2009](#)). Cultural heritages of Lahore hold massive attraction for the tourists (i.e. national and international). Culture heritage is an inspiring factor in people's travel and affects tourism in both positively and negatively ways ([Dora, 2012](#)). In modern era tourism has been increased both nationally and internationally for experiencing a different culture and history ([Stoep 1996](#)).

Cultural tourism includes visiting historic or archeological sites, visiting festivals, watching conventional dances or ceremonies, or simply shopping for handcrafted talent. Tourists' enjoyment through the collection of new information before to travel, their interest, customs, acquaintances with language, lore of other nations, motivation of travel, cultural history, architecture of the destination and area of outstanding beauty, mostly all these elements who encourage the tourists to visit a destination ([Tigu & Arsene, 2008](#)). Moreover, middle and older aged tourists by high education and income level experience these activities. Four elements mostly related

with cultural tourism, 1) Tourism, 2) to use the cultural heritage, 3) tourists' spending (Spending during the visit is an important factor in the tourist financial plan which is one-third of tourism expenses and a primary source of revenue earning from tourism (Meler & Cerovic, 2003) and the fourth is visit of the tourists (Mckercher & Cros, 2002).

This aim of the paper is to study the socio-economic characteristics of the tourists, tourist's pre and post tour analysis regarding cultural heritage and their Willingness to pay for visit.

2. Research Methodology

In recent times, many studies on the attitude of the tourists have been escorted by enhance in knowledgeable research instruments in order research the model in deeply and therefore reveal new relationships (Kuvan & Akan, 2005). Mostly this study based on quantitative methodology and has foundation their analysis on the well prepared questionnaire. Tourists declared their attitude using different options which were given in questionnaire. Samples of 220 respondent's interview (questionnaire) were completed between January and April 2019. From them 20 interviews were conducted in January 2019 as a pre-testing using an open-ended question's format. The main purpose of the pre-testing was to allow respondents to sophisticate the divisions of the main research session, provide clarification for Willingness to pay estimates and confusion or field survey problems (Halstead et al., 1991; Ransom and Mangi, 2010). These 20 questionnaires were not added in the final study. Only 200 questionnaires were used for final analysis. The data of 200 respondents were collected during March and April 2019. In pre-testing open-ended questionnaires were used. In the well prepared questionnaire those questions were converted into close-ended in order to time efficient and avoid to the length of the questionnaire. The interviews were conducted in both languages (i.e. English & Urdu). The questions were presented directly to respondent in order to minimize the misunderstandings with the questionnaire.

The research focused on the two major heritages of Lahore (Badshahi Mosque & Royal Fort). The selection of the respondents were based on approaching every tenth person going back to home after completion the visit, most of the respondents were targeted at the exit point. Data collection were placed 11am to 2 pm or from 4pm to 7pm every day. The educated tourists were positive (90%) with only few tourists refused to take part of the survey. The questionnaire was divided into 3 parts: tourists' an introductory part, which covered a detailed description of their socio-economic characteristics (age, education, income, marital status, occupation and family size), tourists' pre and post attitude (pre visit response of visitors, experiences during visit, post visit response of visitors and for WTP in the form of (yes/no) and a series of monetary values were given those started from 20Rs up to 50Rs and were asked for their maximum WTP under this range.

2.1. Contingent valuation method (CVM)

This study employs contingent valuation method (CVM) which is survey based economic technique to measure the WTP. Contingent valuation method brings out market valuation of a non-market good to compute total preservation value. Contingent valuation method (CVM) has been used which contains both constituents of use and non-use (Echeverria, 1995). The principle of contingent valuation was used for gathering the data of tourist's willingness to pay for visitation of cultural heritage. At was completed for all contingent-valuation questioning arrangements; dichotomous-choice questions were included in the survey by presenting contributors with a contingent market. The exceptional feature of dichotomous-choice questions is that respondents are asked if they would pay a flat sum of money for the item being evaluated or not, responses taken as dependent variable (yes" or no") (Carson, 2000).among other studies of WTP using this method are Rendall et al., 1974), Bishop and Heberlein (1979). Cultural heritages were used as a product attribute.

Tourist's WTP was estimated through two different models, binary logistic regression and ordinary least square (OLS). Logistic regression was used that covenants with circumstances in which the practical outcome for the explained variable (Y) can has only two probable types (Maddala and Lahiri, 2009). This model was chosen due to its capability to pact with a dichotomous explained variable and deep-rooted theoretical background (Alberini et al., 1997: Alberini, 1995 and Kannien, 1995). Meleddu and Pulina (2016) investigated the individual's willingness to pay for tourism and used it on quantitative data and applied logistic model. On the other hand ordinary least square (OLS) method used where the values of an explained variable (Y) and other values of the explain variables (X). The values of an explained variable is defined as a linear relationship of the explain variables adding an error term (ϵ_i).

Both models' equation given below respectively

$$Y = B_0 + \beta_1 D_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + \beta_5 X_5 + \epsilon_i \quad (i)$$

$$Y_i = b_0 + b_1D_i + b_2X_i + \mu_i \quad (ii)$$

Where Y = Final bid (Dependent variable), Y_i = Dichotomous variable (Yes and No)

B_{is} = Coefficients to be determined, D_1 = Gender (1, 0)

X_i = Independent variables like age, income, total cost and distance

The surveyed data were used to analyze the socio-economic characteristics of the tourists through MS Excel and the econometrics techniques were applied to estimate the WTP of the tourists through statistical package (SPSS v. 21).

3. Finding and analysis

Results of the tourist's socio-economic characteristics given below in [table 1](#); the results show that male tourists were in higher numbers 60% rather than females 40%. [Nunkoo and Gursoy, 2012](#)) claimed that females' tourists do less support to tourism. As concern to age level of the tourists, the majority of the tourists were in the age of 16 to 25 (42.5%) and other tourists age were 33.5%, 14% and 9% respectively according to their distribution, this distribution done after age taken through open ended question. Of the sample, 12.5% were those who studied or currently studying in schools, 34.5% from colleges and high percentage of 53 from universities. Education level of the tourists didn't consider in the estimation of WTP; further, higher level of education tourists have positive attitude for tourism ([Haralambopoulos & Pizam, 1996](#)). Over 55% were married and 45% were single. The categories according to their occupation, a high percentage 35.5% were students, 18% were public servants, 21% were carrying privately, 6.5 was retired, 13% were self-employed and 6% were not working. Students founded more interested in visitation of cultural heritage. According to income level majority of the tourists 52% were belonging to middle class, 15% were low, 13.5% were average and 19.5% were belong to higher income level, income level is a key determinant of this study because income level play an important role in tourists WTP. The majority of the tourists were predominantly local 86.5% and 13.5% were foreigners.

Table 1: Socio-economic characteristics of the respondents (tourists)

Profile of Tourists	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender		
Male	120	60
Female	80	40
Age		
16 – 25	85	42.5
26 – 35	67	33.5
36 – 45	30	15
46 or above	18	9
Education Level		
School	25	12.5
College	69	34.5
University	106	53
Marital status		
Single	90	45
Married	110	55
Occupation		
Student	71	35.5
Government servant	36	18
Private employee	42	21
Pensioner	13	6.5
Self-employed	26	13
Unemployed	12	6
Income Level		
Low	30	15
Middle	104	52
Average	27	13.5

High than average	39	19.5
Tourist's residence status		
National	173	86.5
International	27	13.5

Of the sample, tourists pre-visit analysis given in table 2. Almost equal percentage of tourists gathered information about destination from internet and family/friends, 10.5% took from news paper, 12.5% from TV and 2.5% tourists gathered information from co-workers/colleagues. 44% tourists made decision on their behalf to travel, 31% were those who came on the suggestion of family members and 25% came through friends. In the current period of time, technology is very accessible for every person so people get information through social media/internet etc. Majority of the tourists 40% came on visit to make it memorable, 8% were those who wanted to get experience of cultural heritage, 18.5% were already familiar with the place and 33.5% come due to popularity of the place, tourists were well educated and having better understanding about cultural heritages therefore they probably like to visit mostly for couple of reasons. This type of cultural tourists has been prominent whose seeks a deep cultural experience of other culture or heritage (McKercher, 2002). Familiarity with the place also encourages people to visit that site (Mark Morrison and David John Dowell, 2015). In the study of Lankford and Howard (1994) indicated that tourists with greater familiarity with the place or having sufficient knowledge about tourism is more favorable. There are other authors who reached at same conclusion: Davis et al. (1988) and Andereck et al. (2005). Only 8% came alone at cultural heritage, almost equal percentage of tourists who came with friends and in the groups or trips of educational institutes and 195 came with families. Tourists motivation to go on holidays, 35% were wanted to have a good change in mood, 12% wanted to decrease their stress level, 26.5% had the reason to explore new place, 9.5% came to spend time with family members or friends and 17% interested to meet new people. The tourists' motivation for visit cultural heritage has been explored by Poria, Butler and Airey, (2004). They showed tourists go out on holidays to have a good change in mood and also to decrease their stress level.

Table 2: Tourist's attitude toward cultural heritage (Pre-visit analysis)

Tourist's attitude	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Pre-tour analysis		
Information acquisition before travel		
News paper	21	10.5
TV	25	12.5
Internet	74	37
Friends/family	75	37.5
Co-workers/colleagues	5	2.5
Travel decision maker		
Tourist themselves	88	44
Family	62	31
Friends	50	25
Reasons for Travel		
To make it Memorable	80	40
To have experience of cultural heritage	16	8
Familiarity with the place	37	18.5
Popularity of place	67	33.5
Who is with you during this visit?		
Alone	16	8
Friend	71	35.5
Group/trips	75	37.5
Family	38	19
Motivation to go on holiday		
To have a good change	70	35
To decrease stress	24	12
To explore new place/heritage	53	26.5
To Spend time with family and friends	19	9.5
To meet new people	34	17

Tourists' attitude has been the flashing point of many studies that focus on factors that influence such attitude (Akis et al., 1996), Tourists' post visit attitude; results are given in table 3. Majority of the tourists 93.5% were agreed that both destinations have attraction for tourists, 91% would like to visit again, 94.5% were satisfied to their visit at cultural heritage, satisfaction of the tourists also substantiated by Kerstetter et al., (2001) and most important, more than half of the tourists were satisfied by the stockholders of the destination.

Table 3: Tourist's attitude toward cultural heritage (Post-visit analysis)

Post-visit analysis	Yes	No
Both cultural heritages have attraction for tourists?	93.5%	6.5%
Would you like to return again at this destination?	91%	9%
Are you satisfied by visit?	94.5%	5.5%
Are you satisfied about the way we caring our cultural heritages?	67%	33%

Tourists' expenditures were the significant factor of the visit; this is the factor that supports local industry or build opportunities for unemployed people. Tourists total cost in many studies founded negative with WTP García et al., 2017. Tourist's descriptive analysis given in table 4, Average spending on transportation was 13081.4 rupees, food & beverages was mean value of 1408.9, accommodation expenses were 2770, on shopping were 1267.7, and other costs including tickets were 646 rupees.

Table 4: Description of travel cost to tourists cultural heritage

Costs (Rs)	Mean (Rs)
Transportation	13081.4 (27371.9)
Food & Beverages	1408.9 (1246.1)
Accommodation	2770 (5424.6)
Shopping	1267.7 (1390.3)
Other cost	646 (881.1)
Total	19174 (34981.5)

Note; Standard deviation in parenthesis

Tourists' opinion about improvements at cultural heritages and their WTP analysis given in table 5, almost ¼ of the tourists suggested that walking tracks, hospitality issues and traffic safety should be improved, 17% and 7.5% tourists were suggested that plantation and cleanliness is much needed here. This is the consistent with the other studies that generally people willing to pay more for cultural heritages if there is better management (Petrosillo et al., 2007; Togridou et al., 2006). There were several options given to the tourists who came on visit at Lahore, different amounts were asked to them that how much they are WTP. Majority of the tourists were agreed to pay 20rs, 23% were willing to pay 40rs, 13.5% were satisfying to pay 60rs and good numbers 27% were those agreed they can pay more than 60rs. When asked to tourists that are you willing to pay for cultural heritage's visit; more than half 83.5% of the tourists were agreed they would like pay for visit at cultural heritage. Scarpa et al., 2007 also analyzed that maximum tourists agree to pay for cultural heritage visit.

Table 5: Summary of tourists' opinion about improvements at cultural heritages and WTP

What type of improvement you want to see at this destination?	Frequency	Percentages
Walking tracks	52	26
Plantation	34	17
Hospitality	50	25
Traffic safety	49	24.5
Cleanliness/bathrooms	15	7.5
How much are you WTP?		
Up to 20rs.	73	36.5
Up to 40rs.	46	23
Up to 60rs.	27	13.5
More than 60rs.	54	27
Are you WTP?		

Yes	167	83.5
No	33	16.5

Results of the binary regression and OLS given in table 6, where age negatively related with WTP as age increases WTP of the tourists goes down but here age is not a significant. The studies about the age factor are mixed and probably ambiguous (Kuvan & Akan, 2005), Ritchie (1988) observed in his study that younger tourists had a positive relationship as compare to older; there are studies that show older age had positive attitude towards tourism (King et al., 1993; Tomljenovic & Faulkner, 2000). Income is the significant determinant in both models as income level goes up which also encourage the tourists to pay more. Mostly income level has a positive association with income level (Chen, 2015). Total cost has negative relationship with WTP in both models but only significant in binary regression which indicates, as total cost of tourists goes high WTP of male/female tourists goes down Abuamoud et al., 2014. In the last environment is also a key factor in tourists WTP which indicates negative relationship with WTP, and also significant, which indicates as environment does not suit or not up to mark according to tourists than they probably would like to pay less for visit. Many studies examined similar findings that tourists WTP for visit at cultural heritage depends on the money using towards sustainability, improving and conserving the destination (Reynisdottir, Song and Agrusa, 2008; Dodds, Graci and Holmes, 2010; Kim et al., 2007). In the findings of Teo et al., 2011) identified that environment concerns a significant relationship with cultural heritage tourism.

Table 6: Results of logistic model and OLS

Variables	Binary logistic	OLS
Dependent variable	WTP (Yes/No)	Final bid
Age	-.0062 (.02) ^{ns}	.024 (.058) ^{ns}
Income	.00013 (.00003) ^{***}	.00042 (.000034) ^{***}
Total cost	-.000067 (.00002) [*]	.000009 (.000060) ^{ns}
Environment	-.0013 (.001) [*]	-.005 (.001) ^{***}

Note; Standard error in parenthesis (R-square .63)

Note: significant level: * $\rho < 0.05$, ** $\rho < 0.01$, *** $\rho < 0.001$, $\rho^{ns} > 0.05$

4. Conclusion

Some studies have been demonstrated tourists attitude in many aspects including cultural heritage and also estimated their willingness to pay. Cultural heritage of Lahore (Badshahi mosque & Royal fort) have the potential to attract the tourists all over the world due to his historical background. This study provides appreciation of cultural heritage notably it assesses the tourist's attitude for visit cultural heritage and also estimates willingness to pay of the tourists. Contingent valuation method was used to estimate the WTP of the tourists for both destinations. Male tourists were mostly attracted towards cultural heritage, younger tourists came in high numbers and educated people have greater interest in visit. Major determinant of the WTP was income level tourists having good level of income to visit the destinations. Badshahi mosque and royal fort not only attract local tourists they also attract foreign tourists as well. Social media and internet playing an important role in tourists interest to visit cultural heritage, because many tourists get information through internet and TV. Mostly tourists move towards cultural heritage by having a company and also prefer their own self in decision making. In this extension, tourists just not come for fun they come with sole purpose towards cultural heritage to make it memorable it doesn't matter they are coming very 1st time or having several visits. Popularity of the place is also a vital factor which encourages tourists to visit cultural heritage. Tourists motivated by differently, their attitude towards cultural heritage vary when they decide to visit cultural heritage as supported by Kerstetter et al., 2001) and Goh (2010).

Tourists come in large numbers and their spending is another key element of attitude and visit. Tourist's WTP is not just determined by their socio-economic or demo-graphic characteristics but rather by their attitude, actions and their motivation. Tourists give importance to cultural heritage and to their visit in this sense they were WTP more for cultural heritage if money goes to cultural heritage conservation and for better facilities. Tourists' WTP estimated through two different models binary regression and OLS using several variables; income, total cost and environment were effecting tourists' WTP; over all model explanatory power of OLS was also good(63%).

Implications

Most tourists were younger and educated; Tourism planners need to start tourism curriculum in schools and colleges to get involvement of national residents. Understanding to tourist's attitude is a useful tool in destination marketing decisions. Tourist's attitude towards cultural heritage especially with regards to Badshahi mosque and Royal fort depends on authorities. Tourists' spending during their visit; may encourage local industry (e.g. hotels, handicraft products and transportation) to earn profit. Large number of tourists got information from websites; it is recommended that the official websites of tourism department should be updated on regular basis. International tourists also visit these sites; so they may help to correct the balance of payment (BOP) through better facilitations. Tourists' paying amount should be used to educate the tourists on the importance of preserving the environment.

References

- Akis, S., Peristianis, N., & Warner, J. (1996). Residents' attitudes to tourism development: the case of Cyprus. *Tourism management*, 17(7), 481-494.
- Alberini, A. 1995. Efficiency vs bias of willingness-to-pay estimates: bivariate and interval-data models. *Journal of environmental economics and management*, 29(2):169-180.
- Andereck, K. L., Valentine, K. M., Knopf, R. C., & Vogt, C. A. (2005). Residents' perceptions of community tourism impacts. *Annals of tourism research*, 32(4), 1056-1076.
- Bishop, R., & Heberlein, T. (1979). Measuring Values of Extramarket Goods: Are Indirect Measures Biased? *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 61(5), 926-930. doi:10.2307/3180348
- Carson, R.T., 2000. Contingent valuation: A user's guide. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 34 (8), 1413–1418. case of Changdeok Palace. *Tourism Management*, 28(1), 317–322.
- Chen, W. Y. (2015). Public willingness-to-pay for conserving urban heritage trees in Guangzhou, south China. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening*, 14(4), 796-805.
- Davis, C.A., S.E. Noble-Topham, J. Rossant, and A.L. Joyner. 1988. Expression of the borneo box-containing gene En-2 de- lineates a specific region of the developing mouse brain. *Genes Dev.* 2: 361-371.
- Dora, D.V. 2012. Setting and blurring boundaries: Pilgrims, tourists, and landscape in Mount Athos and Meteora. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(2):951-974.
- Echeverria, T. W. 1995. Sea-ice conditions and the distribution of walleye pollock (*Theragra chalcogramma*) on the Bering and Chukchi Sea shelf. *Canadian Special Publication of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, 131-136.
- Halstead, J. M., Lindsay, B. E., & Brown, C. M. (1991). Use of the Tobit model in contingent valuation: experimental evidence from the Pemigewasset Wilderness Area. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 33(1), 79-89.
- Haralambopoulos, N., & Pizam, A. (1996). Perceived impacts of tourism: The case of Samos. *Annals of tourism Research*, 23(3), 503-526.
- Hardy, D. 1988. Historical geography and heritage studies. *Area*, 333-338.
- heritage tourism in Melaka: Development and validation of responsible heritage tourism scale in the Proceeding of Colloquium on Humanities, Science and Engineering (CHUSER 2011) at Penang, Malaysia.
- Ismaiel Naser Abuamoud, James Libbin, Janet Green & Ramzi ALRousan (2014) Factors affecting the willingness of tourists to visit cultural heritage sites in Jordan, *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 9:2, 148-165, DOI: 10.1080/1743873X.2013.874429.
- Kanninen, B. J. 1995. Bias in discrete response contingent valuation. *Journal of environmental economics and management*, 28(1):114-125.
- Kerstetter, D. L., Confer, J. J., & Graefe, A. R. (2001). An Exploration of the Specialization Concept within the Context of Heritage Tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 39(3), 267–274.

- Kerstetter, D. L., Confer, J. J., and Graefe, A. R. (2001). An exploration of the specialization concept within the context of heritage tourism. *Journal of Travel Research* 39(3), 267-274.
- Kim, S. S., Wong, K. K. F., and Cho, M. (2007). Assessing the economic value of a world heritage site and willingness-to-pay determinants: A
- King, B., Pizam, A., & Milman, A. (1993). Social impacts of tourism: Host perceptions. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 20(4), 650–665.
- Kuvan, Y. and Akan, P. (2005) Residents' attitudes toward general and forest-related impacts of tourism: The case of Belek, Antalya, *Tourism Management*, 26(5), pp. 691–706.
- Lankford S.V. Howard D.R. (1994). Developing a Tourism Impact Attitude Scale. In: *Annals of Tourism Research* 21(1) pp. 121–139.
- M Alberini, A., B. Kanninen., and R. T. Carson. 1997. Modeling response incentive effects in dichotomous choice contingent valuation data. *Land economics*, 309-324. addala, G. S., and K. Lahiri. 2009. *Introduction to econometrics*. Wiley, India.
- Mark Morrison & David John Dowell (2015) Sense of Place and Willingness to Pay: Complementary Concepts When Evaluating Contributions of Cultural Resources to Regional Communities, *Regional Studies*, 49:8,1374-1386, DOI: 10.1080/00343404.2013.827335
- McKercher, B. (2002), Towards a classification of cultural tourists. *Int. J. Tourism Res.*, 4: 29-38. doi:10.1002/jtr.346
- McKercher, B. and Du Cros, H. 2002. *Cultural Tourism: The Partnership Between Tourism and Cultural Heritage Management*, New York: The Haworth Press.
- Meleddu, M., and M. Pulina. 2016. Evaluation of individuals' intention to pay a premium price for ecotourism: An exploratory study. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics*, 65:67-78.
- Meler, M., and Z. Cerovic. 2003. Food marketing in the function of tourist product development. *British Food Journal*, 105(3):175-192.
- Millar, S. 1989. Heritage management for heritage tourism. *Tourism management*, 10(1):9-14.
- Mokhlis, S. 2009. Malaysian Chinese consumers: Their ethnic attitudes and shopping orientations. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 4(11):53.
- Nieto-García, M., Muñoz-Gallego, P. A., & González-Benito, Ó. (2017). Tourists' willingness to pay for an accommodation: The effect of eWOM and internal reference price. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 62, 67-77.
- Nunkoo, R., & Gursoy, D. (2012). Residents' support for tourism: An identity perspective. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(1), 243-268.
- Petrosillo, I., Zurlini, G., Corliano, M. E., Zaccarelli, N., & Dadamo, M. (2007). Tourist perception of recreational environment and management in a marine protected area. *Landscape and urban planning*, 79(1), 29-37.
- Petrosillo, I., Zurlini, G., Corliano, M. E., Zaccarelli, N., & Dadamo, M. (2007). Tourist perception of recreational environment and management in a marine protected area. *Landscape and urban planning*, 79(1), 29-37.
- Poria, Y., Butler, R., & Airey, D. (2004). Links between Tourists, Heritage, and Reasons for Visiting Heritage Sites. *Journal of Travel Research*, 43(1), 19–28. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287504265508>
- Rachel Dodds, Sonya Rita Graci & Mark Holmes (2010) Does the tourist care? A comparison of tourists in Koh Phi Phi, Thailand and Gili Trawangan, Indonesia, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 18:2, 207-222, DOI: 10.1080/09669580903215162
- Randall, A., Ives, B., & Eastman, C. (1974). Bidding games for valuation of aesthetic environmental improvements. *Journal of environmental Economics and Management*, 1(2), 132-149.
- Ransom, K. P., & Mangi, S. C. (2010). Valuing recreational benefits of coral reefs: The case of Mombasa Marine National Park and Reserve, Kenya. *Environmental management*, 45(1), 145-154.

- Reynisdottir, M., Song, H., & Agrusa, J. (2008). Willingness to pay entrance fees to natural attractions: An Icelandic case study. *Tourism Management*, 29(6), 1076-1083.
- Riccardo Scarpa, Kenneth G. Willis & Melinda Acutt (2007) Valuing externalities from water supply: Status quo, choice complexity and individual random effects in panel kernel logit analysis of choice experiments, *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 50:4, 449-466, DOI: 10.1080/09640560701401861
- Ritchie, J. B. (1988). Consensus policy formulation in tourism: Measuring resident views via survey research. *Tourism management*, 9(3), 199-212.
- Teo, C.B.C., Abdul Rahim, F., Khan, N.R., Chuah, S.C., and Hassan, F.H. (2011), Assessing tourists' attitude towards responsible cultural
- Tigu, G., & Arsene, O. (2008). Redefining Romania as tourism destination: a strategic approach. *CONTENT/KAZALO 2/2008*, 32.
- Togridou, A., Hovardas, T., & Pantis, J. D. (2006). Determinants of visitors' willingness to pay for the National Marine Park of Zakynthos, Greece. *Ecological Economics*, 60(1), 308-319.
- Tomljenovic, R., & Faulkner, B. (2000). Tourism and older residents in a Sunbelt Resort. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(1), 93-114.
- Vander Stoep, G. A. 1998. Perceptions and status of Michigan as a heritage tourism state: results of an eleven-month telephone survey.