

Valuing marine parks in a developing country: a case study of the Seychelles

LAURENCE F. MATHIEU,

Overseas Development Group, School of Development Studies, University of East Anglia, Norwich NR4 7TJ, UK. Tel.: 01603 592373. Fax: 01603 591170. E-mail: L.Mathieu@uea.ac.uk

IAN H. LANGFORD

Centre for Social and Economic Research on the Global Environment, University of East Anglia, Norwich, UK.

WENDY KENYON

Macaulay Institute, Aberdeen, AB15 8QH, UK.

ABSTRACT. A strategic issue facing many developing economies is the maintenance of natural resources, which are important in ecological terms as well as for providing income from tourism. This paper presents an analysis of the economic value of marine protected areas in the Seychelles. The contingent valuation method (CVM) is used to determine tourists willingness to pay (WTP) for visits to Seychelles' marine national parks. In addition, attitudinal and motivational data are related to respondents' stated economic preferences. Three hundred interviews were conducted in the Seychelles during June 1998 and both tourists having visited a park and a more general population of tourists were surveyed. The results demonstrate that different economic values are predicted for respondents from different countries who display a range of both consumer and citizen behaviour in constructing their preferences. In addition, significantly different WTP amounts are predicted depending on which particular marine parks are visited, and the expectations of visitors to Seychelles. The discussion focuses on exploring how this information may be of use to policy makers in setting a realistic pricing policy for visitors to Marine National Parks in the Seychelles.

1. Introduction

The designation of marine areas as marine reserves increased from about 140 worldwide in 1970 to 450 in 1986 (Kelleher, Bleakley, and Wells, 1995). In many countries marine reserves (defined by the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council as 'specific areas of marine environment managed for the primary purpose of aiding in the recovery of overfished stocks and to insure the persistence of healthy fish stocks, fisheries and habitats') are used to extract economic benefits through promotion of ecotourism, including snorkelling and scuba diving. However, marine protected areas (defined as any area of the marine environment that has been given special status in order to provide lasting protection for part or all of the natural

and cultural resources therein), which include the functions of marine reserves, continue to be created for the main reason of protection of fragile and rare ecosystems. Thus, national parks are necessary to protect biodiversity but can also be sources of direct and indirect revenues which enable countries to balance economic development with environmental protection (Dixon and Sherman, 1990).

In order to achieve both efficient resource management and sustainable economic development, an analysis of the flow of marine park benefits and costs is essential. Economic valuation techniques can be used to measure the benefits associated with environmental conservation projects and nature tourism activities. Net benefit evaluation of marine reserves can also be seen as a tool for decision makers to aid natural resource decisions, such as marine reserve creation. Despite the fact that nature tourism activities are increasing, the application of economic analysis to marine protected areas is small, particularly in developing countries, and most studies only take into account park users (Hoagland, Kaoru, and Broadus, 1995). The objective of this study is therefore to include both park users and potential users in a contingent valuation survey to value marine resource conservation in the Seychelles.

According to Agenda 21 for Small Island Developing States, such as the Seychelles, 'the ocean and coastal environment is of strategic importance and constitutes a valuable development resource' (UNCED, 1993). Indeed, the Seychelles' economy is dominated by tourism and fisheries (Republic of Seychelles, 1997) which directly depend on coastal and marine biological resources and diversity. The presence of protected marine areas provides support to the tourism industry, which, by generating income, employment and foreign exchange, makes a contribution to national development goals and to economic growth. The use of a contingent valuation approach is important as marine resources produce benefits, which cannot be valued with traditional net revenue analysis. However, it is also vital to relate willingness to pay to the context in which values are allocated, as values can only have meaning when related to expectations and motivations for assigning particular values to a resource (Langford *et al.*, 1999, 2000).

The economic background to the marine parks system operating in the Seychelles is described in section 2. Section 3 presents the methods used to derive economic value of the marine parks in the context of individual expectations and motivations. In section 4 particular analyses of the data are presented and discussed in detail. Section 5 provides a general discussion of the results and section 6 assesses the policy implications of the study.

2. Marine national parks in the Seychelles

The Seychelles' archipelago is located off the Southeast coast of Africa, in the Indian Ocean. It consists of an estimated 115 islands which occupy a land area of some 445 km². Ninety per cent of the 76,500 inhabitants live on the main island, Mahe. Most of the population (87 per cent) and the bulk of production and consumption activities are concentrated in a small area in the Eastern and Northern regions of Mahe (Shah, cited in Lundin and

Lindén, 1995). Seychelles has a per capita growth domestic product (GDP) of US\$6500¹ (Republic of Seychelles, 1997), and can therefore be categorized as a middle-income developing country.

Seychelles is an important tourist destination with 130,955 visitors in 1996, and the Seychelles' economy is dominated by tourism. In 1995, tourism was estimated to have generated approximately 18 per cent of the GDP and over 60 per cent of foreign exchange earnings (Republic of Seychelles, 1997). One-fifth of the working population is employed in the tourism industry and the annual quantifiable value of tourism is in excess of 700 million Rupees (US\$140 million), the bulk of which is accounted for by expenditures made on hotels and other purchases (Central Bank of Seychelles, 1997). Tourism in Seychelles is predominantly beach-based and thus directly depends on coastal and marine biological resources. Other aspects of biodiversity, including the presence of protected marine areas, also provide support to the tourism industry and 40,000 tourists visited the Seychelles' marine parks in 1997.

In Seychelles, marine protected areas constitute a total area of 23,000 ha (Shah, 1995), including the Marine National Parks managed by the Marine Parks Authority and other marine reserves such as Aldabras, Aride and Cousin managed by private agencies. The Marine Parks Authority (MPA) of Seychelles was formed in 1996 as a parastatal body, constituted under the Environmental Protection Act of Seychelles 1994, and is responsible for managing the Marine National Parks of Seychelles listed in table 1. The primary management goals are based on the principles of sustainable development and environmental conservation. The MPA employs 31 permanent staff and an additional 13 trainees.² All staff employed by the MPA are Seychellois.

Table 1. *Summary of areas designated as Marine National Parks (MNPs)*

<i>Name of MNP</i>	<i>Date designated</i>	<i>Land area (ha)*</i>	<i>Sea area (ha)*</i>	<i>Total area (ha)*</i>
Sainte Anne Marine National Park	19/03/73	388.71	996.04	1384.75
Baie Ternay Marine National Park	11/06/79	0.99	86.28	87.27
Curieuse Marine National Park	11/06/79	294.46	1283.69	1578.15
Port Launay Marine National Park	11/06/79	3.59	154.26	157.85
Silhouette Marine National Park	26/10/87	10.83	1988.31	1999.14
Ile Coco, Ile La Fouche, Ilot Platte National Park	19/02/97	5.05	165.48	170.53
Total		703.63	4674.06	5377.69

Note: * 10,000 m²: 1 ha and 100 ha: 1 Km².

Source: Adapted from Collie (1998).

¹ Figures for 1996.

² Figures for 1997.

Access to the parks is free for all Seychellois residents, including Seychellois nationals and non-Seychellois residents. Only persons who have a visitor permit (i.e. tourists) and who are over 12 years old are asked to pay a 50 Rupees (\$10) per person per visit admission fee to enter a marine park. The system applies to all the marine parks managed by the MPA, except for Silhouette Marine National Park which has no entry charge, and is therefore considered a 'paper park' as it is designated but involves no administrative costs because it is not managed or monitored (Hoagland, Kaoru, and Broadus, 1995). The revenue from the fees goes towards the costs of managing the marine parks system.

Most tourists visit the parks in glass-bottom boats. They also snorkel and scuba dive and go to the beach within the parks. There are limits on boat movements and anchoring is not allowed on sensitive habitats such as coral within the parks. Activities such as recreational, artisanal, and commercial fishing are not allowed within the Marine National Parks. Only holders of lands within, or adjacent to, the parks have limited reef gleaning and fishing rights within the parks and right of access to their land through the parks (Collie, 1998).

The sale of tickets to tourists for entry into Marine National Parks, as well as fees for the mooring of boats, filming fees, sale of coco-de-mer, sale of tortoises, and hiring of picnic facilities, represent the direct revenue generated by the marine ³parks. In 1997, this revenue amounted to a total of 1,990,058 Rupees. Table 2 lists the direct revenues associated with the Seychelles' marine parks for 1997. Revenues from the marine parks may be compared with the direct costs (see table 3), giving a surplus of 139,354.20 Rupees for 1997. However, estimates from the Seychelles' MPA suggested that in subsequent years the costs would exceed the revenues due to increased management costs. A Government subvention was therefore required to maintain the marine parks system into the twenty-first century. Table 1 gives a description of each Marine Park in terms of land and sea area and date of designation.

Table 2. *Direct revenues associated with the Seychelles Marine Parks, 1997*

<i>Particulars of Revenue</i>	<i>Revenue collected (in Rupees)</i>
Sale of Marine Parks tickets:	
Sainte Anne	782,510.00
Port Launey	13,750.00
Baie Terney	18,000.00
Curieuse	564,300.00
Ile Coco	45,400.00
Mooring of boats fees	1,150.00
Hiring of boats	2,503.35
Filming fees	3,000.00
Hiring of picnic facilities	1,700.00
Miscellaneous	2,600.00
Refund of Expenses	555,144.35
Total revenue	1,990,057.70

Source: pers. comm. Accouche, M. Marine Parks Authority 1998.

Table 3. *Direct costs associated with the Seychelles Marine Parks, 1997*

<i>Particulars of expenditure</i>	<i>Amount of expenditure (in Rupees)</i>
Total personal emoluments	985,101.23
Total office running costs	407,603.02
Total repairs and maintenance	111,242.03
Total transportation costs	259,290.40
Total other costs	108,585.95
Total expenditure	1,850,703.50

Source: pers. comm. Accouche, M. Marine Parks Authority 1998.

The Government subvention (of approximately 300,000 Rupees) is not sufficient to make good the deficit. This could impact on the effective management of the marine parks as budget constraints could hamper many of the MPA activities. Consequently, the parks would lack sufficient protection. The values that tourists might derive from visiting the parks are the use and non-use values. A measure of the use value might reveal that tourists are willing to pay higher entrance fees than those currently being charged. Consequently, an increase in fees could turn this value into money and increase the benefits that are currently realized. As a result, the deficit would be reduced or made good.

3. Survey design

The aim of this study is to estimate the difference between what people are willing to pay to visit the marine parks and what they actually pay (consumer surplus estimate). The consumers' surplus (CS) is defined as the difference between what people would be willing to pay for a good or a service and what they actually pay, an important economic value which is not observed in market transactions (Pearce and Turner, 1990). The method used to measure the amount people are willing to pay for visits to the Seychelles' marine national parks is the contingent valuation method. In the absence of people's preferences as revealed in markets, the contingent valuation method tries to obtain information on consumer's preferences for public goods by posing direct questions about their willingness to pay (WTP) for specified improvements in the public good (Hanley and Spash, 1993). In the WTP format, survey respondents say what they would be willing to pay if a market existed for the good in question. A contingent market is taken to include the good itself (an improved view, better water quality, etc.), the institutional context in which it would be provided and the way in which it would be financed (Pearce and Turner, 1990). In this case, we are attempting to measure recreational use value by eliciting respondents' WTP for a visit to a marine park, although we acknowledge that respondents' may have many different motivations, as we explore in the results and discussion.

In order to estimate tourists' WTP for visiting a marine park in Seychelles, a survey was conducted on three different islands in the Seychelles during June 1998. The questionnaires were prepared and written in English and were administered to tourists in one of two languages, English or French, by one of the authors who is fluent in both these

languages. Tourists were asked their WTP to visit a marine park, as Seychelles' residents do not have to pay to enter a marine park. The method of face-to-face interviews was chosen as it offers the greatest opportunity to motivate the respondent to answer and allows the interviewer to provide observational data (NOAA, 1993). Three hundred interviews were completed with tourists who had visited a marine park or had not visited a marine park but participated in activities such as snorkelling or diving outside marine protected areas. Therefore, the tourists surveyed were on-site users whom Whitehead et al. (1995) define as 'survey respondents who have been consumptive or non-consumptive on-location users of the natural resource'.

Most of the interviews took place on Mahe, the main island, around which are the marine national parks of Ste Anne, Port Launey, and Baie Terney, and the rest of the interviews were conducted on the islands of Curieuse and Coco both being part of marine national parks. On Mahe, tourists were interviewed randomly on the beach and on Curieuse and l'Île Coco, the interviews took place during the visit to the parks.

The questionnaire was in three parts. The first part consisted of a series of questions aimed at obtaining information on the reasons why respondents chose Seychelles as a destination for their holiday and whether they were first-comers or repeated visitors, so that we could assess individual expectations of their holiday in the Seychelles. The second part consisted of eliciting information on why people thought it was a good idea (if they thought it was a good idea) to protect marine areas, so we could assess their motivations for protecting the parks.

The third part of the questionnaire consisted of asking respondents whether they thought it was acceptable to have to pay a fee for visiting a marine park, requiring a yes/no answer, and a WTP amount was elicited from those who replied positively to the payment principle question. The exact text of the WTP section was as follows:

One of the main characteristics of Seychelles waters are the unspoilt reefs with excellent fish life. In order to prevent these marine resources from degrading, marine protected areas such as Marine Parks have been designated in Seychelles. You are probably aware that there is a per visit per person admission fee to be able to enter a Marine Park. Revenues generated through the admission fees are used to cover the costs of Parks' operations. Do you think it is acceptable to be asked to pay a fee to enter a Marine Park?

After respondents had answered 'yes' or 'no', they were asked to give a reason why they stated their particular answer if they wanted to. This allowed us to link together expectations, motivations, and WTP responses for each respondent as shown in figure 1.

Those who responded positively were then asked what amount in Rupees would be the most they would be willing to pay per person per visit to the park. The WTP amount was chosen as an entrance fee of between 0 and 200 Rupees in a checklist format. The checklist method is similar to the payment card method (Mitchell and Carson, 1989), and uses a direct question approach to estimate the WTP of the respondents and




Figure 1. *Linking expectations and motivations to WTP amounts*

provides them with potential WTP amounts as a visual aid. The upper limit was fixed at 200 Rupees as this represents a relatively high fee to enter only one park (e.g. it does not include the travel cost to the park, which is charged by the tour operators).

At the end of the survey, socio-economic data on age, income, education, membership of environmental groups were collected. Income was elicited in US dollars, English pounds, or French francs where appropriate, or in the respondents' national currency, and then converted into French francs for all respondents. The variables, which were constructed from the survey and used in the analysis, are given in table 4. The data were analysed using the SPSS statistical package, using multiple linear and binary logistic

Table 4. *Variables from the survey used in the analysis*

	<i>Variable Name</i>
<i>Expectations (reasons for visit)</i>	
No answer	RNONE
Beaches	RBEACH
Nature	RNATURE
Marine resources	RMARINE
Visit someone	RVISIT
Weather	RWEATH
Diving/Snorkelling	RDIVING
Scenic beauty	RSCENIC
Vegetation	RVEGET
Quiet place (no mass tourism)	RQUIET
Protected areas	RPROTECT
Romanticism	RROMANT
Recommendation	RRECOM
Exoticism/Island	REXOTIC
Proximity	RPROXIM
Environment (unspoiled)	RENVIRON
Dream	RDREAM
Visit a new country	RNEWC
Culture	RCULTURE
Waters	RWATERS
Reputation	RREPUT
<i>Motivations</i>	
No answer	XNONE
Protection/conservation of marine resources	XMARPRO
Future generations	XFUTGEN
To see more species	XSPECIES
For tourists (accessibility)	XTOURIST
Unique resources	XUNIQUE
Important to protect the environment	XENVIR
Not many unspoiled places left	XNOTMAN
To prevent from development	XDEVT
To keep the place clean	XCLEAN
To prevent from resource over exploitation	XEXPLOIT
Only place where animals can live peacefully	XANIMAL
To prevent from resource destruction	XDESTRUC
<i>WTP questions</i>	
Paying a fee to enter park in principle	FEE
Natural logarithm of WTP amount	LNWTP
Residual WTP (see text for explanation)	RESIDWTP
<i>Reason for WTP in principle</i>	
No answer	ZNONE
Seychelles Government/hotels must pay	ZGOVT
Need money to manage a park	ZMANAGE
Don't have to pay elsewhere	ZNOPAY
Conservation/protection	ZCONS
To limit the number of entrance	ZLIMIT
Have to pay everywhere else	ZPAYELS
To participate to resource preservation	ZPRESER
Less chance for the resource to be damage	ZDAMAGE
Only way to protect resources	ZPROTECT

Table 4. *Continued*

	<i>Variable Name</i>
For future generation	ZFUTGEN
To keep the parks clean	ZCLEAN
Maintenance	ZMAINT
Seychelles are too expensive	ZTOOEX
<i>Country of origin</i>	
France	FRANCE
Germany	GERMANY
Switzerland	SWITZ
Italy	ITALY
La Reunion	REUNION
South Africa	SAFRICA
Yugoslavia	YUGO
Netherlands	NETH
Portugal	PORT
United Kingdom	UK
Russia	RUSSIA
Spain	SPAIN
Czech Republic	CZECH
Austria	AUSTRIA
Luxembourg	LUXEM
Ireland	IRELAND
Mauritius	MAURIT
Belgium	BELGIUM
Greece	GREECE
Other	COTHER
<i>Behaviour</i>	
Snorkelling	BSNORK
Scuba diving	BSCUBA
Coral viewing in a glass bottom boat/sub-sea viewer	BCORAL
Other activities	BOTHER
Some activities in marine park	PARKYES
Ste Anne park	STEANNE
Port Launey park	PLAUNEY
Baie Terney park	BAIETERN
Curieuse park	CURIEUSE
Ile Coco park	ILECOCO
<i>Socio-demographic information</i>	
Return visit to Seychelles (i.e. not first visit)	RETURN
Sex (1 = male)	SEX
Age in years	AGE
Younger people under 30 years	AGE<30
Older people over 60 years	AGE>60
Income	INCOME
Lower incomes < 100,000 FF per year	LOWINC
Higher incomes > 400,000 FF per year	HIGHINC
Low educational attainment (Brevet or less)	LOWED
Medium educational attainment (Baccalaureate)	MEDED
High educational attainment (Degree or more)	HIGHED
Member of environmental group	ENVGROUP

regression analyses where appropriate. Goodness-of-fit measures were taken as the R^2 value adjusted for degrees of freedom for the linear regression models, and an approximate R^2 based on the likelihood ratio statistic for the binary regression models (Maddala, 1983; Langford *et al.*, 1998).

4. Results from the survey

Willingness to pay in principle

Only eleven of the 300 people interviewed responded negatively to the payment question, the other 289 being willing, in principle, to pay something to enter a marine park. We must remember that those interviewed were tourists, and local people may have given a much less positive response. The main reason for refusing to pay anything, in principle, was stating that the government should pay.

The payment principle question was used as a binary response variable in logistic regression analyses using the groups of variables shown in table 4. Expectations explained the most variation in the payment principle question, approximately 14 per cent of the total variation. Table 5 shows results from the best-fitting multiple regression equation including all the variables available. Being older, and visiting the Seychelles for beach activities or peace and quiet predicted a negative response, and people who refused to pay were more likely to come from Italy, or especially Yugoslavia. People from Yugoslavia were more likely to mention tourist accessibility as a motivation for protecting marine parks. The refusal to pay is potentially interesting, as it may also reflect the culture of state control of resources in Yugoslavia. Indeed, people visiting from Yugoslavia at the time of the survey were perhaps more used to public

Table 5. *Multiple regression results for willingness to pay in principle and stating that the government should pay*

	<i>FEE</i>
<i>Expectations</i>	
RBEACH	--
RQUIET	---
<i>Justifications</i>	
XNONE	---
<i>Country of origin</i>	
ITALY	--
YUGO	---
<i>Socio-demographic information</i>	
AGE	---
<i>Approx. R²</i>	0.199
<i>Number of positive responses</i>	289
<i>Total number</i>	300

Note: +/–: $P \leq 0.1$; ++/--: $P \leq 0.05$; +++/----: $P \leq 0.01$;
++++/-----: $P \leq 0.001$

rather than private funding of resources such as marine parks (see below). Of the 300 people sampled, 299 actually stated that they were in favour of protecting marine parks, but when asked a follow-up question of why they were motivated to protect marine parks, 52 people could not provide a reason. These people were also less likely to give a positive response to the payment principle question.

Willingness to pay amounts

Surveys which were incomplete, protest bids (those refusing to pay anything in principle) or outliers (greater than 3 standard deviations above the mean) were therefore removed from the data set for the WTP amount analyses (Hanley and Spash, 1993; Mitchell and Carson, 1989; Langford, Bateman, and Langford, 1996). The 270 usable surveys yielded an average value for WTP of 61 Rupees (US\$12.20), which exceeds the 50 Rupees (US\$10) fee instituted in 1997. The difference between these two amounts is the consumers' surplus (CS), representing the portion of the value of the visits that is above the market price. The average consumers' surplus per tourist is 11 Rupees (US\$2.20), giving an estimate of the total consumer surplus of 440,000 Rupees (US\$88,000), given that 40,000 tourists visited the Seychelles' MNPs in 1997.

Multiple regression analyses were then performed using the stated WTP amounts of those who were willing to pay in principle as the dependent variable. Analysing the explanatory variables in groups, as for the payment principle questions, showed that the most variance was explained by respondents' expectations on arrival (adjusted $R^2 = 0.100$) and their country of origin (adjusted $R^2 = 0.153$). Table 6 presents the results of a multiple regression analysis containing all the explanatory variables measured in the study. The parameter estimates represent the mean amount in Rupees which a respondent with the characteristic would pay more or less compared to the baseline amount of 46 Rupees (the whole sample mean was 60 Rupees per person). Hence, visiting with the expectation of going diving results in a mean WTP amount of $(46 + 53) = 99$ Rupees per person, whilst visitors from South Africa would pay $(46 - 34) = 12$ Rupees per person on average. There were significant effects found for visiting four of the MNPs, with respondents being willing to pay more on average if they had visited Curieuse or Ile de Coco, and less if they had visited Baie Terney or Ste. Anne, suggesting that policy makers may need to charge different amounts for different parks for an optimal economic solution to be found. Those respondents who had gone on coral viewing boat trips were also more likely to state higher amounts. Table 7 shows, in the first column, the differences in WTP for different MNPs, with St. Anne, Baie Terney, Curieuse, and Ile Coco being significantly higher or lower than the baseline of 46 Rupees (which represents Port Launey). The second column are these amounts plus the parameter estimates for expectations of good weather, diving and romanticism. If we view these as realized expectations for some people, then the second column of table 7 refers to a higher WTP amount for each MNP given that all three of these expectations are fulfilled. As such, this could be regarded as an upper bound on WTP amounts, which those with these expectations

Table 6. *Multiple regression results for WTP amounts*

	<i>Parameter estimate</i>	<i>Standard error</i>	<i>Significance</i>
<i>Constant</i>	46.011	3.064	+ + + +
<i>Expectations</i>			
RNONE	-21.952	8.962	- -
RWEATH	10.572	3.617	+ +
RDIVING	53.026	8.221	+ + + +
RPROTECT	102.306	16.362	+ + + +
RROMANT	17.316	8.314	+ +
RREPUT	-20.854	7.123	- -
<i>Justification</i>			
XNONE	-9.584	3.907	- -
XENVIR	-23.788	12.370	-
XEXPLOIT	33.401	13.687	+ +
XDESTRUCTION	-29.278	10.691	- - - -
<i>Reason for WTP in principle</i>			
ZCONS	26.696	10.040	+ + +
ZFUTGEN	32.547	16.702	+
<i>Country of origin</i>			
ITALY	17.645	4.890	+ + + +
REUNION	74.022	16.358	+ + + +
SAFRICA	-34.207	16.454	- -
UK	16.683	3.947	+ + + +
RUSSIA	25.996	9.908	+ + +
<i>Behaviour</i>			
BCORAL	12.988	4.167	+ + +
STEANNE	-8.229	4.666	-
BAIETERN	-20.385	7.055	- -
CURIEUSE	17.571	4.634	+ + + +
ILECOCO	25.495	6.113	+ + + +
<i>Adjusted R²</i>		0.425	
<i>Total number</i>		270	

Note: + / - : $P \leq 0.1$; + + / - - : $P \leq 0.05$; + + + / - - - : $P \leq 0.01$;
+ + + + / - - - - : $P \leq 0.001$.

Table 7. *Mean WTP amounts for each MNP*

	<i>Mean WTP</i>	<i>Mean WTP (with realised expectations)*</i>
PORT LAUNEY	46.011	126.925
STEANNE	37.782	118.696
BAIETERN	25.626	106.540
CURIEUSE	63.582	144.496
ILECOCO	71.506	152.420

Note: * including parameter estimates for RWEATH, RDIVING and RROMANT (see text for explanation).

might pay. In addition, we should note that the parameter estimate for 'protected areas' is an additional 102.306 Rupees, and hence those with a real motivation for protection of MNPs would potentially pay this amount more. These different values could be of use if one was considering asking for donations rather than, or in addition to, setting a fixed fee for each MNP.

Interestingly, although income was significantly correlated with WTP amounts as expected ($p < 0.01$), it was not a predictor of WTP in the multiple regression, where other variables provided more statistically significant associations with WTP amounts. In fact, no other socio-demographic variable was significant using either single or multiple regressions) with WTP as the dependent variable. However, there were significant variations for country of origin, with respondents from the UK, La Reunion, Italy, and Russia being willing to pay more, and those from South Africa willing to pay less, on average. These differences remained even when income was controlled for, suggesting that the effects are not due to different incomes of visitors from different countries.

Respondents who gave no specific motivation for protecting the marine parks were likely to pay less, on average, as were those who stated prevention of destruction of the resource and protection of environment in general as motivations, which will be discussed in the section below. However, preventing the specific resource of marine parks from being over-exploited was associated with higher WTP amounts. Giving reasons for WTP in principle, conserving the resource in the present and for future generations were associated with higher WTP amounts. In single dependent variable regressions, higher WTP was also associated with the reasons of providing money for good management and to limit the number of people entering a park.

Visiting with the expectations of going diving, good weather, and visiting protected and romantic locations were associated with higher WTP amounts. Stating no specific reason for visiting was associated with lower WTP amounts, as was visiting because of the reputation of the Seychelles as a holiday location. The last result is interesting as in the particular year the study was conducted, a lot of the coral had been bleached and had died due to the El Niño event in 1998, and may not have looked as spectacular or appealing as people would have expected based on the experiences of people visiting in previous years. About 80 per cent of the corals had been affected in Seychelles by El Niño, beginning in January 1998, and corals were still damaged at the time of the survey. However, we must also bear in mind the fact that only a small number of people ($n = 8$) actually mentioned that the corals were damaged in their comments at the end of the questionnaire. This was probably due to the fact that many first-time visitors had never seen corals before, and hence did not know what to expect.

5. Discussion

One interesting finding from the study is the relatively small amount of variation explained by socio-demographic factors, such as age, sex, education and income. These factors only accounted for 3.4 per cent of the variation in responses to the payment principle question, and 6.0 per cent

of the variation in WTP amounts. Country of origin, expectations, and reasons for visiting were more important in determining WTP responses. A potential explanation for this can be found in Sagoff (1998), who claims that the economic concerns of individuals are influenced by the communal or national values they share with their neighbours, and individual preferences emerge from, or are shaped by, dialogue between individuals within a society, and are then reinforced by this dialogue. In our study, 'dialogue' about environmental issues such as protection of marine parks would largely be confined to the country of origin of respondents, and therefore it is not surprising that nationality is an important predictor of willingness to pay in our study, independent of respondent's income or educational level. A similar result, showing differential attitudes toward protected areas among nationalities was found by Kramer, Sharma, and Munasinghe (1995) in their study on the Mantadia National Park. We must also be aware that we are only sampling people who had sufficient income to travel to Seychelles in the first place, and those with lower incomes presumably spent their vacations elsewhere (particularly the majority of visitors who were from Europe). This may be another reason for the lack of relationship between WTP and income.

We can also determine from our results that individuals are acting both as consumers and citizens in stating their preferences (Brouwer *et al.*, 1999; Sagoff, 1988). Motivations such as preservation for future generations and improving tourist accessibility were significant in our study. Similarly, those who visited Seychelles for the beach or for peace and quiet were less likely to agree to pay to visit a marine park, and those who went for diving would pay more, which could be related to intended use of the resource, whilst those interested in protection of marine resources generally would also pay more. Further, regression analyses (not presented here in full for reasons of conciseness—see Mathieu, Langford, and Kenyon (2000) for full details) showed that different motivations as well as expectations were partly determined by country of origin. For example, Yugoslavian visitors believe the government should pay and have an expectation of good weather as a reason for visiting. In contrast, visitors from the UK were visiting for good weather, but also spectacular scenery, and were willing to pay higher amounts for visiting a marine park. It is also possible that respondents from different countries of origin represent different types of visitor, with different needs, depending on how the Seychelles are marketed as a tourist destination. For example, French people were particularly interested in 'dream holidays' and visited Curieuse MNP. However, differences in marketing may well reflect different national preferences, and definitions of 'holiday' or 'recreation' may vary between countries, and potentially the economic values placed on recreational activities by respondents from different countries. For example, UK and Yugoslavian respondents were both interested in visiting the Seychelles for the good weather, but had very different preservation motivations and WTP responses for the same good, namely marine parks. This also highlights a potential limitation of the contingent valuation method. Whilst we have asked respondents to value a visit to an MNP, based on a limited amount of information, we cannot be certain what respondents were actu-

ally valuing. For example, they could have been giving a value for MNPs in general, or even for protection of the environment in general. Additionally, respondents could be purchasing moral satisfaction by stating a WTP amount (see, for example, Jacobs, 1997 and Langford *et al.*, 2001 for further discussion of these issues). Although we asked participants about their motivations and expectations to account for some of these potential biases, we cannot be certain that these were all captured in the survey. Further qualitative investigation, in depth interviews or focus groups would constitute useful additional information in this case (Kontogianni *et al.*, 2001), although this was not possible in the confines of this particular project.

Examining the WTP amounts, the relatively small value of the consumer surplus per tourist (11 Rupees) in comparison to the values obtained in other park-related studies, for example Shultz, Pinazzo, and Cifuenles (1998), Kramer, Sharma, and Munasinghe (1995), and Dixon, Scura, and van't Hof (1995). However, respondents were also asked how much they would be willing to pay for a visit to one park only, and the amounts were not distributed evenly between parks, as respondents were willing to pay significantly more for visiting Curieuse and Ile de Coco, but significantly less for visiting Baie Terney. In table 7, we use the parameters from the multiple regression analysis presented in table 6 to calculate WTP amounts for visiting each park. In addition, as mentioned in section 4.2, it can be argued that some of the parameters estimated for expectations are in fact *realized expectations* when visitors experience, for example, good weather, good diving conditions and a romantic location, leading to the WTP estimates given in the second column of table 7. These WTP amounts are significantly higher than the current fee of 50 Rupees per visit. Therefore, we can state to policy makers that there are not only differences in the fees, which should be levied from each MNP, but that by understanding the expectations and motivations to visit different MNPs, the continued provision of certain aspects of each park allows for significantly higher fees to be introduced. This information could potentially be of great use to policy makers in setting realistic and flexible entrance fees, based on visitor profiles, including information on country of origin, expectations, and behaviour.

6. Conclusions

The main objective of this study was to identify the value of MNPs to the Seychelles' economy through the calculation of the difference between what the Seychelles' visitors would be willing to pay to visit the marine parks and what they actually pay or consumer surplus estimate. In other words, this study looked at the use value of the marine national parks. This value represents easily realizable benefits, which are over and above those benefits that are currently realized, as WTP values for visits to the parks are higher than the current 50 Rupees fee (both for people having visited a park and people having not visited any park), depending on visitors' expectations. Therefore, the entrance fees could be increased without sharp reductions in visitation, which would result in an increase in the revenue from the fees and in a decrease of the deficit, based on 1997–1998

figures. For example, if the amount of the entrance fee were to be increased to 60 Rupees, the direct benefits from the parks would increase from 2,227,800 Rupees to 2,627,800 Rupees and consequently the deficit would be reduced from 1,827,500 Rupees to 1,427,500 Rupees. If the amount levied for each MNP was increased to 120 Rupees, a reasonable amount suggested by the second column of table 7, this would lead to direct benefits of 5,301,160, Rupees and would wipe out the deficit yielding a profit of 1,245,860 Rupees. However, this would be a very large increase if implemented in one step, and is of course dependent on all visitors having particular expectations, which are then fulfilled. It may also be possible to generate some revenue from imposing a small charge on local visitors, perhaps 10 per cent of the charge to foreign tourists. Of course, these decisions are inherently political, and the economic analysis presented here represents what may be achievable in economic terms only.

However, we must remember that in this study we have only examined the use value of the parks. If non-use values of the parks were assessed, these might reveal that people are willing to contribute for preserving a portion of the world's marine resources, but it is difficult to see who should be included in such a valuation, and how funds should be collected and distributed. In this case, it is likely that such non-use values can only be determined via national or perhaps international political efforts to subsidize the maintenance of the parks. This is particularly important as biological resource depletion and degradation in Seychelles are not just ecological issues affecting the marine parks, but have important economic and political impacts on the Seychelles. Tourism in Seychelles is predominantly beach-based, and thus directly depends on coastal and marine biological resources and diversity. In addition, there are important ethical and moral dimensions, which concern the whole of humanity. Nevertheless, results from a contingent valuation study of this kind, which includes assessment of visitor expectations, motivations, and behaviour can easily and usefully be incorporated into benefit–cost analysis of projects, including conservation components, to determine the economic viability, and hence be invaluable to the Seychelles' government providing guidance for choosing and implementing investments for natural resource conservation and development.

References

- Brouwer, R., N. Owe, R.K. Turner, I.J. Bateman, and I.H. Langford (1999), 'Public attitudes to contingent valuation and public consultation', *Environmental Values* 8: 325–347.
- Central Bank of Seychelles (1997), *Annual Report 1996*, Republic of Seychelles: Central Bank of Seychelles.
- Collie, J. (1998), 'National perspective of management of marine protected areas in Seychelles', Regional Workshop on Marine Protected Areas, Tourism and Communities, Partnership for Conservation in Kenya, 11–30 May, Conference Kenya Wildlife Service with IUCN (International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources).
- Dixon, J.A. and P.B. Sherman (1990), *Economics of Protected Areas: A New Look at Benefits and Costs*, Washington DC: Island Press.

- Dixon, J.A., L.F. Scura, and T. van't Hof (1995), 'Ecology and microeconomics as joint products: the Bonaire marine park in the Caribbean', in C.A. Perrings, K.-G. Mäler, C. Folke, C.S. Holling, and B.-O. Jansson (eds), *Biodiversity Conservation: Problems and Policies*, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Hanley, N. and C.L. Spash (1993), *Cost-Benefit Analysis and the Environment*, Aldershot: Edward Elgar.
- Hoagland, P., Y. Kaoru, and J.M. Broadus (1995), 'A methodological review of net benefit evaluation for marine reserves', Environment Department Papers, Environmental Economics Series, Paper No. 027, The World Bank, Washington DC.
- Jacobs, M. (1997), 'Environmental valuation, deliberative democracy and public decision-making institutions', in J. Foster (ed.), *Valuing Nature: Economics, Ethics and Environment*, London: Routledge.
- Kelleher, G., C. Bleakley, and S. Wells (1995), *A Global Representative System of Marine Protected Areas, Vol. 1*, Washington DC: The Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority, The World Bank and The World Conservation Union.
- Kontogianni, A., M.S. Skourtos, I.H. Langford, I.J. Bateman, and S. Georgiou (2001), 'Integrating stakeholder analysis in non-market valuation of environmental assets', *Ecological Economics* 37: 123–138.
- Kramer, R.A., N. Sharma, and M. Munasinghe (1995), 'Valuing tropical forests: methodology and case study of Madagascar', World Bank Environment Paper No. 13, The World Bank, Washington DC.
- Langford, I.H., S. Georgiou, R.J. Day, and I.J. Bateman (1999), 'Comparing perceptions of risk and quality with willingness to pay: a mixed methodological study of public preferences for reducing health risks from polluted coastal bathing waters', *Risk, Decision and Policy* 4: 201–220.
- Langford, I.H., S. Georgiou, I.J. Bateman, R.J. Day, and R.K. Turner (2000), 'Public perceptions of health risks from polluted coastal bathing waters: a mixed methodological analysis using cultural theory', *Risk Analysis* 20: 691–704.
- Langford, I.H., M.S. Skourtos, A. Kontogianni, R.J. Day, S. Georgiou, and I.J. Bateman (2001), 'Use and nonuse values for conserving endangered species: the case of the Mediterranean monk seal', *Environment and Planning A*. In press.
- Langford, I.H., I.J. Bateman, A.P. Jones, H.D. Langford, and S. Georgiou (1998), 'Improved estimation of willingness to pay in dichotomous choice contingent valuation studies', *Land Economics* 74: 65–75.
- Langford, I.H., I.J. Bateman, and H.D. Langford (1996), 'A multilevel approach to triple-bounded dichotomous choice contingent valuation', *Environmental and Resource Economics* 7: 197–211.
- Maddala, G.S. (1983), *Limited-Dependent and Qualitative Variables in Econometrics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mathieu L.F., I.H. Langford, and W. Kenyon (2000), 'Valuing marine national parks in Seychelles', CSERGE Working Paper GEC 2000–27.
- Mitchell, R.C. and R.T. Carson (1989), *Using Surveys to Value Public Goods: The Contingent Valuation Method*, Washington DC: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- NOAA (1993), 'Proposed Rules, 15 CFR Chapter IX, Natural Resource Damage Assessments under the Oil and Pollution Act of 1990', *Federal Register* 58: 4601–4614.
- Pearce, D.W. and R.K. Turner (1990), *Economics of Natural Resources and the Environment*, New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Republic of Seychelles (1997), 'Public sector investment programme, 1997–1999', Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Planning and Environment, Seychelles.
- Sagoff, M. (1988), *The Economy of the Earth*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shah, N.J. (1995), 'Coastal zone management in the Seychelles', in C.G. Lundin and

- O. Lindén (eds), *Integrated Coastal Zone Management in the Seychelles*, Washington DC: The World Bank.
- Shultz S., J. Pinazzo, and M. Cifuentes (1998), 'Opportunities and limitations of contingent valuation surveys to determine national park entrance fees: evidence from Costa Rica', *Environment and Development Economics* 3: 131–149.
- United Nations Conference for Economic Development (UNCED) (1993), 'Agenda 21, Rio Conference on the Environment and development', United Nations, New York.
- Whitehead, J.C., G.C. Blomquist, T.J. Hoban, and W.B. Clifford (1995), 'Assessing the validity and reliability of contingent values: a comparison of on-site users, off-site users, and non-users', *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 29: 238–251.