

PRODUCT EVALUATION AND TRAVEL MOTIVATION OF DOMESTIC TOURISTS TO ISLAND DESTINATIONS IN MALAYSIA

AZILAH KASIM
HISHAM DZAKIRIA

*School of Tourism, Hospitality and Environmental Management
Universiti Utara Malaysia*

ABSTRACT

This study focuses on product evaluation and tested the relationship between the pull and the push aspects of travel motivation theorized by Dann, (1981) and McGee et al. (1996) within the context of domestic tourism in island destinations. Thus it offers an original contribution to the literature. The study uses personally assisted quantitative survey method at major entry and exit points to four island destinations in the northwest of Peninsular Malaysia. Domestic tourists spending at least one night at the destinations were the study's respondents. Product evaluation findings showed that domestic tourists are concerned with having a wider range of accommodations, an improvement the quantity of the public transport, and a wider range of pricing to suit their needs. They are only moderately impressed with the quality of accommodation, transportation, attractions, and activities provided at the island destinations and are least impressed with the prices, mobile and internet connection as well as food/beverage outlets location and food presentations. Test on the relationship between the pull and push aspects of travel motivation indicated a strong link between the tested variables, thereby providing empirical proof to the tested theory. The practical implication was that destination managers should focus more on quality of tourism provision instead of quantity.

Keywords: *Destination Management, Product Evaluation, Travel Motivation*

INTRODUCTION

Customer feedback is essential for ensuring business success. Similar concept applies at destination management level, where managers have to understand how tourists perceived the destination offerings, in order to ensure tourists' continued satisfaction. Domestic tourist is an important market segment because domestic tourism can offset the losses a destination may experience from the fluctuation and unpredictability

of international tourism. For example, the global economic recession often lead to a major decrease in international tourist arrival in many tourism destinations, reemphasizing the importance of domestic tourism in sustaining local economies (Scheyvens, 2002). For Malaysia, this was evident in 1998 after the country's economy tumbled due to the Asian Financial Crisis (Kasim et al., 2013), forcing the country to reinvigorate its *Cuti-Cuti Malaysia* (holiday in Malaysia) campaign (see The New Strait Times, 2008). Focusing on domestic tourism is a good economic strategy because of their increasing number especially in developing countries. In Malaysia for example, the number of domestic tourists has increased from 74.71 million in 2009 to 131 million in 2011 (Malaysia Country Report, 2013). This placed domestic tourists as an important market segment to target.

Product evaluation is very much a part of consumer behaviour (Schiffmann & Kanuk, 2007). Understanding tourist behaviour is important to both the field of marketing and tourism to explain the way consumers make decisions and act in relation to the consumption of tourism products. While the term 'consumer' would seem to indicate a single concept of demand, the reality is that there is a whole diversity of consumer behaviour, with decisions being made for a range of reasons (Cooper et. al, 2008). Studies on product evaluation will lead to valuable information on the needs, purchase motives and decision process associated with the consumption of tourism, highlight the different market segments and help managers improve their chance of marketing success.

This study presents data on product evaluation within the context of domestic tourism in island destinations. It also attempts to test the relationship between tourists' perception on the destinations' tourism provision (or the pull factors) with the push aspect of travel motivation, to provide empirical evidence to the theory that pull factors such as sunshine, relaxed tempo, and friendly natives both respond to and reinforce push factor motivation (Dann, 1981; McGeet al. 1996).

LITERATURE REVIEW

Product evaluation

Evaluation of tourism product particularly within the context of a tourism destination is often categorized as the 'attractiveness' of the destination in question. Leask (2010) emphasized the importance of destination attractiveness in motivating tourists to visit. They also form

an important determinant for how competitive destination is (Cracolici & Nijkamp, 2009; Leask, 2010) compared to nearby destinations that offer similar products.

There are varied school of thoughts about what resource items can and/or must be included in identifying and evaluating destination attractiveness. For example, Ritchie & Zins (1978) proposed eight attraction factors that could be evaluated for attractiveness while Hu & Ritchie (1993) proposed sixteen attraction factors respectively. Among the most commonly tourist attraction factors stated in the literature are culture/historical resource, nature/ outdoor recreation activities, shopping and infrastructure.

Tourism attractiveness can be evaluated from both demand and supply side. From demand side, evaluation is dependent on personal benefits and the perceived delivery of those benefits to travelers (Mayo & Jarvis, 1981). This is consistent with the proposition that “the travel destination reflects the feelings, beliefs, and opinions that an individual has about a destination’s perceived ability to provide satisfaction in relation to his or her special vacation needs” (Hu & Ritchie, 1993, p. 25). From the supply side, tourism attractiveness is referred to as the pull factor generated by the overall attractions existing in a given place at a certain time (Kaur, 1981). Gearing et al. (1974) proposed seventeen resource items that was grouped into five attribute factors i.e. natural (topography, flora, fauna, sunshine etc.), social (architecture, social activities), historical (ruins, events), recreation and shopping (outdoor activities, museums, casinos), infrastructure (roads, transportation), food (restaurants) and shelter (accommodation). Meanwhile, Richtie & Zins (1978) proposed that attraction factors should include natural beauty, climate, culture and social characteristics, sport, recreation, and education facilities; shopping and commercial facilities; infrastructures; cost of living; attitudes towards tourists; and accessibility. More recently, Chi, Qing, & Qu, (2008) classified nine elements of destination attractiveness i.e. 1. travel environment which include safety, cleanliness, friendliness of people, relaxing atmosphere and pleasant weather, 2. natural attractions, 3. entertainment & events, (4) historic attractions and 5. infrastructure , 6. accessibility , 7. relaxation (i.e. spa, soothing the mind and refreshing the body, spi- ritual rejuvenation); (8) outdoor activities and (9) price and value.

However, as mentioned by Hu & Ritchie (1993), the lack of a consistent, methodologically sound and validated measurement of attractiveness from a demand standpoint indicates the need to use a contextual approach in measuring destination attractiveness. For the purpose of this

study, attraction factors are adapted from Gearing et al. (1974) and Richtie & Zins (1978). Adapting from these authors, and looking at the study context, the attraction factors for this study were decided to be pricing, transportation, activities (social), attractions (nature), accommodation, accessibility (internet), food and beverages. Looking at the selected attributes, perceived product quality is measured. Perceived quality is about the judgments of consumers on a product's superiority (Zeithaml, 1988, cited by Tsioutsou, 2005). As Nilsson et. al (2001) correctly pointed out, quality is essentially a business philosophy with no exact definitions or measurements. Thus, for this study, quality refers to how much the characteristics of product attributes meet or exceed domestic tourists' expectation.

Perceived quality has been empirically found to have direct relationship with satisfaction (Tsioutsou, 2006). In other words, higher product and service quality will bring about higher satisfaction among consumers. This same idea is applicable within the context of destination management. The higher the quality of tourism products and services a destination offers, the better the experience tourists will receive, and the more satisfied they will be about their visit at the destination.

At organizational level, the idea that quality management and practices improve firm performance has been empirically supported (for example, Hendricks & Singhal, 1997; Lemak & Reed, 1997; Lemak & Reed, 2000). Hendricks & Singhal (1997) study on winners of quality award found that firm size and financial capacity strongly correlate with quality performance. Lemak & Reed (1997) studied organizations that have committed themselves to quality management for a period of five years and found that quality practices can positively impact organizational performance via higher market valuation.

Nilsson, Johnson & Gustafsson, (2001), Powell (1995), and Saraph, Benson & Schroeder (1989) developed instruments for measuring quality practices in both a product and service environment. Saraph et al., (1989) studied how organizational conditions such as corporate support for quality, entry barriers, degree of external quality demand for quality practice and past quality performance affect quality practices. They postulate that service firms are not influenced by contextual conditions compared to product firms. Powell (1995) investigated how factors of total quality management correlate with financial performance and concluded that there are differences between product and service organizations. According to his findings, process improvements are more important for a service organization compared to a product organization. A bigger

scale of this study was conducted by Nilsson et al., in 2001. They studied 482 companies in Sweden and found that an organization's customer orientation would significantly influence internal quality practices that would lead to better customer satisfaction. They emphasize that for a service provider, both customer and process orientation play important role on quality and customer satisfaction.

What can be learnt from the above literature is that quality is an essential ingredient in ensuring customer satisfaction. A service provider (including the ones in the tourism industry) needs to focus on the internal processes in the effort to convey quality. It needs to consistently improve the processes involved in its quality practices to make customer happy and satisfied. Applying this to the context of destination management, it is clear that managers need to continuously improve the internal processes on quality to ensure positive quality perception among all the target markets.

As mentioned by Echter & Ritchie (1993), the physical settings of a tourism destination, supported by infrastructures (accommodation, transportation, food and tourist attractions) can be linked to tourist perceptions of quality and value to their holiday experience. Recent empirical evidence on the relationship between perceived quality, satisfaction and behavioural intentions among visitors of a tourist destination has been offered by Žabkar, Brenčič & Dmitrović (2013). The authors used Structural Equation Modelling to explore the relationship between formative and reflective constructs on 1056 tourists in Slovenia. They found that significant and positive correlation between destination attributes and perceived quality of tourist offerings can positively affect satisfaction and behavioural intentions. However, their study focused on international tourists to four destinations in Slovenia whereas this study focuses on domestic tourists to island destination in Malaysia.

Previous studies on tourist satisfaction in the context of travel and tourism (Alegre & Cladera, 2006; Alegre & Garau, 2010; Chi & Qu, 2009; Gursoy, McCleary, & Lepsito, 2003, 2007; Mason & Nassivera, 2013; Neal & Gursoy, 2008; Oppermann, 1998, 2000; Song, Veen, Li, & Chen, 2012) showed that satisfaction is a necessary pre-requisite for a successful tourist destination. Satisfaction is one of the most important predictors of customer loyalty (Ozdemir et al., 2012) because it allows prediction on the choice of a destination, the consumption of products and services, and the decision to return (Chen & Gursoy, 2001; Chi, 2011, 2012; Yoon & Uysal, 2005).

One important reason for prioritizing tourist satisfaction in destination management is that satisfied tourists tend to share their experience with family and friends (Chi & Qu, 2008; Prayag & Ryan, 2012). If a tourist had a holiday that met his or her needs and expectations, he/she may recommend it to others through positive word-of-mouth. Moreover, he/she may well use the tourist products and services again and again, eventually becoming a loyal customer. On the other hand, a disgruntled or unsatisfied tourist may air his/her dissatisfaction more publicly via various forms of media. The strong and positive relationship between quality and tourist satisfaction has been widely found in the literature (see Bigne et al., 2001; Žabkar et al., 2013).

Satisfaction can be measured using perceived quality, perceived risk and perceived value (Quintal et al., 2008) on attributes such as destination image (Girish Prayag, 2009), natural landscapes, service and recreational equipments (Lee T.H., 2009), services, attractions and accessibility (Celeste Eusebio et al., 2011), personal involvement, place attachment and overall satisfaction (Prayag et al 2011 & Girish Prayag 2012). Attributes such as cultural attractions, touristy substructures (Coban, 2012) and benefits they look for from the particular purchase (Otto & Ritchie, 1996; Bigne et al., 2001; Cooper et al. 2008; Swarbrooke & Horner, 2007) could also influence tourist satisfaction. These needs and desires are closely linked to motivators and determinants.

Prebensen's (2000) study of Norwegian's trip satisfaction revealed that tourists' satisfaction with a trip or destination could be the result of many factors, such as their perceptions on products as well as their expectations before and during the trip. The study focused on inner motives for travelling which correspond to Dann's (1981) push factors. Specifically, findings from the study showed that Norwegian charter tourists have been satisfied with travel destinations in southern European countries and consequently intend to purchase the products again and make positive recommendations to others.

The relationship between the image of the destination as perceived by the tourist and their behavioural intentions has been studied by Bigne et al., (2001). Results of the empirical study showed that tourism image is a direct antecedent of perceived quality, satisfaction, intention to return and willingness to recommend the destination. This confirms that quality has a positive influence on satisfaction and intention to return; and that satisfaction determines the willingness to recommend the destination. However, the influence of quality on willingness to recommend and the influence of satisfaction on intention to return cannot be confirmed.

The relationship between destinations' tourism provision (or the pull factors) with the push aspect of travel motivation

An understanding of motivation helps in understanding tourist behaviour, answering the question of why people travel (Cooper et al., 2008) and what initiates a tourist's travel buying behaviour. The study of motivation in tourism has been derived from a range of disciplinary areas, which has led to a diversity of approach in tourism (Cooper et al., 2008). This diversity is reflected in the approaches of various author's discussions of how motivation influences tourists' consumer behaviour. Among earlier discussions on this are given by Dann (1981), McIntosh, Goeldner & Ritchie (1995) and Plog (1994). Dann (1981) described motivation as: 1) the desire to experience phenomena that are different from those available in their home environment; 2) depending on the level of desire (push) and the pull of the destination attraction; 3) behaviour that may not be culturally sanctioned in their home setting; 4) a broad category such as visiting friends and relatives, enjoying leisure activities or study; 5) can be divided into behavioural and tourists role typologies; 6) the authenticity and types of tourist experiences; and 7) the way tourists define their situations.

Many studies have identified the push aspect of travel motivation. Plog (1974) for example proposed that psychocentric tourists tend to seek comfortable and safe destination; and the allocentric types tend to travel/discover new destinations that are at the frontier of tourism. McIntosh, Goeldner & Ritchie (1995) proposed four categories i.e the physical motivators (physically stimulating adventures); the cultural motivators (culturally stimulating adventures); the interpersonal motivators (socially stimulating activities and adventures) and the status and prestige motivators. Meanwhile Swarbrooke & Horner's (2007) proposed seven categories i.e. 1. culture or social activities relating to culture, 2. pleasure or vigorous activities such as shopping, nightlife, 3. status or the desire for exclusivity, fashionability, the ability to be brazen, 4. physical or active outdoor activities, 5. personal development or increasing one's knowledge and skills, 6. personal or meeting friends, making friends) and 7. emotional (escapism, spiritual fulfilment, fantasy) motivators.

Pull motivations have also been identified. Pulled factors are closely related to factors that contribute to tourists' brand image or perception about a destination. According to Yoon and Uysal (2005), pull factors are destination attributes or destination attractiveness that compel tourists to visit. Crouch et al (2000) highlighted that destination attractiveness

depend on both the service infrastructure and destination environment. You et al. (2000) mentioned infrastructures, environment quality and safety as major dimensions of destination attributes.

Dann (1981) argued that pull factors such as sunshine, relaxed tempo, and friendly natives both respond to and reinforce push factor motivation. This is supported by McGee et al. (1996) who said that a destination's attractiveness such as beaches, recreation facilities, cultural attractions, entertainment, natural scenery, shopping and parks may stimulate and reinforce inherent push motivations. In other words, pull factors help shape tourist's push aspect of travel motivations. As there is little empirical evidence on this assumption especially within the context of a developing country, this study tests relationship between pull and push factor using the following hypotheses.

H1: There is a significant relationship between the quantity aspect of the pull factor on the push factors within the context of domestic tourism in island destinations

H2: there is a significant relationship between the quality aspect of the pull factor on the push factors within the context of domestic tourism in island destinations.

METHODOLOGY

The instrument

As mentioned earlier, this study adapted the work of Gearing et al. (1974) and Richtie & Zins (1978) to develop a seven point attraction factors that include 1) accommodation; 2) attraction (natural and social); 3) transportation; 4) activities; 5) accessibility; 6) food and beverage; and 7) pricing. The questionnaire contains a section on opinions and attitudes towards the quantity of tourism service provisions, a section that relates to travel/trip motivations of domestic tourists, and a section on sociodemographic factors. The scale adopted for measuring perception on tourism products and services was Likert scale 1=strongly disagree, 5= strongly agree. To measure perceptions about tourism products and services, the respondents were asked to rate how happy they were with the range and quality of accommodation, transportation, attraction, activities, pricing, accessibility and connectivity as well as the food and beverage outlets available at the island resort. Meanwhile, Swarbrooke & Horner's (2007) seven categories of motivation mentioned earlier were used to measure the travel/trip motivations of domestic tourists.

After the pilot study, a few items were found to be lacking in clarity and/or unsuitable and were therefore removed. The instrument was also compressed because the pilot shows that it was too long. The survey was conducted using intercept street survey by trained enumerators. The period of data collection was six months as the enumerators have to be dispatched in small batches to collect data with high response and reduce time conflict with the enumerators.

Sampling and the pilot study

Prior to the fieldwork, enumerators were trained adequately about the objectives of the research and on the questions listed in the questionnaire. Their comprehension on the research is important to ensure effectiveness of the data collection. They were also trained on the characteristics of respondents that the research requires and how they should approach the respondents. Finally, they were trained to ask a qualifying question to determine if the targeted respondent had visited any of the four island destinations in the past year. Only those who gave positive response were probed further. To ensure compliance with time constraint for fieldwork, and overcome the complexity of getting high responses in an intercept survey, the study appointed 100 enumerators over the course of six months to increase the probability of getting the desired response number.

In trying to determine the study population, extensive literature search was conducted on domestic tourists visiting Langkawi, Penang, Jerejak and Pangkor in 2010 but to no avail except for one of the island. Published data (including in the Tourism Malaysia website) found offer no breakdown between domestic and international arrivals to those island destinations. The Statistics Services Department offers mainly statistics pertaining to value of gross output, cost of input, number of persons engaged, salaries and wages paid and value of assets. For this reason, proportional sampling cannot be conducted. However, the Domestic Tourism Survey 2010 publications do offer statistics based on states, a basic socio-demographic characteristics of domestic tourists. Therefore the socio-demographic characteristics of this study's respondents were compared to those to ensure representativeness of the study population. In the website of Economic Planning Unit of the government at http://www.epu.gov.my/html/themes/epu/images/common/pdf/eco_stat/pdf/1.2.5.pdf, Malaysian population in 2010 was estimated as 26,784,965 people, of which 8,477,869 were residents 14 years old and below. Thus, suitable study respondents were estimated to be 18,307,096. This number was used to calculate the sample size required by the study. A website

called The Survey System was used to calculate required sample because of its ease of use and innovativeness (see its review at <http://survey-software-review.toptenreviews.com/the-survey-system-review.html>). TopTenReviews (see <http://www.toptenreviews.com/methodology.html>) selected The Survey System as the Best Survey Software of 2013.

Referring to the formula shown on Creative Research System website (www.surveysystem.com), a population 18,307,096 would require a sample size of 1894 to give researcher 99% confidence level at ± 3 confidence interval. In other words, the minimum sample size required for the study was 1849. The fieldwork generated 1780 useful responses giving the study a response rate of 96.3%. This was considered a very good outcome because according to Fowler's (1984) regardless of methods used to collect data, a high response rate is extremely important to reduce sample bias when results are intended to be generalized to a larger population.

A pilot test on 30 individuals representing the characteristics of domestic travelers to island tourism destinations was conducted to see the time taken to finish the survey, the appropriateness and clarity of the questions, and to address the issue of validity and reliability. Construct validity was determined using factor analysis; while reliability was determined using Cronbach's method. Validity test was adopted to determine the dimensions for each section. Principal component factor analysis was applied to validate the instruments using varimax rotation techniques. The main objective of factor analysis is to reduce the wide ranging numbers of variables into more manageable groups of factors. Guidelines for the decision in factor analysis are done through explanations of variance. Hair et al.'s (2006) rule of thumb for variance explanation of more than 60% was applied. Next, eigenvalue of more than one and varimax rotation techniques the factor loading on 0.40 and above cut-off criteria for each item were used as decision criteria. Items with less than 0.40 are eliminated for consecutive hypotheses testing.

RESULTS

Product Evaluation

Construct validity analysis of quantity of tourism service provision scale is shown in Table 1. Seven factors were extracted from the analysis and explained 71.36 %s of the variance

Table 1

Construct Validity Analysis for Quantity of Tourism Provision Scale

Item/Factor	Factor Loading						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Pricing							
cPricing1	.787						
cPricing2	.804						
cPricing3	.674						
cPricing4	.746						
cPricing5	.738						
cPricing6	.796						
2. Transportation							
cTransportation1		.830					
cTransportation2		.848					
cTransportation3		.719					
cTransportation4		.602					
cTransportation5		.805					
cTransportation6		.789					
3. Activities							
cActivities1			.613				
cActivities2			.651				
cActivities3			.679				
cActivities4			.757				
cActivities5			.644				
cActivities6			.511				
4. Attraction							
cAttraction1				.505			
cAttraction2				.750			
cAttraction3				.847			
cAttraction4				.787			
cAttraction5				.735			
cAttraction6				.516			

(continued)

Item/Factor	Factor Loading						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Accommodation							
cAccommodation1					.861		
cAccommodation2					.680		
cAccommodation3					.678		
cAccommodation4					.707		
cAccommodation5					.659		
cAccommodation6					.740		
6. Accessibility							
cAccessibility1						.696	
cAccessibility2						.459	
cAccessibility3						.674	
cAccessibility4						.782	
cAccessibility5						.584	
cAccessibility6						.807	
7. Food and Beverages							
cFnB1							.709
cFnB2							.768
cFnB3							.682
cFnB4							.724
cFnB5							.786
<i>Eigenvalues</i>	10.30	8.51	2.94	2.56	1.94	1.65	1.37
<i>% of Variance</i>	25.13	20.75	7.17	6.24	4.72	4.01	3.34
<i>Cumulative</i>	25.13	45.88	53.05	59.29	64.01	68.03	71.36
KMO	0.802**						

(KMO=0.802, Bartlett test is significant at $p < 0.01$). The factors were then labelled as *Pricing* (25.13%), *Transportation* (20.75%), *Activities* (7.17%), *Attraction* (6.24%), *Accommodation* (4.72%), *Accessibility* (4.01%) and *Food and Beverage* contributes 3.34 %s from the total variance explained.

Further inspection found that all dimensions contain six items each; except for *Food and Beverages* with five items. Factor loading for each item in each dimension is also high, ranged from 0.45 to 0.861. The results also show that there are no deleted items for this scale and suggest that all original items in the questionnaire are useable.

Construct validity for quality of tourism service provision scale using factor analysis is shown in table below which indicates that the seven factors extracted explained for 77.62 % of the total variances. The factors were then labelled as *Pricing* that contributes 48.36 %s of variance, *Food and Beverages* (10.05%), *Accessibility* (5.66%), *Activities* (4.80%), *Transportation* (3.19%), *Attraction* (3.04%) and *Accommodation* (2.51%).

The main concern is to determine number of items that can represent each factor/dimension. In order to eliminate items that are not significantly loaded for this scale, varimax rotation techniques were used with factor loading 0.40 and above are retained for further analysis. The result in Table 2 suggests that there will be no item to be deleted. Each factor/dimension contains five items that is similar with the original scale.

Table 2

Construct Validity Analysis for Quality of Tourism Provision Scale

	Factor Loading						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Pricing							
dPricing1	.797						
dPricing2	.738						
dPricing3	.728						
dPricing4	.605						
dPricing5	.731						
2. Food and Beverages							
dFnB1		.885					
dFnB2		.893					
dFnB3		.679					
dFnB4		.825					
dFnB5		.611					
3. Accessibility							
dAccessibility1			.839				
dAccessibility2			.752				
dAccessibility3			.751				
dAccessibility4			.770				
dAccessibility5			.845				

(continued)

	Factor Loading						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Activities							
dActivities1				.556			
dActivities2				.540			
dActivities3				.495			
dActivities4				.769			
dActivities5				.836			
5. Transportation							
dTransportation1					.428		
dTransportation2					.661		
dTransportation3					.673		
dTransportation4					.833		
dTransportation5					.816		
6. Attraction							
dAttraction1						.817	
dAttraction2						.822	
dAttraction3						.582	
dAttraction4						.627	
dAttraction5						.567	
7. Accommodation							
dAccommodation1							.853
dAccommodation2							.654
dAccommodation3							.760
dAccommodation4							.846
dAccommodation5							.781
<i>Eigenvalues</i>	16.927	3.518	1.981	1.681	1.117	1.064	1.055
<i>% of Variance</i>	48.364	10.051	5.659	4.803	3.192	3.039	2.507
<i>Cumulative</i>	48.364	58.414	64.074	68.877	72.069	75.108	77.615
KMO	0.909**						

**p<0.01

Respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement on the statement provided in the questionnaire (Table 3). Mean score is divided to three levels as follows:

- a. Low agreement = 1.00 to 2.25
- b. Moderate agreement= 2.26 to 3.75
- c. High agreement = 3.76 to 5.00

Descriptive analysis shows that the overall perception towards quantity of tourism service provision at the destination was at the moderate level (mean=3.64, *SD*=0.38). It can be found that respondents have high agreement towards items on quantity of accommodation (mean=4.04, *SD*=0.51), transportation (mean=4.11, *SD*=0.45) and pricing (mean=3.85, *SD*=0.60) of tourist provision at island destinations. However, agreements towards other aspects of quantity of tourism service provision such as activities (mean=3.55, *SD*=0.77), accessibility (mean=3.10, *SD*=0.81), and food and beverages (mean=3.12, *SD*=0.89) were at the moderate level.

Table 3

Mean Value of Local Travelers' Perceptions on the Quantity and Quality of Tourism Service Provision in Island Destinations

QUANTITY DIMENSION/ITEM	Mean	SD	Level
	4.05	0.51	<i>High</i>
Accommodation			
1. Resort islands should provide more luxury accommodation for me.	4.11	0.66	<i>High</i>
2. Luxury accommodation is my first concern when I choose to travel to resort islands.	3.98	1.07	<i>High</i>
3. Domestic tourists prefer budget accommodation (e.g. camping) at resort islands.	4.11	0.70	<i>High</i>
4. The quantity of affordable accommodation is my concern when I choose to travel to resort islands.	4.10	0.62	<i>High</i>
5. Costs of accommodation must be affordable and within my budget.	3.97	0.77	<i>High</i>
6. There was a wide range of accommodation types for me to choose from, ranging from budget hotels to exclusive resorts.	4.03	0.68	<i>High</i>
	4.12	0.45	<i>High</i>
Transportation			
7. There is a wide range of transport choices at the resort island.	4.12	0.64	<i>High</i>
8. Luxury transportation is my first concern when I choose to travel to resort islands.	4.00	0.68	<i>High</i>

(continued)

QUANTITY DIMENSION/ITEM	Mean	SD	Level
	4.05	0.51	<i>High</i>
9. There is sufficient public transportation to arrive to the resort island.	3.99	0.61	<i>High</i>
10. There is proper developed route to arrive to the resort island.	4.23	0.63	<i>High</i>
11. I am happy to rent a car to explore the resort island.	4.21	0.66	<i>High</i>
12. Quantity of public transportation within the resort area needs to be improved for tourists.	4.15	0.58	<i>High</i>
Attraction	3.58	0.73	<i>Moderate</i>
13. Scenic natural environment is the number one reason I visit resort islands.	3.32	1.03	<i>Moderate</i>
14. Many natural environments at resort islands are adequately conserved and preserved.	3.73	0.87	<i>Moderate</i>
15. Availability of many manmade attractions is the number one reason I travel to resort islands.	3.40	1.09	<i>Moderate</i>
16. Natural environment at ecotourism site attract me to travel to resort islands because I appreciate nature.	3.68	0.92	<i>Moderate</i>
17. There were enough attractions on the island to keep me entertained during my vacation.	3.72	0.95	<i>Moderate</i>
18. The island needs more entertainment outlets for tourists.	3.65	1.00	<i>Moderate</i>
Activities	3.54	0.76	<i>Moderate</i>
19. Resort islands provided me with many exciting activities (e.g. Rock climbing, snorkeling, water rafting).	3.62	0.99	<i>Moderate</i>
20. Exciting activities motivate me to go to resort islands.	3.58	1.00	<i>Moderate</i>
Pricing	3.85	0.60	<i>High</i>
21. I am satisfied with the range of exciting activities at resort islands.	3.62	1.04	<i>Moderate</i>
22. All the accessories for physical activities (e.g. Rope for rock climbing) are in good condition and safety.	3.50	1.13	<i>Moderate</i>
23. I am actively involved in a rigorous physical fitness programme.	3.43	1.17	<i>Moderate</i>

(continued)

QUANTITY DIMENSION/ITEM	Mean	SD	Level
	4.05	0.51	High
24. The activities being offered at the resort island is suitable for all age groups.	3.46	1.02	<i>Moderate</i>
25. The range of reasonable pricing is my first concern when I choose to travel to resort islands.	3.76	0.97	<i>High</i>
26. The range of pricing for tour packages to this island should be reasonable and affordable for youngsters.	4.09	0.95	<i>High</i>
27. I am willing to pay more if the range of travel packages is interesting.	3.52	1.01	<i>Moderate</i>
28. I gain expected experience for the range of pricing I paid.	4.22	0.81	<i>High</i>
29. The amount of money that I spent for this vacation isn't really good value.	4.07	0.89	<i>High</i>
30. The range of pricing of consumer goods is too expensive on this island.	3.44	1.00	<i>Moderate</i>
Internet accessibility and connectivity	3.11	0.81	<i>Moderate</i>
31. Sufficient and easy internet accessibility is important to me when traveling to resort islands.	3.28	1.11	<i>Moderate</i>
32. The telecommunication service and facilities at the resort island need to be improved.	3.15	1.04	<i>Moderate</i>
33. I can easily contact my family and friends during my vacation at the resort island.	3.21	1.16	<i>Moderate</i>
34. I do not mind not having sufficient contact with the outside world while on vacation.	2.96	1.12	<i>Moderate</i>
35. There is good Internet connection everywhere during my vacation at the resort island.	3.28	1.02	<i>Moderate</i>
36. The Internet and call charges are too expensive.	2.76	0.95	<i>Moderate</i>
Food and beverages	3.13	0.89	<i>Moderate</i>
37. There is a wide variety of food and beverage outlets to choose from.	3.08	1.17	<i>Moderate</i>
38. There are no authentic local cuisines offered to tourists.	2.86	1.00	<i>Moderate</i>
39. The meals are affordable for budget travelers.	3.23	1.05	<i>Moderate</i>
40. The pricing of the meals are too expensive.	3.27	1.13	<i>Moderate</i>
41. I did not find the choices of food and beverage items being offered attractive to me.	3.21	1.04	<i>Moderate</i>
Overall	3.64	0.38	<i>Moderate</i>

(continued)

QUALITY DIMENSION/ITEM	Mean	SD	Level
Accommodation	3.31	0.94	Moderate
1. The room that I stayed in was clean and comfortable.	3.09	1.03	<i>Moderate</i>
2. The facilities at the hotel were well-maintained.	3.31	1.19	<i>Moderate</i>
3. The room rate I paid reflected the level and quality of service being offered.	3.48	1.22	<i>Moderate</i>
4. Hotel staff was helpful, friendly and professional.	3.09	1.15	<i>Moderate</i>
5. The room was too small for my liking.	3.60	1.12	<i>Moderate</i>
Transportation	3.09	0.86	Moderate
6. The public transport at the resort island was efficient and user-friendly.	3.06	1.10	<i>Moderate</i>
7. The rental car did not give me any problems during my travels on the resort island.	3.38	1.05	<i>Moderate</i>
8. The local taxi is too expensive for tourists.	2.93	1.17	<i>Moderate</i>
9. The taxi drivers are not professional in their work.	2.87	1.11	<i>Moderate</i>
10. It was easy to self-drive while traveling on the island.	3.19	1.03	<i>Moderate</i>
Attraction	3.55	0.77	Moderate
11. All attraction sites are well-maintained.	3.27	1.09	<i>Moderate</i>
12. The staffs at the attraction sites are knowledgeable.	3.64	1.16	<i>Moderate</i>
13. The staffs at the attraction sites are not knowledgeable	3.67	1.08	<i>Moderate</i>
14. There is a variety of quality attractions available at the resort island	3.47	1.02	<i>Moderate</i>
15. There are not enough quality attractions available at the resort island	3.71	1.03	<i>Moderate</i>
Activities	3.36	0.73	Moderate
16. There are many educational activities at the resort island	3.51	1.13	<i>Moderate</i>
17. There are many fun activities at the resort island	2.79	1.06	<i>Moderate</i>
18. There are not many quality educational activities at the resort island	4.16	1.04	<i>High</i>
19. There are not many fun activities at the resort island	3.10	1.27	<i>Moderate</i>
20. Facilities and services for physical activities at the resort island are very good	3.24	1.26	<i>Moderate</i>

(continued)

QUALITY DIMENSION/ITEM	Mean	SD	Level
Pricing	2.51	1.14	<i>Moderate</i>
21. Most things are over-priced at the island resort.	3.24	1.19	<i>Moderate</i>
22. I get value for money when buying things at the island	2.51	1.38	<i>Moderate</i>
23. The pricing of food and beverages at the island resort are reasonable	2.47	1.43	<i>Moderate</i>
24. The pricing of accommodations at the resort island are reasonable	2.05	1.39	<i>Low</i>
25. I get value for money when using services at the island	2.25	1.35	<i>Low</i>
Internet accessibility and connectivity	2.34	1.25	<i>Moderate</i>
26. I am well-connected to my telecommunications provider at the island resort.	2.25	1.39	<i>Low</i>
27. I cannot get access to the Internet while at the island resort.	2.88	1.37	<i>Moderate</i>
28. All accommodations in resort islands have good wifi connectivity	2.31	1.69	<i>Moderate</i>
29. All restaurants in island destinations have good wifi connectivity	2.08	1.45	<i>Low</i>
30. Wifi connectivity is not important to me when visiting resort islands	2.21	1.41	<i>Low</i>
Food and beverages	2.39	1.22	<i>Moderate</i>
31. Food and beverage staff had good personal hygiene.	2.54	1.37	<i>Moderate</i>
32. Food and beverage outlets were clean and presentable.	2.69	1.39	<i>Moderate</i>
33. Food and beverage items were well-prepared and well-presented.	2.06	1.31	<i>Low</i>
34. The locations of the food and beverage outlets are hygienic.	2.24	1.42	<i>Low</i>
35. Food and beverage staff gave good customer service.	2.43	1.51	<i>Moderate</i>
QUALITY OF TOURISM SERVICE PROVISION	2.94	0.63	<i>Moderate</i>

Meanwhile, agreement towards items on quality of tourism service provision at the destination was lower than that of quantity (mean=2.95, $SD=0.64$). Most of the respondents have moderate level of agreement

towards items on quality of accommodation (mean=3.31, $SD=0.94$), transportation (mean=3.10, $SD=0.94$), attraction (mean=3.56, $SD=0.78$) and activities (mean=3.37, $SD=0.74$). Only one item on quality i.e. "There are not many quality educational activities at the resort island" received high agreement. The agreements towards items on other aspects of quality such as pricing (mean=2.52, $SD=1.15$), accessibility and connectivity (mean=2.36, $SD=1.25$) and food and beverages (mean=2.41, $SD=1.24$). The interpretation of these results is given in section 5.0.

The relationship between destinations' tourism provision (or the pull factors) with the push aspect of travel motivation

Pearson correlation analysis was used to measure the relationship between the quantity aspect of the pull factor on the push factors within the context of domestic tourism in island destinations. It revealed that motivation has a significant direct relationship with overall quantity of tourism service provision ($r=0.160$, $p<0.01$). However, out of seven attributes tested, only five of them are significantly associated with motivation to travel i.e. quantity of accommodation ($r=0.135$, $p<0.01$); transportation ($r=0.157$, $p<0.01$); attraction ($r=-0.061$, $p<0.05$), accessibility ($r=0.248$, $p<0.01$) and food and beverages ($r=0.203$, $p<0.01$). Other attributes, activities and pricing did not have a significant relationship with motivation to travel.

The results suggest accepting H1. In other words, quantity of tourism service provision can partly explain why domestic tourists are currently drawn to visit island destinations. Nonetheless, island destinations can be more attractive to domestic tourists, if there are a wider range of activities and pricing offered to them.

Test on the relationship between the quality aspect of the pull factor and the push factors within the context of domestic tourism in island destinations also showed a significant relationship ($r=0.248$, $p<0.01$) particularly on five of the attributes i.e. quality of accommodation ($r=0.468$, $p<0.01$), transportation ($r=0.375$, $p<0.01$), attraction ($r=0.417$, $p<0.01$), activities ($r=0.377$, $p<0.01$), and food and beverages ($r=-0.075$, $p<0.05$). Pricing ($r=0.018$, $p>0.05$) and accessibility to internet ($r=-0.005$, $p>0.05$) are not significantly associated with motivation to travel. These results also show that H2 can be accepted. In other words, quality of tourism service provision can also partly explain why domestic tourists are currently drawn to visit island destinations. However, island destinations can benefit from the improvement of quality of pricing and internet accessibility.

Table 4

Relationship between Quantity and Quality of Tourism Service Provision and Local Travelers Motivation to Travel to Island Destinations.

	<i>Motivation</i>	<i>Quantity</i>	<i>Accomm</i>	<i>Transport</i>	<i>Attraction</i>	<i>Activities</i>	<i>Pricing</i>	<i>Internet Access</i>	<i>F&B</i>
<i>Motivation</i>	1								
<i>Quantity</i>	.160*	1							
Accommodation	.135*	.296**	1						
Transportation	.157**	.337**	.681**	1					
Attraction	-.061*	.531**	-.187**	-.043	1				
Activities	-0.035	.658**	-.167**	.062**	.725**	1			
Pricing	-0.002	.745**	-.052*	.083**	.592**	.695**	1		
Internet Accessibility	.248**	.644**	.205**	.059*	-.111**	0.045	.261**	1	
Food and Beverages	.203**	.598**	.121**	-.039	-.074**	0.027	.203**	.850**	1
<i>Motivation</i>	1								
<i>Quantity</i>	.284**	1							
Accommodation	.468**	-.037	1						
Transportation	.375**	.622**	.385**	1					
Attraction	.417**	.651**	.422**	.745**	1				
Activities	.377**	.715**	-.025	.416**	.397**	1			
Pricing	0.018	.831**	-.465**	.228**	.263**	.546**	1		
Internet Accessibility	-0.024	.816**	-.463**	.179**	.231**	.501**	.890**	1	
Food and Beverages	-.075**	.776**	-.522**	.145**	.163**	.456**	.885**	.900**	1

Notes: *p<0.05

**p<0.01

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Domestic travelers are important target market. Their perceptions particularly on the quantity and quality of a destination's tourism products could benefit destination managers in countries that prioritize domestic tourism. Therefore, destination managers should strive to understand domestic travelers' perspectives on the matter. This study has highlighted some insights that could be useful, as elaborated below. Product evaluation data showed that overall, domestic tourists are concerned with having a wider range of accommodations when visiting island destinations. While they are satisfied with the quantity of transportation provided at the destinations, they indicated a need to further improve the quantity of the public transport. They are only moderately concerned the range of attractions, activities, internet connectivity food/beverages at the destinations. However, they would like to see a wider range of pricing to suit their needs. Domestic tourists are also only moderately impressed with the quality of accommodation, transportation, attractions, and activities at the selected destinations. They are least satisfied with value for money pricing, connection with telecommunications provider and wifi as well as food/beverage outlets location and food presentations.

Linking this to Bigne et al.'s (2001) and Žabkar et al., (2013) contentions that there is strong and positive relationship between perceived quality, satisfaction and behavioural intention, it can be inferred that domestic travelers' low satisfaction on the quality of tourism provision found in this study can have important negative implication to future domestic tourism in island destinations, unless pre-empted by well-planned strategies by destination managers.

Theoretical and managerial contributions

Referring to the relationship between the pull aspect and the push aspect of travel motivations, it has been shown that both the quantity and quality of tourism provisions (the pull aspect) can influence the push aspect of domestic tourists' travel motivation to island destinations. From the theoretical contribution standpoint, the findings of this study suggest that there is a relationship between the pull and push aspects of travel motivation, at least within the context of island tourism in Malaysia. It provides empirical support to the theory that pull factors both respond to and reinforce push factor motivation (see Dann, 1981; McGee et al. 1996). From managerial standpoint, there are a few implications that could be useful to practitioners i.e. island destination managers. Firstly,

island destinations could attract more domestic tourists in the future if destination managers focus more on quality of tourism provision instead of quantity. They also might want to provide more value for money packages and better internet accessibility for domestic travelers to have a more enjoyable time at the islands. For example, instead of adding more hotels in Langkawi, destination managers might want to make sure that existing hotels offer better value for money packages and better internet access.

Study limitation and suggestion for future research.

The limitation of this study may lie on the lack of proportionate sampling to ensure a more representative response about the issue being studied. Future attempt on similar study should be more rigorous in finding detailed information about the breakdown between international and domestic travelers on each destination selected. A more meaningful findings may also result if future researcher take a location/island specific (case study) research approach.

A second limitation of the paper is that it provides a broad introduction on domestic tourists' product evaluation and travel motivation. Future work on similar topic can benefit from deeper analysis based on socio-demographic profile of those tourists, their awareness, and trip features (see Mathieson and Wall, 1982) so that better insights on the issue could be offered. Finally, as this study adopted the work of Gearing et al. (1974) and Richtie & Zins (1978) to define destination attractiveness, it did not focus on the 'islandness' characteristics of the study context. This issue could perhaps be the interest of future study on this matter.

REFERENCES

- Alegra, J., & Garau, J. (2010). Tourist satisfaction and dissatisfaction. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 37(1), 52-73.
- Bigne, J. E., Sanchez, M. I. & Sanchez, J. (2001). Tourism image, evaluation variables and after purchase behaviour: Inter-relationship. *Tourism Management*. 22. 607-616.
- Alegre, J., & Cladera, M. (2006). Repeat visitation in mature sun and sand destinations. *Journal of Travel Research*, 44(3), 288-297.
- Celeste E. and Armando L. V. 2011 "Destination Attributes' Evaluation, Satis- faction and Behavioural Intentions: A Struc- tural Modelling Approach". *International Journal of Tourism Research*. doi:10.1002/jtr
- 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.
- Chen, J. S., & Gursoy, D. (2001). An investigation of tourists' destination loyalty and preferences. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 13(2), 79–85.
- Chi, C. G. Qing, & Qu, H. (2008) Examining the structural relationships of destination image, tourist satisfaction and destination loyalty: An integrated approach. *Journal of Tourism Management*, 29: 624- 636.
- Chi, C. G-Q. (2011). Destination loyalty formation and travelers' demographic characteristics: A multiple group analysis approach. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, 35(2), 191-212.
- Cooper, C., Fletcher, J., Fyall, A. Gilber, D. & Wanhill, S. (2008). *Tourism: Principles and Practice*. (4th ed.). Essex: Prentice Hall.
- Cracolici, M.F. & Nijkamp, P. (2009). The attractiveness and competitiveness of tourist destinations: A study of Southern Italian regions. *Tourism Management*, 336-344.
- Creative Research System: Your complete survey software solution since 1982. Available at <http://www.surveysystem.com/>
- Dann, G. M. (1981). Tourism motivations: An appraisal. www.crt.dk/...tourism_motivation_and_marketing_strategies_denmark_jie_zhang_carl_henrik_marcussen_crt_2007.pdf accessed 7/5/11
- Department of Statistic (2011). *Domestic Tourism Survey 2010*. Printed by the Department of Statistics. Also available at
- Echter, C.M. & Ritchie, B.Jr. (1993). The measurement of destination image: an empirical assessment of destination image: an empirical assessment. *Journal of Travel Research* 3(3):3-13.
- Fowler, F. J. Jr. (1984). *Survey research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gearing, C.E., Swart, W. and Var, T. (1974), Establishing a Measure of Touristic Attractiveness, *Journal of Travel Research*, 12, 1-8.
- Gursoy, D. McCleary, K.W. & Lepsito, L.R. (2007). Propensity to complain: Affects of personality and behavioral factors. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 3(3), 358-386.
- Hu, Y. and Ritchie, B. (1993), Measuring Destination Attractiveness: A Contextual Approach, *Journal of Travel Research*, (Fall), 25-34.
- Kasim, A., Dzakiria, H. Park, C., Mohd Nor, N.A., Mokhtar, M.F. & Radha Rashid, J.R. (2013). Predictors of travel motivations among domestic tourists to island destinations. *ANATOLIA International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality*. Doi: 10.1080/13032917.2012.751865.
- Leask, A. (2010). Progress in visitor attraction research: Towards more effective management. *Tourism Management*, 155-166.
- Lee, T.-H. (2009). A structural model for examining how destination image and interpretation services affect future visitation behavior: a case study of Taiwan's Taomi eco-village. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 17(6): 727-745.

- Lemak, D. J., & Reed, R. (2000). An application of Thompson's typology to TQM in service firms. *Journal of Quality Management*, 5, 67 – 83.
- Malaysia Country Report (2013). *Malaysia Country Report*. UNWTO 25th CAP-CSA and UNWTO Conference on Sustainable Tourism Development, Hyderabad, India. Retrieved from http://dtxqtq4w60xqpw.cloudfront.net/sites/all/files/pdf/malaysia_country_report_2012.pdf.
- Mason, M.C. & Nassivera, F. (2013). A conceptualization of the relationships between quality, satisfaction, behavioral intention and awareness of a festival. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing and Management*, 22(2), 129-148.
- Mathieson, A. & Wall, G. (1982). *Tourism: Economic, physical and social impacts*. Longman: Harlow.
- Mayo, E.J. and Jarvis, L.P. (1981). *Psychology of Leisure Travel*. Boston: CBI Publishing Co., 191-223.
- McGee M et al. (1996). Event tourism is globally important in terms of its popular appeal and abilitymay stimulate and reinforce inherent push factors .bai2006.atistr.org/CD/Papers/2006bai616 2.doc – accessed 7/5/11
- Neal, J. D., & Gursoy, D. (2008). A multifaceted analysis of tourism satisfaction. *Journal of Travel Research*, 47(1), 53–62.
- Nilsson, L. Johnson, M.D. & Gustafsson, A. (2001), The impact of quality practices on customer satisfaction and business results: product versus service organization, *Journal of Quality Management*, 6(2001) 5-27.
- Oppermann, M. (1998). Destination threshold potential and the law of repeat visitation. *Journal of Travel Research*, 37(2), 131–137.
- Oppermann, M. (2000). Tourism destination loyalty. *Journal of Travel Research*, 39(1), 78–84.
- Otto, J. E. & Ritchie, J.R.B. (1996). The service experience in tourism. *Tourism Management*, 17(3). 165–174.
- Ozdemir, B., Aksu, A., Ehtiyar, R., C ¨ozel, B., C ¨ozel, R. B., & I- ¨c ¨igen, E. T. (2012). Relationships among tourist profile, satisfaction and destination loyalty: Examining empirical evidences in Antalya region of Turkey. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 21(5), 506–540.
- Prebensen, N. K. (2005). Norwegian tourists motivations and perceptions. *Journal of Hospitality & Leisure Marketing*, 12(3): 63-85.
- Prayag, G. (2008). Image, Satisfaction and Loyalty – The Case of Cape Town. *Anatolia: An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 19(2): 205-224.

- Prayag, G. (2012). Paradise for Who? Segmenting Visitors' Satisfaction with Cognitive Image and Predicting Behavioural Loyalty. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 15(February 2011): 1-15. doi:10.1002/jtr.
- Prayag, G., & Ryan, C. (2011). Antecedents of Tourists' Loyalty to Mauritius: The Role and Influence of Destination Image, Place Attachment, Personal Involvement, and Satisfaction. *Journal of Travel Research*, 51(3): 342-356.
- Powell, T. C. (1995). Total quality management as competitive advantage: a review and empirical study. *Strategic Management Journal*, 16, 15 – 37.
- Prayag, G. (2009). "Tourists' Evaluations of Destination Image, Satisfaction, and Future Behavioral Intentions – the Case of Mauritius". *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 26(8): 836- -853.
- Proceedings of Australian and New Zealand Marketing Academy Conference, Dec 1 2008. Olympic Park, Sydney: University of Western Sydney.
- Quintal, V. & Phau, I. (2008). A Structural Approach Towards Perceptions and Satisfaction of Revisit Intentions, in Spanjaard, D. and Denize, S. and Sharma, N. (ed),
- Ritchie, B. J. R. and Zins M. (1978), Culture as a determinant of the attractiveness of a tourist region, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 5(2): 252-267.
- Saraph, J. V., Benson, P. G., & Schroeder, R. G. (1989). An instrument for measuring the critical factors of quality, management. *Decision Sciences*, 20, 810 – 829.
- Scheyvens, R. (2002). *Tourism for Development: Empowering Communities*. Prentice Hall, Harlow.
- Schiffman, L.G. & Kanuk, L.L. (2007). *Consumer Behaviour*. 9th ed. New York: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Song, H., Veen, R., Li, G., & Chen, J. L. (2012). The Hong Kong tourist satisfaction index. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(1), 459–479.
- Swarbrooke, J. & Horner, S. (2007). *Consumer behaviour in tourism*. Oxford: Butterworth Heinemann.
- The New Strait Times, (March 8, 2008). *Boosting domestic tourism*. Retrieved from <http://malaysiahotelnews.blogspot.com/2008/03/boosting-domestic-tourism.html>
- Tsioutsou, R. (2005). *Marketing Bulletin*, 2005, 16, Research Note 4. www.epu.gov.my/html/themes/epu/images/common/pdf/eco_stat/pdf/1.2.5.pdf
- Yoon, Y., & Uysal, M. (2005). An examination of the effects of motivation and satisfaction on destination loyalty: A structural model. *Tourism Management*, 26(1), 45–56.

Žabkar, V., Brenčič, M.M. & Dmitrović, T. (2013). Modelling perceived quality, visitor satisfaction and behavioural intentions at the destination level. *Tourism Management*, 31(4), 537-546.