

Determinants of User Intention in Using Tourism Malaysia Facebook

Khairulhilmi A Manap^a, Muhamad Sham S. Ali^b, Muhamad Shamsul Ibrahim^c, ^aPhD Student, Department of Communication, Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication, Universiti Putra Malaysia (UPM), Serdang, 43400 Selangor, Malaysia, ^bDepartment of Mass Communication, College of Arts and Sciences, Abu Dhabi University, 59911, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, ^cKolej Universiti Poly-Tech MARA, Jalan 6/91, Taman Shamelin Perkasa, 56100 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, Email: ^akhairulhilmi78@gmail.com, ^bmuhamad.sham@adu.ac.ae, ^cshamsul@kuptm.edu.my

Facebook users have their motive which encourages them to choose a preferred Facebook page. A motive embedded in an individual can be stimulated to become active. A motive could turn into motivation during a certain process. The purpose of this research is to determine the user intention in using Tourism Malaysia 'Facebook' account. It also seeks to validate the adequacy of the generated items representing the construct involved in this research. The Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) validation includes attitude, subjective norms, behavioural control response, Facebook user experience, response, and engagement. This research collected 237 valid responses from active Facebook users. The results of the study show that the attitude is considered invalid as a construct in this research due to the model fit issue. However, the remaining items and constructs in this study are considered valid and reliable. Therefore, it can be applied in the research and suitable for the second level (measurement model) analysis for validity and reliability.

Key words: *Attitude, subjective norms, behaviour control response, experience, engagement.*

Introduction

Tourism is an information intensive industry (Cox et al. 2009). The tourism industry relies on communication with tourists through strong customer relationships and various channels to market their products and services (Poon, 1993). Indeed, social media has grown to be the most effective medium for tourists to seek information and share their travelling experiences



(Cox et al. 2009; Yoo & Gretzel 2008; Gretzel 2006). Given the prevalence of social media use among tourists, social media has become an indispensable platform for tourism marketers (Chan & Denizci, 2011; Huang, 2011; Munar, 2010). For businesses, it represents a marketing opportunity that transcends the traditional middleman and connects organisations directly to consumers. Social media offers differing values to organisations, which is enhanced through brand existence (de Vries, Genslers & Lee Flang, 2012), word-of-mouth communication (Chen et al. 2011b), improving sales (Agnihotri et al. 2012), sharing information with others (Lu & Hsiao, 2010) and generating public support towards tourism products (Ali, 2011; Ballantine & Stephenson, 2011).

Literature Review

According to Buhalis and Law (2008), the technology of communication and information has had an impact on the travel aspect. Internet evolution and social networking are some of the factors that has changed the structure of travel and tourism industry, such as how to buy a travel package and other aspects of traveller experience. Lyu and Wang (2015) mentioned that travellers prefer to use social media for seeking information rather than traditional sources.

Social media is a media that can share, interact and provide immediate feedback and attention for the user. It is important for National Tourism Organisations to adopt the use of social media while disseminating tourism information to users. Factors of the determinant of user intention for technology based on last research includes usefulness response, performance expectation, and interest in use (Davis, 1989; Davis et al. 1989; Venkatesh & Davis, 2000; Croteau & Vieru, 2002; Schaper & Pervan, 2006; Rogers, 1995; Mohd Sobhi et al. 2011). The credibility and trustworthiness of social media applications are increasing and today's tourist trust these travel applications more than face-to-face professional travel advice. The Planned Behavioural Theory (Ajzen, 1991) is a popular social psychology theoretical model and often applied in describing various behavioural or behavioural situations. Technological Acceptance Model (*TAM*), proposed by Davis (1986), for various types of information systems and communication. *TAM* forecasts individual adoption and voluntary use of technology. Perkowski and Etzioni (1999) said that the quality information network is useful if the user can evaluate the information provided by a web site that is accurate, complete, and up to date. Sanchez-Franco et al. (2015) mentioned when customers believe in a product, their involvement, commitment and loyalty towards the products are also high that will make their intentions to buy the products higher. According to Schegg et al. (2008) and Wang et al. (2002), it is a big loss not to use social media and understand the importance of social media.

Development of an Instrument for Survey

The instrument to measure user intention to use Facebook of Tourism Malaysia consists of five items for attitude, five items for subjective norms, six items for behavioural control response, ten items for Facebook user experience, thirty items for Facebook user response, and five items for Facebook user engagement. The items were adopted from the previous scholars (Refer to Table 1 below). Green and Pearson (2011) also adopt and adapt the mechanism of the items to be applied in their research. In addition, the instrument content validity was validated by three experts from the Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication in Universiti Putra Malaysia, Malaysia. Every item was measured using a five-point Likert Scale with 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (disagree), 3 (neutral), 4 (agree), and 5 (strongly agree).

Table 1: Constructs and items

Constructs	Items	Scholars
Attitude	1. I would like to use Facebook Cuti-Cuti 1Malaysia for holidays in the future.	Julian et al. (2013).
	2. I earn interest when viewing Facebook Cuti-Cuti 1Malaysia.	
	3. It is easy and good for me to use Facebook Cuti-cuti 1 Malaysia compared to other tourism social media.	
	4. Cuti-Cuti 1Malaysia Facebook good to use for further details on booking travel.	
	5. I would suggest Facebook Cuti-Cuti 1Malaysia for other partners.	
Subjective norm	1. Overall I am satisfied with the Facebook Cuti- Cuti 1Malaysia.	Sudheer et al. (2012)
	2. I feel the need to share information with Facebook friends of Cuti-Cuti 1Malaysia.	
	3. Urge my friends to use Facebook Cuti-Cuti 1Malaysia.	
	4. Friends expect me to use Facebook Cuti-cuti 1Malaysia to get tourist information	
	5. Use Facebook Cuti-Cuti 1Malaysia is a wise	
Behaviour Control Response	1. It is easy for me to use Facebook Cuti-cuti 1Malaysia for holidays	Julian et al. (2013)
	2. I was easy to control the use of Facebook Cuti-cuti 1Malaysia in granting leave information	
	3. Participate in social media Facebook Cuti-Cuti 1Malaysia is easy	
	4. I am efficient use all functionality available on Facebook Cuti-cuti 1Malaysia	

	5. I rarely run into the problem that makes it difficult for me use Facebook Cuti-Cuti 1Malaysia	
	6. Know how to use Facebook Cuti-Cuti 1Malaysia	
Facebook user experience	1. Update the latest vacation profile	Vasalou et al. (2010),
	2. Put a holiday for all	
	3. Submit a story/comment past vacations.	
	4. See vacations booked on social media.	
	5. Evaluate story vacation of yourself.	
	6. Share holiday information to other users.	
	7. Find new contacts that have the same interests.	
	8. Buy vacation packages online.	
	9. Invite a friend online Share holiday information to other users. who interest in travel.	
	10. Connect with friends who are interested in tourism.	
Facebook user response	1. Information in the Facebook Cuti-Cuti 1Malaysia is understandable and clear.	Julian et al. (2013).
	2. Facebook on Cuti-cuti 1Malaysia does not require much thinking effort. *	
	3. Facebook is to use Cuti- Cuti 1Malaysia.	
	4. Facebook Cuti-Cuti to make skilled 1Malaysia I to get tourist information.	
	5. Facebook Cuti-Cuti 1Malaysia is extremely easy to use.	
	6. Facebook Cuti-Cuti 1Malaysia in the quest for tourist information could speed up my mission.	
	7. Facebook Cuti-Cuti to increase my productivity 1Malaysia in search of information.	
	8. Facebook Cuti-Cuti 1Malaysia facilitate I decided.	
	9. Facebook Cuti-Cuti 1Malaysia enabled me to finish quests with ease.	
	10. Facebook Cuti-Cuti vacation planning help 1Malaysia efficiently.	
	11. The information contained within Facebook on 1Malaysia leave is valid.	
	12. Users ' comments on Facebook Cuti-Cuti 1Malaysia is reliable.	
	13. Facebook Cuti-Cuti 1Malaysia unbiased. *	
	14. I feel I can trust the information in social media.	
	15. Facebook Cuti-Cuti 1Malaysia has quality information.	
	16. There is a lot of information in the Facebook Cuti-Cuti 1Malaysia.	

	17. Save time using Facebook Cuti-cuti 1Malaysia.	
	18. Easily share information Facebook Cuti-Cuti 1Malaysia.	
	19. Many benefits using Facebook Cuti-cuti 1Malaysia.	
	20. the invaluable benefits of using Facebook Cuti-cuti 1Malaysia.	
	21. I am happy using Facebook Cuti-cuti 1Malaysia.	
	22. Experience using Facebook Cuti-cuti 1Malaysia is very excited.	
	23. Facebook Cuti –Cuti 1Malaysia give me satisfaction.	
	24. I'm a based on Facebook Cuti-cuti 1Malaysia a heartening.	
	25. Facebook Cuti-Cuti 1Malaysia is entertaining activities.	
	26. The Facebook Cuti-Cuti 1 Malaysia to supply accurate information to users.	
	27. Facebook Cuti-Cuti 1Malaysia provides information relating thereto.	
	28. Information on Facebook Cuti-cuti 1Malaysia is up to date.	
	29. Information Facebook Cuti-Cuti 1Malaysia uploaded as appropriate time.	
	30. Information Facebook Cuti-Cuti 1Malaysia is an extra value.	
Facebook user engagement	1. Provide guidance to other users in obtaining information on Facebook Cuti-Cuti 1Malaysia.	Zhou et al. (2010).
	2. Profitable use Facebook Cuti-Cuti 1Malaysia.	
	3. Highly relevant in finding travel information.	
	4. Useful will benefit both.	
	5. Meaningful to me when using it.	
	6. Item negative questions	

Data Collection

The adopted items in the instrument were pre-tested on 35 officers of Tourism Malaysia in Headquarters, Putrajaya, Malaysia with a purpose of testing some aspects of different variables. The instrument reliability was measured using Cronbach's Alpha. Table 2 below shows the Cronbach's Alpha value for the pre-test was between 0.81 to 0.89. Generally, the acceptance of social media instruments using Alpha's alpha value is high. In general, value of alpha's alpha (α) of more than 0.8 value reliability is high. Therefore, no adjustment is required in the survey questions.

Table 2: Reliability Coefficient of the Research Instrument (Pre-Test)

Variables	No. of Items	Cronbach Alpha
Attitude	5	0.81
Subjective Norms	5	0.87
Behaviour control response	6	0.89
Facebook user experience	10	0.91
Facebook user response	30	0.90
Facebook user engagement	5	0.91

For the actual data collection, 237 valid responses were collected. **114** per cent male and **123** per cent female between the ages of 18 to 60 years old have responded to this survey. The responses were collected from the local users of ‘*Tourism Malaysia*’ Facebook.

Finding and Discussion

The research conducted confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) and a measurement model for each construct with a purpose to check the adequacy of the generated items representing their construct. CFA is the first level of analysis to assist the researcher in defining the important structure of variables in the analysis (Díaz, José Blázquez, Molina, & Martín-Consuegra, 2013). CFA indicates interrelated items for a specific construct and could represent the construct. The research also applied the second level analysis (measurement model) of specifying and validating the constructs in SEM analysis to test for the model fit, the constructs discriminant validity and reliability.

Table 3: Demographic profile of participants in the study

Characteristics	Frequency(<i>f</i>)	Percentage (%)
Gender		
Male	114	48.1
Female	123	51.9
Age		
18-25	105	44.3
26-34	78	32.9
35-44	38	16.0
45-59	14	5.9
Over 60	2	0.8
Races		
Malay	211	89.0
Chinese	19	8.0



Indian	4	1.7
Others	3	1.3
Status		
Single	158	66.7
Married	79	33.3
Education Level		
High School	27	11.4
Diploma	74	31.2
Degree	118	49.8
Master/PhD	18	7.6
Year Become Facebook Member		
Less 1 year	107	45.1
1 Year	71	30.0
2 Years	35	14.8
3 Years	14	5.9
4 Years	2	0.8
Over 5 years	8	3.4
Time Spent On Facebook		
0-1 Hour	164	69.2
2 Hours	61	25.7
3 Hours	7	3.0
4 Hours	3	1.3
5 Hours	1	0.4
6 Hours	1	0.4
Time Spent Daily On Facebook		
Tourism	86	23.6
Less Than 10 mins	71	30.0
11-20 minutes	43	18.1
21-30 minutes	24	10.1
31-40 minutes	6	2.5
41-50 minutes	2	0.8
51-60 minutes	5	2.1
Over 1 hour		

Details on the demographics of participants are presented in Table 3. A total of 237 respondents (48.1% male, 51.9% female), aged between 18-25 (44.3%) were selected as the main respondents. A degree holder represent the highest number of the respondents (49.8%). The majority of respondents become a Facebook member for less than 1 year. Meanwhile, 164 respondents (69.2%) spent their time on Facebook for less than 1 hour. In terms of time spent using the Toursim Malaysia Facebook, majority of respondents spent their time 20 minutes per day (30%).

CFA for Attitude

The study tested model fit for attitude to ensure the items included in the Facebook user attitude are not weak and able to meet the convergence validity and reliability requirement. Yet, the finding showed, the fit indices value to measure model fit for attitude failed to meet the model fit level of acceptance (Refer to Table 4). The analysis indicated that the model for attitude failed to meet two of the three criteria. Based on Holmes-Smith, Coote and Cunningham (2006) and Hair et al. (2010) recommendation, a model is considered fit if the fit indices value met the level of acceptance for all model fit categories. During CFA, any item that does not fit the measurement model due to low factor loading value should be discarded from the model. Discarding items that failed to meet factor loading characteristics will increase the model validity and reliability (Gregg & Walczak, 2010; Green & Pearson, 2011; Barrera & Carrión, 2014). Díaz, Blázquez, Molina, and Consuegra (2013) mentioned that an acceptable factor loading value should exceed 0.5 and less than 1.0. However, the factor loading analysis on the items consists in attitude indicated that all the present items met the characteristics of factor loading (Refer to Table 5). Therefore, due to the fitness indices value issue, the study concluded that Facebook user attitude is deemed invalid since it failed the confirmatory test. In addition, Facebook user attitude will be discarded from the second level (measurement model) construct validation and reliability test.

Table 4: Table Fitness for Attitude

Category	Model Fit Indices	Indicator Value Received	Fit Indices Value
Absolute Fit	RMSEA	<=.08>	.15
	GFI	>=.9	.94
Parsimonious Fit	X²/df	<5.0	6.97
Incremental Fit	AGFI	>=.9	.83
	CFI	>=.9	.91
	NFI	>=.9	.908
	TLI	>=.9	.838

Table 5: Factor Loading Value for Attitude

Item	Load Factor
Attitude 1	.717
Attitude 2	.754
Attitude 3	.725
Attitude 4	.623
Attitude 5	.561

CFA for Subjective Norm

The study checked model fit for the subjective norm to ensure the items consisting in the particular construct are not weak and able to meet the items' convergence validity and reliability provision. In the beginning, the subjective norm contains five items. However, one item was deleted due to its failure to meet the factor loading characteristics (Refer to Table 5). Díaz, Blázquez, Molina, and Consuegra (2013) mentioned that an acceptable factor loading value should exceed 0.5 and less than 1.0. By deleting an unqualified item, subjective norm fitness indices value will be affected and increase the validity and reliability of the items (Gregg & Walczak, 2010; Green & Pearson, 2011; Barrera & Carrión, 2014). The fitness indices value for subjective norm indicated that the construct met all the model fit categories. Therefore, the construct is considered valid and ready for convergence validity and reliability analysis.

To measure the remaining interrelated items consists of subjective norms, it was determined through convergent validity analysis. The items are considered to converge if the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) value is exceeded 0.5. Table 6 indicated AVE value for items in subjective norms is 0.58. Therefore, subjective norms comprise only four items. Another researcher such as Yu and Zhao (2013) and Xu, Benbasat, and Cenfetelli, (2013) also used a similar principle to determine their construct validity in their study.

The study also determined its construct reliability based on the reliability value as suggested by Kang and Norton (2004) that reliability values must between 0.70 to 0.9 to be considered as satisfactory. Table 7 indicated that the construct reliability for subjective norms is 0.846. Therefore, subjective norms met the reliability value and considered reliable as a construct and been accepted for the second stage modelling analysis process for reliability and validity measurement (Measurement Model).

Table 6: Table Fitness for subjective norm

Category	Model Fit Indices	Indicator Received	Value	Fit Indices Value
Absolute Fit	RMSEA	<=.08		.00
	GFI	>=.9		.99
Parsimonious Fit	X²/df	<5.0		.22
Incremental Fit	AGFI	>=.9		.99
	CFI	>=.9		1.0
	NFI	>=.9		.99
	TLI	>=.9		1.01

Table 7: Factor loading value for subjective norm

Items	Load Factor	AVE	CR
Norm 2	.703	0.58	0.846
Norm 3	.813		
Norm 4	.695		
Norm 5	.826		

CFA for Behavior Control Response

Initially, the behaviour control response contains six items. However, one item was deleted to meet the behaviour control response model fitness indices value. Table 7 indicated the fitness indices value in each category for behaviour control response. Díaz, Blázquez, Molina, and Consuegra (2013) mentioned that an acceptable factor loading value should exceed 0.5 and less than 1.0. Two out of three categories met the compatibility index as suggested by Hair, Anderson, Tatham and Black (2010). The study decided to retain behaviour control response as a construct and considered it fit as a model due to only one category of model fit exceeded the suggested value. In addition, the remaining items also met an acceptable value for factor loading provision.

To measure the remaining interrelated items consisting of behaviour control response, convergent validity analysis was used to determine the measurement. The items are considered to converge for the construct if the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) value is exceeded 0.5. Table G indicated AVE value for items in behaviour control response is 0.592. Therefore, the behaviour control response comprises only 5 items. Another researcher such as Yu and Zhao (2013) and Xu, Benbasat, and Cenfetelli, (2013) also used a similar principle to determine the construct validity in their study.

The study also determined its construct reliability based on the reliability value as suggested by Kang and Norton (2004) that reliability values must be between 0.70 to 0.9 to be

considered as satisfactory. Table 9 indicated construct reliability for behaviour control response is 0.879. Therefore, the behaviour control response is considered reliable as a construct and adequate for the second stage modelling analysis process for reliability and validity measurement (Measurement Model).

Table 8: Table Fitness for Behavior Control Response

Name of Category	Model Fit Indices	Indicator Value Received	Fit Indices Value
Absolute Fit	RMSEA	<=.08	.09
	GFI	>=.9	.97
Parsimonious Fit	X²/df	<5.0	3.01
Incremental Fit	AGFI	>=.9	.92
	CFI	>=.9	.98
	NFI	>=.9	.97
	TLI	>=.9	.96

Table 9: Load Factor Value for Behaviour Control Response

Items	Load Factor	AVE	CR
Control 2	.741	0.592	0.879
Control 3	.763		
Control 4	.845		
Control 5	.758		
Control 6	.735		

CFA for Facebook User Experience

The study tested model fit for Facebook user experience to ensure that the items of the particular construct are not weak and are able to meet the convergence validity and reliability criteria. Initially, the Facebook user experience contains ten items. However, five items were removed to increase the construct validity and reliability. Díaz, Blázquez, Molina, and Consuegra (2013) mentioned that an acceptable factor loading value should exceed 0.5 and less than 1.0 (refer to table 9). By deleting an unqualified item, Facebook user experience model fit will be affected and increase the validity and reliability of the item (Gregg & Walczak, 2010; Green & Pearson, 2011; Barrera & Carrión, 2014). The fitness indices value for Facebook user experience indicated that the construct met all the model fit categories as suggested by Hair, Anderson, Tatham and Black in 2010 (Refer to Table 9). Thus, the Facebook user experience is considered fit and valid as a construct. In addition, Facebook user experience also ready for the convergence validity and reliability analysis.

The items interrelated in Facebook user experience was determined through convergent validity analysis. The items are considered related if the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) value is exceeded 0.5. Table 11 indicated AVE value for items in Facebook user experience is 0.530. Therefore, facebook user experience comprises only 5 items. Another researcher such as Yu and Zhao (2013) and Xu, Benbasat, and Cenfetelli, (2013) also used a similar principle to determine their construct validity in their study.

The study also determined facebook user experience reliability as a construct based on the reliability analysis. As suggested by Kang and Norton (2004) the reliability values must be between 0.70 to 0.9 to be considered as satisfactory. Table I indicated construct reliability for Facebook User Experience is 0.847. Therefore, Facebook User Experience met the reliability value. Thus, the Facebook user experience is considered reliable as a construct and suitable for the second stage modelling analysis process for reliability and validity measurement (Measurement Model).

Table 10: Table Fitness for Facebook User Experience

Name of Category	Model Fit Indices	Indicator Value Received	Fit Indices Value
Absolute Fit	RMSEA	$\leq .08$.01
	GFI	$\geq .9$.99
Parsimonious Fit	X²/df	< 5.0	1.02
Incremental Fit	AGFI	$\geq .9$.97
	CFI	$\geq .9$	1.000
	NFI	$\geq .9$.98
	TLI	$\geq .9$.99

Table 11: Load Factor Value for Facebook User Experience

Items	Load Factor	AVE	CR
Nature 3	.700	0.530	0.847
Nature 4	.544		
Nature 5	.803		
Nature 6	.805		
Nature 8	.755		

CFA for Facebook User Response

The study analysed model fit for a Facebook user response to ensure the items in the particular construct are not weak and are able to meet the items convergence validity and reliability criteria. Initially, the Facebook user response consists of thirty items. Fifteen items were omitted to meet the Facebook User response model fit indices value. By omitting the

unqualified item, Facebook user response model fit will increase the validity and reliability of the items (Gregg & Walczak, 2010; Green & Pearson, 2011; Barrera & Carrión, 2014). Díaz, Blázquez, Molina, and Consuegra (2013) mentioned that an acceptable factor loading value should exceed 0.5 and less than 1.0 (refer to table 12). The model fit indices value for Facebook user response indicated that the construct met all the model fit categories as suggested by Hair, Anderson, Tatham and Black in 2010 (refer table 13). Thus, Facebook user response is considered fit and valid as a construct. Additionally, Facebook user response also set for convergence validity and reliability analysis.

Average Variance Extracted (AVE) value is used to measure convergence validity of the items consists in Facebook user response. The items are considered related if the AVE value exceeded 0.5. Table 12 indicated AVE value for the items in Facebook user response is 0.601. Thus, Facebook user response consists of fifteen items only. Another researcher such as Yu and Zhao (2013) and Xu, Benbasat, and Cenfetelli, (2013) also used a similar principle to determine their construct validity in their study.

The Facebook user response reliability as a construct is determined based on the reliability value. Kang and Norton (2004) suggested that reliability values must from 0.70 to 0.9 to be considered as satisfactory. Table 13 indicated construct reliability for Facebook User response is 0.957. Therefore, Facebook user response is considered reliable as a construct and suitable for the second stage modelling analysis process for reliability and validity measurement (Measurement Model).

Table 12: Table Fitness for Facebook User Response

Category	Model Fit Indices	Instructions Value Received	Fit Indices Value
Absolute Fit	RMSEA	$\leq .08$.08
	GFI	$\geq .9$.88
Parsimonious Fit	X²/df	< 5.0	2.79
Incremental Fit	AGFI	$\geq .9$.84
	CFI	$\geq .9$.94
	NFI	$\geq .9$.91
	TLI	$\geq .9$.93

Table 13: Load Factor Value for Facebook Response

Items	Load Factor	AVE	CR
Believe5	.773	0.601	0.957
Believe5	.781		
Benefit1	.776		
Benefit2	.831		
Benefit3	.855		
Benefit4	.837		
Benefit5	.844		
Fun1	.812		
Fun2	.798		
Fun3	.808		
Quality2	.714		
Quality5	.767		
Useful4	.745		
Easy5	.631		
Easy2	.605		

CFA for Facebook User engagement

Originally, Facebook user engagement contains five items. However, one item was deleted to meet the Facebook user engagement model fit indices value. Table 14 indicated the fitness indices value in each category for behaviour control response. Díaz, Blázquez, Molina, and Consuegra (2013) mentioned that acceptable factor loading value should exceed 0.5 and less than 1.0. Two out of three categories met the compatibility index as suggested by Hair, Anderson, Tatham and Black (2010). The study decided to retain Facebook user engagement as a construct and considered it fit as a model due to only one category of model fit which slightly exceeded the suggested value. In addition, the remaining items also met an acceptable value for factor requirement.

The items interrelated consists of Facebook user engagement is measured via convergent validity analysis. The items interrelated is determined based on the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) value > 0.5 . Table M indicated AVE value for the items in Facebook user engagement is 0.711. Hence, the finding showed only four items are considered interrelated in Facebook user engagement. Another researcher such as Yu and Zhao (2013) and Xu, Benbasat, and Cenfetelli, (2013) also used a similar principle to determine the construct validity in their study.

The study also determined Facebook user engagement reliability as a construct based on the reliability value. As suggested by Kang and Norton (2004) that reliability values must

between 0.70 to 0.9 to be considered as satisfactory. Table 15 indicated construct reliability for Facebook user engagement is 0.908. Therefore, Facebook user engagement is considered reliable as a construct and adequate for the second stage modelling analysis process for reliability and validity measurement (Measurement Model).

Table 14: Table Fitness for Facebook User Engagement

Name of Category	Model Fit Indices	Instructions Value Received	Fit Indices Value
Absolute Fit	RMSEA	$\leq .08$.118
	GFI	$\geq .9$.983
Parsimonious Fit	X^2/df	< 5.0	4.285
Incremental Fit	AGFI	$\geq .9$.917
	CFI	$\geq .9$.989
	NFI	$\geq .9$.986
	TLI	$\geq .9$.968

Table 15: Load Factor Value for Facebook User Engagement

Items	load factor	AVE	CR
Involvement2	.852	0.711	0.908
Involvement3	.873		
Involvement4	.837		
Involvement5	.810		

Conclusion

To measure the Facebook user intention of using Tourism Malaysia Facebook, the researcher performed CFA analysis for all constructs involved in this study before testing the construct relationship using structural equation model (SEM). Thus, using CFA this study was able to verify the adopted items consisted in the construct of the study. After the unidimensionality assessment, validity, and reliability test, some of the items were discarded. As a result of the CFA, attitude is found invalid as a construct due to its failure to meet the model fit provision. While for subjective norms and behaviour control response, one item is deleted for each construct to meet the model fit requirement and valid as constructs. Whilst for Facebook user experience, five items were removed from the presence list of items to increase the construct validity and reliability. Similarly, Facebook user response also deleted fifteen items from the presence list of items to increase the validity and reliability. Similar to subjective norms and behaviour response, the Facebook user engagement removed one item to meet the model fit indices value, validity, and reliability. The items consist of the Facebook user response and user engagement are highly converged compared to the subjective norm, behaviour control response, and Facebook user experience based on the AVE value for each construct. Also, all



the constructs except attitude are considered reliable in this research. All in all, the remaining items and constructs in this study is considered valid and reliable to measure user intention to use the Facebook of Tourism Malaysia.

REFERENCES

- Agnihotri, R., Kothandaraman, P., Kashyap, R. & Singh, R. (2012) Bringing 'social' into sales: the impact of salespeople's social media use on service behaviors and value creation. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 32, 3, pp. 333-348.
- Ali, H. (2011) Exchanging value within individuals' networks: social support implications for health marketers. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 27, 3/4, pp. 316-335.
- Ballantine, RW & Stephenson, R.J. (2011) Help me, I'm fat! Social support in online weight loss networks. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 10, 6, pp. 332-337.
- Chan, N. L., & Denizci G. B. (2011). Investigation of social media marketing: How does the hotel industry in Hong Kong perform in marketing on social media websites? *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 28(4), 345–368.
- Chen, Y., Fay, S. & Wang, Q. (2011b) The role of marketing in social media: how online consumer reviews evolve. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 25, 2, pp. 85-94.
- Cox, C., Burgess, S., Sellito, C., & Bultjens, J. (2009). The role of user generated content in tourists' travel planning behaviour. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing and Management*, 18(8), 743-764.
- Díaz, E., José Blázquez, J., Molina, A., & Martín-Consuegra, D. (2013). Are the non-governmental organisations' web sites effective?. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, 16(4), 370-392.
- de Vries, L., Gensler, S. & Leeflang, ES.H. (2012) Popularity of brand posts on brand fan pages: an investigation of the effects of social media marketing. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 26, 2, pp. 83-91.
- DG. Gregg, S. Walczak, *The relationship between website quality, trust and price premiums at online auctions*. *Electronic Commerce Research*. 2010 Mar 1;10(1):1-25.
- DT. Green, JM. Pearson, *Integrating website usability with the electronic commerce acceptance model*. *Behaviour and Information Technology*. 2011 Mar 1;30(2):181-99.
- E. Díaz, J. Blázquez, A. Molina, D. M.-Consuegra. *Are the non-governmental organisations' web sites effective?*. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*. 2013 Aug 30;16(4):370-92
- Gretzel, U. (2006). Consumer generated content – trends and implications for branding. *e-Review of Tourism Research*, 4(3), 9–11.



- Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1998). *Multivariate Data Analysis* (5th ed.) Upper Saddle River, New Jersey, USA: Prentice-Hall International, Inc.
- Huang, L. (2011). Social media as a new play in a marketing channel strategy: Evidence from Taiwan travel agencies' blogs. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 17, 615–634.
- Holmes-Smith, P., Coote, L., & Cunningham, E. (2006). *Structural Equation Modeling: From the Fundamentals to Advanced Topics*. Melbourne: SREAMS.
- JD. Xu, I. Benbasat, RT. Cenfetelli . *Integrating service quality with system and information quality: An empirical test in the e-service context*. *Mis Quarterly*. 2013 Sep 1;37(3).
- Julian K. Ayeh, Norman Au, & Rob Law (2013). Predicting the intention to use consumer generated media for travel planning. *Tourism Management*. Vol.35.132-143.
- Lu, H.-P & Hsiao, K.-L. (2010). The influence of extro/introversion on the intention to pay for social networking sites. *Information & Management*, 47, 3, pp. 150-157.
- Lyu, S.O. & Wang, J., 2015. 'Are the days of information centres gone? Effects of the ubiquitous information availability'. *Tourism Management*, 48, 54–63.
- Munar, A. M. (2010). Tourist-created content: Rethinking destination branding. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 5(3), 291–305
- Pallant, J. (2011) *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using the SPSS program*. 4th Edition, Allen & Unwin, Berkshire.
- Poon, A. (1993). *Tourism, Technology and Competitive Strategies*. Oxon: CAB International
- P. Yu , D. Zhao. *Effect of website quality factors on the success of agricultural products B2C e-commerce*. In *International Conference on Computer and Computing Technologies in Agriculture 2013* Sep 18 (pp. 98-113). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg
- RB. Barrera, GC. Carrión, *Simultaneous measurement of quality in different online services*. *The Service Industries Journal*. 2014 Jan 25;34(2):123-44..
- S. Kang, HE. Norton, *Nonprofit organisations' use of the World Wide Web: are they sufficiently fulfilling organisational goals?*. *Public Relations Review*. 2004 Sep 1;30(3):279-84.



- Sudheer M., Muragesh Y., Sachin S., & T. Prasad .(2012). Adoption of Social Media by Business Education Students: Application of Technology Acceptance Model (TAM).National Institute of Industrial Engineering. India.
- Vasalou, A., Joinson, A.N., Courvoisier, D. (2010). “Cultural differences, experience with social networks and the nature of true commitment in Facebook”, *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 68: 719-728.
- Yoo, K. H., & Gretzel, U. (2008). Use and impact of online travel reviews. In P. O’Connor, W. Ho’pken, & U. Gretzel (Eds.), *Information and communication technologies in tourism* (pp. 35–46). Vienna, Austria: Springer Verlag.
- Zhou, T., Lu, Y., & Wang, B. (2010). Integrating TTF & UTAUT To Explain Mobile Banking User Adoption. *Computers in Human Behavior*.26(4).760–767.