

# Tourist's Willingness To Pay For Urban Tourism: *Determining The Factors Of Their Visit*

Muhammad Hassan Mahboob,<sup>+</sup> Muhammad Ashfaq,<sup>++</sup> Asad Afzal Humayon<sup>3</sup> & Kanwar Saleem Akhtar<sup>4</sup> (Pakistan)

## Abstract

The basic purpose of this paper was to assess the visitor's *willingness to pay* (WTP) and also explore the factors which play an important role for visit *urban tourism* (UT). The Lahore is the multicultural city of Pakistan which has many beneficial activities for entrepreneurs as well as for the tourists. Data of 250 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 (yes/no) was used to estimate the tourists' WTP. Two models were used in the estimation one binary regression and other was *ordinary least square* (OLS). The findings showed that majority of the tourists were willing to pay for UT, and also acknowledged that tourists were interested to get good memories, experience and knowledge through this visit; Tourist's income was positive and significant determinant factor of UT, total cost was the main concern for the visitors, therefore they were negatively related with WTP. Findings of this study recommended practical implications for stakeholders.

**Keywords:** *Urban Tourism, Willingness To Pay, Visitors, Total Cost, Environment, Lahore, Pakistan*

<sup>+</sup> Muhammad Hassan Mahboob, Research Scholar, Institute of Agricultural and Resource Economics, University of Agriculture, Faisalabad, Pakistan. email: m.hassan1695@gmail.com.

<sup>++</sup> Muhammad Ashfaq, Professor, Institute of Agricultural and Resource Economics, University of Agriculture, Faisalabad, Pakistan. email: mashfaq@uaf.edu.pk.

<sup>3</sup> Asad Afzal Humayon, Professor, COMSATS Institute of Information Technology, Vehari, Pakistan. email: asafhu@gmail.com.

<sup>4</sup> Kanwar Saleem Akhtar, Prof., NFC Institute of Engineering and Technology Multan, Pakistan. email: kanwarsaleem@nfciet.edu.pk.

## Introduction

The cities are the most important component of urban and cultural tourism in Pakistan. These cities influx visitors tend to be concentrated in urban tourism centers, which overlap unevenly with cultural centers. The most of these centres are protected under each country's rules & regulations. Moreover, many of them have been included in the United Nations educational, scientific and cultural organization (UNESCO) List of World Heritage Sites. In these cases, the dialogue employ the definition of "Groups of Buildings" as defined in the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (1972) and, specifically, urban buildings corresponding to "historic cities" (1987 Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention). The face "historic urban landscape" was coined recently, a term that has become preserved in institutional doctrine on heritage based on the Vienna Memorandum (2005) and the object of a specific UNESCO Recommendation (2011). The Preservation of historical buildings and sites are vital to uphold and conserve a nation's history and heritage sites (Mahirah et al., 2020). The Lahore is the witness of history that how the rulers changed his identity over the time, "Jain, Hindu, Buddhist, Greek, Muslim, Afghan, Sikh and the British. The Lahore became a multicultural city of Pakistan due to these reasons. Lahore is also the 2nd largest city of Pakistan. During the Mughals Empire (1524 to 1752) Lahore reached at its peak of architectural glory, they gave many finest architectural and monuments. In the last two decades Pakistan faced many terrible terrorists' attacks in all over the cities, which affected the Lahore as well. Therefore tourists' appearance in Pakistan decreased by large numbers as compare to the past numbers. Lahore holds a 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). They see the large numbers of people as congestion, since it has a negative effect on their quality of life, especially in the area of public order (anti-social behavior, people's safety, noise, dirt, lack of access for ambulances, etc.). Problems with overcrowding in public spaces result in the loss of residential attractiveness in the Lahore which is losing residents while increasing its focus on urban tourism.



Figure 1. Badshahi Mosque & Royal Fort (Lahore, Pakistan): Source, Author.

## Urban Tourism And Cultural Heritages

Urban tourism is also called city tourism; usually every country has some main cities which used as an urban tourism. There are several definitions of UT, but according to World Tourism Organization (UNWTO), a type of tourism which takes place in urban space. UT includes heterogeneous range of cultural, architectural, social, technological, natural experiences, educational reasons, festivals and events, and products for leisure and business. A 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). UT have a significant inspiration on people's attitude, actions at the level of the both the individual and society. Urban Cultural tourism includes visiting historic or archeological sites, visiting festivals, watching conventional dances or ceremonies, or simply shopping for handcrafted talent. The tourists carried different activities when they visit urban places like, visit to buildings within a city, art galleries, museums, temples, skyscrapers, historical buildings, parades, concerts, festivals and protests etc. In the same way, there is a correlation between city tourism and shopping tourism, especially for people from smaller towns or countryside, who takes advantage of sightseeing while shopping. There is a substantial flow of visitors and day/night trippers inspired or motivated by cultural and factors and interested in historic heritage and/or contemporary culture and urban space. These flows coexist with tourists with local and more heterogeneous intentions. 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). Although some cities have been receiving visitors for a long time, urban tourism really started to emerge in the 1990s. During these years, tourism industry growing rapidly, tourism took on a high-profile role on the urban agenda and tourism research rediscovered the cities. This was a period of major studies on urban tourism, which usually included specific chapters on the impact of tourism on the city (Page, 1995; Law, 2002).

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

### Research Methodology

The work explored in this paper by well prepared qualitative and quantitative questionnaires. The questionnaire was developed in the English with the help of literature and well reputed researcher of the tourism filed. 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 Rees et al., 2010). 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 tourists WTP and their attitude were tackled in terms of three different aspects: tourists' socio-economic characteristics, which covered a detailed description of (Gender, Age, education, income level, occupation and their family size); the second part of the questionnaire

was consisted on tourists' pre and post visit attitude and the last one covering for WTP in the form of (yes/no) and a series of monetary values were given. A sample of 250 tourists was interviewed in the second quarter of 2020. 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 2pm or from 4pm to 7pm every day. This study employed contingent valuation method (CVM). Contingent valuation method brings out market valuation of a non-market good to compute total preservation value. CVM has been used which contains both constituents of use and non-use (Echeverria, 1995; Mahboob et al., 2020). CVM was used for gathering the data of tourist's willingness to pay for visitation of urban spaces and cultural heritage. Dichotomous-choice questions were included in the survey by presenting contributors with a contingent market value. 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). Tourist's WTP were estimated through two different models, the binary logistic regression and OLS. A wide range of researchers have been performed (Mahboob et al., 2020). This model was chosen due to its capability to pact with a dichotomous explained variable and deep-rooted theoretical background (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.

### Model Specifications

In this study we used two different models as given below, first equations used for flat sum of money which asked to the tourists that how much you are willing to pay for this visit (i.e. 20, 50 or 100 PKR. Moreover, the second equation are based on binary logistic model, where the respondents showed their interest either they are willing or not (Yes-No). Both models' equation given below respectively:

$$Y_{i1} = \beta_0 + \beta_{i1}D_{i1} + \beta_{i2} Xi_1 + \beta_{i3}Xi_2 + \beta_{i4}Xi_3 + \beta_{i5}Xi_4 + \epsilon_i \quad (A)$$

Where  $Y_{i1}$ , is the flat sum of money in PKR; Dependent variable (DV) of the Ordinary Least Square (OLS) model; this is a simple linear regression model and other Independent Variables (IVs) of this model are showed with  $Xi_1$ ,  $Xi_2$ ,  $Xi_3$  and  $Xi_4$ . To interpret the results;  $\beta_0$ ,  $\beta_i$  are used as an intercept and coefficients of the OLS model respectively, while  $D_{i1}$  is a dichotomous variable of the model which is having the values in the form of (0 & 1). Below is the second equation (B)

$$Y_{i2} = b_0 + b_iD_{i1} + b_iX_{i1} + \mu_i \quad (B)$$

Where  $Y_{i2}$ , is the Dependent Variable (DV) of the Binary logistic model; the independent variables of this model shown with  $X_{i1}$ , and To interpret the results;  $b_0$ ,  $b_i$  are used as an intercept and coefficients of the binary logistic model respectively, while  $D_{i1}$  is a dichotomous variable of the model which is having the values in the form of (0 & 1).

$Y_{i2}$  = Dichotomous Variable (Yes/No)

$X_i$  = Independent Variables like age, income, total cost and distance

$\epsilon_i$  &  $\mu_i$  = Error Terms of the models.

The survey 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).

### Findings and Analysis

The results of the tourist's socio-economic characteristics given above in figure 2; the male tourists were in higher numbers 60% as compare to female 40%. Nunkoo and Gursoy, 2012) estimated that females' tourists do less support to tourism rather than males. As for concern to age level, the most of the tourists were in the age of 16 to 25 years, and other tourist's age (years) were 32%, 12% and 16% respectively according to their distribution, majority of the students who came there were studying in the colleges (56%). In addition, higher level of education tourists have positive attitude for tourism (Haralambopoulos & Pizam, 1996). Over 56% were married and 44% were single. The categories according to their occupation, a high percentage were students, public servants, 20% self-employed or privately working and 28% were not working 16%. Students founded more interested in visitation of urban places and cultural heritages. According to income level most of the tourists 48% were belonging to middle class, 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.

<i>Tourist's profile</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
<i>Gender</i>		
<b>Male</b>	150	60
<b>Female</b>	100	40
<i>Age (Years)</i>		
<b>16 – 25(years)</b>	100	40
<b>26 – 35(years)</b>	80	32
<b>36 – 45(years)</b>	30	12
<b>46 or above (years)</b>	40	16
<i>Education Level</i>		
<b>School</b>	50	20
<b>College</b>	140	56
<b>University</b>	60	24
<i>Marital status</i>		
<b>Single</b>	110	44
<b>Married</b>	140	56
<i>Occupation</i>		
<b>Student</b>	90	36
<b>Public servant</b>	50	20
<b>Private employee</b>	70	28
<b>Unemployed</b>	40	16
<i>Income Level</i>		
<b>Middle Level</b>	120	48
<b>Average Level</b>	70	28
<b>Upper Level</b>	60	24

Figure 2. Socio-Economic characteristics of the tourists.

Tourists pre-visit analysis on urban tourism given in figure 2. Majority of the visitors 60% gathered information about urban tourism from TV/Internet. 44% tourists made decision on their behalf to experience urban tourism, 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 32% came on visit to make it memorable. This type of urban tourism and 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) highlighted that visitors with greater familiarity with the place or having sufficient knowledge about urban tourism is more favorable. There are other authors who reached at same conclusion: Davis et al. (1988) and Anderreck et al. (2005). Only few came alone at urban spaces and cultural heritages, almost equal percentage of tourists who came with friends and in the groups or trips of educational institutes. Tourists motivation to go on holidays to experience urban tourism, 28% were wanted to have a good change in mood, 12% wanted to decrease their stress level, 16% had the reason to explore new place, 12% came to spend time with family members or friends and 32% interested to meet new people. The tourists' motivation for visit cultural heritage has been explored by Poria, Butler and Airey, (2004).

<i>Tourist's attitude</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
<b><i>Pre-tour analysis</i></b>		
<b><i>Information acquisition before travel for urban tourism</i></b>		
<i>News paper</i>	60	24
<i>TV/Internet</i>	150	60
<i>Friends/family/colleagues</i>	40	16
<b><i>Travel decision maker for urban tourism</i></b>		
<i>Tourist themselves</i>	110	44
<i>Family</i>	70	25
<i>Friends</i>	70	28
<b><i>Reasons for Travel for urban tourism</i></b>		
<i>To make it Memorable</i>	80	32
<i>To have experience of urban tourism</i>	40	16
<i>Familiarity</i>	60	24
<i>Popularity</i>	70	28
<b><i>Who is with you during this visit?</i></b>		
<i>Alone</i>	60	24
<i>Friend</i>	110	44
<i>Group/trips</i>	40	16
<i>Family</i>	40	16
<b><i>Motivation to go on holiday on urban tourism</i></b>		
<i>To have a good change</i>	70	28
<i>To decrease stress</i>	30	12
<i>To explore new place/heritage</i>	40	16
<i>To Spend time with family and friends</i>	30	12
<i>To meet new people</i>	80	32

Figure 3. Tourist's attitude toward urban tourism.

Post-visit analysis of the visitors	In the favor	Against
Both urban tourism and cultural heritages have attraction for tourists?	94%	06%
Would you like to return again at this destination?	95%	05%
Are you satisfied by visit of this city?	92%	08%
Are you satisfied about the way we caring our cultural heritages and developing urban areas?	65%	35%

Figure 4. Tourist’s attitude toward urban tourism and cultural heritage.

Tourists’ attitude has been the flashing point of many studies so far that focus on factors that influence such attitude (Akis et al., 1996), Tourists’ post visit attitude for urban tourism; are given in figure 4. Most of the tourists 94 percent were agreed that both destinations have attraction for tourists, 95 percent would like to visit again, 92 percent 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.

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

Figure 5. Description of travel cost to tourists for urban tourism. (Standard deviation in parenthesis).

Tourists’ expenditures were the significant factor of the urban tourism; these are the factor that supports local industry or builds opportunities for unemployed people and enhance the economic activities. Tourists total cost in many studies founded negative with willingness to pay Gutiérrez et al., 2017; Mahboob et al., 2020. Tourist’s descriptive analysis regarding urban tourism visit are given in figure 5.

Variables	Binary logistic	OLS
<b>Dependent Variable (DV)</b>	<b>Willingness to Pay (Yes/No)</b>	<b>Monetary Term</b>
Age (IV)	-.0062 (.02) <sup>ns</sup>	.024 (.058) <sup>ns</sup>
Income (IV)	.00013 (.00003) <sup>***</sup>	.00042 (.000034) <sup>***</sup>
Total cost (IV)	-.000067 (.00002) <sup>*</sup>	.000009 (.000060) <sup>ns</sup>

Figure 6. Results of logistic model and ordinary least square. Note; Standard error in parenthesis (R-square .63) Note: significant level: \*p<0.05, \*\*p<0.01, \*\*\*p<0.001, p<sup>ns</sup>>0.05

Results of the binary regression and OLS given in figure 6, where age negatively related with WTP FOR urban tourism as age increases visitors wouldn't go to experience urban tourism. Further, age isn't a significant factor of the WTP as results showed. 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 aged; there are studies that show older age had positive attitude toward tourism (King et al., 1993; Tomljenovic & Faulkner, 2000). Income is the significant determinant in both models as income level goes up which also urges the visitors to pay more urban tourism. Mostly income level has a positive association with income level (Chen, 2015; Mahboob et al., 2020). Total cost has negative relationship with WTP in both models but only significant in binary regression which indicates, as total cost of visitors goes high WTP of male/female tourists goes down Abuamoud et al., 2014. Many studies examined similar findings that tourists WTP for urban tourism and cultural heritage depends on the money used towards sustainability, improving and conserving the destination (Reynisdottir, Song and Agrusa, 2008; Kim et al., 2007; Mahboob et al., 2020). In the findings of Teo et al., (2011) identified that environment concerns a significant relationship with cultural heritage tourism.

### Conclusion and Implications

A multicultural status of Lahore has the potential to attract the tourists all over the world due to his historical background. The city's historic urban landscape, one of the constituent that make it so attractive to tourists, is being threatened by a rapid tourist satisfaction process (Jansen, 2009). The rising numbers of the visitor is having a positive impact on the local residents of the Lahore. In terms of the urban layout, the loss of quality in the historic site and its image is particularly striking. In Lahore, tourism has produced urban landscape. In fact, it has given the city many iconic buildings that are part of its tourist image, like Badshahi mosque, Royal fort, Minar-e Pakistan, Emporium mall, Railway station and famous parks etc. The threats affect the formal, socio-economic and symbolic aspects of this urban tourism. Because of its historic origins, public space in the Lahore is limited. The streets, which are pedestrianised, are narrow and there is hardly any open space. As a result, the growth in visitor numbers leads to overcrowding and causes serious mobility and car parking problems. Visitors and residents view large numbers of people very differently. However, the extent of the impact is different depending on which aspect you look at. This study provides appreciation of urban tourism and cultural heritage notably it assesses the tourist's attitude for visit urban cultural tourism and also estimated willingness to pay of the visitors. CVM was used to estimate the WTP of the visitor for urban tourism. Male tourists were mostly attracted towards urban tourism and cultural heritage, younger tourists came in high numbers and educated people have greater interest in urban tourism. Major determinant of the WTP was income level tourists having good level of income to experience the urban tourism. Social media and internet playing an important role in tourists interest to urban tourism and cultural heritage, because many tourists get information through internet and TV. Tourists motivated by differently, their attitude towards urban tourism and cultural heritage vary when they decide to visit cultural heritage as supported by Kerstetter et al., (2001) and

Goh (2010). 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 urban tourism and cultural heritage especially with regards to Badshahi mosque and Royal fort depends on authorities. Tourists' spending during their visit; may encourage local industries (e.g. hotels, handicraft products and transportation) to generate economic benefits.

## References

- Abuamoud, I.N., J. Libbin, J. Green and R. AL Rousan, R. "Factors Affecting the Willingness of Tourists to Visit Cultural Heritage Sites in Jordan." *Journal of Heritage Tourism* 9(2), (2014):148-165.
- Akis, Sevgin, Nicos Peristianis and Jonathan Warner. "Residents' Attitudes to Tourism Development: The Case of Cyprus." *Tourism Management* 17, no. 7 (1996): 481-494.
- Alberini, Anna, Barbara Kanninen and Richard T. Carson. "Modeling Response Incentive Effects in Dichotomous Choice Contingent Valuation Data." *Land Economics* (1997): 309-324.
- Alberini, Anna. "Efficiency vs Bias of Willingness-to-Pay Estimates: Bivariate and Interval-data Models." *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 29, no. 2 (1995): 169-180.
- Andereck, Kathleen L., Karin M. Valentine, Richard C. Knopf, and Christine A. Vogt. "Residents' Perceptions of Community Tourism Impacts." *Annals of Tourism Research* 32, no. 4 (2005): 1056-1076.
- Bishop, Richard C. and Thomas A. Heberlein. "Measuring Values of Extramarket Goods: Are Indirect Measures Biased?." *American Journal of agricultural Economics* 61, no. 5 (1979): 926-930.
- Carson, Richard T. Contingent Valuation: A User's Guide. *Environmental Science & Technology* 34 (8), (2000) :1413-1418. DOI: 10.1021/es990728j:1413-1418.
- Chen, Wendy Y. "Public Willingness-to-Pay for Conserving Urban Heritage Trees in Guangzhou, south China." *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening* 14, no. 4 (2015): 796-805.
- Chen, Zhaoyu. "A Qualitative Pilot Study Exploring Tourists' Pre and Post-trip Perceptions on the Destination Image of Macau." *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing* 36, no. 3 (2019): 330-344.
- Della Dora, Veronica. "Setting and Blurring Boundaries: Pilgrims, Tourists, and Tandscape in Mount Athos and Meteora." *Annals of Tourism Research* 39, no. 2 (2012): 951-974.
- Dodds, Rachel, Sonya Rita Graci and Mark Holmes. "Does the Tourist Care? A Comparison of Tourists in Koh Phi Phi, Thailand and Gili Trawangan, Indonesia." *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 18, no. 2 (2010): 207-222.
- Hall, C. Michael and Heather Zeppel. "History, Architecture, Environment: Cultural Heritage and Tourism." *Journal of Travel Research* 29, no. 2 (1990): 54-55.

- Halstead, John M., Bruce E. Lindsay and Cindy M. Brown. "Use of the Tobit Model in Contingent Valuation: Experimental Evidence From the Pemigewasset Wilderness Area." *Journal of Environmental Management* 33, no. 1 (1991): 79-89.
- Haralambopoulos, Nicholas, and Abraham Pizam. "Perceived Impacts of Tourism: The Case of Samos." *Annals of Tourism Research* 23, no. 3 (1996): 503-526.
- Hardy, Dennis. "Historical Geography and Heritage studies." *Area* (1988): 333-338.
- Kanninen, Barbara J. "Bias in Discrete Response Contingent Valuation." *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 28, no. 1 (1995): 114-125.
- Kerstetter, Deborah L., John J. Confer and Alan R. Graefe. "An Exploration of the Specialization Concept Within the Context of Heritage Tourism." *Journal of Travel Research* 39, no. 3 (2001): 267-274.
- Kim, Samuel Seongseop, Kevin KF Wong and Min Cho. "Assessing the Economic Value of a World Heritage Site and Willingness-to-pay Determinants: A Case of Changdeok Palace." *Tourism Management* 28, no. 1 (2007): 317-322.
- King, Brian, Abraham Pizam and Ady Milman. "Social Impacts of Tourism: Host Perceptions." *Annals of Tourism Research* 20, no. 4 (1993): 650-665.
- Kuvan, Yalçın, and Perran Akan. "Residents' Attitudes Toward General and Forest-related Impacts of Tourism: The Case of Belek, Antalya." *Tourism Management* 26, no. 5 (2005): 691-706.
- Lankford, Samuel V. and Dennis R. Howard. "Developing a Tourism Impact Attitude Scale." *Annals of Tourism Research* 21, no. 1 (1994): 121-139.
- Lee, Changuk Charles. "Investigating Tourist Attachment to Selected Coastal Destinations: An Application of Place Attachment." (1999). Archived Dissertations. 70. [https://tigerprints.clemson.edu/arv\\_dissertations/70](https://tigerprints.clemson.edu/arv_dissertations/70) (accessed December 2020).
- Mahboob, M. H., Ashfaq, M., Khan, R. A., Kamal, Y., & Humayon, A. A. Tourists' Attitude Towards Cultural Heritage and their Willingness to Pay to Visit: a Case Study of Lahore, Pakistan. *Conservation Science in Cultural Heritage* (2020) 20, 125-138.
- Mahirah, Kamaludin, Faizah Haron Nazatul and Azrin Shah Razali Mohd. "Tourists' Preferences for Preservation of World Heritage Site Stadthuys, Malacca." *Journal of Environmental Management & Tourism* 11, no. 2 (42) (2020): 281-289.
- McKercher, Bob and Hilary Du Cros. *Cultural Tourism: The Partnership Between Tourism and Cultural Heritage Management*. Routledge, 2002.
- McKercher, Bob. "Towards a Classification of Cultural Tourists." *International Journal of Tourism Research* 4, no. 1 (2002): 29-38.

- Meleddu, Marta and Manuela Pulina. "Evaluation of Individuals' Intention to Pay a Premium Price for Ecotourism: An Exploratory Study." *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics* 65 (2016): 67-78.
- Meler, Marcel and Zdenko Cerovic. "Food Marketing in the Function of Tourist Product Development." *British Food Journal* (2003).
- Millar, Sue. "Heritage Management for Heritage Tourism." *Tourism Management* 10, no. 1 (1989): 9-14.
- Mokhlis, Safiek. "Malaysian Chinese Consumers: Their Ethnic Attitudes and Shopping Orientations." *International Journal of Business and Management* 4, no. 11 (2009): 53-62.
- Morrison, Mark and David John Dowell. "Sense of Place and Willingness to Pay: Complementary Concepts When Evaluating Contributions of Cultural Resources to Regional Communities." *Regional Studies* 49, no. 8 (2015): 1374-1386.
- Nieto-García, Marta, Pablo A. Muñoz-Gallego and Óscar González-Benito. "Tourists' Willingness to Pay for an Accommodation: The Effect of eWOM and Internal Reference Price." *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 62 (2017): 67-77.
- Nunkoo, Robin and Dogan Gursoy. "Residents' Support for Tourism: An Identity Perspective." *Annals of Tourism Research* 39, no. 1 (2012): 243-268.
- Petrosillo, I., G. Zurlini, M. E. Corliano, N. Zaccarelli and M. Dadamo. "Tourist Perception of Recreational Environment and Management in a Marine Protected Area." *Landscape and Urban Planning* 79, no. 1 (2007): 29-37.
- Poria, Yaniv, Richard Butler and David Airey. "Links Between Tourists, Heritage and Reasons for Visiting Heritage Sites." *Journal of Travel Research* 43, no. 1 (2004): 19-28.
- Randall, Alan, Berry Ives and Clyde Eastman. "Bidding Games for Valuation of Aesthetic Environmental Improvements." *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 1, no. 2 (1974): 132-149.
- Ransom, Kevin P. and Stephen C. Mangi. "Valuing Recreational Benefits of Coral Reefs: The Case of Mombasa Marine National Park and Reserve, Kenya." *Environmental Management* 45, no. 1 (2010): 145-154.
- Reynisdottir, Maria, Haiyan Song and Jerome Agrusa. "Willingness to Pay Entrance Fees to Natural Attractions: An Icelandic Case Study." *Tourism Management* 29, no. 6 (2008): 1076-1083.
- Ritchie, JR Brent. "Consensus Policy Formulation in Tourism: Measuring Resident Views Via Survey Research." *Tourism Management* 9, no. 3 (1988): 199-212.
- Scarpa, Riccardo, Kenneth G. Willis and Melinda Acutt. "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, no. 4 (2007): 449-466.
- Silberberg, Ted. "Cultural Tourism and Business Opportunities for Museums and Heritage Sites." *Tourism Management* 16, no. 5 (1995): 361-365.

Somnuxpong, Suprapa. "Chiang Mai: A Creative City Using Creative Tourism Management." *Journal of Urban Culture Research* 20 (2020): 112-132.

Tigu, Gabriela and Octavian Arsene. "Redefining Romania as Tourism Destination: A Strategic Approach." *CONTENT/KAZALO* 2/2008 (2008): 32.

Togridou, Anatoli, Tasos Hovardas and John D. Pantis. "Determinants of Visitors' Willingness to Pay for the National Marine Park of Zakynthos, Greece." *Ecological Economics* 60, no. 1 (2006): 308-319.

Tomljenovic, Renata, and Bill Faulkner. "Tourism and Older Residents in a Sunbelt Resort." *Annals of Tourism Research* 27, no. 1 (2000): 93-114.

Vander Stoep, Gail A. "Perceptions and Status of Michigan as a Heritage Tourism State: Results of an Eleven-month Telephone Survey." In: Vogelsong, Hans G., comp, ed. *Proceedings of the 1997 Northeastern Recreation Research Symposium*, 1998.