

## Effects of Destination Attributes on Tourists' Behavioral Intentions to Kuala Selangor

Mazlina Mahdzar, Arni Abd Gani

Faculty of Hotel and Tourism Management, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Puncak Alam  
Campus, Selangor, Malaysia

To Link this Article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v8-i16/5138>

DOI:10.6007/IJARBSS/v8-i16/5138

**Published Date:** 30 December 2018

### Abstract

Study the tourists' satisfaction on destination attributes is vital for successful destination marketing as it plays an important role in increasing the country economic growth. Besides, it is important to discover new attributes of destination image to strengthen the image construct, and it also played a significant role in tourist satisfaction and loyalty. Therefore, the objective of this study is to examine the influence of destination attributes and their behavioral intentions in Kuala Selangor, Malaysia. A convenient sampling technique was used to select the sample. A total of 313 questionnaires were distributed to tourists at Kuala Selangor and were returned. The result from the finding suggests that tourists who have higher perceptions of the destination attributes of Kuala Selangor are more likely to have a positive experience and increasing behavioral intentions to revisit. Therefore, Kuala Selangor destination marketers need to pay attention to provide customers with unique experiences to ensure their relationship with the customer through repeat visitation.

**Keywords:** Tourism, Destination Attributes, Behavioral Intentions, Kuala Selangor.

### Introduction

Travel attributes represent a set of destination features that describe a place as a tourist destination, and it affects the image of a destination (Kim, 2014). Destinations are required to create its images to enhance the satisfaction of tourist on their travel experiences as it will tend to influence their behavior (Zhang, Fu, Cai & Lu, 2014). Assessment of destination attributes helps management recognize the satisfaction of tourists and therefore directs the destination's competitiveness and provides valuable management information for the tourist destination planning process (Vodeb, 2017). The destination attributes that have been planned through the well managed and publicize is necessary because it is a crucial aspect in tourists' final destination evaluation (Cracolici, Nijkamp & Rietveld, 2008) and their future behavior regarding their revisit intention and recommendation decision (Yoon & Uysal, 2005). As a result, destination image has an impact on tourist destination choices and their satisfaction as well as after sales behavior (Ramseook-Munhurrin, Seebaluck & Naidoo, 2015).

Understanding and prevising tourists' intentions to revisit to particular destinations are essential (Prayag, 2009). Destination attributes have an impact on the behavior of tourists. Tourist behavior includes the process of selecting a destination, visiting and approach the destination (Chen & Tsai, 2007). Thus, tourism stakeholders should know how to create an attractive image on their destinations as well as improve their marketing efforts to develop an image and maximize the effective use of their resources (Ramseook-Munhurrin, Seebaluck & Naidoo, 2014). Therefore, this study aims to assess the attributes of the destination that provides experience to tourists at Kuala Selangor and its effects on their post-consumption evaluation.

## **Conceptual Framework and Hypotheses**

### ***Destination Attributes***

Destination attributes is a mixture of the different elements that attract travelers' to a destination that is critically important for several reasons. Destination attributes should, therefore, be wise to focus attention on those attributes that are likely to have the most significant beneficial impact on particular segments of the tourism market (Crouch, 2011). Tourists will compare the attributes of destinations when selecting a specific destination. They will choose a destination with attributes that important for them as it is a pull factor for some reasons as tourists compare the possible destinations they can visit and make their decisions according to the attributes a destination have (Echtner & Ritchie, 1993). There are factors that effecting destination attributes that were also used to measure the destination image (Echtner & Ritchie, 1993). According to this study, there are some strong attributes for Kuala Selangor such as accessibility, physiography, place attachment, activities and events, cost/value, safety/security, hospitality, and superstructure.

### ***Destination Attributes and Behavioral Intentions***

Several studies analyzed the impact of the evaluation of destinations attributes on the tourist behavior intention (e.g., Prayag & Ryan, 2012; Chi & Qu, 2008; Chen & Tsai, 2007; Chen & Chen, 2010). These image of destination tends to influence the tourist's destination intention to travel to consume the destination products and services, and also will influence their decision to return (Coban, 2012). The tourist evaluation on their perception towards attributes of destination (Ross, 1993) due to, it is a picture of the tourist attitude towards many signs that related to the destination characteristics such as the attractions and facilities provided by that destination (Echtner & Ritchie, 2003). It has the same issue that destination image has positively affected tourist behavior in the future (Court & Lupton, 1997). Tourists' behavior is expected to image on a particular destination that will impact on their destination choosing process, in term of how they evaluate their travel experiences that will also impact on their intentions which has been studied by many authors (Goodall, 1988). Hence, destination image is believed can be influenced to tourist's decision making. Last but not least, successful marketing strategies also have a significant influence on tourist behavior towards a particular destination (Stabler, 1995). The hypotheses, therefore are:

H1: The higher destination attributes the higher it influences on the tourist behavioral intention (TBI).

H1a: There is a positive relationship between physiography and tourist behavioral intention.

H1b: There is a positive relationship between activities & events and tourist behavioral intention.

H1c: There is a positive relationship between hospitality and tourist behavioral intention.

H1d: There is a positive relationship between cost/value and tourist behavioral intention.

H1e: There is a positive relationship between safety/security and tourist behavioral intention.

H1f: There is a positive relationship between superstructure and tourist behavioral intention.

## **Methods**

### ***Study Settings***

Kuala Selangor city that located in Selangor is well known in its attractions and has attributes of historical and natural attractions as well as exotic food. Among its tourist attractions includes historical sites of Bukit Melawati, the adventure of fireflies sightseeing at Kampung Kuantan, Kuala Selangor Nature Park, eagle watching and fresh seafood.

### ***Measures***

Destination attributes items were adapted and modified from Kim (2014). The destination attributes consist of six dimensions identified as Physiography, Activities & Events, Cost/Value, Safety/Security, Hospitality, and Superstructure. Physiography was measured using four items, Activities & Events was measured using four items, Cost/Value and Safety/Security was captured using four items and three items respectively, Hospitality and Superstructure was measured using three items and four items respectively. Respondents had to rate the degree to which they agreed based on their recent visit to Kuala Selangor on each of items of a 5-point Likert scale ranging from (1) Strongly Disagree to (5) Strongly Agree. In this study, four items measure were employed to assess tourist revisit intentions as the ultimate dependent construct.

Data collection was conducted by using the convenience sampling method. A total of 313 self-administrated questionnaires were collected from tourists aged 18 years old and above at the main attractions of Kuala Selangor such as Bukit Malawati and Fireflies sightseeing in Kampung Kuantan in January to March 2018, coded and used in the analysis.

### ***Data Analysis***

The data were analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) to test the reliability, descriptive statistics for socio-demographics while hypotheses were tested through structural equation modeling using Partial Least Square (PLS) method.

## **Results**

### ***Measurement model***

To assess the constructs, the validity and reliability of the construct (Table 1) were employed to establish confidence in the measurement model. Convergent validity was examined and verified when all items in a measurement model are statistically significant, and average variance extracted (AVE) were all greater than 0.50. As shown in Table 1, all

indicators had significant factor loadings higher than 0.70 ( $p < 0.01$ ). Average variances extracted ranged from 0.65 to 0.83, indicating strong convergent validity. The construct reliability (CR) values were all well above the suggested standard of 0.70. Therefore, it can be concluded that all latent constructs possess sufficient reliability. The discriminant validity test in this study also indicated that the discriminant validity was upheld for all constructs.

Table 1

*Construct Validity and Reliability*

| MEASUREMENT ITEMS                        | FACTOR<br>LOADING<br>(>0.7) | CRONBACH'S<br>ALPHA (>0.7) | CR<br>(>0.708) | AVE<br>(>0.5) |
|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------|---------------|
| <b>Physiography</b>                      |                             | 0.835                      | 0.901          | 0.751         |
| Appeal natural attraction                | 0.888                       |                            |                |               |
| A large species flora & fauna            | 0.847                       |                            |                |               |
| Preserved nature                         | 0.865                       |                            |                |               |
| Preserved fireflies                      | 0.673                       |                            |                |               |
| <b>Activities &amp; Events</b>           |                             | 0.735                      | 0.848          | 0.651         |
| Various types of recreational activities | 0.829<br>0.252              |                            |                |               |
| Participation in activities offer        | 0.729                       |                            |                |               |
| Special events                           | 0.857                       |                            |                |               |
| Unique activities                        | 0.305                       |                            |                |               |
| New experience activities                |                             |                            |                |               |
| <b>Hospitality</b>                       |                             | 0.889                      | 0.931          | 0.818         |
| Friendliness of local people             | 0.895                       |                            |                |               |
| Local people offer assistance            | 0.908                       |                            |                |               |
| Local people sharing the information     | 0.910                       |                            |                |               |
| <b>Cost/Value</b>                        |                             | 0.806                      | 0.886          | 0.721         |
| Value for money                          | 0.856                       |                            |                |               |
| Worth spending                           | 0.888                       |                            |                |               |
| Reasonable price                         | 0.802                       |                            |                |               |
| Costly                                   | 0.614                       |                            |                |               |
| <b>Safety/Security</b>                   |                             | 0.812                      | 0.889          | 0.729         |
| Safe                                     | 0.894                       |                            |                |               |
| Secure belonging                         | 0.901                       |                            |                |               |
| Safety & precaution first                | 0.760                       |                            |                |               |
| <b>Superstructure</b>                    |                             | 0.743                      | 0.853          | 0.659         |
| Food galore                              | 0.826                       |                            |                |               |
| Historical attraction                    | 0.801                       |                            |                |               |
| Natural attraction                       | 0.680                       |                            |                |               |
| Unique destination                       | 0.808                       |                            |                |               |
| <b>Behavioural Intention</b>             |                             | 0.898                      | 0.937          | 0.831         |
| Positive comment                         | 0.907                       |                            |                |               |
| Recommend                                | 0.928                       |                            |                |               |
| Revisit                                  | 0.900                       |                            |                |               |

|                                 |       |
|---------------------------------|-------|
| Revisit alternative destination | 0.573 |
|---------------------------------|-------|

### Structural Model

Table 2 shows the result of the coefficient determination,  $R^2$  and Adjusted  $R^2$  between construct. The corrected  $R^2$  values in table 2 refer to the explanatory power of the predictor variable(s) on each construct. Based on the table 67.6% ( $R^2 = 0.676$ ) of respondents' behavioral intentions can be predicted by destination attributes (physiography, activities & events, cost/value, safety/security, hospitality, and superstructure). According to Chin (1998), endogenous latent variables classified into three classes that are: Substantial ( $R^2 = 0.67$ ); Average ( $R^2 = 0.33$ ); Weak ( $R^2 = 0.19$ ). Hence, in this study, the result shows that tourists' behavioral intention ( $R^2 = 0.676$ ) can be described as substantial.

Table 2

Result of Coefficient Determination,  $R^2$ ; adjusted  $R^2$

| Constructs            | R-Square, $R^2$ | Adjusted R-Square |
|-----------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Behavioural Intention | 0.684           | 0.676             |

Table 3

Result of the Structural Model (hypotheses testing)

| Hypothesis | Construct         | Path | Construct | t-values | p-values | Decision        |
|------------|-------------------|------|-----------|----------|----------|-----------------|
| H1a        | physiography      | ->   | TBI       | 2.62     | 0.01     | Significant     |
| H1b        | activities/events | ->   | TBI       | 3.65     | 0.00     | Significant     |
| H1c        | Hospitality       | ->   | TBI       | 1.68     | 0.09     | Not Significant |
| H1d        | Cost / Value      | ->   | TBI       | 4.04     | 0.00     | Significant     |
| H1e        | Safe / Security   | ->   | TBI       | 0.32     | 0.75     | Not Significant |
| H1f        | Superstructure    | ->   | TBI       | 3.35     | 0.00     | Significant     |

The result as summarized in Table 3 indicates four out of the six effects of hypotheses were found to be significant. T-values  $> 1.96$  is significant with a two-tailed test and p-values are significant if  $p < 0.05$  (Hair et al., 2010). The effects of Physiography had a positive influence on Tourist behavior Intentions ( $t=2.62$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), thus H1a is supported. The effects of Activities/Events, Cost/ Value, and Superstructure were also found to exert a positive influence on Tourist Behavioural Intentions ( $t=3.65$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ;  $t=4.04$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ;  $t=3.35$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ). Therefore, hypotheses 1b, 1d, and 1f were also supported. However, the finding revealed that the effects of Hospitality and Safe/Security did not influence Tourist Behavioral Intentions ( $t=1.68$ ,  $p > 0.01$ ;  $t=0.32$ ,  $p > 0.01$ ). This concludes that hypotheses 1c and 1e were not supported.

### Discussions and Conclusion

The objective of this study is investigating the relationship and effect between destination attributes of Kuala Selangor and tourist behavioral intentions. Results indicate that destination attributes represent six dimensions that is Physiography, Activities & events,

Cost/value, Safety/security, Hospitality, and Superstructure. From the study it revealed that out of the six dimensions, there are two (2) hypotheses are not significant which are hospitality, and safety/security attributes towards tourist behavioral intention as the t-values are >1.96 while the others are significant.

The result of this study indicates that a good perception of destination attributes (i.e., physiography, activities and events, cost & value and superstructure) can elicit positive behavioral intentions. Thus, Kuala Selangor should make an effort to enhance tourist experience and satisfaction by designing and maintaining good destination attributes, which leads to favorable revisit intentions. For example, Kuala Selangor destination management should, therefore, emphasize more on the attributes that reflect nature appeals, buildings, and facilities, value for money for products and mix activities to create more leisurely and pleasant surroundings. In support of this finding, Mahdzar et al. (2015) indicate that a variety of activities enables a destination to cater to different types of tourists and value for money for products such as offering a quality of products in a destination is a crucial destination attribute.

In line with the previous studies, this study verified that destination attributes had an impact on tourist revisit intentions. This study gives a significant value for Kuala Selangor tourism officials on the factors of destination attributes that are important for destination marketers to market their destination. Besides, this study also could be a guideline for tourism marketer to forecast what the crucial things to be included and their improvement towards current tourism products and services so that Kuala Selangor can be sustained and be a well-known destination. Therefore, destination marketers could consist of descriptions in elements of physiography, activities, and events, cost/value, and superstructure to ensure that the destination images and the information they provide are realistic representations of what they offer.

### Acknowledgement

This research is funded through the research grant obtained from DUCS (Dana UiTM Cawangan Selangor) (Grant No: 600-UITMSEL (PI. 5/4) (025/2018)).

### Corresponding Author

Dr. Mazlina Mahdzar, Faculty of Hotel and Tourism Management, UiTM, Puncak Alam Campus, 42300 Bandar Puncak Alam, Selangor, Malaysia.  
Email: nina@salam.uitm.edu.my

### References

- Chen, C. F. & Chen, F.S (2010). Experience quality, perceived value, satisfaction and behavioral intentions for heritage tourists. *Tourism Management*, 31, 29–35.  
doi:10.1016/j.tourman.2009. 02.008
- Chen, C.F & Tsai, D.G (2007) How destination image and evaluative factors affect behavioral intentions? *Tourism Management*, 28 (4), 1115-1122.
- Chi, C.G.Q & Qu, H. (2008), Examining the structural relationships of destination image, tourist satisfaction and destination loyalty: an integrated approach. *Tourism Management*, Vol. 29 No. 4, pp. 624-636.



- Chin, W.W (1998). Issues and opinion on structural equation modeling. *MIS Quarterly*, Vol.22, No. 1, pp. vii–xvi.
- Coban, S. (2012). The effects of the image of destination on tourist satisfaction and loyalty: The Case of Cappadocia. *European Journal of Social Science*, 29(2): 222-232.
- Court, B. and Lupton, R. (1997). Customer portfolio development: modeling destination adopters, inactive, and rejecters. *Journal of Travel Research*, 36(1), 35-43.
- Cracolici, M., Nijkamp, P. & Rietveld, P. (2008). Assessment of tourism competitiveness by analyzing destination efficiency. *Tourism Economics*, 14(2), 325-342.
- Crouch, G.I (2011). Destination Competitiveness: an analysis of determinant attributes. *Journal of Travel Research*, 50(27): 27-45.
- Echtner, C. M. & Ritchie, J. R. B. (2003). The meaning and measurement of destination image. *The Journal of Tourism Studies*, 37-48.
- Echtner, C. M. & Ritchie, J. R. B. (1993). The measurement of destination image: An empirical assessment. *Journal of Travel Research*, 31(4), 3-13.
- Goodall, B. (1988). How tourists choose their holidays: An analytical framework. In B. Goodall, & G. Ashworth (Eds.), *Marketing in the tourism industry: The promotion of destination regions* (pp. 1–17).
- Govers, R. & Go, F. (2005). Projected destination online: Website content analysis of picture and text, *Information Technology and Tourism*, 7 (2), 1-18.
- Hair, J.F., Black, W.C., Babin, B.J., & Anderson, R.E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis: A global perspective* (7th ed.). Pearson Education International.
- Kim, J. H. (2014). The antecedents of memorable tourism experiences: The development of a scale to measure the destination attributes associated with memorable experiences. *Tourism Management*, 44, 34-45.
- Mahdzar, M., Shuib, A., Ramachandran, S., & Herman, M. S. (2015). The role of destination attributes and memorable tourism experience in understanding tourist revisit intentions. *American-Eurasian Journal of Agricultural & Environmental Sciences*, 15(Tourism & Environment, Social and Management Sciences), 32-39. IDOSI Publications. ISSN: 1818-6769.
- Prayag, G. (2009), Tourists' evaluations of destination image, satisfaction, and future behavioral intentions – the case of Mauritius. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, Vol. 26 No. 8, pp. 836-853.
- Prayag, G. & Ryan, C. (2012), Antecedents of tourists' loyalty to Mauritius: the role and influence of destination image, place attachment, personal involvement, and satisfaction. *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 51 No. 3, pp. 342-356.
- Ramseook-Munhurrana, P; V.N. Seebalucka, & P. Naidooa, (2014), Examining the structural relationships of destination image, perceived value, tourist satisfaction and loyalty: case of Mauritius. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 175 (2015), 252 – 259.
- Ross, G.F., (1993). Ideal and actual images of backpacker visitors to Northern Australia, *Journal of Travel Research*, 21 (3), 54-57.
- Stabler, M. (1995). "The image of destination regions: theoretical and empirical aspects". In *Marketing in Tourism Industry: The Promotion of Destination Regions*, Good all and Ashworth, eds., 133-159.

- Vodeb, K., & Nemec Rudež, H. (2017). Which attributes are important to tourists in a mature seaside destination? A case of Opatija in Croatia. *Turizam: međunarodni znanstveno-stručni časopis*, 65(3), 267-279.
- Yoon, Y. & Uysal, M. (2005). An examination of the effects of motivation and satisfaction on destination loyalty: a structural model. *Tourism Management*, 26, 45-56.
- Zhang, H., Fu, X., Cai, L.A. & Lu, L. (2014). Destination image and tourist loyalty: a meta-analysis. *Tourism Management*, Vol. 40, pp. 213-223.