

Eviews

/

Eviews

(Barbier, et al., 1997)

« () » :

.() «.

،

...

)

(

()

،

() .

) ()

(

()

•

()

/ / /

(Ficker and Schonlau, 2002)

()

:

/

:

:

()
(Pedroso, et al., 2007)
WTP
(Kuma and Kumarr, 2007)
(Lee and Han, 2002)
CVM
(Sheikh, et al., 2007)
(White and Lovett, 1999)
(Schlapfer, 2007)
(Mc Millan, et al., 2006)
(Schlapfer, 2007). ()
(Pedroso et al. 2007)
()
()
(Kolstad, 2000) .
(CVM)
•
• (WTA) (WTP)
•
()

$$\Delta U = U(1, Y-A; S) - U(0, Y; S) + (\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_0) :$$

(Pi)

(A)

$$P_i = F \eta(\Delta U) = \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-\Delta U)} =$$

$$\frac{1}{1 + \exp\{- (\alpha - \beta A + \gamma Y + \theta S)\}}$$

(Maximum

Likelihood)

WTP

(WTP)

(A)

$$E(WTP) = \int_0^{MaxA} F \eta(\Delta U) dA =$$

$$\int_0^{MaxA} \left(\frac{1}{1 + \exp\{- (\alpha^* + \beta A)\}} \right) dA$$

α^*

WTP

E(WTP)

$$U(1, Y-A; S) + \varepsilon_1 \geq U(0, Y; S) + \varepsilon_0 :$$

U

A Y .

S

%

()

%

$\varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_0$.

:()

% /

/	/	/	/	/	
/	/	/	/	/	
/	/	/	/	/	

(% /)

(% /)

(% /)

/

/

:()

(:)

		/	/	
		/	/	
%				
%				
% /				
% /				
% /				
% /				
% /				
% /				
% /				
% /				

(:)

()

Views

()

:()

	t		
0	/	/	
/	/	/	
/	/	/	
/	/	/	

(Adams, et al. 2007)

$$\int_0^{75000} \frac{1}{1 + \exp \{ - (\text{intrecept} - \beta X) \}} = 8803.92$$

()

Amirnejad,)

)

(et al. 2006

/ (

(Kumar and Kumar, 2007)

(WTP)

- 1- Ramsar Convension on Wetlands
- 2- Ecological Values

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 3- Contingent Valuation Method (CVM) | 8- Revealed Preference |
| 4- Existence Value | 9- Stated Preference |
| 5- Option Value | 10- Willingness to Pay (WTP) |
| 6- Bequest Value | 11- Willingness to Accept (WTA) |
| 7- Total Economic Value | 12- Use Value |
| | 13- Non-use Value |
| | 14- Nitrogen Recycle |

Adams,C., et al. 2007. The use of contingent valuation for evaluating protected areas in the developing world: Economic valuation of Morro does Diabo State Park, Atlantic Rainforest, São Paulo State (Brazil). *Ecological Economics* (62): 309- 320.

Amirnejad,H., et al. 2006. Estimating the existence value of north forests of Iran by using a contingent valuation method. *Ecological Economics*. (58): 665-675.

Barbier, E.B., et al. 1997. *Economic Valuation of Wetlands: A Guide for Policymakers and Planners*. Ramsar Convension Bureau.

Fricker,D.F., M., Schonlau. 2002. Advantages and disadvantages of internet research surveys: evidence from the literature. *Field Methods* 14 (4), 347–367.

Kolstad,C. 2000. *Environmental Economics*. Axford University Press.

Kumar,M., P.,Kumar. 2007. Valuation of the ecosystem services: A psycho-cultural perspective. *Ecological Economics* (2007), doi:10.1016/j.ecolecon.2007.05.008

MacMillan,D., N.,Hanley, N.,Lienhoop. 2006. Contingent valuation: Environmental polling or preference engine. *Ecological Economics*.(60): 299-307

Lambert,A. 2003. *Economic Valuation of Wetlands: an ImportantComponent of Wetland Management Strategies at the River Basin Scale*. Ramsar Convension.

Lee,Ch., H.,Sang-Yoel. 2002. Estimating the use and preservation values of national parks' tourism resources using a contingent valuation method. *Tourism Management* 23: 531–540.

Pedroso,C., H.,Freitas and T.,Domingos. 2007. Testing for the survey mode effect on contingent valuation data quality: A case study of web based versus in-person interview.*Ecological Economics*. (62): 388- 398

Schlapfer,F. 2007. *Contingent Valuation: A New Perspective*. *Ecological Economics*. doi:10.1016/j.Ecoloecon.2007.10.010

Shaikh,L., L.,Sun and G.,Kooten. 2007. Treating respondent uncertainty in contingent valuation: A comparison of empirical treatments. *Ecological Economics*. (62): 115-125.

White, P.C.L., J.C., Lovett. 1999. Public preferences and willingness-to-pay for nature conservation in the North York Moors National Park UK. *Journal of Environmental Management* (55): 1 – 13.