

Kuala Selangor perceived attractiveness as a domestic tourism destination

Journal of Tourism, Hospitality & Culinary Arts (JTHCA)
2018, Vol. 10 (2) pp 63-80
© The Author(s) 2018
Reprints and permission:
UITM Press
Submit date: 14th June 2018
Accept date: 6th November 2018
Publish date: 30th December 2018

Hasan Mohamed Zakaria

Azlizam Aziz

Universiti Putra Malaysia, Malaysia

hasanzack93@gmail.com

Proposed citation:

Zakaria, H.M. & Aziz, A. (2018). Kuala Selangor perceived attractiveness as a domestic tourism destination. *Journal of Tourism, Hospitality & Culinary Arts*, 10(2), 63-80.

Abstract

This study aims to provide a more in-depth knowledge of visitors' perceived attractiveness of a destination. The role of the perceived importance of an attractiveness attribute and the ability of the destination to fulfill visitors' need was assessed using the Multi Attribute Model. Survey was conducted at multiple attraction sites in Kuala Selangor. A total of 390 responses were analyzed using SPSS 23 software program. The result found that heritage, history, and cultural attraction attractiveness attribute was perceived as the most important factor and having the highest ability to satisfy the needs of the visitors. This result provides information on how domestic visitors perceive the attractions in Kuala Selangor and on which attribute to be focused by destination marketers for future marketing strategy.

Keywords:

Destination, attractiveness, Kuala Selangor, Multi Attribute Model

1 Introduction

Tourism has emerged as a fast-growing industry in many countries, contributing significantly to their economy. The continued viability of this industry, in the long run, is dependent on the increasing proportion of the world's population. Tourism as an activity involves the movement of visitors from their point of origin to their selected destination. Depending on the type of tourism they are seeking for, tourists travel

outside of their national or international boundary. In this process, visitors shall come across different organizations or individuals that provide them with various tourism services and products (Azura et al., 2007).

It is important to understand that a visitor's attraction can only be defined about the evaluation of someone who considers it an attraction. Attraction cannot be measured without explicit reference to a visitor's context. However, no such context-related evaluation has so far been fully tried. Most evaluations on visitor's attraction are largely based on the destinations' characteristics (Formica & Uysal, 2006; Kim, 1998; Lee et. al, 2010; Crompton, 1979). Evaluation of different attractions that have been provided by the destination plays an important role in determining the attractions that are suitable, interesting, and able to attract visitor to visit the place.

In the early 1960s and 1970s, destination attractiveness had received much attention from researchers regarding its concept or measurement (Kozak & Rimmington, 1998; Sparks, 2007; Um et al., 2006). Attributes in a destination have been identified to determine the attractiveness of tourism destinations. Some of the attractiveness attributes of a particular destination receive good feedback from the tourist while others may not (Lee et al., 2009). Thus, attractiveness attributes need to be measured as they will affect the decision of tourists in choosing their destination and the tendency to revisit it.

As one of the tourism destinations in Selangor, and place for multiple attractions and products (Table 1), Kuala Selangor provides many types of attractions such as heritage, natural area, gastronomy, and recreation area, the location of Kuala Selangor nearby Klang Valley and the development of Lebuhraya Kuala Lumpur-Kuala Selangor (LATAR) expressway have improved the accessibility for visitors, attracting more visitors to Kuala Selangor in recent years. Like Putrajaya and Shah Alam, Kuala Selangor offers unique tourism attractions which are depicted in Table 1. Putrajaya has multiple attractions including Perdana Putra, Putra Mosque, and Putra Square which become the main attractor for visitors to visit. On the other hand, Shah Alam provides nature and adventure attractions, such as Skytrex and Shah Alam National Botanical Garden.

These two nearby destinations offer almost the same number of attractions as Kuala Selangor does. However, these two destinations receive a higher number of visitors compared to Kuala Selangor. In 2016, the number of visitors who visited Putrajaya reached millions (Putrajaya Corporation, 2016) while Shah Alam Botanical Garden received 383,329 visitors (TBNSA, 2016). Thus, there is a need to study the attractiveness of Kuala Selangor which has the potential to diversify tourism in the state of Selangor. For this strong reason, planners, marketers and service providers at Kuala Selangor must be able to create strategic tourism marketing plans to encourage more visitors and fulfill the expectations of the market. Thus, research is needed to evaluate the attractiveness of Kuala Selangor to provide necessary information and knowledge.

The diversity of attractions in a destination provides ample choices, opportunities, and reasons for a visitor to visit a destination. The diversity of the offered products in a

destination needs to be coherent and linked between them (Farmaki, 2012; Jansen-Verbeke, 1986; Lawton & Weaver, 2006). Thus, it will increase the frequency of visitation to a destination.

Table 1: Places of interest around Kuala Selangor

Attraction Type	Place of Interest
Ecotourism	Bukit Malawati
	Kelip-kelip Kampung Kuantan
	Taman Alam Kuala Selangor
	Pantai Remis Jeram
	Kelip-kelip Bukit Belimbing
	Pantai Sungai Sembilang Jeram
	Bagan Pasir Penambang Kuala Selangor
Agro tourism	Peladang Agrotourism Centre Homestay
Cultural and Heritage Tourism	Muzium Sejarah Kuala Selangor
	Pameran Bukit Malawati
Homestay	Homestay Sg. Sireh
Sport Tourism	Royal Golf Club Kg. Kuantan
Edu-tourism	INPENS International College
	Universiti Selangor (UNISEL) 3
Gastronomy and Shopping	Restaurant Ikan Bakar Pantai Jeram
	Aroma Ikan Bakar Pantai Jeram
	Restaurant Kuala Selangor Pasir Penambang
	Satay Hut Tanjung Karang
	Bagan Pasir Penambang
	Kompleks Ikan Masin, Pasir Penambang

Sources: *Tourism Selangor Berhad (2014), Kajian Rancangan Struktur Negeri Selangor (2035)*

Iconic place such as Bukit Malawati, Kampung Kuantan (firefly), Taman Ikan Air Tawar Tawar, Taman Alam Kuala Selangor and Homestay (Inap Desa) are among the main attractions that have attracted a high number of visitors in recent years to Kuala Selangor. Table 2 reports the number of visitors entered Kuala Selangor.

Table 2: Number of visitors visited Kuala Selangor

Attraction/Place	Number of Visitor
Kuala Selangor	286,691
Bukit Malawati	111,741
Kg. Kuantan (Kelip-Kelip)	46,317
Taman Ikan Air Tawar	41,426
Taman Alam Kuala Selangor	36,832
Muzium Sejarah Daerah Kuala Selangor	50,375

Source: *Tourism Selangor Berhad (2014), Kajian Rancangan Struktur Negeri Selangor (2035)*

However, from Table 2, the number of visitors who have visited Kuala Selangor was un-even; they were only concentrated in one particular destination instead of visiting other attractions that were offered nearby said destination such as Bukit Melawati. In 2013, Bukit Melawati had the highest number of visitors while other attractions such as Kg Kuantan (firefly), Taman Ikan Air Tawar, and Taman Alam Kuala Selangor received 50% fewer visitors. Such uneven distribution of visitors affects the current tourism activities and development in Kuala Selangor.

The study of destination attractiveness could boost the development of infrastructure and facilities in the attraction area. Developing in such a way will also help to preserve all the resources for present and future use (McIntosh, Goeldner & Ritchie, 1995; Inskeep, 1994). In Kuala Selangor, there are many resources including heritage building, beach, and natural areas that can be developed and preserved so that each attraction can attract more tourists. The study of destination attractiveness will help improve the economic activities in Kuala Selangor and avoid the physical obsolescence of historical buildings and the surrounding areas (Anbalangan, 2000).

As a destination marketer, the information gathered from this study is crucial to identify on how visitors see Kuala Selangor as a tourism destination, how the visitors choose a place to visit, how to meet visitor expectations, how they perceive an attraction and which of the attraction appealing the most and which is less. Therefore, this study evaluates how important each one of the attractions in influencing visitor's decision to visit Kuala Selangor. In addition, this study assesses the ability of each one of the attractions in meeting visitor's need during the visit to Kuala Selangor and measure the overall attractiveness of Kuala Selangor based on both the importance and ability of each attraction.

1.1 Destination attractiveness

In the recent decades, tourism research field and policy makers for a tourism destination have given attention in the concept of destination attractiveness and its measurement (Formica & Uysal, 2006; Kim, 1998; Lee et al., 2010). The attractiveness of a destination affects a person's destination of choice, the desire of fulfillment, intention to revisit, the perception of benefits and motivations, positive impression of

sentiment pioneers, the measure of cash spent, and duration of stay (Henkel et al., 2006).

As mentioned in the study by Mayo and Jarvis (1982) and Vengesayi (2003), destination attractiveness can be referred to as the visitors' perception about a destination and its ability to satisfy their needs. Hence, the study of destination attractiveness is necessary to understand the relative importance of drawing people to travel and their frequency of visit (Lee et al., 2009). Joseph et al. (2018) in the study of festivities and the tourism destination attractiveness of Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria defined that destination attractiveness was the physical, cultural or ambient features of a place that visitor perceived about a destination.

An area without attractiveness cannot be developed in the tourism industry but can be considered as a primary element in a tourism system, allowing consumers to have the much-needed motivation to make a decision (Lo & Jim, 2015). Furthermore, the unique attributes in a destination will determine its attractiveness. The attractiveness attribute will influence the visitors' evaluation of destination attractiveness and decision to choose a destination (Cheng-Fei Lee et al., 2009). As indicated by Cracolici, Nijkamp, and Rietveld (2008), attractiveness can be referred to as the service that satisfies the visitor in terms of availability, quality, and management. Thus, attractiveness has influenced the motivation of visitors to travel (Ke, 2012).

There are two major study approaches in the context of destination attractiveness. The first approach is referred as the tourism attraction which focuses on the physical features of the destination while the second approach focuses on the intangible features that are the mental constructs that exist only in the mind of potential and actual visitors (Mikulić et al., 2016). In this study, by using the first approach, the visitors evaluated the destination attractiveness according to the attractiveness attribute available in Kuala Selangor.

1.2 Factor influencing destination attractiveness

Most studies on the factors influencing destination attractiveness mainly focus on the destination's accessibility, amenities and infrastructure, scenery, and local community (Reitsamer et al., 2016). In a study conducted by Gearing et al. (1974), the attributes of destination attractiveness were grouped into the following five major categories: natural factors, social factors, historical factors, recreational and shopping facilities, infrastructure, food, and shelter. The process of determining the factor began by preparing a list of possible destination attributes based on the literature review presented in this study, including the research on tourism destination attractiveness, and the tourism attractions offered in Kuala Selangor. For this study, these factors or attractiveness attributes were selected based on the type of attractions available in Kuala Selangor. These attractiveness attributes are summarized as shown in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Summarization of attractiveness attribute

Attribute	Summary
Heritage, History and Cultural Attraction	This attribute includes historical building, museum, arts, and crafts
Culture and Community Attraction	This attribute comprises of local hospitality a pleasant attitude toward visitors, price levels for services, communication barrier, and unique custom
Agrotourism	This attribute includes any activities related to agriculture such as farm visit, harvesting, planting, and fishing
Cuisine	This attribute includes restaurants, food stall, and traditional cuisine
Event	This attribute includes all event held in Kuala Selangor such as concert, festival, fair
Adventure and Sport Attraction	This attribute includes all sport and recreation activities such as a marathon, ATV ride, football game, and nature trekking
Nature Attraction	This attribute includes the outdoor attraction, natural beauty of the area and unique landscape.
Shopping	This attribute includes the shopping activities mall and market

Sources: Azlizam (2002) and Aswad (2014)

2 Methodology

2.1 Measurement of attractiveness

In the previous destination attractiveness study, Gearing, Swart, and Var (1974) were among the pioneers that developed the touristic attractiveness measurement. Their study evaluated multiple destinations in Turkey using a set of determinant attributes to identify the destination attractiveness. The study by Chen and Hsu (2000) used 18 generic destination-related attributes that were tied to destination image to investigate the attribute that influenced Korean visitors' perceived destination image and identify the relationship between visitors' perception of attractiveness and their decision to travel abroad. To measure the destination attractiveness, the researchers explored the top image attributes such as trip planning timeframe, budgeted travel costs, and length of the travel which influence the consumers' destination choice. The researchers found that visitors tend to make decisions within two months before their departure when the travel cost was perceived as low.

The study by Castro, Souza, and Thapa (2015) in National Park of Brazil mentioned that destination attractiveness could be predicted through reputation, recreation facilities, attractions in the region and the population density. The study also found that the attractiveness attribute of the national park is a strategic planning tool for protected

areas. Reitsamer and Brunner-Sperdin (2017) on the other hand measured destination attractiveness using Gestalt theory and the landscape preference approach of Kaplan and Kaplan (1989) the impact of place perception on tourist well-being in three different Austrian regions of tourism destinations.

A study by Azlizam, Syed-Alias, Mazlina, Idris, and Manohar (2018) suggested 13 attributes to measure the attractiveness of Kuala Tahan National Park. In their research, the average index of each of the attractions available was measure by multiplying the intensity of individual statements to the number of persons who are having the same intensity, and the score was divided with the number of samples. Similarly, Idris, Aziz, and Samdin (2015) evaluated 20 attributes to measure the attractiveness of Bukit Nanas Recreational Forest as an ecotourism destination.

From the earlier review, the most accurate source to measure destination attractiveness is by determining the visitor perception. The introduction of the multi-attribute model in perception-attractiveness studies has become one of the most important contributions as it provides the necessary research framework to measure destination attractiveness.

2.2 Destination Attractiveness Model

Destination attractiveness model is a modified model from ATO model Fishbein (1967) by specifying attractiveness as an indication of an individual's attitude towards a destination. This modified model is a similar model used and tested by Matejka (1973), Brayley, Var, and Sheldon, (1990), Yangzhou and Ritchie (1993) and Azlizam (2002). This model can be shown in the following equation:

$$T_i = a_i = \sum_{k=1}^n B_{ik}E_k$$

such that:-

- T_i = Attractiveness of destination (Attractiveness)
- a_i = A unidimensional measure of respondent's attitude toward a destination
- B_{ik} = The strength of respondents' belief or perceived importance of a attractiveness attribute k is possessed by destination
- E_k = The degree of performance or ability of attractiveness attribute to satisfy respondents' own need

The main component that is importance or belief is retained in this modified version. Performance or ability component in this model enables this study to investigate the ability of each attractiveness attribute perceived by visitor and the relative importance

of those attractiveness attribute in determining visitation to the destination. As for this study, the attractions associated with Kuala Selangor as the attractiveness attribute were examined. As mentioned before, these attraction types included historical attraction, nature, and cuisine. The sampling population of this study consisted of domestic visitors arriving in Kuala Selangor, who are 18 years old or older. Potential respondents were randomly selected from any of the selected important attractions in Kuala Selangor such as Bukit Melawati, Muzium Sejarah Kuala Selangor and Kelip-kelip Kg Kuantan.

Temporal stratified random sampling was used in this study. Respondents were divided into four strata based on the different period that are a weekday, weekend, public holiday and school holiday. For each location, the number of respondents selected was based on the number of visitors in each attraction. The study only focused on domestic visitor in Kuala Selangor. This sampling technique allows for the variability through a time of the gathered information from the visitor (Rivest, 2002; Allee & Hidioglou, 1988).

The questionnaire was constructed based on two types of validity: face and content validity. For content validity, an expert panel was used to validate the instrument. This was to ensure that the attribute in the questionnaire represented the purpose and objective of the instrument (Gall et al., 2003). Before the pilot study, to establish face validity, 15 questionnaires were distributed in three different attractions in Kuala Selangor: Bukit Melawati, Taman Rimba Alam, and Kelip-kelip Kg Kuantan. The process was to ensure the questionnaire applied to be used as the actual research instrument (Ary et al., 2002).

The pilot study was necessary to determine the reliability of the instrument, the time needed by the respondent to complete the questionnaire, the suitability of the language used, and the problem of understanding. From the pilot study, the questionnaires were modified and improved to eliminate any ambiguous statements based on the responses and recommendations of the respondents to ensure that the instrument (questionnaire) was reliable before the actual survey was carried. In this study, there were no attributes eliminated as the reliability test showed that the attribute has high internal consistency.

The Socio-demographic data, visitors' profile, visitors' trip characteristics to Kuala Selangor, and measurement of destination attractiveness (importance of the destination attractiveness and perceived ability) were analyzed using descriptive analysis. As indicated by Finn et al. (2000), the mean was calculated by dividing the total values of the data set by the number of values while the use of percentages helped compare two or more variables. Besides that, to assess the variance of mean scores, the standard deviation was used in this study. Data was more focused on mean if the standard deviation was small, and *vice versa* (Finn et al., 2000; Field, 2009).

Mean multiplicative score was used to measure the attractiveness of Kuala Selangor. The mean from each attractiveness attribute was derived by multiplying the

mean importance and the mean ability. As mentioned in the previous chapter, this calculation was based on the ATO formula by Fishbein (1967) and modified by specifying attractiveness as an indication of an individual’s attitude towards the destination.

3 Findings

3.1 Socio-demographic Characteristics of Respondents

According to the Table 1.4, most of the respondents surveyed was between the age of 21–30 years old which accounted for 38.2 % (f=149) of the total respondents followed by 31-40 years old (25.4%, 15-20 years old (24.9%) and 41-50 years old (9%). The least age group was 51 years old and above (2.6%). The second item of the socio-demographic characteristic is the gender of respondents. The frequencies of the male are 152 (39%), and frequencies of the female are 238 (61%). Next is the household monthly income. Majority of the respondents fell within between RM0 – RM2000 income group (63.3%) followed by RM2001 – RM3000 income group (13.1%) and RM6001 and above income category (9.2%). For income group RM3000 – RM4000 the frequency is 24 (6.2%) while income group RM4001 – RM5000 is represented by 21 respondents (5.4%). The smallest income group is RM5001 – RM6000 (2.8%). For the level of education, respondents were asked to state their latest level of education either primary school, high school, university/college or no formal education. Majority of the respondent attended university/college which accounts for 259 (66.4%) followed by high school (32.3%), primary school (0.8%) and for no formal education (0.5%).

Table 4: Socio-demographic characteristics of respondent

Items	Categories	Frequencies	Percentage (%)
Age*	15 - 20 years old	97	24.9
	21 - 30 years old	149	38.2
	31 - 40 years old above	99	25.4
	41 - 50 years old above	35	9.0
	51 – above	10	2.6
Gender	Male	152	39.0
	Female	238	61.0
Household monthly income	0 – 2000	247	63.3
	2001 – 3000	51	13.1
	3001 – 4000	24	6.2
	4001 – 5000	21	5.4
	5001 – 6000	11	2.8
	6001 – above	36	9.2
Level of education	Primary school	3	0.8
	High school	126	32.3
	University / College	259	66.4
	No formal education	2	0.5
Employment status	Employed full time	159	40.8

	Employed part-time	14	3.6
	Student	179	45.9
	Own business	25	6.4
	Unemployed	13	3.3
Ethnic group	Malay	302	77.4
	Chinese	37	9.5
	Indian	34	8.7
	Others	4	1.0

Source: Field data (2017)

In terms of employment status, most of them are students that account for 179 respondents (45.9%) and employed full time with the frequency of 159 respondents (40.8%). Other employment status shows a big different from these two categories. For own business category, the frequency is 25 respondents (6.4%), employed part-time with 14 respondents (3.6%) and lastly unemployed category with 11 respondents (3.3%) along with the students (15.3%) and unemployed (14.4%). As for the ethnic group of respondents, Malay is the largest group that is represented by 302 respondents (77.4%) followed by Chinese, 37 respondents (9.5%), Indian that is 34 respondents (8.7%) and lastly other ethnic groups that are four respondents (1%).

3.2 Attractiveness of Kuala Selangor

To analyse the perceived attractiveness of Kuala Selangor as a tourism destination, this study applies the same technique as applied by Azlizam (2002) and Aswad (2012). Mean multiplicative between importance scores (Eik) and Ability (Bik) was used for calculating the attractiveness scores of attributes of Kuala Selangor as shown in Table 1.5 below. The results will answer the specific objective for the research; to measure the overall attractiveness of Kuala Selangor.

Table 5: Mean multiplicative attractiveness scores (Eik.Bik) of attractiveness attributes of Kuala Selangor

Attractiveness attributes	¹ Importance (Bik)	² Ability (Eik)	(Eik. Bik)	Rank
Heritage, history and cultural attraction	4.05	4.28	17.33	1
Culture and community attraction	3.89	2.78	10.81	4
Agrotourism	3.61	2.36	8.52	7
Cuisine	3.46	3.30	11.42	2
Event	3.29	2.92	9.61	6
Adventure and sport tourism	3.40	3.08	10.47	5
Nature attraction	4.35	2.54	11.05	3
Shopping	2.86	2.75	7.87	8

¹ Respondents were requested to indicate the level of importance of each item on a 5-point Likert scale where 1 is "extremely not important" to 5 "Very important".

²Respondent were requested to indicate the level of performance of each item on a 5-point Likert scale where 1 is “very poor” to 5 “excellent”.

n=390; *Eik.Bik* is the overall attractiveness

Based on the table, heritage, history, and cultural attraction were perceived by the visitor as the most attractive with the mean multiplicative score (*M*=17.33). The second highest mean multiplicative score is cuisine (*M*=11.42) followed by nature attraction (*M*=11.05). The visitor also perceived that shopping is the least attractive with the mean multiplicative score (*M*=7.87). An importance-performance analysis was used to get the efficient result to determine the specific weaknesses and strength of the attributes.

Table 6: Perceived importance and ability of the attractiveness attributes of Kuala Selangor

Attractiveness attributes	¹ Importance		² Ability		T-test
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Heritage, history and cultural attraction	4.05	.97	4.28	.74	-4.53
Culture and community attraction	3.89	.95	2.78	.92	21.09
Agrotourism	3.61	1.08	2.36	.93	21.56
Cuisine	3.46	1.10	3.30	1.10	2.74
Event	3.29	1.12	2.92	1.08	6.28
Adventure and sport tourism	3.40	1.17	3.08	1.12	5.48
Nature attraction	4.35	.88	2.54	.82	37.78
Shopping	2.86	1.24	2.75	1.21	1.76

¹ Respondents were requested to indicate the level of importance of each item on a 5- point Likert scale where one is “extremely not important” to 5 “Very important.”

² Respondents were requested to indicate the level of performance of each item on a 5-point Likert scale where one is “very poor” to 5 “excellent.”

** *p* < .05, *** *p*<.01, *****p*<.001; *n*=384

Based on Table 6, heritage, history and cultural attraction (*M*¹=4.05, *M*²=4.28) were perceived as the most attractive compared to other attractiveness attributes at Kuala Selangor. There were multiple historical attractions in Kuala Selangor such as Melawati Fort, poisoned well, Bedrock (*Batu Hampar*), and a lighthouse that visitors could visit while visiting Kuala Selangor. The study done by Kale and Weir (1986) found that culture was the most important factor as the touristic attribute for the Americans when visiting India because India has a long history and unique cultural traditions.

The table (Table 6) also showed that the second highest attractiveness attribute was cuisine. Kuala Selangor offered a large variety of food from traditional to modern cuisines. As Kuala Selangor is situated near to the coast such as Pantai Remis, fresh seafood has become one of the pull factors for visitors. Cuisine can be considered as one of the most enjoyable activities that can be done in a holiday destination and visitors

are less likely to reduce their expenses on cuisine (Pyo et al., 1991; Ryan, 1997). This result was supported by previous studies that highlighted the increase in the number of people travelling for gastronomical reasons (Bessiere, 1998; Hall and Sharples, 2003; Long, 2004).

The study by Enright and Newton (2005) found that food was the second most important attracter for Hong Kong. All these factors have influenced tourism industry as food tourism, becoming a pull factor in destination marketing (Boniface, 2003; Cohen & Evieli, 2004; Hall & Sharples, 2003; Hjalager & Richards, 2002; Okumus et al., 2007). Meanwhile, the high perceived attractiveness in nature attraction was supported by the study done by Balmford et al. (2009). They stated that nature-based tourism industry had grown rapidly all over the world; this phenomenon gave difficulty to the two major economic countries such as the USA and Japan in attracting tourists. Nature attraction as top three most attractive attributes was supported by the study by Dwyer et al. (1989) who found that visitors were willing to pay a high value for these elements and other 'green feature' in the environment including trees, forests, lake, and picnic areas. This includes other additional benefits such as water resources, lack of crowds, lack of vandalism, and less litter in natural areas.

Studies by few researchers (Cracolli & Nijkamp, 2008; Mayo, 1973; Gearing, Swart & Var, 1974; Ritchie & Zin, 1978) found that natural beauty and scenery were the most important attribute perceived by tourists in determining the destination attractiveness. Kim et al. (2012) also mentioned in their study that the most basic element in attracting tourists to a location was the natural form and landscape. Tourists preferred to visit Europe, Middle-East and South-East Asian countries for their natural tourism destinations (Laarman & Gregersen, 1996; Priskin, 2001; Tisdell & Wilson, 2012). It is also found that nature-based tourism in the third world countries had increasing numbers of visits.

As for culture and community attraction, the attractiveness score was below than nature attraction. Homestay attraction was perceived as less attractive compared to Kelip-Kelip Kg Kuantan and Taman Rimba Alam Kuala Selangor. The finding also supported the research done by Ritchie and Zins (1978) who found socio-cultural characteristics were perceived as second only to natural beauty in their study of attractiveness in Quebec City. Later in 2008, Cracolli and Nijkamp stated that cultural and social characteristics were perceived as the second most important when compared to accessibility and other attractiveness attributes.

The less attractive adventure and sports attraction can be related to the natural characteristics and different landscape. The diverse natural characteristics and different landscape will allow for a wide range of sporting activities thus increasing the attractiveness in adventure and sports attraction (Egner, 2000; Lehar & Frischhut, 2009; Pomfret, 2006; Fehringer & Bayer, 2017). Sporting events such as marathon are seasonal, occurring two to three times a month. During data collection, there was no sports event held in Kuala Selangor.

4 Conclusion

Most domestic visitors who had visit Kuala Selangor are female, in the age category 21 to 30 years old and income category less than RM2000 per month. Most of them have a university or college level of education and belong to the Malay ethnic group. From the trip information, most the visitors use the car as the main transportation and enquire the information about Kuala Selangor from family and friends. The visitors who visited Kuala Selangor conducted sightseeing and touring as the main reason. As for the current trip to Kuala Selangor, most of the visitors are a day tripper and the visitors that stay one or more night prefer hotel or motel as their accommodations. The visitors that came to Kuala Selangor had taken several leisure trips at least 80km from home during the last 12 months. The visitors also sometime visit historical attraction on their trip, acquire information on a historical attraction when planning their trip and made a selection for pleasure trip based on number and type of its historical attraction.

The general objective of this study was to examine the attractiveness of Kuala Selangor as perceived by domestic visitors. There are four specific objectives for this research. The first objective was set to evaluate the perceived importance of attractiveness attribute in Kuala Selangor in the visitors' decision to visit, while the second objective was to measure the visitors' perceived ability of attractiveness attribute in Kuala Selangor. In order to answer the objective, 5 factor of attractiveness attributes were listed. In perceived importance, heritage, history, and cultural attraction were seen as the most important attractiveness attribute in Kuala Selangor as a tourism destination.

In contrast, shopping gets the least importance attribute. Heritage, history and cultural attraction also were perceived as having the highest ability to satisfy the visitor's need. Agrotourism was perceived as having the least ability to satisfy the visitor's need. As for overall attractiveness, heritage, history, and cultural attraction were perceived as the most attractive attribute among all in Kuala Selangor. On an overall basis, the attractiveness of Kuala Selangor was found to be 10.89 out of 25.00 indicating the district as having a relatively low attractiveness as a tourism destination.

However, the result of this study proved that the attraction in Kuala Selangor was not quite attractive as the score of attractiveness is average. The low score of attractiveness is because of the high importance of each attractiveness attribute but had low ability to satisfy the need of the visitor. This could be due to the attractions in the area that not well managed such as in Taman Ikan Air Tawar and Taman Rimba Alam that fail to offer a unique attraction. Some attraction however well managed as a tourism site, this includes Kelip-kelip Kg Kuantan and Bukit Melawati.

The further testing of Multi Attribute Model or the theory of Attitude toward Object in Kuala Selangor by using specifying attractiveness attribute has proved that the model or theory can be replicated to measure attitude and destination attractiveness of visitor in the current destination. The replication of this model in Kuala Selangor may increase

the knowledge on how the model works and could create the space for improvements. Despite these results, the study managed to gather some valuable information pertaining to the perception of domestic visitors on the ability of each attractiveness attribute in Kuala Selangor. Similarly, the domestic visitors had also indicated the most and least important attractiveness attribute in their decision to visit Kuala Selangor. Such information is vital to give managers directions to take in the future to improve Kuala Selangor as a tourism destination.

Moreover, from the present study, the results demonstrate deeper understanding of destination attractiveness to define the contextual setting in which attractiveness has been assessed. The study on multiple types of attractions in Kuala Selangor may provide crucial information on Kuala Selangor's position in the highly competitive domestic tourism environment. For the marketers, especially tourism agencies, instead of focusing on few attractions, now the marketers can strategize for all attractions to be promoted in the future. Promoting multiple attractions in Kuala Selangor will help tourism agencies to diversify Kuala Selangor's tourism profile. The importance of such diversification effort is to ensure that Kuala Selangor no longer depends on the existing attractions such as Bukit Melawati and Kelip-Kelip Kg Kuantan.

For future research, this study may provide some directions to be taken by other researchers who might be interested in studying in-depth about other small attractions that may influence domestic visitors to visit Kuala Selangor. For example, instead of distributing questionnaires at top attractions, researchers may distribute them at other attractions as well. This will help to elicit deeper information and understanding about Kuala Selangor. Besides that, future research may include foreign visitors as respondents. The perception of the domestic and foreign visitor may differ from one another. The study with domestic and foreign visitors may increase the knowledge on how the visitors perceive the attractions in Kuala Selangor.

Furthermore, to obtain deeper understanding of how Kuala Selangor is being perceived and evaluated by visitors, the questionnaire can include various type of attractions in detail. From this improvement, the researcher can examine in details about factors influencing visitors to come to visit Kuala Selangor. Also, towards the goal of obtaining deeper information from the visitors, future research is therefore encouraged to investigate the subject from different perspectives such as marketing, resource management, visitor/crowd management, conservation communication, tourist behavior and so on. As such, in the future, the management and authority will have more comprehensive data to base their decision in managing the resources at Kuala Selangor for public enjoyment and its sustainability.

5 References

Allee, P. L. V., & Hidiroloui, M. A. (1988). On the stratification of skewed populations. *Survey methodology*, 14(1), 33-43.

- Anbalangan, V. (2000). A place steeped in history and legend, it is now almost a ghost town. *New Straits Times*. 8 September.
- Azlizam, A. (2002). *An Evaluation of the Attractiveness of Langkawi Island as a Domestic Tourist Destination Based on the Importance and Perceptions of Different Types of Attractions* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Information and Learning Company (3074967).
- Azlizam, A., Syed-Alias, S.N.H., Mazlina, J., Idris, N.H. & Manohar, M. (2018). The attractiveness of Taman Negara National Park, Malaysia as perceived by local visitors. *Journal of Wildlife and Parks*, 33.
- Azura; R. Joy and M. R. Salimbangan, (2007). *Residents' Perception on the Impacts of Tourism Development*. Guiuan: Eastern Samar.
- Balmford, A., Beresford, J., Green, J., Naidoo, R., Walpole, M., & Manica, A. (2009). A Global Perspective on Trends in Nature-Based Tourism. *PLoS Biology* 7(6), e1000144. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.1000144>.
- Bessiere, J. (1998). Local development and heritage: Traditional food and cuisine as tourist attractions in rural areas. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 38(1), 21–34.
- Boniface, P. (2003). *Tasting tourism: Traveling for food and drink*. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing.
- Brayley, R., Var, T., & Sheldon, P. (1990). Perceived influence of tourism on social issues. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 17(2), 285–289. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383\(90\)90089-A](https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(90)90089-A).
- Castro, E.V., Souza, T.B., Thapa, B. (2015), Determinants of tourism attractiveness in the national parks of Brazil. *Parks*, 21(2), 51-62.
- Chen, J. S., & Hsu, C. H. (2000). Measurement of Korean tourists' perceived images of overseas destinations. *Journal of Travel Research*, 38(4), 411-416.
- Cohen, E., & Evieli, N. (2004). Food in tourism: Attraction and impediment. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(4), 755–778.
- Cracolici, M. F., Nijkamp, P., & Rietveld, P. (2008). Assessment of tourism competitiveness by analysing destination efficiency. *Tourism Economics*, 14(2), 325-342.
- Dwyer, J. F., Schroeder, H. W., Louviere, J. J., & Anderson, D. H. (1989). Urbanites willingness to pay for trees and forests in recreation areas. *Journal of Arboriculture*, 15(10), 247-252.
- Egner, H. (2000): *Trend- und Natursport als System. Die Karriere einer Sportlandschaft am Beispiel Moab, Utah*. Mainz: Johannes Gutenberg-Universität.
- Enright, M. J., & Newton, J. (2005). Determinants of tourism destination competitiveness in Asia Pacific: Comprehensiveness and universality. *Journal of travel research*, 43(4), 339-350.
- Fehringer, A., & Bayer, J. (2017). Characterisation of Alpine summer sport tourists.
- Fishbein, M. (1967). Attitude and the prediction of behavior. *Readings in attitude theory and measurement*.
- Farmaki, A. (2012). A comparison of the projected and the perceived image of Cyprus. *Tourismos*, 7(2), 95-119.
- Formica, S., & Uysal, M. (2006). Destination attractiveness based on supply and demand evaluations: An analytical framework. *Journal of Travel Research*, 44(4), 418–430.
- Gearing, C. E., Swart, W. W., & Var, T. (1974). Establishing a Measure of Touristic Attractiveness. *Journal of Travel Research*, 12(4), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1177/004728757401200401>.
- Hall, C. M., & Sharples, L. (2003). The consumption of experiences or the experience of consumption? An introduction to the tourism of taste. *Food Tourism around the World: Development, Management and Markets*, London, Butterworth-Heinemann.

- Henkel, R., Henkel, P., Agrusa, W., Agrusa, J., & Tanner, J. (2006). Thailand as a tourist destination: Perceptions of international visitors and Thai residents. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 11(3), 269-287.
- Hjalager, A., & Richards, G. (Eds.). (2002). *Tourism and gastronomy*. London: Routledge.
- Idris, N. H., Aziz, A., & Samdin, Z. Measuring the Attractiveness of Bukit Nanas Recreation Forest as Ecotourism Destinations. *Adventure and Ecotourism in Malaysia*, 87.
- Inskeep, E. (1994). *National and Regional Tourism Planning*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Jansen-Verbeke, M. (1987). Women, shopping and leisure. *Leisure Studies*, 6(1), 71-86.
- Kale, S. H., & Weir, K. M. (1986). Marketing third world countries to the Western traveler: The case of India. *Journal of Travel Research*, 25(2), 2-7.
- Kaplan, R., & Kaplan, S. (1989). *The experience of nature: A psychological perspective*. CUP Archive.
- Kim, H. B. (1998). Perceived attractiveness of Korean destinations. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 25(2), 340-361 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383\(98\)00007-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(98)00007-3).
- Kim, J. H., Ritchie, J. B., & McCormick, B. (2012). Development of a scale to memorable tourism experiences. *Journal of Travel Research*, 51(1), 12-25.
- Ke, L. (2012): The weakness and innovation of China eco-tourism. - *Physics Procedia* 25: 953-957.
- Kozak, M., & Rimmington, M. (1998). Benchmarking: Destination Attractiveness and Small Hospitality Business Performance. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 10(5), 184-188.
- Laarman, J. G., & Gregersen, H. M. (1996). Pricing policy in nature-based tourism. *Tourism Management*, 17(4), 247-254. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0261-5177\(96\)00016-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0261-5177(96)00016-7).
- Lee, C. F., Ou, W. M., & Huang, H. I. (2009). A study of destination attractiveness through domestic visitors' perspectives: the case of Taiwan's hot springs tourism sector. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 14(1), 17-38.
- Lee, C. F., Huang, H. I., & Huery-Ren, Y. (2010). Developing an evaluation model for destination attractiveness: Sustainable forest recreation tourism in Taiwan. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 18(6), 811-828.
- Lehar, G./Frischhut, B. (2009): Outdoor-Sport als Chance gegen die Sommerkrise? In: Mountain. Lo, A. Y., Jim, C. Y. (2015): *Protest response and willingness to pay for culturally significant urban trees: Implications for Contingent Valuation Method*. – *Ecological Economics* 114: 58-66.
- Long, L. M. (Ed.). (2004). *Culinary tourism*. Kentucky: The University Press of Kentucky.
- Mayo, E. J. (1973, August). Regional images and regional travel behavior. In *The Travel Research Association Fourth Annual Conference Proceedings* (pp. 211-218).
- Mayo, E. J., & Jarvis, L. (1982). *The Psychology Of Leisure*.
- Matejka, J. K. (1973). Critical factors in vacation area selection. *Arkansas Business and Economic Review*, 6(1), 17-19.
- McIntosh, R., Goeldner, C., and Ritchie, B. (1995) *Tourism: Principles, Practices, and Philosophies*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Meinung, A. (1989). Determinants of the attractiveness of a tourism region. *Determinants of the attractiveness of a tourism region.*, 99-101.
- Mikulić, J., Krešić, D., Miličević, K., Šerić, M., & Ćurković, B. (2016). Destination attractiveness drivers among urban hostel tourists: An analysis of frustrators and delighters. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 18(1), 74-81.

- Okumus, B., Okumus, F., & McKercher, B. (2007). Incorporating local and international cuisines in the marketing of tourism destinations: The cases of Hong Kong and Turkey. *Tourism management*, 28(1), 253-261.
- Pomfret, G. (2006). Mountaineering adventure tourists: a conceptual framework for research. *Tourism management*, 27(1), 113-123.
- Priskin, J. (2001). Assessment of natural resources for nature-based tourism: the case of the Central Coast Region of Western Australia. *Tourism Management*, 22, 637-648. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177\(01\)00039-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(01)00039-5).
- Pyo, S., Uysal, M., & McLellan, R. (1991). A linear expenditure model for tourism demand. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 18(2), 443-454.
- Reitsamer, B. F., Brunner-Sperdin, A., & Stokburger-Sauer, N. E. (2016). Destination attractiveness and destination attachment: The mediating role of tourists' attitude. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 19, 93-101.
- Reitsamer, B. F., & Brunner-Sperdin, A. (2017). Tourist destination perception and well-being: What makes a destination attractive? *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 23(1), 55-72.
- Ritchie, J. B., & Zins, M. (1978). Culture as determinant of the attractiveness of a tourism region. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 5(2), 252-267.
- Rivest, L. P. (2002). A generalization of the Lavallée and Hidiroglou algorithm for stratification in business surveys. *Survey Methodology*, 28(2), 191-198.
- Ryan, C. (1997). *The tourist experience: The new introduction*. London: Cassell.
- Sparks, B. (2007). Planning A Wine Tourism Vacation? Factors That Help to Predict Tourist Behaviour.
- Tisdell, C. A., & Wilson, C. (2012). *Natural-based tourism and conservation: new economic insights and case studies*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781781005163>.
- Um, S., Chon, K., & Ro, Y. (2006). Antecedents Of Revisit Intention. *Annals Of Tourism Research*, 33(4), 1141-1158.
- Vengesayi, S. (2003). A conceptual model of tourism destination competitiveness and attractiveness. ANZMAC 2003 Conference Proceedings, Adelaide, 1-3. (pp. 637-647) December.
- Yangzhou Hu, & Ritchie, J. R. B. (1993). Measuring Destination Attractiveness: A Contextual Approach. *Journal of Travel Research*, 32(25), 25-34. <https://doi.org/10.1177/004728759303200204>.
- Maria, C. B. (2011, March 24). *Stratified Sampling For Time Dependent Survey Variables*. Retrieved From https://Ec.Europa.Eu/Eurostat/Cros/System/Files/NTTS2013fullPaper_103.Pdf
- Departement Of Statistic Malaysia (2016, October 14). *Tourism Satellite Account 2015*. Retrieve From https://Dasm.Gov.My/V1/Index.Php?R=Column/Cthemebycat&Cat=111&Bul_Id=E_kponhlvzllyn001yzinyjbgvmtzqt09&Menu_Id=TE5CRUZCblh4ZTZMODZlBmk2aWRR_QT09
- Carvalho, C. A. (2008). Impact Of Consumer Attitude In Predicting Purchasing Behaviour. *Vasa*, (2005). Retrieved From <http://Medcontent.Metapress.Com/Index/A65RM03P4874243N>
- International Recommendations For Tourism Statistics 2008 (2008). Retrieve From <https://Unstats.Un.Org/Unsd/Tradekb/Knowledgebase/50551/IRTS-2008>

Perbadanan Putrajaya (2016). Retrive From [Http://Www.Ppj.Gov.My/](http://www.ppj.gov.my/)
Taman Botani Negara Shah Alam (2016). Retrive From
[Http://Www.Tbnsa.Gov.My/En/Web/Guest/Number-Of-Visitor](http://www.tbnsa.gov.my/en/web/guest/number-of-visitor)
Tourism Selangor Berhad (2014). *Kajian Rancangan Struktur Negeri Selangor 2035*. Retrive From
[Http://Jpbdselangor.Gov.My/Muat-Turun/Laporan/Rancangan-Struktur-Negeri-
Rsn-1/Draf-Rancangan-Struktur-Negeri-Selangor-2035.Html](http://jpbdselangor.gov.my/muat-turun/laporan/rancangan-struktur-negeri-rsn-1/draf-rancangan-struktur-negeri-selangor-2035.html)