

**CAPACITY AND ATTITUDE OF HOST COMMUNITY
TOWARDS NEGATIVE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS
OF TOURISM
IN LANGKAWI ISLAND, MALAYSIA**

By

SHARAREH KHOSRAVI HAFTKHANI

**Thesis Submitted in Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of
Philosophy**

February 2016

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Life as a PhD student and living in a foreign country with all the issues you have to deal with has never been easy. Thus, the completion of this thesis has been made possible only through the encouragement and support of many individuals.

First, I would like to extend my heartiest appreciation to my main advisor, Professor Dr. Badaruddin Mohamed, for his invaluable guidance and support throughout my doctoral pursuit. His research skill and personality have truly inspired me personally and professionally. I would also like to thank my wonderful co-advisor, Professor Dr. Vikneswaran Nair, for his time, energy, guidance, and contribution to my work. His constructive suggestions and comments have improved my work and learning experience.

I would like to appreciate my family members Parvin Raissi, Maryam Khosravi, Shadi Khosravi. Their endless love, support, encouragement and prayers is gratefully acknowledged, especially, my patient mother who raised me with a love of science and supported me in all my pursuits. I owe her more than I can adequately express.

I would like to thank my dear friend Dr. Seyed Reza Omranian for his help, and encouragement. I would like to offer him my warmest appreciation and deepest thanks.

Lastly, I gratefully acknowledge the funding source that made my Ph.D. work possible. I was funded by the research grant obtained from the Universiti Sains Malaysia under the Tourism Capacity and Impact Studies grant [Grant No: 1001/PTS/8660011].

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF FIGURES	ix
LIST OF PLATES	x
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xi
ABSTRAK.....	xii
ABSTRACT	xiv
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Introduction.....	1
1.2 Background of the Study	2
1.3 Statement of the Problem	5
1.4 Research Questions	9
1.5 Objectives of the Study	10
1.6 Research Hypothesis	11
1.7 Significance of the Study.....	12
1.8 Scope of the Study.....	13
1.9 Research Methodology	14
1.10 Organization of the Chapters	14
1.11 Definition of Key Terms.....	16
1.12 Conclusion	18
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	19
2.1 Introduction.....	19
2.2 Concept of Community	20

2.2.1	Community Capacity	21
2.2.2	Theory of Community Capacity Building.....	26
2.2.3	Barriers to Community Capacity Building.....	30
2.2.4	Dimensions of Community Capacity	34
2.2.5	Components of Community Capacity Assessment.....	37
2.3	Tourism Development and Administration in Malaysia	47
2.3.1	Tourism Development Policies in Malaysia	50
2.3.2	The Study Site (Langkawi Island)	54
2.3.3	Tourist Arrival in Langkawi Island (1985-2015)	58
2.3.4	Tourism Development in Langkawi Island	60
2.4	Impacts of Tourism Development on Islands of Malaysia.....	62
2.4.1	Environmental Impacts of Tourism on islands.....	65
2.4.2	Habitat Loss and Langkawi Island Challenges	67
2.4.3	Tourism Impacts on Island Communities	69
2.4.4	Host community Attitude toward Tourism Impacts	70
2.4.5	Host Community Attitude toward Environmental Impacts	71
2.4.6	Host Community Attitude and Community Capacity Indicators	73
2.4.7	Measuring Host Community Attitude toward Negative Environmental Impacts of Tourism.....	78
2.5	Conceptual Framework of the Study.....	79
2.5.1	Development of Hypothesis	80
2.6	Conclusion	81
CHAPTER 3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY		83
3.1	Introduction.....	83
3.2	Research Design.....	83
3.3	Method of Study.....	87
3.3.1	Assessment of Community Capacity	87
3.3.2	Quantitative Technique	89
3.4	Sampling Frame	91
3.4.1	Sampling Method.....	92
3.4.2	Langkawi Island Population	93
3.4.3	Sample Size	95
3.4.4	Respondents.....	97

3.4.5	Data Sources for Questionnaire Development	97
3.5	Survey Questionnaire Development.....	99
3.5.1	Background of Respondents.....	100
3.5.2	Level of Community Capacity in Conserving Natural Environment (Exogenous/Independent Variable).....	101
3.5.3	Host Community Attitude toward Negative Environmental Impacts of Tourism (Endogenous/Dependent Variable)	105
3.6	Translation Process	107
3.7	Pilot Test.....	108
3.8	Data Collection	109
3.9	Data Analysis and Interpretation.....	111
3.9.1	Preliminary Data Analysis	111
3.9.2	Partial Least Squares (PLS).....	112
3.10	Conclusion	115
CHAPTER 4 DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS.....		116
4.1	Introduction.....	116
4.2	Descriptive Analysis.....	116
4.2.1	Socio-Demographic Characteristics	117
4.2.2	Relationship between Demographic Characteristics and Attitude .	124
4.3	Measurement Model Assessment.....	142
4.4	Descriptive Analysis of Variables.....	150
4.5	Structural Model.....	155
4.6	Conclusion	158
CHAPTER 5 DISCUSSION		160
5.1	Introduction.....	160
5.2	An Overview of the Research	160
5.3	Discussion of the Findings.....	162
5.3.1	Discussion of the Socio-Demographic Characteristics.....	162
5.3.2	Discussion of the Descriptive Analysis	163
5.3.3	Discussion of the PLS Analysis.....	171
5.3.3.1	Antecedents of Host Community Attitude toward Negative Environmental Impacts of Tourism	173

5.4	Conclusion	183
CHAPTER 6 POLICY IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSION		184
6.1	Introduction.....	184
6.2	Significant Implications of the Research.....	184
6.2.1	Theoretical Implications.....	184
6.2.2	Practical Implications.....	186
6.3	Areas of Further Research	191
6.4	Conclusion	192
REFERENCES		194
APPENDICES		

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 2-1: Key Capacity Features at the Three Levels of Community Capacity	23
Table 2-2: Literature Review on Community Capacity	25
Table 2-3: Capacity Building Definitions	27
Table 2-4: Summary of Community Capacity Building	29
Table 2-5: Barriers to Community Capacity Building	33
Table 2-6: Selected Models of Community Capacity Dimensions from (1976-2012)	35
Table 2-7: Tourist Arrivals and Receipts to Malaysia by Year	47
Table 2-8: Government Allocation for Tourism Development in Malaysia	50
Table 2-9: Summary of Adverse Impacts on the Natural Environment	66
Table 2-10: Positive and Negative Environmental Impacts of Tourism.....	72
Table 3-1: Research Design Map	86
Table 3-2: Taxonomy Review of Different Methods for Measuring Community Capacity.....	88
Table 3-3: Quantitative Technique	90
Table 3-4: Distribution of Langkawi island population.....	93
Table 3-5: Population of Langkawi Island 1970-2013	94
Table 3-6: Stratified Sampling Frame of the Study Site	96
Table 3-7: Topic Covered in Literature Review	98
Table 3-8: Demographic Variables	100
Table 3-9: Shared Vision Items	102
Table 3-10: Sense of Community Items	103
Table 3-11: Participation Items	103
Table 3-12: Knowledge and Skills	104
Table 3-13: Lifelong Learning Items	105
Table 3-14: Tourism Natural Environmental Issues	106
Table 3-15: Locations of Data Collection	109
Table 4-1: Residential Status of Respondents	117
Table 4-2: Length of Residency	118
Table 4-3: Living District.....	118
Table 4-4: Gender of Respondents	119

Table 4-5: Age of Respondents	120
Table 4-6: Ethnicity	120
Table 4-7: Level of Education	121
Table 4-8: Respondents' Occupations	122
Table 4-9: Job Relevancy to Tourism	123
Table 4-10: Length of Working in a Tourism-Related Sector	123
Table 4-11: Interaction with Tourists	124
Table 4-12: Residential Status and Attitude of Respondents	125
Table 4-13: Length of Residency and Attitude of Respondents.....	126
Table 4-14: Living District Attitude of Respondents	128
Table 4-15: Gender of Respondents and Attitude	130
Table 4-16: Age of Respondents and Attitude	131
Table 4-17: Ethnicity and Attitude of Respondents	132
Table 4-18: Level of Education and Attitude of Respondents	134
Table 4-19: Respondents' Occupations and Attitude	136
Table 4-20: Job Relevancy to Tourism and Attitude	138
Table 4-21: Length of Working in a Tourism-Related Sector and Attitude	139
Table 4-22: Interaction with Tourists and Attitude	141
Table 4-23: Measurement Model Results	144
Table 4-24: Cross Loading Results.....	147
Table 4-25: Results of Discriminant Validity	149
Table 4-26: Detailed Descriptive Analysis of Variables	151
Table 4-27: Descriptive Analysis of Variables	154
Table 4-28: Hypotheses Testing (Structural Model) Results	156
Table 4-29: Summary of Hypotheses Testing Results.....	158
Table 5-1: Hypotheses and Summary of the Results.....	171

LIST OF FIGURES

	Page
Figure 2.1: Community Capacity and Tourism Development	29
Figure 2.2: Components of Community Capacity in Conserving Natural Environment (Independent Variable)	39
Figure 2.3: Map of Malaysia	49
Figure 2.4: Geographical location of Langkawi Island	55
Figure 2.5 Tourist Arrival in the Langkawi Island 1985-2015	60
Figure 2.6: Tourism Development Growth 2005-2013	61
Figure 2.7: Conceptual Framework	80
Figure 4.1: Measurement Model Results	146
Figure 4.2: Structural Model Results	157

LIST OF PLATES

	Page
Plate 2.1: Langkawi Mangrove Forest in Kilim G.F Park	56
Plate 2.2: Kilim Geo-Forest Park, Langkawi	57
Plate 2.3: Dirty Pond in Pantai Pasir Hitam	68

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

MOCAT	Ministry of Culture, Arts and Tourism
TDCM	Tourist Development Corporation Malaysia
NEP	National Economic Plan
NTMP	National Tourism Master Plan
NDP	National Development Policy
WWF Malaysia	Worldwide Fund for Nature Malaysia
RTMP	The Rural Tourism Master Plan
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
LADA	Langkawi Development Authority
SPSS	Statistical Package for the Social Sciences
SEM	Structural Equation Modelling
PLS	Partial Least Square
CR	Construct Reliability
AVE	Average Variance Extracted

**KAPASITI DAN SIKAP MASYARAKAT TEMPATAN TERHADAP IMPAK
NEGATIF ALAM SEKITAR PELANCONGAN
DI PULAU LANGKAWI, MALAYSIA**

ABSTRAK

Kesedaran yang terhad terhadap konsep keupayaan masyarakat dalam kajian pelancongan dan kekurangan pertimbangan mengenai peranan kapasiti masyarakat sebagai syarat penting dalam pembangunan pelancongan lestari telah menjejaskan destinasi tuan rumah, terutamanya di kawasan sedang membangun. Andaian kajian ini menunjukkan bahawa komuniti dengan tahap keupayaan yang tinggi dalam memelihara alam semulajadi menunjukkan sikap yang lebih baik terhadap kesan pelancongan kepada alam sekitar, yang seterusnya membantu sektor pelancongan mengekalkan proses pembangunan dan meminimakan impak negatif terhadap alam sekitar. Kajian ini menggunakan lima dimensi keupayaan masyarakat untuk memelihara alam sekitar, yang terdiri daripada perkongsian visi, semangat kemasyarakatan, penglibatan, pengetahuan dan kemahiran, dan pembelajaran sepanjang hayat, sebagai peramal utama sikap terhadap kesan pelancongan kepada alam sekitar. Rangka kerja konseptual diuji secara empirikal untuk mengkaji hubungan antara keupayaan masyarakat dan sikap terhadap impak negatif pelancongan terhadap alam sekitar. Kajian soal selidik telah digunakan untuk tujuan pengutipan data. Sampel kajian ini dijalankan secara berstrata berdasarkan populasi penduduk tempatan yang terlibat dengan pelancongan di enam daerah kediaman di Pulau Langkawi, sebagai kawasan kajian. Borang soal selidik diedarkan di kawasan kajian pada 14-23 Jun 2014 dan sebanyak 403 maklum balas telah diperolehi. Analisis frekuensi telah digunakan untuk memperolehi maklumat demografi responden dan tahap semasa keupayaan masyarakat dalam memulihara alam semula

jadi. ‘Partial Least Square (PLS) version 2.0’ digunakan untuk menguji hipotesis. Hasil kajian mendapati tahap keupayaan masyarakat dalam memelihara alam sekitar kurang memuaskan dan wujudnya keperluan untuk membangunkan keupayaan masyarakat untuk pembangunan akan datang di Pulau Langkawi. Hasil kajian ini menunjukkan perkongsian visi, semangat kemasyarakatan, penglibatan, pengetahuan dan kemahiran, dan pembelajaran sepanjang hayat merupakan faktor penentu yang penting tentang sikap terhadap kesan pelancongan kepada alam sekitar.

**CAPACITY AND ATTITUDE OF HOST COMMUNITY TOWARDS
NEGATIVE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF TOURISM
IN LANGKAWI ISLAND, MALAYSIA**

ABSTRACT

Limited attention to the concept of community capacity in the tourism literature and lack of consideration regarding the role of community capacity as an essential prerequisite of sustainable tourism development created some difficulties in host destinations, particularly in developing areas. This research dwelt upon the premise that a community with higher capacity in conserving natural environment may express better attitude toward negative environmental impacts of tourism, which in turn, help tourism to directly maintain development process and reduce creation of negative environmental impacts. This study used five dimensions of community capacity for conserving natural environment, namely; shared vision, sense of community, participation, knowledge and skills, and lifelong learning, as major predictors of attitude toward negative environmental impacts of tourism. The conceptual framework was empirically tested to investigate the relationship between community capacity and attitude toward negative environmental impacts of tourism. Survey questionnaires were used as an administered tool for data collection. The sample for this study was proportionally stratified among the local residents' populations with tourism-related jobs in the six residential districts in Langkawi Island, as the study site. The questionnaires were distributed in Langkawi Island from 14 to 23 June 2014. A total of 403 responses were obtained. Subsequently, frequency analysis was used to attain the demographic information of respondents and obtain the current level of community capacity in conserving natural environment. Partial Least Square (PLS) version 2.0 was employed to test the

hypothesis. Results showed that the level of community capacity in conserving natural environment is not satisfactory which indicates an urgent need of building community capacity for further tourism development in Langkawi Island. It was also found that shared vision, sense of community, participation, knowledge and skills, and lifelong learning, were important determinants of host community attitudes toward negative environmental impacts of tourism.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

The relationship between tourism and the environment as well as conservation of island destinations and its unique characteristics have been universally recognized as important facts. Tourism industry is directly and indirectly related to the environment and exploits natural resources extensively. In other words, the quality of natural environment has always been an indispensable factor for tourism industry. The potential benefits of tourism associated with conservation and protection of the natural environment. However, the environmental destruction caused by negative impacts of tourism industry regarded as its potential threats. Consequently, it is essential to acknowledge the capacity of host community and utilize it as an effective strategy in preserving the natural environment and their living area for themselves and future generation. This study aims to explain the importance of using community capacity for having a sustainable tourism industry in Langkawi Island.

This chapter comprises of the following items: overview of the research background, statement of the Problem, research questions, objectives of the study, research hypothesis, significance of the study, scope of the study, research methodology, organization of the chapters, definition of key terms and conclusion.

1.2 Background of the Study

Tourism, as one of the world's fastest growing industries, has a large amount of impacts. Although tourism development has inclusive economic benefits, it also shows negative social and environmental impacts in many destinations. Kavallinis and Pizam (1994) stated that environmental impacts are those connected with the natural and the man-made environment of a tourist destination. Undeniably, tourism needs natural resources in order to facilitate its expansion. However, uncontrolled tourism development poses various threats to natural areas on tourist destinations. It puts enormous pressure on the natural environment which leads to severe impacts such as, heightened vulnerability to forest fires, increased pollution, natural habitat loss, discharges into the sea, soil erosion, and increased pressure on endangered species. Holden (2000) mentioned that tourism industry often puts lots of pressure on natural resources which compel local residents to compete for the use of scarce natural resources. Moscardo (2008a) described different forms of negative environmental impacts includes destruction of ecosystems when tourism infrastructure is built; pollution and problems with waste disposal; depletion of natural resources in the local environment, including water and food stocks; changes in wildlife behaviour; inappropriate architecture used for tourism facilities.

According to Kavallinis and Pizam (1994) tourism environmental impacts divided into two categories including the actual and the perceived. Inskeep (1991) suggested that environmental impact matrices and statements are the ways to identify and assess the effects. A series of environmental impacts that have been studied in previous research includes litter and waste; water shortage and inefficient treatment of sewage; damage to corals; soil and beach erosion; air, water, and noise pollution;

crowding and congestion; damage to ecosystems; loss of flora and fauna; disturbance to wildlife; increased fire frequency; and urbanization (Buckley & Pannell, 1990; Farrell & McLellan, 1987; May, 1991). Other scholars have included group of environmental impacts such as traffic, air, noise, water, and sea pollution; and depletion of resources (Caneday & Zeiger, 1991; Long et al., 1990).

Alternatively, tourism is capable of creating beneficial effects on the natural environment. It can help to raise awareness about environmental values. It can also contribute as a tool to fund protection of natural areas and increase the economic importance of these places which leads to provision of substantial benefits to local communities through sustainable tourism development. However, despite all positive and negative environmental aspects of tourism development, usually its benefits have been eroded by the negative impacts or slow to appear and more often restricted to certain groups within the community. According to Forstner (2004, p. 9) “*the most basic barrier to effective tourism development is a lack of knowledge about tourism among locals*”. The lack of tourism knowledge can lead to limited local tourism leadership, ineffective planning and coordination, and limited participation of local stakeholders in tourism which are all elements of community readiness or capacity to participate in tourism development. Paronen and Oja (1998) defined community capacity as a significant factor for enhancing the process of sustainable development and long term growth. Similarly, Smith et al. (2001) described that community capacity is the essence of development. In general, the ability of individuals, organizations and communities to handle their own affairs and work collectively to develop and maintain changes is defined as community capacity (Hounslow, 2002). Consequently, the real understanding of community capacity is a prerequisite for

sustainable tourism development. The proper understanding of community capacity leads to improving tourism benefit and reducing its negative impacts on host community and their home environment. A considerable number of different concepts have been used to evaluate the capacity of communities by different scholars such as (Alexander & McKenna, 1998; Bennett et al., 2012; Blackman et al., 2004; Chaskin et al., 2001; Forstner, 2004; Frank & Smith, 1999; Hiwasaki, 2006; Koutra, 2007; MacLellan et al., 2007; Moscardo, 2008a; Murray & Dunn, 1995; Notzke, 2004; Skinner, 2006; Victurine, 2000; Williams & O'Neil, 2007).

Based on the assumption that host community should express more responsibility than others stakeholders regarding the creation of negative environmental impacts of tourism, this study attempts to explore the relationship between host community capacity in conserving natural environment and community attitude toward negative environmental impacts of tourism. Moreover, it seeks to evaluate the level of community capacity in conserving natural environment, with particular reference to Langkawi Island in Malaysia. This study employed the theory of community capacity, which is people centred and highlights the importance of existing community capacity to identify their concerns and convert their potential into community outcomes (i.e., environmental sustainability). The following section examines existing problems.

1.3 Statement of the Problem

Several gaps have prompted this research including limited attention to the concept of community capacity in the tourism literature and lack of consideration regarding the role of community capacity as an essential prerequisite for sustainable tourism development (Bourke & Luloff, 2010; Moscardo, 2008a; Reid et al., 2004). Whilst other disciplines such as health, education, management and agriculture have been widely exploited this concept, the negligence of community capacity in tourism literature as well as tourism sector has created some difficulties in host destinations, particularly in developing areas. In addition, based on the sustainability pattern, the role of community members as the main stakeholders who are directly affected by tourism consequences is essential. It is important to understand what makes their attitudes toward tourism development (Allen et al., 1988). According to Getz (1994) individual's attitudes have strong association with their values and mostly strengthened by their experiences. Since one's attitudes do not change quickly, monitoring of locals' reactions and attitudes toward tourism requires for sustainable tourism development (Long & Richardson, 1989). Therefore, locals care and responsibility is needed to maintain further tourism development in tourist destinations. The given argument provides the exquisiteness of conducting research on the relationship between host community capacity in conserving natural environment and attitude toward negative environmental impacts of tourism.

According to Bramwell and Lane (2010) different places have different barriers to sustainable tourism development. Sirakaya et al. (2002) noted that the locals' attitudes in developed economies is diverse comparing to developing economies due to the dissimilarities in the nature and extend of impacts on the host communities.

Moreover, it has been mentioned that the principles of 'locality' should be applied in the planning process and policies should be place-specific and relative to the dynamics of the local economy (Beeton, 2006; Hawkins & Mann, 2007). Consequently, it can be suggested that findings from previous studies on determinants of locals' attitude might not be enough to destinations that are unique in many aspects, such as islands, particularly when such economies present significant challenges in terms of sustainable development (Bardolet & Sheldon, 2008; Twining-Ward & Butler, 2002). The unique characteristics of islands and the lack of research on relationship between locals' capacity and their attitudes especially in ASEAN region countries including Malaysia, may lead a strong justification for conducting research in islands in Malaysia.

According to World Economic Forum (2012), Malaysia reported as a developing country in the South-East Asia region with a growing international tourism sector. The success of Malaysia's islands in attracting tourists with its natural beauties leads to initialling Langkawi Tourism Blueprint. Langkawi Island is regarded as one of the most favourite tourist destinations for both domestic and international tourists in the northern part of Malaysia. Tourism industry in Langkawi focuses on geological and natural heritage of the island. According to Kasim and Dzakiria (2015) the Malaysian Prime Minister in 2012 launched the Langkawi Tourism Blueprint, which provides guideline to help Langkawi Island to attain a global top 10 island and an eco-tourism destination status by the year 2015. Langkawi Blueprint was expected to double the island's tourism revenue from MYR 1.9 billion in 2010 to MYR 3.8 billion by the end of 2015 (Lee, 2013). Based on Langkawi Blueprint strategy, tourism in Langkawi Island has not only been

responsible for improving the community in terms of services and infrastructures, but also it should improve the local economy by providing employment and giving opportunities for the local residents to get benefit from it (Rahman & Roslan, 2015). An extensive amount of resources have been invested in tourism by federal government, development agencies and local people of Langkawi believing it will bring a range of benefits to their communities and improves the living conditions of local people. For example, according to Ministry of Finance Malaysia (2012), Malaysia's Prime Minister Datuk Seri Najib Razak mentioned that *"To further promote tourist arrivals as well as domestic tourism, tourist destinations, in particular Pulau Langkawi, will be re-developed. The Langkawi Five-Year Tourism Development Master Plan will be launched with an allocation of RM420 million. Among the initiatives to be undertaken are the restructuring of the Langkawi Development Authority, setting up a park rangers unit, upgrading museums, beaches and small businesses as well as providing a more efficient transportation system."* Tourism industry in Langkawi changed the employment pattern from agriculture to tourism and hospitality services. It has become one of the most important sources of employment that keep locals from moving to other cities. Langkawi economic opportunities provide Malaysian government with substantial tax revenues. The local people of Langkawi had also experienced changes from a traditional life with low income to a semi-modern life with more income, modern infrastructure and utilities. Local residents of Langkawi, like any other tourism destinations, are major actors in sustainable tourism development since they are directly affected by the industry (Murphy, 1985). According to Hashim et al. (2011, p. 13) *"Langkawi which was cursed to be a padang jarak padang terkukur (in Malay language, meaning a barren field) by Mahsuri the legendary princess, has now been transformed from merely an*

island of myths and legends, to a tourist island which in the year 2000 was declared Langkawi the Tourism City by the Malaysian government". However, the pressures arising from the process of rapid development (Ahmad et al., 2013; Hashim et al., 2011; Lee, 2013) accompanied by the lack of adequate community capacity (Liu, 2006) caused Langkawi to experience an increasing use of natural resources and resulted in being adversely impacted from tourism (Marzuki, 2015). Massive reduction of natural resources can destroy locals' living environment and eventually lowers tourists' willingness to revisit. Hence, there is an essential need for more attention to the host community capacity in conserving and preserving natural environment as an effective strategy for sustainable tourism development. Indeed, host community should be more responsible toward environmental costs of tourism and act as stewards of natural environment to effectively care for and conserve local resources (Ross & Wall, 1999).

On the other hand, the number of visitors continuously increase due to the promotion of tourism in the island which derived from political will (Lee, 2013; Liu, 2006). Hence, further development will be required to cater the increasing needs of tourism facilities and infrastructures. Subsequently, the delicate balance between sustainable tourism development and conservation of Langkawi natural environment becomes even more fragile. In other words, there are fears that without adequate community capacity the situation cannot be sustained and would eventually pose a serious threat to the pristine environment and natural resources of Langkawi Island. Since, negative environmental impacts of tourism could destroy tourism industry in the long term; dependence of the host community on tourism industry should create more responsibility among local people.

From previous research in Langkawi Island, it was found that knowledge gaps exist in two areas: first, in the lack of adequate community capacity (Liu, 2006); and second, in attitude of the host community to take responsibility in recognizing their involvement in producing and handling tourism impacts (Jahi et al., 2009). The main contribution of this research is to use the host community capacity as an effective strategy. It can change community attitude and role in order to reduce the negative environmental impacts of tourism. Attention to the host community capacity in conserving natural environment not even leads to increasing community's awareness regarding negative environmental impacts of tourism but also protects and conserves their living environment. This research specifies the need of more attention to the host community capacity and attitude.

1.4 Research Questions

In order to solve the mentioned problems, this research explores the following questions:

1. Is there an adequate level of capacity in conserving natural environment among host community members of Langkawi Island?
2. Is there any relationship between community capacity in conserving natural resource and attitude of host community toward negative environmental impacts of tourism?

Moreover, the following sub-questions have been also considered.

- a. Is there any relationship between community shared vision and community attitude toward negative environmental impacts of tourism?

- b. Is there any relationship between sense of community and community attitude toward negative environmental impacts of tourism?
- c. Is there any relationship between community participation and community attitude toward negative environmental impacts of tourism?
- d. Is there any relationship between knowledge and skills and community attitude toward negative environmental impacts of tourism?
- e. Is there any relationship between lifelong learning and community attitude toward negative environmental impacts of tourism?

1.5 Objectives of the Study

In line with the research gaps and research questions described in Sections 1.3 and 1.4, this study focuses on the level of host community capacity in conserving natural environment and the attitude toward negative environmental impacts of tourism. Moreover, the current study aims to investigate the relationship between five dimensions of community capacity in conserving natural environment namely; shared vision, sense of community, participation, knowledge and skills, and lifelong learning and the community attitude toward negative environmental impacts of tourism. The main objectives of this study are as follows:

- 1. To assess the current level of community capacity in conserving natural environment
- 2. To investigate the relationship between community capacity and their attitude toward negative environmental impacts of tourism.

For this purpose the following sub-objectives have been considered as well.

- a. To investigate the relationship between shared vision and attitude toward negative environmental impacts of tourism.
- b. To investigate the relationship between sense of community and attitude toward negative environmental impacts of tourism.
- c. To investigate the relationship between community participation and attitude toward negative environmental impacts of tourism.
- d. To investigate the relationship between community knowledge and skills and attitude toward negative environmental impacts of tourism.
- e. To investigate the relationship between lifelong learning and attitude toward negative environmental impacts of tourism.

1.6 Research Hypothesis

In general, this research aims to explore how to alleviate negative environmental impacts caused by tourism industry through capacity of the host community members in conserving natural resources. It particularly investigates the relationship between current level of host community capacity in conserving natural environment and host community attitude toward negative environmental impacts of tourism in Langkawi Island. Hence, the main hypothesis of this study is as following;

H₁: The level of host community capacity in conserving natural environment has a positive effect on the host community attitude toward negative environmental impacts of tourism.

For the purpose of testing the hypothesis of this research, five sub-hypotheses are proposed based on the five dimensions of community capacity.

H_{1a}: The level of community shared vision has a positive effect on the host community attitude toward negative environmental impacts of tourism.

H_{1b}: The level of sense of community has a positive effect on the host community attitude toward negative environmental impacts of tourism.

H_{1c}: The level of community participation has a positive effect on the host community attitude toward negative environmental impacts of tourism.

H_{1d}: The level of community knowledge and skills has a positive effect on the host community attitude toward negative environmental impacts of tourism.

H_{1e}: The level of community lifelong learning has a positive effect on the host community attitude toward negative environmental impacts of tourism.

1.7 Significance of the Study

The importance of assessing community capacity is well-known. Assessment of community capacity gives a real insight into the assets, abilities and opportunities exist within a community. It enables community members to take action and leading roles to improve their living condition and protect their living area (Chaskin et al., 2001; Forstner, 2004; Goodman et al., 1998; Laverack, 2005). This research particularly highlights the importance of host community capacity in conserving natural environment. It emphasizes on certain abilities within the host community as an effective factors that can predict host community attitude toward negative environmental impacts of tourism. A further essential characteristic of this research line is its multidisciplinary. There are many possible approaches to assess community capacity which has many implications for community members, as seen through disciplines such as agriculture, education, health promotion and tourism development. The community capacity is measured in order to help community

leaders, operators, inside/outside developers and planners to have better insight into that particular community. It eventually leads community members to be more capable of managing change and handling its impacts. In other words, planners and administrators with having the knowledge and information about the community could effectively control or/and reduce the negative environmental impacts of tourism. This research finding indicates factors facilitate the prediction of the host community attitude toward negative environmental impacts of tourism. Moreover, a clear understanding of the host community attitude helps to plan properly for sustainable tourism development. It has been stated that attitudes of local community should be considered before planners and developers investigate limited natural resources (Gursoy & Rutherford, 2004). Thus, in pursuing sustainable tourism development, the capacity of host community in conserving natural environment should receive extra attention and more support, so tourism can directly maintain development process and reduce creation of negative environmental impacts.

1.8 Scope of the Study

The current study focuses on the concept of community capacity in conserving natural environment, as well as its relationship with the host community attitude toward negative environmental impacts of tourism. Langkawi Island has been chosen as the area of the study. The samples consist of local residents of Langkawi Island engaging in tourism-related industry which is referred as host community in this study. The scope of this research is limited to the local residents of Langkawi Island. Thus, the results might not be generalized to other communities.

1.9 Research Methodology

The initial phase of this research involved collating related contributions published in high ranked journals and books, thesis and government reports to provide an overview of the research problems, questions, objectives and research framework. This study mainly was employed quantitative technique with support of some interviews to assess Langkawi host community capacity in conserving natural environment and examine its relationship with community attitude toward negative environmental impacts of tourism. Survey questionnaires were used as an administered tool for data collection. The questionnaires were then distributed in Langkawi Island. After two weeks of data collection, 403 out of 600 questionnaires were completed and usable. The response rate for this study was 67%. Collected data from the previous step analysed through different software including SPSS and PLS. Conclusion has been drawn based on the results of the analysis.

1.10 Organization of the Chapters

This section focuses on further clarification about the thesis structure and the organization and layout of the chapters in the current study. This study has five chapters which are introduced as following:

Chapter 1 starts with an introduction and the research background which provides an overview of the study. It continues by describing the problem statement which is a description of the issues and gaps addressed in this research. This chapter follows by presenting the research questions, research objectives and hypothesis of the study. It is continued with an explanation of the significance and scope of the

study. Finally, the research methodology, organization of the chapters and definition of key terms used in this study are outlined.

Chapter 2 reviews the literature that has been conducted in the area of this study. In particular, this chapter outlines the relevant concepts, conceptual framework, the study site and development of the research hypothesis for the study based on the literature.

Chapter 3 describes the research methodology used for this study. It focuses on research design, including development of measurement scales, pilot test results, population, sample and sampling method, data collection technique, data editing and coding, and reliability validity tests. It follows by presenting a discussion on the statistical method, and data analysis, comprising of descriptive analysis and PLS procedure.

Chapter 4 presents the results of the statistical analyses which include: the descriptive analysis on socio demographic characteristics of respondents as well as major variables of this study. Smart PLS software also provides the results of the measurement model and structural model.

Chapter 5 provides discussion of the findings for the current study. First, it presents an over view of the research. Subsequently, it continues by discussion of the findings which includes discussion of the socio-demographic characteristics; discussion of the descriptive analysis ; and discussion of the PLS analysis. Lastly, the

antecedents of host community attitude toward negative environmental impacts of tourism are presented and discussed in this chapter.

Chapter 6 presents the contributions of the study to the current knowledge in the field of tourism, which follows by presenting a description of the practical and theoretical implications of the findings. Moreover, the conclusion of the findings is discussed in this chapter.

1.11 Definition of Key Terms

This section provides a brief definition for each key term used in this study. These definitions concentrate on the precise meaning to give a good understanding of each term. The definition of community capacity, shared vision, sense of community, community participation, knowledge and skills, lifelong learning and attitude toward tourism environmental impacts are as follows:

Community Capacity: community capacity commonly described as the essence of development (Smith et al., 2001) as well as an important factor for enhancing the process of sustainable development and long term growth (Paronen & Oja, 1998). This research utilizes the definition of Balint (2006, p. 140) who referred to community capacity as *“the levels of abilities necessary to set and achieve relevant goals”*.

Shared vision: Bopp et al. (2000) defined shared vision as a picture of the community at some time in the future, painted in enough detail that people can

imagine it. It is a vision to which people are committed as it reflects their goals and values (Senge et al., 2001).

Sense of community: Buckner (1988) defined sense of community as a sense of belonging to a place and or a group of people in which it involves interaction with other members of the community. Sense of community motivates high level of concern for community issues among community members (Bopp et al., 2000) which is a significant factor for overcoming sustainability challenges (Moscardo, 2005).

Participation: Laverack and Thangphet (2009) referred to community participation as a concept that strives to bring different stakeholders together for decision making and community problem solving. Participation is an essential step to ensure tourism development is sustainable (Cole, 2006).

Knowledge and Skills: According to Chaskin et al. (2001) knowledge and skills have been referred as a human capital. Knowledge and skill help people to think and act in new ways (Aref & Redzuan, 2009).

Lifelong learning: Scott and Gough (2004, p. 38) depicted that *“Lifelong learning widely perceived as a vital ingredient of capacity building for a sustainable future which provides the community members with opportunities for learning and experience”*.

Attitude toward negative environmental impacts of tourism: According to Koballa and Glynn (2014) attitude is commonly defined as a continuous attribute with a possible range of expression about a phenomenon. Research into the attitudes of those who are involved in the tourism industry with the focus on the environmental impacts mostly have utilized an assortment of environmental aspects (Belisle & Hoy, 1980; Caneday & Zeiger, 1991; Kavallinis & Pizam, 1994; Liu & Var, 1986; Long et al., 1990)

1.12 Conclusion

This chapter introduced the issues related to the topic under investigation, as well as the foundation of the research. It explained the research background that lead to the statement of the problem, research questions, and research hypothesis and research objectives. The significance of the research, the scope of the research, and the research methodology are defined and described. Lastly, the organization of each chapter and the definition of key terms used in this study are presented. In the following chapter, a detailed review of the relevant literature is presented.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the process of assessing community capacity in conserving natural environment as well as its relationship with attitude of host community toward tourism negative environmental impacts. The discussion begins with a review of community capacity concept, theory of community capacity building and other related topics such as dimensions of community capacity, barriers to community capacity building and components of community capacity in conserving natural environment. The aim of this stage is to assess the level of community capacity through its dimensions as well as to construct the first part of research model. The first part of research model aims to answer the first research question. The next two sections focus on tourism development and its related impacts in Malaysia and particularly in Langkawi Island. Consequently, the review continues with general environmental impacts on island destinations and other related topics including: tourism impacts on island communities, and host community attitude toward environmental impacts. This stage aims to find out the attitude of host community toward negative environmental impacts caused by tourism. The final part of this chapter discusses the conceptual framework of the study which aims to answer the research questions of this study.

2.2 Concept of Community

A community is a group of people that perform main social functions (Mattessich et al., 1997). Hillery (1955) mentioned that the common components of community are area, common ties and social interaction. Jafari (2000) described that each community have five major functions: economic (i.e. production, distribution and consumption); socialization; social control; social participation; and mutual support. Williams and Lawson (2001) stated the fact that a group of people live in the same geographical area does not necessarily indicate they belong to the same community. Community was then defined as a combination of social units who share common interest or goals. Commonly, several types of communities have been identified by the social science scholars (Heller, 1989; Suttles & Suttles, 1972; Verity, 2007) namely: community as place, community as social system, and community as interest based group. In other words, a group of people who live within a geographically defined area (geo-political space, workplace, neighbourhood, physical location) and who have social and psychological ties (connections and networks; heterogeneous groups of people who share interest, struggles, occupations, tasks) with each other and with the place where they live (Mattessich et al., 1997; Verity, 2007) can be define as a community. Consequently, the concept of community can be summarized as a small combination of social units who live in a settlement, exercising a degree of autonomy in their life, sharing the goals and desires, to participate in daily life, together with a sense of belonging. According to Chavis and Wandersman (1990) community development, community building, and community organization are the terms to represent the process of enhancing the quality of community. Individuals' participation is a central mechanism in this process.

In tourism studies, although tourists emanate from communities, greater emphasis is often placed on destination areas and the places which tourists visit. Less commonly, assemblages of visitors in destination areas may possess community attributes as in the case of seasonal, cottage or camping communities. Great concern is usually expressed both by residents and researchers, for maintenance of the characteristics of host communities, particularly in remote or developing areas and for the changes which their residents, economies, landscapes and political structures undergo as tourism evolves. Residents of such communities are often encouraged to take greater control of their futures by becoming involved in community planning and thereby influencing decisions about tourism development in their home areas and protecting desired community attributes.

2.2.1 Community Capacity

According to Smith et al. (2001) community capacity commonly described as the essence of development as well as an essential factor for enhancing the process of sustainable development and long term growth (Paronen & Oja, 1998). Balint (2006, p. 140) described that “*community capacity refers to the levels of competence, ability and skills necessary to set and achieve relevant goals*”. Community capacity more often understood as the qualities of a capable community (Labonte & Laverack, 2010) and “*like community development, describes a process that increases the assets and attributes that a community is able to draw upon in order to improve their lives*” (Laverack, 2005, p. 267). McLeroy (1996) revealed that characteristics of communities have a strong influence on individual’s abilities to identify, mobilize, and address social and public problems. On the other hand, Rogers et al. (1995) mentioned that development and use of knowledge, skills, and resources help the

community and its members to change consistently with their desired public goals. According to Ewing (2007) the capacity of residents to acknowledge their concerns and convert their potential into community outcomes largely influenced by how the region responded to the growing influences of tourism. It has been suggested that there are some domains require attention when defining community capacity and describing its characteristics (Balint, 2006; Goodman et al., 1998; Hounslow, 2002; Simpson et al., 2003; Woodhouse, 2006), including: knowledge and the ability to define and suggest solutions for problems; the ability to critically evaluate proposed projects and activities; local leadership and entrepreneurship; specific technical and managerial skills in target areas; networks and community cohesiveness; equitable partnerships with external organizations; resources and infrastructure; and motivation and confidence.

Based on Moscardo (2008a, p. 9): *“Two key factors are common to all the definitions of community capacity: first that community capacity is about collective knowledge and ability within the community itself; and second that this knowledge and ability is used to define problems and options from within the community”*. Community capacity has been seen as a prerequisite for any developing process which has been engaged through some combination of three levels of social agency namely individuals, organizations, and community (networks/environment) (Chaskin, 2001). The individual level consists of human capital and leadership, knowledge, skills, awareness, training, education and participation in community-improving activities which help individuals to enhance the level of control they have over relevant aspects of their lives (Bennett et al., 2010; Chaskin, 2001). At the organizational level, community capacity building requires significant changes to

help professionals deliver their services (Aref & Redzuan, 2009). At the network level, local capacity building for tourism needs power improvement for advocacy, decision making and changing community attributes toward tourism industry (Bennett et al., 2010). According to Chaskin (2001, p. 298) *“the network level concerns social structure patterns of relations among individuals and organizations”*. Table 2-1 illustrates the key capacity features and elements at the three levels of community capacity.

Table 2-1: Key Capacity Features at the Three Levels of Community Capacity

Level of Capacity	Definition of Capacity	Elements on which Capacity Is Based
Individual	The will and ability to set objectives and achieve them using one’s own knowledge and skills.	Knowledge, skills, value, attitude, health, awareness, etc.
		Human resources (capacities of individuals in organizations)
Organization	Anything that will influence an organization’s performance.	Physical resources (facilities, equipment, materials, etc) and capital
		Intellectual resources (organizational strategy, strategic planning, business know-how, production technology, program management, process management, inter-institutional linkage, etc.)

Community/Network	The network and conditions necessary for demonstrating capacity at the individual and organizational levels. It includes: systems and frameworks necessary for the formation/ implementation of policies and strategies beyond an individual organization. It includes administrative, legal, technological, political, economic, social and cultural environments.	Organizational structure and management methods which affect the utilization of the resources (human, physical intellectual assets) such as organizational culture, incentive and reward system, etc.
		Leadership of managers
		Formal institutions (laws, policies, decrees, ordinances, membership rules, etc)
		Informal institutions (customs, cultures, norms, etc)
		Social capital, social infrastructure, etc.
		Capacities of individuals and organizations under the environment

Source: Adapted from Lusthaus et al. (1999)

There have been numerous and varied approaches to community capacity studies and its related subjects. Table 2-2 proposes a number of works which study this subject. The review has considered contributions published in high ranked journals and books. Table 2-2 is a personal overview of the stream of research on community capacity which can be examined by topics and or authors.