CHAPTER 4
RESEARCH RESULTS

4.1 Introduction

Chapter 4 will cover the finding and results after the analysis of questionnaires collected. The data collected were analyzed on statistical software named SPSS version 17.0. It will cover seven segments, which are: descriptive statistics, normality test, factor analysis, correlation test, reliability test, hypothesis testing, and summary.

4.2 Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics are used to explore the data collected and to summarize to provide general observation from the data collected. A total of 620 questionnaires were distributed to international tourists in Kuala Lumpur areas and 573 questionnaires were returned. However only 567 questionnaires were usable to this study. (Table 23)

Table 23 Kuala Lumpur's image by demographic variables:-

Criteria	Group	n	%
Nationality	Africa	11	1.9
	Asia	327	57.7
	Europe	101	17.8
	Middle East	47	8.3
	North America	30	5.3
	Oceania	23	4.1
	South America	28	4.9
Gender	Male	220	38.8
	Female	347	61.2
Marital status	Single	343	60.5
	Married	224	39.5
Age	Under 20 years old	20	3.5
	21-24 years old	165	29.1
	25-34 years old	239	42.2
	35-44 years old	89	15.7
	45-54 years old	40	7.1
	55-64 years old	13	2.3
	65 and above	1	0.2
Number of time visited to Kuala Lumpur	1	191	33.7
	2	179	31.6
	3	83	14.6
	4	44	7.8
	5	29	5.1
	6	16	2.8
	7	3	0.5
	8	7	1.2
	9	1	0.2
	10	10	1.8
	14	4	0.7
Purpose of visit	Holiday	308	54.3
	Visiting friends/relatives	71	12.5
	Business/meeting	62	10.9
	Convention/exhibition	4	0.7
	Shopping	47	8.4
	Health treatment	2	0.4
	Education	54	9.5
	Attending special events	13	2.3
	Others	6	1.0
Traveling Alone	Yes	89	15.7
	No	478	84.3

(Continued on next page)

Table 23 *(continued)*

Criteria	Group	n	%
If no, travel with	Spouse	66	13.8
	Family/relatives	132	27.6
	Friends	247	51.7
	Children	1	0.2
	Business Associates	32	6.7
Education level	Secondary school	27	4.8
	Certificate/Diploma	98	17.3
	Degree/Professional certificate	341	60.1
	Master's degree	90	15.9
	Doctorate degree	11	1.9
Occupation	Professional/technical	195	34.4
	Managerial/administrative	139	24.5
	Businessman	47	8.3
	Retiree	19	3.4
	Student	91	16.0
	Government	20	3.5
	Housewife	9	1.6
	Unemployed	17	3.0
	Others	30	5.3
Monthly household income	Under MYR 1,500 (Under USD 500)	72	12.7
	MYR 1,501 – 3,000 (USD 501 – 1,000)	122	21.5
	MYR 3,001 – 5,000 (USD 1,001 – 1,666)	179	31.6
	MYR 5,001 – 7,000 (USD 1,667 – 2,333)	85	15.0
	MYR 7,001 – 9,000 (USD 2,334 – 3,000)	28	4.9
	MYR 9,001 and above (USD 3,001 and above)	81	14.3
Learn about KL	Previous trip(s)	150	26.4
	Internet	170	30.0
	Brochures/travel guidebooks	60	10.6
	Travel agent	17	3.0
	Word-of-mouth	128	22.6
	Newspapers, magazines	22	3.9
	Advertisement by Ministry of Tourism Malaysia	20	3.5
Days in KL	Less than 1 day	14	2.5
	1-2 days	51	9.0
	3-5 days	202	35.6
	About 1 week	147	25.9
	About 2 - 3 weeks	49	8.6
	1 month	17	3.0
	More than 1 month	87	15.3

4.3 Normality Test

Normality tests are used to determine whether a data set is well-modeled by a normal distribution or not, or to compute how likely an underlying random variable is to be normally distributed. Normality can also be assessed by examining skewness and kurtosis values (Hair et al., 2006). Skewness and kurtosis values of ± 1 are acceptable (Leech et al.,2005). In this study, the distributions are highly skewed and degrees of kurtosis are acceptable.

Table 24 Assessment of the measurement:-

	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis
Cognitive Image (Natural & history attraction)	3.5245	.58866	-.177	.592
Cognitive Image (Cultural)	3.4705	.63142	-.144	.443
Cognitive Image (Environment & infrastructure)	3.2384	.69192	-.371	.654
Cognitive Image (Price & cost)	3.4731	.69850	-.212	.407
Affective image	3.4891	.51023	.519	.930
Overall destination image	3.5725	.52562	.212	.721
Perceived trip quality (Natural & history attraction)	3.5284	.57204	-.159	.391
Perceived trip quality (Cultural)	3.4716	.59695	-.186	.712
Perceived trip quality (Environment & infrastructure)	3.2587	.67100	-.458	.747
Perceived trip quality (Price & cost)	3.4568	.67048	-.107	.328
Perceived value	3.4085	.62904	-.064	1.244
Satisfaction	3.4978	.58328	.344	.546
Tourist's behavioral intention	3.4653	.59649	-.007	.358

4.4 Factor Analysis

Factor analysis attempts to identify underlying variables, or factors, that explain the pattern of correlations within a set of observed variables. Factor analysis is often used in data reduction to reduce a large number of variables to a smaller number of factors that explain most of the variance observed in a much larger number of manifest variables. More frequently, factor analysis is used as an exploratory technique when the researcher wishes to summarize the structure of a set of variables.

The SPSS software package used in this study includes Bartlett's test of sphericity (Bartlett 1950) and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy (Kaiser 1970) to assist assess the adequacy of their correlation matrices for factor analysis.

Table 25 Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) Measure of Sampling Adequacy, Bartlett's Test of Sphericity and Variance

Variables	KMO	Bartlett's Test of Sphericity			Variance
		Approx. Chi-Square	df	Sig.	(%)
Cognitive Image	0.908	5074.528	190	.000	60.11
Affective Image	0.834	799.172	15	.000	48.35
Overall Destination Image	0.790	610.460	10	.000	50.95
Perceived Trip Quality	0.910	4531.139	190	.000	58.54
Perceived Value	0.845	1314.646	10	.000	65.68
Satisfaction	0.811	784.052	6	.000	65.77
Tourists' Behavioral Intention	0.831	1213.493	10	.000	63.70

The Kaiser (1974) recommends a bare minimum of 0.5 and that value between 0.5 and 0.7 are mediocre, values between 0.7 and 0.8 are good, value between 0.8 and 0.9 are great and values above 0.9 are superb (Hutcheson & Sofroniou, 1999). For these data, the values of KMO are all above 0.7, so we should be confident that the sample size is adequate for factor analysis.

Bartlett's Test of Sphericity is a test statistic used to examine the hypothesis that the variables are uncorrelation in the population. In other words, the population correlation matrix is an identity matrix; each variable correlates perfectly with itself ($r = 1$) but has no correlation with the other variables ($r = 0$). From table 25, we can see that the Bartlett's test of sphericity are significant which are small enough to reject the hypothesis. It is concluded that the strength of the relationship among variables are strong.

Communalities and factor loadings were used as cutoff criteria to determine the number of factors derived. (Hair et al., 1998) Items with loadings lower than 0.4 and with loadings higher than 0.4 on more than one factor were eliminated.

With this, factor loading for each variable is examined.

i) Cognitive image

The exploratory factor analysis was performed to determine the underlying dimensionality of 'cognitive image' by analyzing patterns of correlations among the 33 image attributes. Employing the principal components factor

analysis, four factors with an eigenvalue greater than one explained 60.11% of the total variance of cognitive image scale (Table 25). Among the 33 cognitive image attributes, thirteen items with factor loading less than 0.4 were removed from the scale. These are “interesting museum/exhibits”, “wide arrays of shows, exhibitions”, “colorful nightlife”, “wide variety of entertainment”, “good variety of activities for children”, “friendly and helpful local people”, “pleasant weather”, “wide variety of shop facilities”, “wide variety of restaurant”, “wide choice of accommodations”, “severe traffic problems”, “diversity of cultural/historical attractions”, “comfort of build/man-made environment”

The result of varimax-rotated factor pattern implies that the first factor concerns “natural and history attraction” (5 items, factor loading ranging from .59 to .77). The second factor relates to “cultural” (5 items, factor loading ranging from .58 to .75). The third factor consists of the characteristics of the “environment & infrastructure” (6 items, factor loadings ranging from .56 to .70). The fourth factor relates to “price and cost” (4 items, factor loadings ranging from .68 to .82). These four factors were used as indicators for the latent construct ‘cognitive image’ of Kuala Lumpur in subsequent analysis. The result of the factor analysis for cognitive image is shown in Table 26.

Table 26 Dimension of Cognitive Image

My perception of KL is that KL offers :	Factor loadings	Communality
Factor 1 : Natural & history attraction	**F1**	
Attractive natural attractions	.775	.675
Rich and beauty scenery	.720	.619
Gorgeous gardens	.693	.550
Distinctive history and heritage	.598	.503
Vintage buildings	.611	.534
Factor 2 : Cultural	**F2**	
Tempting/colorful culture events and festivals	.586	.517
Excellent quality and fun local/western music	.606	.542
Adequate publicizing of cultural activities	.726	.645
Adequate means by which citizens can gain access to culture	.757	.710
A good cultural experience	.692	.615
Factor 3 : Environment & infrastructure	**F3**	
Safe and secure environment	.676	.581
Clean and tidy environment	.708	.629
Quality infrastructure	.705	.548
Good network of tourist information	.699	.578
Enough signs as indicators	.700	.566
General quality of KL offer is good	.565	.426
Factor 4 : Price & cost	**F4**	
Reasonable price for food and accommodation	.799	.702
Good value for money	.819	.766
Reasonable price for attractions and activities	.819	.754
Good bargain shopping	.682	.560

ii) Affective image

Through principal components factor analysis, one factor with an eigenvalue greater than one explained 48.35% of the total variance of affective image scale (Table 25). The result of the varimax-rotation interpreted 6 items with factor loadings ranging from .64 to .75 for affective image is shown in Table 27 and item of “relaxing” with loading lower than 0.4 was eliminated.

Table 27 Dimension of Affective Image

	Factor loadings	Communality
Pleasant	.654	.427
Exciting	.653	.427
Arousing	.640	.409
Favorable	.735	.540
Enjoyable	.752	.566
Fun	.730	.533

iii) Overall destination image

Principal components factor analysis indicates that one factor with an eigenvalue greater than one explained 50.95% of the total variance of overall destination image scale (Table 25). The result of the varimax-rotation interpreted 5 items with factor loadings ranging from .67 to .76 for overall destination image is shown in Table 28.

Table 28 Dimension of Overall Destination Image

	Factor loadings	Communality
KL has a favorable overall image	.725	.525
I think most people have a positive opinion about KL	.766	.586
The local people at KL is friendly towards the tourist.	.678	.459
KL has a unique image	.698	.487
I think KL is popular	.700	.490

iv) Perceive trip quality

Similarly, the same exploratory factor analysis was performed to determine the underlying dimensionality of 'perceived trip quality' by analyzing patterns of correlations among the 33 image attributes. Four factors with an eigenvalue greater than one explained 58.54% of the variance of perceived trip quality scale (Table 25). Thirteen items with loading factors less than 0.4 were removed from the scale.

The varimax-rotated factor pattern implies that the first factor related to "natural and history attraction" (5 items, factor loadings ranging from .58 to .72). The second factor relates to "cultural" (5 items, factor loadings ranging from .63 to .73). The third factor concerns "environment and infrastructure" (6 items, factor loadings ranging from .48 to .71). The fourth consists of the attributes of "price and cost" (4 items, factor loadings ranging from .71 to .80). The arithmetic means of the four multi-item factors were used to build the

construct perceived trip quality for subsequent analysis. The result of the factor analysis for perceived trip quality is shown in Table 29.

Table 29 Dimension of Perceived Trip Quality

My own experience tells me that KL has :	Factor loadings				Communality
Factor 1 : Natural & history attraction	**F1**				
Attractive natural attractions	.671				.544
Rich and beauty scenery	.722				.577
Gorgeous gardens	.726				.579
Distinctive history and heritage	.634				.569
Vintage buildings	.582				.523
Factor 2 : Cultural		**F2**			
Tempting/colorful culture events and festivals		.709			.600
Excellent quality and fun local/western music		.697			.608
Adequate publicizing of cultural activities		.730			.637
Adequate means by which citizens can gain access to culture		.661			.622
A good cultural experience		.630			.520
Factor 3 : Environment & infrastructure			**F3**		
Safe and secure environment			.649		.542
Clean and tidy environment			.713		.595
Quality infrastructure			.691		.583
Good network of tourist information			.712		.603
Enough signs as indicators			.691		.533
General quality of KL offer is good			.484		.449
Factor 4 : Price & cost				**F4**	
Reasonable price for food and accommodation				.740	.628
Good value for money				.805	.722
Reasonable price for attractions and activities				.785	.712
Good bargain shopping				.715	.560

v) Perceive value

Principal components factor analysis indicates that one factor with an eigenvalue greater than one explained 65.68% of the total variance of perceived value (Table 25). The result of the varimax-rotation interpreted 5 items with factor loadings ranging from .74 to .84 for perceived value is shown in Table 30. From the result showed that tourists overall appraisal of the perceived value is on money paid for purchasing goods and services in Kuala Lumpur rather than on non-monetary price (i.e. knowledge and experience).

Table 30 Dimension of Perceived Value

	Factor loadings	Communality
Staying in KL is worth every dollar paid.	.740	.548
The price of Bed &Breakfast/half board/full board in KL is reasonable	.829	.688
The price of additional offer at KL (i.e. price of food and drink, price of souvenirs, price of handcrafted products and prices of excursions) are favorable	.807	.651
Considering what I would pay for a trip, I will get more than money my money's worth by visiting KL	.847	.717
The cost of visiting KL are a bargain relative to the benefit I receive	.825	.680

vi) Satisfaction

For the construct of satisfaction, principal components factor analysis indicates that one factor with an eigenvalue greater than one explained 65.77% of the total variance (Table 25). The result of the varimax-rotation

interpreted 4 items with factor loadings ranging from .80 to .82 for satisfaction is shown in Table 31.

Table 31 Dimension of Satisfaction

	Factor loadings	Communality
I am pleased that I decided to visit KL	.800	.639
The visit to KL exceeded my expectations.	.820	.673
I am satisfied with the visitation in KL	.817	.668
KL has given a good overall travelling experience (e.g. quality of service and price)	.807	.651

vii) Tourists' Behavioral Intention

The tourist's judgment about the likeliness i) revisit Kuala Lumpur again or ii) willingness to recommend Kuala Lumpur to others inclusive friends and relatives are showed in the principal components factor analysis which indicates that one factor with an eigenvalue greater than one explained 63.70% of the total variance of tourists' behavioral intention (Table 25). The result of the varimax-rotation interpreted 5 items with factor loadings ranging from .76 to .84 for tourists' behavioral intention is shown in Table 32.

Table 32 Dimension of Tourists' Behavioral Intention

	Factor loadings	Communality
If I had to decide again I would choose KL again	.802	.644
I will recommend KL to my friends and relatives	.788	.621
I will speak highly of KL to friends and relatives	.796	.634
KL would be my preferred choice for future vacation	.841	.708
I am likely to visit KL in the near future	.760	.578

4.5 Reliability Test

There are several different reliability coefficients. One of the most commonly used is Cronbach's alpha. Generally, a value above 0.7 is considered adequate for internal consistency (Nunnaly, 1978). Table 33 summarized the Cronbach's Alpha score for each variable used in this study.

Table 33 Summary of Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Analysis

Variables	Cronbach's Alpha
Cognitive Image	
i) Natural & history attraction	0.797
ii) Cultural	0.824
iii) Environment & infrastructure	0.837
iv) Price & cost	0.856
Affective Image	0.785
Overall Destination Image	0.757
Perceived Trip Quality	
i) Natural & history attraction	0.773
ii) Cultural	0.812
iii) Environment & infrastructure	0.833
iv) Price & cost	0.833
Perceived Value	0.867
Satisfaction	0.826
Tourists' Behavioral Intention	0.857

4.6 Correlation Test

Correlation looks at the relationship between two variables in a linear fashion. In this study, simple bivariate correlations using Pearson's product-moment correlation was performed. Simple bivariate correlations, also referred to as zero-order correlation, refers to the correlation between two continuous variables, and is the most common measure of linear relationship.

Coefficient and its associates significant value (p) are examining in interpreting the correlation coefficient. The output confirms the results that a significant positive relationship exists among the variables.

Table 34 Inter-construct correlations

		CI– Natural & History Attraction	CI – Cultural	CI – Environment & Infrastructure	CI – Price & Cost	Affective Image	Overall Destination Image	PTQ – Natural & History Attraction	PTQ – Cultural	PTQ – Environment& Infrastructure	PTQ – Price & Cost	Perceived Value	Satisfaction	Tourist's Behavioral Intention
CI - Natural & History Attraction	Pearson Correlation	1	.586**	.474**	.418**	.319**	.319**	.534**	.257**	.219**	.185**	.304**	.281**	.317**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567
CI - Cultural	Pearson Correlation	.586**	1	.582**	.425**	.311**	.254**	.352**	.485**	.308**	.248**	.327**	.267**	.308**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567
CI - Environment & Infrastructure	Pearson Correlation	.474**	.582**	1	.513**	.431**	.356**	.386**	.383**	.582**	.274**	.459**	.431**	.390**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567
CI - Price & Cost	Pearson Correlation	.418**	.425**	.513**	1	.416**	.366**	.281**	.298**	.280**	.512**	.461**	.402**	.335**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567
Affective Image	Pearson Correlation	.319**	.311**	.431**	.416**	1	.534**	.393**	.359**	.430**	.471**	.601**	.592**	.515**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567
Overall Destination Image	Pearson Correlation	.319**	.254**	.356**	.366**	.534**	1	.385**	.357**	.409**	.430**	.494**	.608**	.490**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567

(Continued on next page)

Table 34 *(continued)*

PTQ - Natural & History Attraction	Pearson Correlation	.534**	.352**	.386**	.281**	.393**	.385**	1	.508**	.487**	.423**	.392**	.430**	.404**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567
PTQ - Cultural	Pearson Correlation	.257**	.485**	.383**	.298**	.359**	.357**	.508**	1	.569**	.389**	.429**	.399**	.407**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567
PTQ – Environment & Infrastructure	Pearson Correlation	.219**	.308**	.582**	.280**	.430**	.409**	.487**	.569**	1	.513**	.523**	.494**	.457**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567
PTQ - Price & Cost	Pearson Correlation	.185**	.248**	.274**	.512**	.471**	.430**	.423**	.389**	.513**	1	.543**	.496**	.424**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000
	N	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567
Perceived Value	Pearson Correlation	.304**	.327**	.459**	.461**	.601**	.494**	.392**	.429**	.523**	.543**	1	.579**	.523**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000
	N	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567
Satisfaction	Pearson Correlation	.281**	.267**	.431**	.402**	.592**	.608**	.430**	.399**	.494**	.496**	.579**	1	.673**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000
	N	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567
Tourist's Behavioral Intention	Pearson Correlation	.317**	.308**	.390**	.335**	.515**	.490**	.404**	.407**	.457**	.424**	.523**	.673**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567	567

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

4.7 Hypothesis Testing

The proposed theoretical framework in Fig. 4 was tested by using eight constructs: namely cognitive image, affective image, destination personality, overall destination image, perceived trip quality, perceived value, satisfaction and tourists' behavioral intentions.

From the result above, factors of "natural and history attraction", "cultural", "environment and infrastructure" and "price and cost" were served as the measurement variables of cognitive image and perceived trip quality. Linear regression and one-way ANOVA are used to test the relationship postulated in the hypothesis.

Hypothesis 1

H1a: There is a significant relationship between cognitive image (natural and history attraction) and overall destination image.

Table 35 ANOVA between cognitive image (natural and history attraction) and overall destination image

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	15.865	1	15.865	63.798	.000[a]
	Residual	140.505	565	.249		
	Total	156.371	566			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Cognitive image - natural & history attraction

b. Dependent Variable: Overall destination image

The result of applying the ANOVA procedure indicated that the cognitive image (natural and history attraction) had significant relationship on overall destination image of Kuala Lumpur, F = 63.798, p = 0.000, β = .319, r^2=.101. The respondents perceived Kuala Lumpur is having natural and history attractions that formed the overall destination image in tourists' mind.

H1b: There is a significant relationship between cognitive image (cultural) and overall destination image.

Table 36 ANOVA between cognitive image (cultural) and overall destination image.

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	10.117	1	10.117	39.083	.000[a]
	Residual	146.254	565	.259		
	Total	156.371	566			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Cognitive image - cultural

b. Dependent Variable: Overall destination image

The visitors perceived Kuala Lumpur as potentially offering a good cultural experience in their visit. The standard regression analysis showed that the cognitive image (cultural) had significant relationship on overall destination image of Kuala Lumpur, F = 39.083, p = 0.000, β =. 254, r^2=.065. It is true where culture of Malaysia from different races always draws on tourists' mind even before or after their visitation.

H1c: There is a significant relationship between cognitive image (environment and infrastructure) and overall destination image.

Table 37 ANOVA between cognitive image (environment and infrastructure) and overall destination image

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	19.802	1	19.802	81.925	.000[a]
	Residual	136.568	565	.242		
	Total	156.371	566			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Cognitive image - environment and infrastructure

b. Dependent Variable: Overall destination image

Standard regression analysis showed that the cognitive image (environment and infrastructure) had significant relationship on overall destination image of Kuala Lumpur, F = 81.925, p = 0.000, β =. 356, r^2=.127. Kuala Lumpur as a capital of Malaysia definitely has its highest quality of infrastructure that it also be measured as significant impact to overall destination image of Kuala Lumpur.

H1d: There is a significant relationship between cognitive image (price and cost) and overall destination image.

Table 38 ANOVA between cognitive image (price and cost) and overall destination image

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	20.988	1	20.988	87.590	.000[a]
	Residual	135.383	565	.240		
	Total	156.371	566			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Cognitive image - price and cost

b. Dependent Variable: Overall destination image

The results were also positive in terms of the reasonable price and cost in Kuala Lumpur. Standard regression analysis showed that the cognitive image (price and cost) had significant relationship on overall destination image of Kuala Lumpur, $F = 87.590$, $p = 0.000$, $\beta = .366$, $r^2 = .134$.

H2: There is a significant relationship between affective image and overall destination image.

Table 39 ANOVA between affective image and overall destination image

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	44.597	1	44.597	225.430	.000[a]
	Residual	111.774	565	.198		
	Total	156.371	566			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Affective Image

b. Dependent Variable: Overall destination image

The study makes it clear that affective image had significant relationship on overall destination image of Kuala Lumpur, F = 225.430, p = 0.000, β =.534, r^2=.285. Tourists who visited to Kuala Lumpur has different feeling of “pleasant”, “exiting”, “arousing”, “favorable”, “enjoyable” and “fun” that also be important elements toward overall destination image of Kuala Lumpur.

Hypothesis 3

H3a: There is a significant relationship between destination personality (sincerity) and overall destination image.

Table 40 Descriptive between destination personality (sincerity) and overall destination image

Descriptive

Overall destination image

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Reliable	118	3.6237	.51452	.04737	3.5299	3.7175	2.20	5.00
Sincere	168	3.5024	.51932	.04007	3.4233	3.5815	1.80	5.00
Intelligent	93	3.4452	.49001	.05081	3.3442	3.5461	2.40	5.00
Successful	109	3.6697	.49694	.04760	3.5754	3.7641	2.60	5.00
Wholesome	79	3.6608	.59170	.06657	3.5282	3.7933	2.20	5.00
Total	567	3.5725	.52562	.02207	3.5291	3.6158	1.80	5.00

Through oneway ANOVA, the result showed that the destination personality (sincerity) had a significant relationship on overall destination image, F= 3.96, p = .004 and “successful” and “wholesome” are character relatively to be best represent Kuala Lumpur.

H3b: There is a significant relationship between destination personality (excitement) and overall destination image.

Table 41 Descriptive between destination personality (excitement) and overall destination image

Descriptive

Overall destination image

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Exciting	193	3.6104	.54495	.03923	3.5330	3.6877	1.80	5.00
Daring	117	3.5761	.53056	.04905	3.4789	3.6732	2.40	5.00
Original	153	3.4523	.49192	.03977	3.3737	3.5309	2.40	5.00
Spirited	104	3.6750	.50565	.04958	3.5767	3.7733	2.60	5.00
Total	567	3.5725	.52562	.02207	3.5291	3.6158	1.80	5.00

On the other side, oneway ANOVA also showed that the destination personality (excitement) had a significant relationship on overall destination image, F= 4.39, p = .005 and perceived by the tourists that “spirited” is best represent Kuala Lumpur.

H3c: There is a significant relationship between destination personality (conviviality) and overall destination image.

Table 42 Descriptive between destination personality (conviviality) and overall destination image

Descriptive

Overall destination image

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Friendly	135	3.6059	.54742	.04711	3.5127	3.6991	2.20	5.00
Family Oriented	93	3.6323	.56283	.05836	3.5163	3.7482	2.40	5.00
Charming	118	3.6085	.55679	.05126	3.5070	3.7100	2.40	5.00
Modern	170	3.5129	.48303	.03705	3.4398	3.5861	1.80	5.00
Traditional	51	3.4902	.44238	.06195	3.3658	3.6146	2.60	4.60
Total	567	3.5725	.52562	.02207	3.5291	3.6158	1.80	5.00

The results were less positive in terms of destination personality in Kuala Lumpur being conviviality. The oneway ANOVA analyses resulted in acceptance of the null hypothesis in relation to the overall destination image, F= 1.43, p = .220.

Hypothesis 4

H4a: There is a significant relationship between overall destination image and perceived trip quality (natural and history attraction)

Table 43 ANOVA between overall destination image and perceived trip quality (natural and history attraction)

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	27.389	1	27.389	98.049	.000[a]
	Residual	157.824	565	.279		
	Total	185.213	566			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Overall destination image

b. Dependent Variable: Perceived trip quality – Natural and history attraction

Standard regression analysis showed that the overall destination image had significant relationship on perceived trip quality (natural and history attraction), $F = 98.049$, $p = 0.000$, $\beta = .385$, $r^2 = .148$.

H4b: There is a significant relationship between overall destination image and perceived trip quality (cultural)

Table 44 ANOVA between overall destination image and perceived trip quality (cultural)

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	25.670	1	25.670	82.398	.000[a]
	Residual	176.022	565	.312		
	Total	201.693	566			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Overall destination image

b. Dependent Variable: Perceived trip quality - Cultural

Standard regression analysis showed that the overall destination image had significant relationship on perceived trip quality (cultural), F = 82.398, p = 0.000, β =.357, r^2=.127.

H4c: There is a significant relationship between overall destination image and perceived trip quality (environment and infrastructure)

Table 45 ANOVA between overall destination image and perceived trip quality (environment and infrastructure)

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	42.549	1	42.549	113.242	.000[a]
	Residual	212.290	565	.376		
	Total	254.839	566			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Overall destination image

b. Dependent Variable: Perceived trip quality – Environment and infrastructure

Standard regression analysis showed that the overall destination image had significant relationship on perceived trip quality (environment and infrastructure), F = 113.242, p = 0.000, β =.409, r^2=.167.

H4d: There is a significant relationship between overall destination image and perceived trip quality (price and cost).

Table 46 ANOVA between overall destination image and perceived trip quality (price and cost)

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	47.052	1	47.052	128.185	.000[a]
	Residual	207.390	565	.367		
	Total	254.441	566			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Overall destination image

b. Dependent Variable: Perceived trip quality – price and cost

Standard regression analysis showed that the overall destination image had significant relationship on perceived trip quality (price and cost), F = 128.185, p = 0.000, β =.430, r^2=.185.

Hypothesis 5

H5a: There is a significant relationship between perceived trip quality (natural and history attraction) and satisfaction.

Table 47 ANOVA between perceived trip quality (natural and history attraction) and satisfaction

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	35.652	1	35.652	128.379	.000[a]
	Residual	156.907	565	.278		
	Total	192.560	566			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Perceived trip quality – Natural and history attraction

b. Dependent Variable: Satisfaction

Standard regression analysis showed that the perceived trip quality (natural and history attraction) had significant relationship on satisfaction, F = 128.379, p = 0.000, β =.430, r^2=.185.

H5b: There is a significant relationship between perceived trip quality (cultural) and satisfaction.

Table 48 ANOVA between perceived trip quality (cultural) and satisfaction

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	30.661	1	30.661	107.003	.000[a]
	Residual	161.898	565	.287		
	Total	192.560	566			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Perceived trip quality - Cultural

b. Dependent Variable: Satisfaction

Standard regression analysis showed that the perceived trip quality (cultural) had significant relationship on satisfaction, F = 107.003, p = 0.000, β =.399, r^2=.159.

H5c: There is a significant relationship between perceived trip quality (environment and infrastructure) and satisfaction.

Table 49 ANOVA between perceived trip quality (environment and infrastructure) and satisfaction

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	46.899	1	46.899	181.913	.000[a]
	Residual	145.661	565	.258		
	Total	192.560	566			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Perceived trip quality – Environment and infrastructure

b. Dependent Variable: Satisfaction

Standard regression analysis showed that the perceived trip quality (environment and infrastructure) had significant relationship on satisfaction, F = 181.913, p = 0.000, β =.494, r^2=.244.

H5d: There is a significant relationship between perceived trip quality (price and cost) and satisfaction.

Table 50 ANOVA between perceived trip quality (price and cost) and satisfaction

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	47.347	1	47.347	184.218	.000[a]
	Residual	145.213	565	.257		
	Total	192.560	566			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Perceived trip quality – Price and cost

b. Dependent Variable: Satisfaction

Standard regression analysis showed that the perceived trip quality (price and cost) had significant relationship on satisfaction, F = 184.218, p = 0.000, β =.496, r^2=.246.

H6: There is a significant relationship between overall destination image and perceived value.

Table 51 ANOVA between overall destination image and perceived value

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	54.708	1	54.708	182.629	.000[a]
	Residual	169.251	565	.300		
	Total	223.959	566			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Overall destination image

b. Dependent Variable: Perceived value

This study assessed the manner in which overall destination image affect perceived value. As the result of the analysis of hypothesis, the overall destination image had a significant relationship on perceived value, F = 182,629, p = 0.000, β =.494, r^2=.244.

H7: There is a significant relationship between perceived value and satisfaction.

Table 52 ANOVA between perceived value and satisfaction

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	64.470	1	64.470	284.372	.000[a]
	Residual	128.090	565	.227		
	Total	192.560	566			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Perceived value

b. Dependent Variable: Satisfaction

This study also assessed how perceived value affect tourists' satisfaction. The result of standard regression analysis showed that the perceived value had significant relationship on satisfaction, F = 284.372, p = 0.000, β =.579, r^2=.335. Thus confirming our hypothesis, the perceived value did indeed exert a positive effect on the tourists' satisfaction during their visitation to Kuala Lumpur.

H8: There is a significant relationship between satisfaction and tourists' behavioral intention.

Table 53 ANOVA between satisfaction and tourists' behavioral intention

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	91.285	1	91.285	468.448	.000[a]
	Residual	110.100	565	.195		
	Total	201.386	566			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Satisfaction

b. Dependent Variable: Tourist's behavioral intention

This study assessed how the tourists' satisfaction affects their behavioral intention. According to the result of our analysis of hypothesis 8, the satisfaction had significant relationship on tourists' behavioral intention, F = 468.448, p = 0.000, β =.673, r^2=.453. Thus, the tourists who are satisfied with their visit to Kuala Lumpur will subsequently willing to recommend Kuala Lumpur to their friends and relatives and be consider visiting Kuala Lumpur again in future.

Hypothesis 9

H9a: There is a significant relationship between destination personality (sincerity) and tourists' behavioral intention.

Table 54 Descriptive between destination personality (sincerity) and tourists' behavioral intention

Descriptive

Tourists' behavioral intention

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Reliable	118	3.4525	.53104	.04889	3.3557	3.5494	2.20	4.80
Sincere	168	3.3869	.54196	.04181	3.3044	3.4695	2.00	5.00
Intelligent	93	3.3634	.65272	.06768	3.2290	3.4979	2.00	5.00
Successful	109	3.5963	.62597	.05996	3.4775	3.7152	1.80	5.00
Wholesome	79	3.5899	.64760	.07286	3.4448	3.7349	1.40	5.00
Total	567	3.4653	.59649	.02505	3.4161	3.5145	1.40	5.00

This study surveyed the relationship between sincerity of destination personality and tourists' behavioral intention. According to the result of our analysis, the destination personality (sincerity) exerted a negative effect on tourists' behavioral intention with F= 3.661 and p = .006 which was bigger than the significant level of 0.000. Thus, the hypothesis, the destination personality (sincerity) exerted no significant relationship on tourists' behavioral intention.

H9b: There is a significant relationship between destination personality (excitement) and tourists' behavioral intention.

Table 55 Descriptive between destination personality (excitement) and tourists' behavioral intention

Descriptive

Tourists' behavioral intention

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Exciting	193	3.4943	.62218	.04479	3.4060	3.5826	1.40	5.00
Daring	117	3.4444	.61762	.05710	3.3314	3.5575	2.00	5.00
Original	153	3.4013	.54988	.04446	3.3135	3.4891	2.00	5.00
Spirited	104	3.5288	.58785	.05764	3.4145	3.6432	2.00	5.00
Total	567	3.4653	.59649	.02505	3.4161	3.5145	1.40	5.00

The relationship of destination personality (excitement) and tourists' behavioral intention was evaluated and result of the analysis from oneway ANOVA also showed destination personality (excitement) exerted negative effect on tourists' behavioral intention, F= 1.181, p = .316. Thus, the hypothesis of destination personality (excitement) has a significant relationship with tourists' behavioral intention was rejected.

H9c: There is a significant relationship between destination personality (conviviality) and tourists' behavioral intention.

Table 56 Descriptive between destination personality (conviviality) and tourists' behavioral intention

Descriptive

Tourists' behavioral intention

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Friendly	135	3.5748	.57116	.04916	3.4776	3.6720	1.40	5.00
Family Oriented	93	3.5226	.66400	.06885	3.3858	3.6593	2.00	5.00
Charming	118	3.5525	.60521	.05571	3.4422	3.6629	2.40	5.00
Modern	170	3.3424	.55829	.04282	3.2578	3.4269	1.80	5.00
Traditional	51	3.2784	.53677	.07516	3.1275	3.4294	2.00	4.20
Total	567	3.4653	.59649	.02505	3.4161	3.5145	1.40	5.00

This study assessed how destination personality (conviviality) affects tourists' behavioral intention. From the result of our analysis, destination personality (conviviality) had a significant relationship on tourists' behavioral intention, F= 5.18, p = .000 and character of "charming" in Kuala Lumpur will promote tourists' behavioral intention willingness to re-visit and recommend.

H10: There is a significant relationship between age of tourists and overall destination image of Kuala Lumpur.

Table 57 Descriptive between age of tourists and overall destination image

Descriptive

Overall destination image

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Under 20 Years Old	20	3.4200	.40988	.09165	3.2282	3.6118	2.60	4.20
21 - 24 Years Old	165	3.5976	.55259	.04302	3.5126	3.6825	1.80	5.00
25 - 34 Years Old	239	3.5423	.50661	.03277	3.4777	3.6068	1.80	5.00
35 - 44 Years Old	89	3.5528	.56086	.05945	3.4347	3.6710	2.40	5.00
45 - 54 Years Old	40	3.7350	.46274	.07317	3.5870	3.8830	2.80	5.00
55 - 64 Years Old	13	3.6615	.57379	.15914	3.3148	4.0083	3.00	5.00
65 and above	1	3.8000	.	.	.	.	3.80	3.80
Total	567	3.5725	.52562	.02207	3.5291	3.6158	1.80	5.00

Result from the one-way Anowa indicates that age of the tourists exerted negative effect on overall destination image of Kuala Lumpur, F= 1.229, p = .289. The overall destination image showed no significant different among the age groups and so hypothesis of age of tourists has a significant relationship with overall destination image of Kuala Lumpur was rejected.

4.8 Summary

From the framework above, the summary of hypothesis testing results:-

Table 57 Descriptive between age of tourists and overall destination image

Hypothesis		Testing result
H1	Cognitive image → Overall Destination Image	Supported
H2	Affective image → Overall Destination Image	Supported
H3	Destination personality → Overall Destination Image	
H3a	Destination personality (Sincerity) → Overall Destination Image	Supported
H3b	Destination personality (Excitement) → Overall Destination Image	Supported
H3c	Destination personality (Conviviality) → Overall Destination Image	Not supported, p=0.220
H4	Overall Destination Image → Perceived quality	Supported
H5	Perceived trip quality → Satisfaction	Supported
H6	Overall Destination Image → Perceived value	Supported
H7	Perceived value → Satisfaction	Supported
H8	Satisfaction → Tourists' behavioral intention	Supported
H9	Destination personality → Tourists' behavioral intention	
H9a	Destination personality (Sincerity) → Tourists' behavioral intention	Not supported, p=0.006
H9b	Destination personality (Excitement) → Tourists' behavioral intention	Not supported, p=0.316
H9c	Destination personality (Conviviality) → Tourists' behavioral intention	Supported
H10	Age → Overall destination image	Not supported, p=0.289

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

The current study tested the inter-relationship of overall destination image, perceived trip quality and perceived value, satisfaction and tourists' future intention toward Kuala Lumpur. The implications for research, study limitations, and future research directions are discussed in the following paragraph.

5.2 Summary of Finding

In this analysis, a total of 567 questionnaires were taken into account. The respondents are those international tourists who have been visited to Kuala Lumpur. In the total amount of 567, Asia tourists (327) formed the largest group; and follow by Europe (101), Middle East (47), North America (30), South America (28), Oceania (23) and Africa (11).

The respondents to this study is make up of 61.2% female and 38.8% male and single tourists (60.5%) is more than married tourists (39.5%).

Between the ages for the respondents, most of them fall into the category of 25-34 (42.2%). This could also be said that this group of people is having financial independent to enable them to travel around. In this study, most of the tourists