

CHAPTER 4

RESEARCH RESULTS

This chapter presents the findings of the survey. It consists of six thoroughly analysed sections. The first section described the demographic profiles of the respondents. Section two depicted the personality profiles of the respondents. Section three exposed the actual travel behaviour of the respondents pertaining to their domestic holidays. The subsequent section four, disclosed the ratings of benefits offered within the Malaysian holiday destinations given by the respondents, whilst section 5 revealed the importance of benefits sought to the respondents during their holidays within the country. Lastly, section 6 compared the results of benefits offered to and benefits sought by respondents in regards to domestic holidays.

Some of the variables have been collapsed into a single category in order to provide a valid analysis for cross tabulation. Any cells, which had a count less than 5, which are considered not valid. Therefore, variables were combined to give a larger count into the cells so as to produce a more reliable result.

4.1 Summary of Survey Distribution

A total of 350 questionnaires were distributed amongst workers in the public, government and semi-government sectors around Petaling Jaya and Kuala Lumpur. Seventy percent of those total or 250 questionnaires have been successfully collected. Two had been rejected due to wrong interpretation of the questions instruction, hence the inability to interpret data. Therefore, 248 responses were utilised for the purpose of this research.

4.2 Demographic Profile of Respondents

This section investigates the very crucial of the research information. Respondents' personal data will be examined to become the basis for interpretations and comparisons of the research findings. This part encompasses the frequency interpretation and cross tabulations within the demographic profile.

4.2.1 General Description of Respondents Demographic Profile

This analysis will be based on the frequency of the demographic profile of respondents presented in Table 4.2.1.

Table 4.2.1 Demographic Profile of the Respondents

		Frequency	Percent
Gender	Male	116	46.8
	Female	132	53.2
	Total	248	100
Age	20 – 29 years old	140	56.5
	30 – 39 years old	81	32.7
	40 – 49 years old	18	7.3
	50 – 59 years old	9	3.6
	Total	248	
Marital Status	Single	148	59.7
	Married	96	38.7
	Divorced	4	1.6
	Total	248	100
Do you have children	Yes	80	32.3
	No	168	67.7
	Total	248	100

Table 4.2.1 Demographic Profile of the Respondents (Con't)

		Frequency	Percent
How many children			
	None	170	68.5
	1 – 3	64	25.9
	4 – 7	14	5.6
	Total	248	100
Age of eldest child			
	None	170	69
	1 – 12	52	21
	13 – 19	15	6
	22 – 40	11	4
	Total	248	100
Occupation Sector			
	Government	10	4.0
	Private	226	91.1
	Semi	12	4.8
	Total	248	100
Occupation Level			
	Professional	48	19.4
	Upper Management	11	4.4
	Middle Management	45	18.1
	Lower Management	99	39.9
	Operational Staff	30	12.1
	Others	15	6.0
	Total	248	100
Education			
	SPM or its equivalent and below	40	16.1
	STPM/Diploma or its equivalent	44	17.1
	University Degree or its equivalent	136	54.8
	Master/PhD or its equivalent	18	7.3
	Others	10	4.0
	Total	248	100
Gross Income per month			
	RM1999 and below	55	22.2
	RM2000-3999	120	48.4
	RM4000-5999	47	19.0
	RM6000-7999	15	6.0
	RM8000 and above	11	4.4
	Total	248	100

The male respondents constituted 46.8% and female respondents constituted 53.2% of the total sample. More than half of the respondents were between the age bracket of the 20 – 29 years old (56.5%) and 32.7% of the total respondents fell into the 30 – 39 years old category. These two categories were understandably high because the survey had mainly targeted young working executives. This was because they would probably have extra discretionary income and time, which would enable them to become more active travellers. Subsequently, 40 – 49 years makeup for 7.3% and 50 – 59 years represented 3.6% of the total sample.

In terms of marital status, single individuals constituted 59.7% and married individuals constituted 38.7% of the total respondents. This was expected, as most active travellers are those who do not have much commitment. Only a small percentage constituted the divorced category (1.6%). Out of 96 married individuals, 75 of those have children. In terms of occupation, almost all respondents are from the private sector (91.1%). Nevertheless, 4% of total respondents were from the government sector and 4.8% were from the semi-government sector. 39.9% of the total respondents were lower management staffs, 19.4% constituted professionals, 18.1% were middle management and 12.1% were operational staffs. Upper management comprised 4.4% and others made up of 2% of the total respondents. More than half of the respondents have at least a university's degree (54.8%). Whilst, 17.7% have at least a diploma or STPM, 16.1% have at least an SPM, 7.3% have at least Masters or PHD, and 1.6% have qualifications other than those listed in the questionnaire, such as professional courses and CLP.

For gross income per month, 48.4% of the respondents belonged to the RM2000-3999 range, 22.2% have income below RM1999, 19% - RM4000-5999, 6% - RM6000-7999, and 4.4% - RM8000 and above.

4.2.2 Cross Tabulation Within the Demographic Variables

Cross tabulations between the variables within the demographic profile was done to provide a more refined finding and to proof their significant relationships amongst the variables. Table 4.2.2(i) and 4.2.2(ii) describe the results that were generated at a significant level of 0.05 and below.

(i) Marital Status Versus Children

Table 4.2.2(i) Marital Status Vs Children

Marital Status (= 0.000)	Children		
	Yes	No	Total
Single	1	147	148
Married	75	21	96
Divorced	4	0	4
Total	80	168	248
No Children (= 0.000)			
None	0	168	168
1 – 3	66	0	66
4 – 7	14	0	14
Total	80	168	248
Age of Eldest Child (= 0.000)			
None	0	168	168
1 – 12	54	0	54
13 – 19	15	0	15
22 – 40	11	0	11
Total	80	168	248

Note: (= Significance Level)

Based on Table 4.1(i), out of 148 single individuals, do not have children save for one, and all the divorcees have children. Those individuals with children have within 1 – 3 children (66 respondents) and the rest have 4 – 7 children (14 respondents). More than half of those with children had their eldest child within the ages of 1 – 12 years

(54 respondents), 13 – 19 years (15 respondents), and 22 – 40 years (11 respondents).

(ii) Age Versus Income

Table 4.2.2(ii) Age Versus Income

Income (= 0.000)	Age		
	20 – 29 years	30 – 59 years	Total
RM1999/Below	42	13	55
RM2000 – RM3999	76	44	120
RM4000/Above	22	51	73
Total	140	108	248

Note: (= Significance Level)

In Table 4.1(ii), age groups of 30 – 39 and 40 – 59 years have been collapsed into a single group; and income groups of RM4000 – 5999 and RM6000 and above have also been collapsed to provide a larger count on the cell in order to give a statistically valid analysis.

Out of 248 respondents 120 individuals (48%) are earning between RM2000 – 3999. Majority of this group are between the ages of 20 – 29 years (76 individuals). The other 44 individuals belonged to 30 – 39 years old category. Incidentally, the majority of individuals in the 30 – 59 years old group also earns between RM2000 – 3999 (54%). Out of 73 individuals with the income of between RM4000 and above, 51 were from the 30 – 59 years old group (69.8%).

4.3 Personality Typology

This section refers to Tables 4.3.1 and 4.3.2. It explored respondents' demographic characteristics pertaining to their personality types. This section disclosed its relationships between respondent's demographic profiles and actual travel behaviour. To ensure that cells have at least 5 counts in each cell for cross tabulation statistic validity, the personality variables were collapsed into three personality types, namely - psychocentric, midcentric and allocentric.

4.3.1 General Description of Respondents Personality

This analysis will be based on the frequency of the personality profile of respondents presented in Table 4.3.1.

Table 4.3.1 Personality Type

	Frequency	Percent
Psychocentric	2	0.8
Near Psychocentric	32	12.9
Midcentric	101	40.7
Near Allocentric	85	34.3
Allocentric	28	11.3
Total	248	100

Table 4.2 depicts that majority of the respondents belong to the midcentric personality (40.7%). This shows that most respondents are flexible to become near psychocentric and near allocentric. This means that they are flexible to become adventurous travellers as well as travellers that prefer non high-level activities such as rest and relax, or simply shopping and sightseeing. 34.3% of the respondents are near allocentric and 12.9% are near psychocentric. Pure psychocentric and allocentric personalities each constitute 11.3% and 0.8%, respectively.

These findings confirmed Plog's theory that most people belong to the midcentric and only a few would fall onto both extremes of

psychocentric and allocentric (Plog, 1987). In this case, the results reveal that most Malaysian travellers are midcentric and inclined towards allocentricism.

4.3.2 Cross Tabulation Between Respondents' Personality and Demographic Profile

This cross tabulation seeks to identify the demographic profiles of the various personality types. The analysis will be based on the frequency of the personality profile of respondents presented in Table 4.3.2.

Table 4.3.2 Personality Vs Demographics

		Personality			
		Psycho-centric	Mid-centric	Allo-centric	Total
Age (= 0.009)					
	20 – 29	12	55	73	140
	30 – 59	22	46	40	108
	Total	34	101	113	248
Children (= 0.000)					
	Yes	22	34	24	80
	No	12	67	89	168
	Total	34	101	113	248
No. Children (= 0.000)					
	None	12	67	91	170
	1 – 3	16	28	20	64
	4 – 7	6	6	2*	14
	Total	34	101	113	248
Education Level (= 0.001)					
	Secondary/Below	17	42	25	84
	Under/Post Graduate/Above	17	59	88	164
	Total	34	101	113	248

Note: (= Significance Level)

Table 4.3.1 captured results from a cross tabulation between respondents personality and demographic variables. Only variables

that produced a significant level of 0.05 or less will be accepted as being valid and reliable.

The age groups had been further collapsed due to the count of these groups was less than 5, to ensure statistically reliable data for analysis purposes. Age group of 40 – 59 years had been combined into the 30 – 39 years group. Like wise, 22 – 40 years group of the eldest child age have been joined together into 13 – 40 group. Occupation levels have been simplified into three groups. Upper management were combined with professional; and lower management with operational staff. Education has also been reduced into 2 levels. SPM, STPM/Diploma have been combined into a single secondary level and University degree and Master or Phd have merged to become under/post graduate level. Lastly, Income has also been compressed into 3 levels, whereby; all options from RM4000 and above were combined into one.

(i) Personality Versus Age

The table above reveals that, out of 248 respondents, 140 are from the 20 –29 age category and 108 were from the 30 – 59 category. The majority of individuals in the 20 –29 age category (73 individuals) belong to the allocentric group, 55 were midcentric and only 12 individuals were psychocentric. In the 30 – 59 age category, majority of individuals were well distributed between midcentric (46 individuals) and allocentric (40 individuals). Psychocentrics constitute 22 individuals of that category.

Based on this table, it can be concluded that most allocentric individuals were younger and most psychocentric individuals were older. This finding substantiates Brock Philips (1998) findings that allocentric travellers are typically young. This can be explained by the characteristics of allocentric as being self-confident, open on life, enjoys discovery and new experiences, and is more versatile (Plog 1987). These active and high-level activities individuals were generally

composed of the young travellers. Whereas, the psychocentric individuals tend to concentrate on life's small problems, bound to specific location, generalised anxieties and a sense of powerlessness (Plog 1987). This passive and low-key characteristic generally make up of those not so young individuals.

(ii) Personality Versus Children

This tabulation also reveals that most allocentrics do not have any children (89 respondents), with only 24 allocentric respondents do have children. All allocentric respondents who have children, own 1 – 3 children, except for 2 respondents who have 4 – 7 children. This is justifiably support their active lifestyle, as by having children, their activities will be reduced and changed to more family-oriented lifestyle. Therefore by having fewer children helps them to maintain their allocentric lifestyle. As their family gets bigger, it is expected that their personality will eventually change from allocentric to more near psychocentric.

(iii) Personality Versus Occupation

As for occupational level, most allocentrics belong to lower management/operational staff level (50%), 31.9% were middle management and 31.9% of them were within professional and upper management level category. Midcentric comprised of 56.4% of the lower management, 25.7% upper management, and 17.8% middle management level. Psychocentric has the biggest percentage of professional/upper management individuals (35.3%) though lower management/operational staffs (44.1%) constitute the highest within its category and middle management the lowest (20.6%).

(iv) Personality Versus Education

In terms of education level, an equal number of psychocentric respondents corresponded to both secondary and below (50%) and under/post graduate level (50%). Midcentric group comprises 41.6% of individuals from the secondary and below level, and the other 58.4% were from the under/post graduate and above. Allocentric, on the other hand, the majority of 77% comprised from the under/post graduate group and 22.1% from the secondary group. This shows that most allocentric individuals are more intelligent. This finding supports Philip (1998) claim that allocentric travellers are more intelligent than most.

4.4 Actual Travel Behaviour

This section illustrates respondents' actual behaviour pertaining to domestic travelling. Generally, the respondents have a reasonably positive attitude towards domestic holidays.

4.4.1 General Description of Respondents' Actual Travel Behaviour

This analysis will be based on the frequency of the actual travel behaviour of respondents presented in Table 4.4.1.

Table 4. 4.1 Actual Travel Behaviour

I love to spend my holidays within the country		Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree		6	2.4
Disagree		49	19.8
Indifferent		73	29.4
Agree		102	41.1
Strongly Agree		18	7.3
Total		248	100

Table 4. 4.1 Actual Travel Behaviour (Con't)

I always spend my holidays within the country		
Strongly Disagree	8	3.2
Disagree	51	20.6
Indifferent	55	22.2
Agree	104	41.9
Strongly Agree	30	12.1
Total	248	100
By spending my leisure holidays within the country, I help improve the Malaysian economy		
Strongly Disagree	4	1.6
Disagree	14	5.6
Indifferent	41	16.5
Agree	137	55.2
Strongly Agree	52	21.0
Total	248	100
The costs of travelling within the country are worth the value		
Strongly Disagree	11	4.4
Disagree	32	12.9
Indifferent	48	19.4
Agree	126	50.8
Strongly Agree	31	12.5
Total	248	100
What is the normal duration of your domestic leisure holidays		
1 – 3 days	150	60.5
4 – 6 days	66	26.6
7 days and above	32	12.9
Total	248	100
When do you normally go for domestic leisure holidays		
Weekend	51	20.6
Public Holidays	84	33.9
School Holidays	35	14.1
Non-holiday seasons	72	29.0
Others	6	2.4
Total	248	100

48% of the total respondents agree and strongly agree that they "love to spend their holidays within the country" and 54% of the total respondents agree and strongly agree that they "always spend their holidays within the country". However, negative responses come from 22.2% of the total respondents who disagree and strongly disagree that they "love to spend their holidays within the country" and 23.8% disagree and strongly disagree that they "always spend their holidays within the country". For those who do not have any opinion on these matters selected "indifferent" as their responses. 29.4% of the total respondents chose not to have any opinion on "love to spend their holidays within the country" and 22.2% of the total respondents chose the same on the variable to "always spend their holidays within the country".

A startling 76.2% of the respondents believe that spending their holidays within the country can help the Malaysian economy, and another 63.3% of the respondents think that cost to travel within the country offer good value for money. This is a pleasant discovery because in spite of the increase of local flights fares by Malaysian Airline recently, people are positive towards domestic holidays. However, only 7.3% think that spending holidays within the country can help the Malaysian economy, and 17.3% of the total respondents do not think that cost to travel within the country offer good value for money. Both variables have 16.5% and 19.4% indifferent responses respectively.

For the length of stay that they are willing to spend, 60.5% of the respondents would stay 1 – 3 days on each trip, 26.6% 4 – 6 days, and 12.9% - 7 days or more. The results indicated that 33.9% of the respondents prefer to travel during public holidays, hence, their preferences to spend not more than 3 days. Non - holiday seasons are also amongst the most preferred which constitute 29% of the total respondents. 20.6% prefer to go only during the weekends and 0.8%

constitute the others option which comprises of the freedom to travel whenever they like without specific period or occasion.

In summary, the majority of the respondents love to spend and always spend their holidays within the country. Approximately, two-third of the respondents believe that by spending their holidays within the country will help improve the Malaysian economy and the costs of holidays are offer value for money. More than half of the respondents prefer to spend their domestic holidays only during weekends and public holidays. Therefore, majority of them spend 1-3 days for these domestic vacations.

4.4.2 Cross Tabulation Between Personality and Actual Travel Behaviour

A cross tabulation was done between respondents personality types and their actual travel behaviour variables. As depicted in table 4.3(ii), only one variable produced a significant result. Variable "I always spend my holidays within the country " scored a significant level of 0.46, therefore it has statistical value and is worth comparing.

Table 4.4.2 Actual Travel Behaviour Vs Personality

		Personality			
		Psycho-centric	Mid-centric	Allo-centric	Total
I always spend my holidays within the country (= 0.46)					
	Disagree	5	22	32	59
	Indifferent	3*	27	25	55
	Agree	26	52	56	134
	Total	34	101	113	248

Note: (= Significance Level)

76.5% psychocentric respondents are active participants of domestic holidays. This percentage also constitutes the largest amongst all the personality types. This is most appropriate because characteristics of

domestic holidays correspond to psychographic definition of preferring familiar surrounding and prefer to travel by road. Subsequently, 14.5% disagree on spending their holidays within the country, and only 9% do not have a decision. Majority of midcentric respondents prefer to spend their holidays within the country (51.5%), 21.8% do not spend it locally and 26.7% were indecisive. Within the allocentric group, it was revealed that this active group always spend their holidays within the country (49.6%). The remaining 50.4% was distributed almost equally amongst individuals who do not spend their holidays locally (28.3%) and those who do not have any opinion (22.1%).

4.4.3 Cross Tabulation Between Demographic and Actual Travel Behaviour

A cross tabulation between respondents' demographic variables and their actual behaviour was conducted. Only variables that are within the significant level of 0.05 were analysed.

Table 4.4.3(i) Gender Versus Duration of the Trip

Gender (= 0.21)	Duration of Trip		
	1 – 3 days	4 days/Above	Total
Male	79	37	116
Female	71	61	132
Total	150	98	248

Note: (= Significance Level)

(i) Gender Versus Duration of Trip

Based on Table 4.4.3(i) above, the tabulation shows that there is a significant level of 0.21 between respondents' gender and their usual duration on a domestic holiday trip. Out of 248 respondents, 150 normally stay 1 – 3 days during their holidays within the country. The remaining 98 respondents will stay 4 days or more. Within those who would stay 1 – 3 days, 52.7% are male and 47.3% are female. Those

who would stay 4 days or more, 61 were females (62.2%) and 37 were males (37.8%).

Table 4.4.3(ii) Age Vs Occasion To Travel

Age (= 0.001)	Occasion To Travel			
	Weekends/Public Holidays	School Holidays	Non-Holiday Seasons	Total
20 – 29	88	11	41	140
30 – 59	47	24	37	108
Total	135	35	78	248

Note: (= Significance Level)

(ii) Age Versus Occasion To Travel

As shown in table 4.4.3(ii) above, the tabulation shows that there was a significant level of 0.001 between respondents' ages and their choice of time to travel. It is apparent that respondents prefer to travel during weekends and public holidays (54.4%) for their domestic holidays. This is understandable because a domestic holiday does not require lengthy duration because destinations short travelling time and most destinations are familiar to local visitors. Moreover, respondents were working individual thus weekends and public holidays were the only times they were able to go for a holiday. Within this weekend category, 20 – 29 years old individuals constituted 65.1% and 30 – 59 years old constituted 34.8% of the total.

Table 4.4.3 (iii) Marital Vs Actual Travel Behaviour

Cost to travel within the country are worth the value (= 0.016)	Marital Status		
	Single	Married	
			Total
Disagree	26	17	43
Indifferent	38	10	48
Agree	88	69	157
Total	152	96	248

Table 4.4.3 (iii) Marital Vs Actual Travel Behaviour (Con't)

	Marital Status		
	Single	Married	
Occasion To Travel (= 0.000)			
Weekends/Public Holidays	95	40	135
School Holidays	11	24	35
Non-Holiday Seasons	46	32	78
Total	152	96	248

Note: (= Significance Level)

(iii) Marital Status Versus Costs

According to Table 4.4.3(iii), the analysis shows a significant level of 0.16 that being married or single influences the level of agreement between the travelling costs and the value. Basically, majority of respondents (single - 56% and married - 44%) agree that costs of travelling within the country offered value for money. Nevertheless, 17.3% of respondents disagreed and 19.3% do not have an opinion on that matter. Within the disagree category, singles constitute 60.5% and married constitute 39.5%. Married people who have children would be rather sensitive to the costs and are quite content with domestic holidays as they are cheaper and require less time to plan. Married people who are working would appreciate easy pre-travel arrangements, low costs holidays, such as holidays within the country and short travelling time.

(iv) Marital Status Versus Occasion To Travel

As stated in the Table 4.4.3(iii), both statuses have majority respondents in the weekend and public holidays category (54.4%). Single individuals constituted 70.4% and married individuals constitute of 29.6%. Within these married individuals, 25% travel during school holidays, 33.3% during non-holiday seasons and 41.7% during weekends and public holidays. Within the singles parameters, 7% travel during school holidays, 30.3% travel during non-holiday seasons and 62.5% travel on weekends and public holidays.

Table 4.4.3(iv) Education Vs Actual Travel Behaviour

	Education Level		
	Secondary/ Below	Under/Post Graduate/Above	
I love to spend my holidays within the country(=0.012)			Total
Disagree	17	38	55
Indifferent	16	57	73
Agree	51	69	120
Total	84	164	248
By spending my holidays within the country, I help Malaysian economy (=0.045)			
Disagree	7	11	18
Indifferent	7	34	41
Agree	70	119	189
Total	84	164	248

Note: (= Significance Level)

(v) Education Level Versus Love to Spend Holidays Within the Country

Based on Table 4.4.3(iv), this analysis produces a significant level of 0.012. The table informs that most of the people with at least a secondary education are active participants of the local holiday destinations (60.7% of the group's respondents). Meanwhile, the highly educated, those with at least an under or postgraduate degree only score 42.1% of their group's total. The rationale of these differences could be the level of income of these two groups. It is assumed that the highly educated people hold better-paid jobs than the secondary educated ones. Therefore, they can afford to have their holidays outside the country. The secondary educated people can only be contented with what they could afford, i.e. local destinations. Nonetheless, Both levels have almost an equal percentage for disagreeing with spending their holidays within the country. Secondary group scores 20.2% and highly educated group scores 23.2%.

(vi) Education Level Versus Spending to Help Malaysian Economy

In reference to that same table above, the cross tabulation between respondents level of education and the perception of "by spending holidays within the country will help improve the Malaysian economy" produced a significant level of 0.045. Most respondents (76.2%) from both levels of education, secondary and below (37.4%%) and under and post graduate and above (62.6%), agree with the statement. It can be said that both groups understand the economical aspects of spending money inside or outside the country. However, there were small groups of 16.5% and 7% of the respondents who do not have an opinion and disagreed of the matter, respectively.

Table 4.4.3(v) Income Vs Actual Travel Behaviour

	Income			
	RM1999 /Below	RM2000 - 3999	RM4000/ Above	Total
I love to spend my holidays within the country (=0.003)				
Disagree	11	29	15	55
Indifferent	9	31	33	73
Agree	35	60	25	120
Total	55	120	73	248
I always spend my holidays within the country (= 0.010)				
Disagree	8	24	27	59
Indifferent	12	25	18	55
Agree	35	71	28	134
Total	55	120	73	248

Note: (= Significance Level)

(vii) Income Versus Love to Spend Holidays Within the Country

Table 4.4.3(v) above illustrated that the cross tabulation gives a result of 0.003 significant level. There are three income groups being compared against the statement " I love to spend my holidays within the country". 63.6% of the RM1999 and below, 50% of the RM2000 –

RM3999, and 34% of the RM4000 – RM5999 group respondents chose to agree with the statement. Evidently, the lowest earning group gathers the largest amongst all the groups. This is so because it would be the most affordable type of holidays for them. On the other hand, the highest earning group collect the smallest. This prevails because this group of people can afford to have their holidays outside the country.

(viii) Income Versus Always spend Holidays Within the Country

Table 4.4.3(v) above, also explained that in actuality, people are more willing to spend their holidays within the country. There is a slight increase in interest of respondents comparing to the earlier cross tabulation. The significant level reaches 0.010. In actuality, all groups agreed that they always spend their holidays within the country except for RM1999 and below group, which maintains at 63.6%. Whereas, RM2000 – 3999 increased by 9.2% to 59.2%, and RM4000 and above increased by 4.4% to 38.4% in actuality.

The probable rationale for these increases are that these groups do go to local tourist destinations but do not treat it as a holiday but rather a brief break over the weekend or even just a day trip.

4.5 Respondents' Level of Agreement On Domestic Tourism Benefits

This part reveals respondents level of agreement on the various benefits offered in the domestic tourism. Benefits listed as variables are replicated and slightly modified from Gearing, Stuart, and Var (1976) Criteria Judging Touristic Attractiveness. There are, natural landscapes, cultural festivals, local food, local architecture, modern architecture, historical sites, adventurous activities, rest and relax, shopping, children activities, night time recreations, accommodations, infrastructure and costs. The level of agreement stretches along a 5-likert-scale method, which starts at strongly disagree and ends at strongly agree. Due to small cell value, the 5 likert scale has been reclassified into disagree, indifferent and agree.

4.5.1 Demographic and The Level of Agreement On The Benefits Offered

A cross tabulation between respondents' demographic variables and their level of agreement has been done. Pearson's Chi-square analysis was performed to test the significance of association in the cross tabulation. Only variables that are at or below the significant level of 0.05 will be analysed.

Table 4.5.1(i) Education Vs Costs

	Education Level		
	Secondary/ Below	Under/Post Graduate/Above	Total
It is cheap to travel within the Peninsular by air (= 0.010)			
Disagree	30	92	122
Indifferent	22	31	53
Agree	32	41	73
Total	84	164	248

Table 4.5.1(i) Education Vs Costs (Con't)

	Education Level		
	Secondary/ Below	Under/Post Graduate/Above	Total
It is cheap to travel to East Malaysia by air (= 0.002)			
Disagree	29	84	113
Indifferent	12	33	45
Agree	43	47	90
Total	84	164	248

Note: (= Significance Level)

(i) Education Level Versus Costs (0.010).

Based on table 4.5.1(i) above, more than half of the under/post graduate respondents (56.1%) disagree to that statement "It is cheap to travel within the peninsular". Nevertheless, 25% agree with that statement and 18.9% have no opinion. The secondary group is more favourable towards travelling by air within the Peninsular. More than a third of its respondents disagree (35.7%) and agree (38.1%) and the remaining 26.2% were indecisive on that matter.

On the statement "It is cheap to travel to East Malaysia by air", the more highly educated group still disagree with it. More than half of its respondents (51.2%) disagreed, 28.7% agreed and 20.1% indifferent. On the other hand, more than half of respondents (51.2%) from the secondary category agree with that statement. Although the level of disagreement still maintains at 34.5, the level of indecisiveness fell to 14.3%.

It can be gathered with these two associations that people with a secondary education or lower are more favourable towards the costs of travelling within the country. The indifference option that took rather a large portion in the scale may be caused by the low level of awareness amongst the respondents about local tourism.

Table 4.5.1(ii) Education Vs Infrastructure

Infrastructure: (= 0.000)	Education Level		
	Secondary/Below	Under/Post Graduate/Above	Total
Disagree	11	31	42
Indifferent	6	43	49
Agree	67	90	157
Total	84	164	248

Note: (= Significance Level)

(ii) Education Level Versus Infrastructure (= 0.000)

It can be seen from the table that the secondary group is rather content with the infrastructure of the country as to give comfort and safety during spending holidays. 79.8% is within the agreement level, 13.1% in disagreement level and 7% is indifferent. Under/post graduate group, although 45.1% disagreed and were indecisive, 54.9% agreed with the statement. Comparing the two, under/post graduate individuals are more sceptical that Malaysia has the proper infrastructure to bring comfort and safety to local tourists as well as the foreign tourists.

Table 4.5.1(iii) Income Vs Costs

	Income			Total
	RM1999/ Below	RM2000 - 3999	RM4000/ Above	
It cheap to travel within the Peninsular by air (= 0.029)				
Disagree	20	68	34	122
Indifferent	19	17	17	53
Agree	16	35	22	73
Total	55	120	73	248

Table 4.5.1(iii) Income Vs Costs (Con't)

	Income			
	RM1999/ Below	RM2000 - 3999	RM4000/ Above	Total
It is cheap to travel to East Malaysia by air (= 0.016)				
Disagree	15	64	34	113
Indifferent	15	15	15	45
Agree	25	41	24	90
Total	55	120	73	248

Note: (= Significance Level)

(iii) Income Versus Costs

The table 4.5.1(iii) above shows that the lowest income group has the lowest disagreement level (36.5%) towards the costs to travel within the Peninsular. Majority of the income groups of RM2000 and above disagreed with the statement. RM2000 – 3999 scored 56.7% and RM4000 and above scored 46.6%. of their respective groups disagreed that it is cheap to travel within the Peninsular by air.

Closely associated with the analysis on Peninsular, the agreement level of this analysis towards the costs to travel to East Malaysia is rather similar. Those two highest income groups still hold true at their disagreement with cost the matter. The lowest income group still holds to be the smallest to disagree. 45% of the lowest income group agrees that it is cheap to travel to East Malaysia and the two highest income groups holds about a third of their respective respondents.

Table 4.5.1(iv) Gender Vs Shopping

	Gender		
	Male	Female	Total
Malaysia provides a haven for shopping (= 0.015)			
Disagree	14	17	31
Indifferent	33	18	51
Agree	69	97	166
Total	116	132	248

Note: (= Significance Level)

(iv) Gender Versus Shopping ($\chi^2 = 0.015$)

In terms of Malaysia is a shopping haven, Table 4.5.1(iv) above depicts that 73.5% of the females and 59.5% of the male respondents agree with this statement. 12.1% male and 12.1% female respondents disagree with this. Male respondents have double indifferent response than female because assumingly those males have less to say on shopping matters. It is already a cliché linking women with shopping; hence they have more opinions on this matter as opposed to have no opinion.

4.6 Respondents' Level of Importance Pertaining to the Benefits Sought in Domestic Holidays

This section reveals respondents level of importance with regards to the various benefits offered in the domestic tourism. Benefits listed as variables are the same as 4.5 – a replication and adaptation of Gearing, Stuart, and Var (1976) Criteria Judging Touristic Attractiveness. There are, natural landscapes, cultural festivals, local food, local architecture, modern architecture, historical sites, adventurous activities, rest and relax, shopping, children activities, night time recreations, accommodations, infrastructure and costs. The level of importance stretches along a 5 likert scale of very importance to not importance. Due to small cell value, the 5-likert scales have been collapsed into three, important, indifferent and less important.

4.6.1 Cross Tabulation Demographic and the Level of Importance on Benefits Sought

A cross tabulation between respondents' demographic variables and their level of importance has been done. Pearson's Chi-square analysis was performed to test the significance of association in the cross tabulation. Only variables that are at or below the significant level of 0.05 will be analysed.

Table 4.6.1(i) Gender Versus Demographic

	Gender		
	Male	Female	
Night Recreations (= 0.027)			
Important	68	58	126
Indifferent	29	35	64
Not Important	19	39	58
Total	116	132	248
Rest and Relax (= 0.008)			
Important	90	120	210
Indifferent	18	6	24
Not Important	8	6	14
Total	116	132	248

Note: (= Significance Level)

(ii) Gender Versus Night Recreations (= 0.027)

In Table 4.6.1(i) above, half of the total respondents (50.8%) rate night recreations as being important. Out of that, 53.9% were from the male group and 46.1% from the female group. Obviously, we could see that male members of the population were more concern than the females in seeking nighttime entertainment during their holidays. Nonetheless, the majority of both gender groups rate nighttime recreations as being important. If the groups' enthusiasm is being observed, it can be found that males are unlikely to give up night time recreations as only 16.4% rate less important. Whereas, the females rate 29.5%.

(iii) Gender Versus Rest and Relax (= 0.008)

More than four-fifth of the total respondents (84.7%) rate to seek the benefit to rest and relax during their holidays as important. Within that number indicated in Table 4.6.1(i), 90.9% represents the female and 77.6% represent the male population. It can be seen that both gender groups look for something low-key activities during their holidays, although the female population are more concern with it. Furthermore,

15.5% of the male group do not care much of the benefit, while only 3% of the female group chose to be indifferent.

Table 4.6.1(ii) Age Vs Benefits Sought

		Age		
		20 – 29 years	30 – 59 years	Total
Adventurous Activities (= 0.004)				
	Important	88	57	145
	Indifferent	37	22	59
	Not Important	15	29	44
	Total	140	108	248
Night Recreations (= 0.038)				
	Important	81	45	126
	Indifferent	32	32	64
	Not Important	27	31	58
	Total	140	108	248
Shopping (= 0.004)				
	Important	89	83	172
	Indifferent	34	9	43
	Not Important	17	16	33
	Total	140	108	248
Local Food (= 0.042)				
	Important	91	56	147
	Indifferent	33	28	61
	Not Important	16	24	40
	Total	140	108	248

Note: (= Significance Level)

(iv) Age Versus Adventurous Activities (= 0.004)

More than half of the total respondents (58.5%) rate that it is important for them to have adventurous activities during their holidays. Within this group, 62.9% are individuals between the ages of 20 – 29 years and 52.8% are from the 30 – 59 age category. This is apparent that the older the traveller, the less adventurous they are; and the younger they are, the more adventurous they become. This is substantiating further

with the 26.9% of the older group rate adventurous activities as less important and only 10.7% of the younger group. This had confirmed Phillip Brocks finding. (Reference)

(v) Age Versus Night Recreations ($= 0.038$)

Out of the 126 respondents (50.8%) who rate night recreations as important, 64.3% of the individuals are between the ages of 20 – 29 years and 35.7% are from the 30 – 59 years of age group. Within the younger group, 57.9% rate night recreations as being important in their holidays and less than half of the older group (41.7%) think the same. Evidently, the younger group is more interested in the night scenes rather than the older group.

(vi) Age Versus Shopping ($= 0.004$)

Out of the 172 respondents (69.4%) who seek to shop during their holidays, 51.7% were from the 20 – 29 years and 48.3% were from the 30 – 59 years age group. Within these age groups, the older group were more incline to the shopping activities rather than the younger one. 76.9% of the older group rate shopping as important, while only 63.6% of the younger group think the same. Moreover, the younger group has 24.3% of its members who do not have any opinion on this matter, while the older group is quite certain of its stand, hence the low scoring of 8% on the indifferent option.

(vii) Age Versus Local Food ($= 0.042$)

More than half of the total respondents (59.3%) rate the benefit of trying out local food during their holidays as important. The age group of 20 – 29 years represented 61.9% and 30 – 59 years represented 38.1% of the population that in favours of local food. Based on the results, it was found that there was more of the younger age group

(65%) that is willing to try out local food during their holidays rather than the older group, which only fetched 51.9% of their group.

Table 4.6.1(iii) Marital Status Vs Benefits Sought

	Marital Status		
	Single	Married	Total
Adventurous Activities (= 0.009)			
Important	96	49	145
Indifferent	38	21	59
Not Important	18	26	44
Total	152	96	248
Night Recreations (= 0.000)			
Important	92	34	126
Indifferent	36	28	64
Not Important	24	34	58
Total	152	96	248
Children Activities (= 0.000)			
Important	69	76	145
Indifferent	42	7	49
Not Important	41	13	54
Total	152	96	248

Note: (= Significance Level)

(viii) Marital Status Versus Adventurous Activities (= 0.009)

Table 4.6.1(iii) described that out of 58.5% of the total respondents rate adventurous as being important in the benefits sought during their holidays, 66.2% were single and 33.8% were married. Within the singles group, 63.2% and 51% from the married group rate it as important. The rate for singles' is higher than married because married individuals have to take their children or spouses into consideration. It is a lot easier to be adventurous if one has no significant others to think of.

(ix) Marital Status Versus Night Recreations (= 0.000)

Obviously, singles would prioritise night recreations more than the married respondents. 60.5% of the singles rate this benefit as

important and only 15.8% rate it as not important. On the other hand, 35.4% of the married respondents rate it as important and another 35.4% as not important. Most singles would still look for night recreations availability during their holidays.

(x) Marital Status Versus Children Activities ($\alpha = 0.000$)

Obviously, those who are married with children will be more concern of children activities during their holidays. 79.2% of the married individuals and 45.4% of the singles seek activities for children in their holiday destinations. 45.4% is quite high for people who do not have children to be so concern of children activities. This group of people is assumable those who are young at hearts. They enjoy theme parks which not only caters for children but also for the children' parents or guardians.

Table 4.6.1(iv) Any Children Vs Benefits sought

Adventurous Activities ($\alpha = 0.002$)	Children		
	Yes	No	
Important	39	106	145
Indifferent	17	42	59
Not Important	24	20	44
Total	80	168	248

Note: (α = Significance Level)

(xi) Children Versus Adventurous Activities ($\alpha = 0.002$)

Individuals who have children do not rate adventurous activities as being an important benefit that they would seek during their holidays. Therefore less than half of its respondents (48.8%) agree that these activities as being important. While those with no children, 63.1% agree that it is important. Generally, adventurous activities will attract more singles or those who do not have children.

Table 4.6.1(v) Education Vs Benefits Sought

	Education Level		
	Secondary/ Below	Under/Post Graduate/Above	Total
Historical Sites (= 0.007)			
Important	65	94	159
Indifferent	9	39	48
Not Important	10	31	41
Total	84	164	248
Modern Architecture (= 0.000)			
Important	53	59	112
Indifferent	17	49	66
Not Important	14	56	70
Total	84	164	248
Cultural Festivals (= 0.021)			
Important	44	56	100
Indifferent	20	51	71
Not Important	20	57	77
Total	84	164	248

Note: (= Significance Level)

(xii) Education Level Versus Historical Sites (= 0.000)

Respondents who have at least a secondary education or below are more inclined towards prominent historical sites and buildings. Based on Table 4.6.1(v), almost four fifth of this particular group (77.4%) rate historical sites as being an important benefit that they would seek for during their holidays. The other group which consist of at least an under/post graduate education, only 57.3% of them think that historical sites as being important.

(xiii) Education Level Versus Modern Architecture (= 0.000)

Apparently the marginally educated individuals (63.1%) are more interested in the modern architecture than the highly educated ones

(36%) in seeking for the benefits during their holidays. Only 16% of the marginally educated group think it is not important and more than double of that amount of the highly educated group who think the same.

(xiv) Education Level Versus Cultural Festivals ($\alpha = 0.021$)

The marginally educated group has more share than the highly educated in terms of seeking cultural festivals as one of the important benefits sought during holidays. It represents 52.4% of its group, while the highly educated respondents only represent 34.5% of the important level segment.

Table 4.6.1(vi) Occupation Level Vs Benefits Sought

	Occupation			
	Upper Management	Middle Management	Lower Management	
Cultural Festivals ($\alpha = 0.026$)				Total
Important	28	10	62	100
Indifferent	24	14	33	71
Not Important	22	21	34	77
Total	74	45	129	248
Historical Sites ($\alpha = 0.006$)				
Important	46	19	94	159
Indifferent	16	15	17	48
Not Important	12	11	18	41
Total	74	45	129	248

Note: (α = Significance Level)

(xv) Occupation Level Versus Cultural Festivals ($\alpha = 0.026$)

In reference to Table 4.6.1(vi), Professional/Upper Management and Lower Management/Operational staff groups represent the highest in

the cultural festivals important option. The upper management level constitutes 37.8% and lower management constitutes 48% of the total important sectors respondents. Middle management only constitutes 22.2%.

(xvi) Occupation Level Versus Historical Sites ($\alpha = 0.006$)

Upper management represents 62.1% and lower management represents 72.9% in agreeing the historical sites as being important during their holidays. Middle management represents 42%. It is apparent that lower management individuals are more interested with historical sites as well as cultural festivals. They are more involved to local features during their holidays.

Table 4.6.1(vii) Income Vs Benefits Sought

	Income			
	RM1999/ Below	RM2000– RM3999	RM4000 /Above	
Modern Architecture ($\alpha = 0.000$)				
Important	36	52	24	112
Indifferent	8	27	31	66
Not Important	11	41	18	70
Total	55	120	73	248

Note: (α = Significance Level)

(xvii) Income Versus Modern Architecture ($\alpha = 0.000$)

According Table 4.6.1(vii), the lowest earning income group reaches the highest portions amongst all the income groups along the important column in the modern architecture option. It shows that the highest earning income group (32%) has the least interests in the modern architecture during their holidays. The lowest income group (65%) have the most interests in the particular architecture.

4.7 Means Comparisons Between the Level of Agreement on the Benefits Offered in Malaysian Tourism and the Importance of them to the Respondents

This section compares the respondents' level of agreement on the benefits offered in Malaysian tourism and the importance of the benefits to them. The results will give an implication of whether or not Malaysian tourism fulfils what local tourists need.

4.7.1 Means Comparisons Between Benefits Sought and Benefits Offered

The T-Test analysis was performed to test the significance of the comparisons between the means. Only variables that are at or below the significant level of 0.05 will be analysed.

Table 4.7.1 Paired Samples Statistics

Paired Samples	Mean
<u>Rest and Relax</u> (= 0.007)	
Benefit Offered Agreement	3.60
Benefit Sought Importance	4.11
<u>Accommodations</u> (=0.025)	
Benefit Offered Agreement	3.58
Benefit Sought Importance	4.18

Note: (= Significance Level)

(i) Rest and Relax

Based on Table 4.7.1, there was an average of 3.60 level of agreement in the benefit offered category. This means that on a whole, respondents' level of agreement fell in between indifferent and agrees. And the importance of this variable in holidays is quite high, in between

agree and strongly agree. This means that even though the importance of this benefit to the travellers is quite major, the local tourism failed to fulfil it offers to the standard of travellers.

(ii) Accommodations

In consistent with the analysis above, the mean of agreement level of respondents on children activities available in Malaysia is 3.58. This average fell in between indifferent and agree. Whereas, the importance level fell in between agree and strongly agree. Again, the benefit offered did not reach to the expectation of the travellers.