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The purpose of this paper is to review and compare the development of an attitudinal scale for measuring residents’ attitudes toward tourism in the context of the Eastern and Western community. To date, two standardized scales which focused on the Western community were developed by Lankford and Howard (1994) and Ap and Crompton (1998). None, however, has been developed in the context of the Eastern community. Since both the communities have different culture and beliefs toward certain aspects, the development of the scale is important in order to understand resident attitudes. Thus, a study was undertaken in Langkawi Island, Malaysia for the purpose of developing the scale and the results were compared with the existing scale. Several similarities and differences of items are found in the scale developed for both the Eastern and Western contexts.
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INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, the questions of reliability and validity of the measures used for measuring attitude toward tourism have been the main issues in studying tourism impacts. As reported by Ap (1990), out of 20 published papers on resident attitudes and perceptions of tourism impacts, only one reported on the reliability and validity of the measures used. Thus, it is noted that tourism has lagged behind areas in the development and application of both theory and methods used for measuring attitude toward tourism.

Generally, there are three approaches in developing an attitudinal scale. The first approach is by selecting an existing scale and testing it within a different concept or other destinations. The second approach is by modifying an existing scale or introducing a new set of items to the scale. The third approach is by developing totally a new attitudinal scale and accordingly, it follows a procedure by Churchill (1979) and consists of eight steps (Figure 1). The procedure for developing a better scale is also been recognized by Antil and Bennet (1979) and Ap and Crompton (1998).

To date, there are two standardized attitudinal scale that was developed for the purpose of tourism research and both scales followed a procedure suggested by Churchill (1979) and DeVellis (1991). Since both scales focus on the Western tourism context, the items in the scale probably reflect a similar cultural background of the sample community. However, it is important to develop another
scale for the purpose of understanding the attitudes of the Eastern community since it has different cultural background compared to the Western community. French and Italians, for example, are perceived by residents as excessively demanding tourists (Boissevian and Inglott, 1979). Whilst, Americans are perceived by residents as cautious, calculating and purposeful (Brewer, 1978).

Hofstede (1980) identified five dimensions of culture which influenced the behaviour of different communities; power distance, individualism, masculinity, uncertainty avoidance and long-term orientation. Research undertaken by Hofstede (1991) also noted that the Asian societies tend to score high in long-term orientation, collectivism and power distance while the Western societies tend to score low long-term orientation, collectivism, power distance and uncertainty avoidance. Thus, it is important to develop another scale for the purpose of understanding the Eastern community perceptions toward tourism development in their area. Therefore, in order to develop the scale in the Eastern tourism context, a study was undertaken in Langkawi Island, Malaysia.

Accordingly, the objectives of this paper are primarily;
i) to describe the development of the scale in Langkawi Island, Malaysia, and
ii) to review and compare the items appeared from the scale developed in the context of the Eastern community with the scale developed in the context of the Western community.

The findings would be significant in order to understand the cultural background of the Eastern community. It would also indicate that there is a need to develop a different attitude scale from the one that already existed due to the community’s culture.

![Procedure for Developing a Better Scale](image)

Churchill (1979:66)
FRAMEWORK OF THE STUDY

Lankford and Howard (1994) develop Tourism Impact Attitude Scale (TIAS) for the purpose of gauging host community attitudes toward tourism. It involves four steps; the first step is the generation of items, the second step is a pretest scale, the third step is scale purification and finally, the last step is scale verification. TIAS consists of 27 items with two factors; Factor 1 comprises of 18 items that is identified as ‘concern for local tourism development’ whilst, Factor 2 comprises of nine items that is identified as ‘personal and community benefits’ (Table 1). The scale has also been tested in other communities within different destinations (Lankford, 1994; Schneider et. al., 1997).

In accordance, Ap and Crompton (1998) develop another scale based on the consequences existed in TIAS and it involves six steps (Table 2). The first step is development of an item pool (generation of items). In order to assess the clarity and reliability of the scale, and also to reduce the items into a small number, the second step involves a selection of seven panel judges. The third step follows by item wording, the fourth step involves a scale purification method, the fifth step involves a scale verification method, and finally, the last step involves an assessment of convergent validity.

The scale demonstrates a dimensional distinctiveness and stability, internal consistency, content validity and convergent validity. It also consists of 35 items of tourism impacts and seven domains; social and cultural, economic, crowding and congestion, environmental, services, taxes and community attitudes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1 Items</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Factor 2 Items</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Against new tourism development</td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td>Better roads due to tourism</td>
<td>0.807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage tourism in community</td>
<td>0.840</td>
<td>Public service improve due to tourism</td>
<td>0.791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should not attract more visitors</td>
<td>0.810</td>
<td>Have more money to spend</td>
<td>0.789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should encourage tourism in Gorge</td>
<td>0.803</td>
<td>Has increased my standard of living</td>
<td>0.762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage more intensive development</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>More recreation opportunities</td>
<td>0.640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism vital for community</td>
<td>0.759</td>
<td>Provides highly desirable jobs</td>
<td>0.601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council right in promoting tourism</td>
<td>0.753</td>
<td>Shopping opportunities are better</td>
<td>0.559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community should become destination</td>
<td>0.746</td>
<td>Support for local tax levies for tourism</td>
<td>0.487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negatively impacts environment</td>
<td>0.742</td>
<td>Will play major economic role</td>
<td>0.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise level not appropriate</td>
<td>0.730</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More litter from tourism</td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourists are valuable</td>
<td>0.723</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit outdoor recreation development</td>
<td>0.702</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime has increased</td>
<td>0.699</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits outweigh consequences</td>
<td>0.666</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like to see tourism be main industry</td>
<td>0.510</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning can control impacts</td>
<td>0.484</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will provide more jobs in community</td>
<td>0.416</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalues</td>
<td>13.87</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained variance</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha coefficients</td>
<td>0.9612</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of total 27 Item TIAS</td>
<td>0.964</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lankford and Howard (1993:130)
In order to develop an attitudinal scale for measuring residents’ attitudes toward impacts of tourism in the Eastern context, both scales are used as a guideline to begin constructing the scale in Langkawi Island, Malaysia. In addition, it also follows the procedures suggested by Churchill (1979) and Zaichowsky (1985).

**BACKGROUND OF LANGKAWI ISLAND**

Langkawi Island is located at the North of Malaysia and is divided into six districts; Kuah, Ayer Hangat, Bohor, Ulu Melaka and Kedawang. The population of Langkawi Island consists of about 62,617 people with various racial backgrounds. Before 1980s, Langkawi Island was known as an agricultural and fishery area and in fact, it was the largest producer of anchovies in Peninsular Malaysia. Langkawi Island has been selected for this study due to the fact that it reflects various eastern communities. Almost 91.2% of the people in Langkawi Island are Malays, 5.1% are Chinese and 2% are Indians (Langkawi Residential/Socioeconomic Study, 1999). Thus, the development of the scale can contribute to the context of Eastern tourism.

Langkawi Island receives a dramatic impact on the major concerns of the residents’ life such as economic, environmental and socio-cultural since it becomes a tourist destination beginning from 1987 (Ngah, 1991; Din, 1993; Othman, 1998; Kayat, 2000). For the purpose of managing, controlling and promoting the Island as a tourist destination, the government had established Langkawi Development Authority (LADA) in 1990. Through LADA, the government had allocated RM320 million for infrastructure and public facilities development and in addition, under the Sixth Malaysia Plan 1991-1995, the amount had increased to RM350 million. Until 1999, the number of tourist’ arrivals in Langkawi Island was 1,559,528 million and this has proved that it has been successfully marketed as an international tourist destination.

Additionally, Langkawi Island is now considered as a center for tourism development in Malaysia. The growth of tourism in the island has led to several researchers undertaken by both individuals and organizations. Previous study undertaken by Din (1993) in Langkawi Island indicated that the local people perceived economic impacts of tourism development in the island positively since

---

**Table 2**

Scale Development and Purification Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage Number</th>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>Total Number of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Generation of initial item pool</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Items remaining after assessment for content validity by 7 expert judges</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Items loading saliently on specified a priori domains in a factor analysis of pretest data</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Inclusion of 10 items to measure the physical/environmental domain. These items were selected by reliability analysis from among items that were a priori assigned to the physical/environmental by the expert judges</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Additional items emerge in the pretest</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Items loading saliently on domains in a factor analysis of the aggregate data from 958 respondents</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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its benefited them, particularly through increasing more job opportunities and at the same time increased their income and standard of living. However, in a recent study by Mohd Shariff et. al (2000), it was noted that the local people of Langkawi Island actually perceived the economic impacts of tourism negatively due to the fact that tourism development was not the main economic contributor to the island.

The findings of both studies are probably can be explained by the fact that the attitudes of the local people in Langkawi Island were influenced by their cultural background. Kayat (2000) in her study found that the local people of Langkawi Island general values such as religion, culture and environment had more direct influenced on the evaluation of the social impacts of tourism development in the island. Accordingly, the findings also indicated the influenced of the culture to the local people attitudes toward tourism development. The local people of Langkawi Island tend to perceive the impacts of tourism development based on their belief and culture rather than on the fact the development contributes more benefits to them.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE SCALE

Accordingly, the first step in developing the scale involved the generation of tourism impact items. All the 35 items in the scale developed by Ap and Crompton (1998) were included for the test together with several other items cited from the current literature. Interviews were undertaken by using a focus group that consisted of four individuals who were experts in tourism development of Langkawi Island. Their opinion and comments were significant in generating the items at the early stage of the study. An unstructured format was used and the group was asked:

(i) Based on your knowledge and experiences of being in Langkawi, how does tourism in the area affect the residents’ life?
(ii) In your opinion, what are the benefits and costs of tourism in Langkawi?
(iii) What do you think are the major contributions of tourism in Langkawi especially to the residents?

As a result, thirteen additional items were included in the item pool which make it 48 impacts items all together (Table 3).

Table 3  
Tourism Impacts Items (48)

- Increased the noise level
- Demand for cultural activities and programs
- Varieties of cultural activities
- Demand for historical activities and programs
- Opportunities to learn about other people
- Recognition of the local culture
- Varieties of entertainment
- Opportunities to restore and protect historical structures
- Opportunities to meet interesting people
- Understanding of different people and cultures
- Vitality of the residents’ life
- Increased the revenue generated
- Increased the number of jobs
- Increased the residents’ personal income
- Increased the amount of income going to local business
- Varieties of shopping facilities
- Increased the investment spending
- Varieties of restaurants
- Increased the level of traffic congestion
Increased the size of crowds affect the enjoyment of residents activities
Increased the size of crowd restrict residents activities
Increased the number of driving hazards
Destroyed the natural environment
Destroyed the wildlife
Destroyed the quality of natural environment
Increased the level of urbanization
Increased the physical ability of local services
Increased the quality of local services
Increased the financial resources of local services
Increased the amount of local taxes collected
Increased the amount of property taxes collected
Increased the amount of local sales taxes collected
Created the residents’ positive attitude
Created the community spirit among residents
Created the residents’ pride
Increased the level of crime
Increase the standard of living
Increased the amount of vandalism
Created changes in traditional culture
Increased the cost of living
Opportunities for cultural exchange
Created preservation of cultural identity
Improved the image of residents
Improved the appearance of residents’ area
Increased the amount of trade for local businesses
Demand for the accommodation
Disrupted the peace and tranquility
Increased the prices of goods

The next step involved an evaluation and assessment from the panel of expert judges. Nine experts in the field of tourism were selected as judges. Their comments and suggestions were important in determining the content validity of the scale. The judges were asked to indicate whether the item was, (1) clearly representative of a tourism impact, (2) somewhat representative of a tourism impact, or (3) not representative of a tourism impact. They were also asked to indicate if the items were in the, (1) economic domain, (2) environmental domain, (3) social and cultural domain, or (4) other domain to be specified.

The results ended by eliminating four items, one was considered as redundant to the other item; ‘tourism creates a variety of cultural facilities and activities in the residents’ area’, whilst the other three of them were considered as ‘not significant’ to be included in the scale since the variables cannot be measured. The items were, ‘tourism creates preservation of the residents’ cultural identity’, ‘tourism improves the understanding and image of the residents’ and ‘tourism disrupts the peace and tranquility of the residents’. In addition, two items were considered as double-barreled questions because they had two different variables that need to be measured differently.

In order to test for content validity of the scale, the items therefore were restructured from ‘tourism increases the investment and development spending in the residents’ area’ as ‘tourism increases the investment spending in the residents’ area’ and ‘tourism creates opportunities for cultural exchange and education between the residents and tourists’ as ‘tourism creates opportunities for cultural exchange between the residents and tourists’. The end results consisted of 44 items and seven domains; economic, environmental, socio-cultural, crowding, services, community attitudes and taxes.
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For the purpose of scale purification, 220 students from the Northern University of Malaysia were selected as a pretest sample. The data collected was analyzed using a Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) for Windows and the first step was to factor analyze all the items in the scale. Factor analysis was used for removing the redundancy from a set of correlated variables and representing the variables with a smaller set of derived variables. The items were calculated for an item-to-item correlation matrix using a principal component analysis and since the factors were considered as unrelated to or independent of one another, varimax rotation method was used to redefining the factors.

In order to decide on how many factors to remain in the scale, correlation coefficients test was done where items that failed to meet the 0.30 minimum coefficient criteria and/or loaded onto more than one factor were eliminated from the scale (Tinsley and Tinsley, 1987). Besides the factor loadings, the concept of an eigenvalue was also used in the analysis for the purpose of deciding on how many factors to remain. Eigenvalue was the equivalent number of variables which the factor represented. A factor associated with an eigenvalue of more than 1, indicated that the factor accounted for a much variance in the data collection. Thus, items which had less than 1 eigenvalue were eliminated from the scale.

The results ended with 11 factors appeared with eigenvalues above 1. However only four factors were confirmed - environmental, economic, socio-cultural and amenity services/attitude. The factors were then analyzed for internal consistency using Cronbach’s coefficient alpha. According to Sekaran (1992), the test is considered in almost every case as an adequate test of internal consistency reliability. The procedure involved calculating the average intercorrelations among the items measuring the concept. A high consistency was indicated by alpha value of 1 and above. In additions, items with corrected item-to-item correlations below 0.5 were eliminated (Zaichkowsky, 1985; Bearden et. al., 1989). The results had indicated alpha coefficient for the four factors, ranged from 0.64 to 0.91 with a cumulative variance accounted for 48.4%.

In addition, only 19 items had factor loadings above 0.3 and loaded cleanly onto one factor. Since it was only at the beginning of the stage, the scale was further purified and the items were tested for their reliability. In addition, 11 items had item-to-item correlation of above 0.5. Thus, the items to be tested for verification consisted of thirty items. Before the items were further verified, they were revised and carefully worded to avoid bias. The results ended with 29 items where one item was eliminated, ‘the natural environment’ since it was redundant with ‘the quality of the natural environment’.

The sample for the study was selected from each district of Langkawi Island; Kuah, Padang Matsirat, Ayer Hangat, Bohor, Ulu Melaka and Kedawang. For the purpose of making sure that the sampling frame has an equal probability of being selected or was deliberately designed to select proportionately to the size of the area or strata, Probability Proportionate to Size or known as PPS was chosen (Baker, 1999). The sample size was determined by the items remaining in the pretest sample. Accordingly, it was based on the criteria for factor analysis where there should be a minimum of five cases for every item (Tinsley and Tinsley, 1987). Since the items remained were 29, the sample size was calculated as 145 respondents.

The results ended with 17 items loaded cleanly onto one factor and above 0.3 coefficients. Four items loaded onto one factor solution and they were eliminated from the scale since they presented a single item factor that had no meaning. The final results ended with thirteen items and five domains with strong Cronbach’s alpha value ranged from 0.64 to 0.89; environmental, amenity services, socio-cultural, community attitude and economic (Table 4).
DISCUSSIONS

The purpose of this article is to review and compare the items appeared from the development of the scale in the context of Eastern community and the Western community. Langkawi Island was selected as a sample presented an Eastern tourism community for the purpose of developing an attitudinal scale and the results ended with 13 items. All the 13 items were tested for their reliability and the results indicated strong levels of item-to-total correlations, except for two items in the amenity services which indicated low and weak item-to-total correlation of 0.41 and 0.35.
Environmental domain was confirmed in the analysis with Cronbach’s alpha of 0.89 and a variance of 19.2%. Two items however, were not expected to load onto the factor - ‘the capacity of local services to perform their services in the residents’ area’ and ‘the amount of local taxes collected in the residents’ area’. The loading of the two items probably can be explained by the fact that the ability of the local services and the collection of the local taxes due to tourism development in Langkawi Island are found by the residents to significantly affect the environment. The capacity of local services in performing their duties has probably given great impact to the environment instead of the service sector. In addition, the local taxes collected also did not contribute much to the economy of residents in Langkawi Island but probably has affected the overall environment in Langkawi Island.

Meanwhile item, ‘the investment spending in the residents’ area’ which was expected to load onto the economic domain, did not. The same goes to the item, ‘the size of crowds which affect the enjoyment of residents activities in the public area’ which was expected to load onto the crowding domain. Both items loaded cleanly onto the amenity services domain together with ‘the variety of restaurants in the residents’ area’. However, the Cronbach’s alpha of the factor was 0.64, quite low compared to other factors and accounted for only 11.7% of the variance. It is possible that investment spending in Langkawi Island is considered by the residents as one of the factors which contribute to the service sector instead of the economic sector. In fact, size of crowds is probably significant with the opinions of the panel of expert judges where at this stage, the judges believed that tourism development did not cause crowding in Langkawi Island. Only in certain situations, the size of crowds in the island has been the major caused for over-crowding, for example during LIMA (Langkawi International Maritime and Aerospace Exhibition) and Le Tour De Langkawi.

Items, ‘demand for cultural activities and programs in the residents’ area’ and ‘demand for the historical activities and programs in the residents’ area’ represented a logical and natural fit to the sociocultural domain. However the item, ‘the noise level in the residents’ area’ which was expected to load onto the crowding domain, did not. It can be explained by the fact that crowding is not caused by tourism, thus, the noise level due to tourism in Langkawi Island is probably seen to give more impact on the social aspect of the community’s life.

The scale developed for the Eastern tourism context however, has several similarities and differences to the Western scales. Twelve out of thirteen items are consistent with the items in the scale developed by Ap and Crompton (1998). Accordingly, this reveals that the development of the scales is consistent to one another. In fact, one item - ‘standard of living’ is consistent with the item in TIAS (Lankford and Howard, 1994). However, several items in Ap and Crompton (1998) also do not appear prominently from the analysis. The items are consisted in the socio-cultural domain - ‘opportunities to learn about other people and culture’, ‘opportunities to meet interesting people’ and ‘understanding of different people and culture’. The attitude can probably be explained by the fact that the community does not want to accept outsiders because they do not want their cultures to be influenced by tourists. This supported a study undertaken by Mohd. Shariff et. al (2000) which reported that the people of Langkawi perceived tourists negatively because they believed that tourists had badly influenced their cultural background.

Nevertheless, several items which consisted in the other two scales are also eliminated. Item ‘residents’ positive attitude toward tourists’ does not appear prominently in the first place. This would probably due to the fact that residents have their own perceptions toward tourists based on their beliefs and values. In fact, it could also be explained by the fact that the local people of Langkawi have negative attitude toward tourists as indicated in a previous studies (Kayat, 2000; Mohd. Shariff et. al. (2000). Three other items also do not appear from the scale compared to the other
two scales. They are, ‘size of crowds which affect the residents activities in the public area’, ‘the number of driving hazards by tourists’ and ‘the level of traffic congestion’. In this case, residents of Langkawi Island probably do not like to blame tourist for causing problems such as crowding occurred in their area and traffic congestion.

Eventually, the items appeared in the study did not support Doxey’s Irridex Model (1975) which explains that residents’ attitudes toward tourism firstly are positive, then they will change to irritability and resentment in the later stages of the development. In the case of Langkawi Island, the community did not accept tourists in the first place even though they believed that tourism development did create several positive impacts to their area. This consequently supported the study regarding residents’ attitudes toward impacts of tourism in Langkawi Island which indicated that residents tend to perceive impacts of tourism, either positively or negatively depending on how much they would affect their personal lives (Mohd. Shariff and Tahir, 2003).

CONCLUSIONS

The items appeared from the development of the scale actually reflect the cultural background of the community itself. Even though there were only few items which did not appear compared to the items in the scale developed by Ap and Cropmton (1998), these items represent the perceptions of the community toward tourism development in their area and particularly toward the tourists. Eventually, it also indicates that the Eastern community has different cultural background which significantly consistent to a study undertaken by Hofstede (1991). Therefore, the items need to be taken seriously in developing the attitudinal scale for the Eastern context.

TIAS was tested in several communities in order to test for its validation and the results indicated that several other domains appeared from the scale (Rollins, 1997; Schneider et. al., 1997). Thus, this has reflected the diversity of culture in the communities that could determine attitudes toward tourism development. The differences in the factors appeared indicated that there exist different perceptions and attitudes toward tourism development. The reason is because of the different selected areas which consist of Asian and Eastern communities with different cultural backgrounds compared to the Western.

Langkawi Island has been chosen as a survey destination because it is a developing tourism destination which consists of people with different cultural backgrounds. They share different values and beliefs which may influence their attitudes and perceptions toward certain situations. Thus, the development of the scale is important in measuring the extent of their attitudes toward tourism and interpreting the results. It is suggested from the study that the scale can be applied in another tourism context of Eastern community. Even though the scale was tested on a small number of respondents in Langkawi Island, which may not represented the whole Eastern community, the scale has been developed by taking into considerations the cultural background of the Eastern community. Thus, the items appeared from the scale would be valid and reliable enough for the purpose of understanding the residents’ attitudes toward tourism in the context of Eastern community.
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