

## CHAPTER FOUR

### RESULTS

The previous chapter explained the methodology for this research. This chapter reports the results of the study which are divided into four parts based on the data obtained from the questionnaires as follows:

- 1.1 Demographic information
- 1.2 Trip information
- 1.3 Attitude toward visiting Inner Rattanakosin Island
- 1.4 Respondents' problems and impressions

#### 4.1 DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

One hundred and fifty foreign tourists who visited Inner Rattanakosin Island from December 2009 to January 2010 were asked to participate in this research. However, only 118 questionnaires were completed. The demographic information of the respondents is presented below in the form of frequency and percentages in Table 1.

*Table 1. Demographic Information of the Respondents*

Demographic information	Frequency	Percentage (%)
<b>1. Gender</b>		
Male	63	53.4
Female	55	46.6
Total	118	100.0
<b>2. Age</b>		
Below 20	6	5.1
21-30	29	24.6
31-40	45	38.1
41-50	18	15.3
51-60	12	10.2
Over 60	8	6.8
Total	118	100.0

*(table continued)*

**Table 1. (continued)**

Demographic Information	Frequency	Percentage (%)
<b>3. Continent</b>		
Asia	29	24.6
Europe	36	30.5
Africa	4	3.4
Australia	6	5.1
North America	37	31.4
South America	6	5.1
Total	118	100.0
<b>4. Occupation</b>		
Government employee	27	22.9
State Enterprise employee	4	3.4
Private Company employee	38	32.2
Business Owner	10	8.5
Student	19	16.1
Others	20	16.9
Total	118	100.0

Table 1 shows that the total number of foreign respondents in this research was 118 people who were traveling around Inner Rattanakosin Island. More than half of the respondents or 53.4% were male, and 46.6% were female. The respondents' ages ranged from less than 20 years old to more than 60 years old. 38.1% of them were 31 to 40 years old, and 24.6% of them were 21 to 30 years old. For the ages of the other subjects, please see Table 1. The majority of them were from North America (31.4%), followed by Europe (30.5%), and Asia (24.6%). Regarding their occupation, most of the subjects were employees of private companies (32.2%), followed by government officials (22.9%), and others, including retired, NGO employees and unemployed (16.9%), students (16.1%), business owners (8.5%), and employees of state enterprises at only 3.4%.

#### **4.2 TRIP INFORMATION**

In this part, the study looked at the respondents' trip arrangements. Nine closed-ended questions were employed to find out the characteristics of their trips.

Table 10 reveals the revisiting tendency of the respondents and also provides the reasons for revisiting or not revisiting.

**Table 2. Trip Patterns**

<b>Trip patterns</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage (%)</b>
Self-organized	78	66.1
Organized through a travel agency	24	20.3
Others	16	13.6
Total	118	100.0

Table 2 shows that most of the respondents' trips (66.1%) were self-organized, while 20.3% were organized through a travel agency. Only 13.6% were organized by others, including friends, relatives, and the respondents' companies.

**Table 3. Trip Length**

<b>Trip length</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage (%)</b>
1 week or less	38	32.2
2-3 weeks	48	40.7
3-4 weeks	14	11.9
More than 1 month	18	15.3
Total	118	100.0

Table 3 reveals that 40.7% spent 2-3 weeks traveling in Thailand, whereas 32.2% spent one week or less. 18% said that they would spend more than one month and only 11.9% traveled in Thailand for 3-4 weeks.

**Table 4. Trip Expenses**

<b>Trip expenses</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage (%)</b>
Less than US \$500	21	17.8
US \$501-1,000	16	13.6
US \$1,001-1,500	23	19.5
More than US \$1,500	58	49.2
Total	118	100.0

Table 4 indicates that 49.2% spent more than US\$ 1,500 on the trip while 19.5% of them used US \$1,001-1,500 and only 17.8% spent less than US \$500.

**Table 5. Purpose of Visit**

Purpose of visit	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Recreation	81	68.6
Business /Official	6	5.1
Religion	2	1.7
Visiting friends or relatives	9	7.6
Others	20	16.9
Total	118	100.0

Table 5 shows that 68.6% of the respondents visited Bangkok for recreation while 16.9% came for other purposes such as study or medical treatment.

**Table 6. Type of Accommodation**

Type of accommodation	Frequency	Percentage (%)
One to three-star hotels	42	35.6
Four to five-star hotels	34	28.8
Guesthouses	24	20.3
Others	18	15.3
Total	118	100.0

Table 6 indicates that 35.6% of the respondents chose to stay at one- to three-star hotels, 28.8% decided to stay at four- to five-star hotels, and 20.3% stayed at guesthouses. The rest, or 15.3%, stayed with friends or at relatives' houses.

**Table 7. First Time Visiting Inner Rattanakosin Island**

First time visit	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Yes	95	80.5
No	23	19.5
Total	118	100.0

Table 7 shows that 80.5% of the respondents had been to Inner Rattanakosin Island before, whereas 19.5% had never been to this area.

**Table 8. Length of Visit to Inner Rattanakosin Island**

Length of visit	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Half a day	37	31.4
One day	65	55.1
Others	16	13.6
Total	118	100.0

Table 8 shows the length of their visits to Inner Rattanakosin Island. 55.1% traveled in this area for one day and 31.4% spent half a day visiting. Another 13.6% visited this area for a couple days.

**Table 9. Source of Information**

Source of information	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Friends or relatives	34	28.8
Travel agencies	10	8.5
Tourism Authority of Thailand	1	0.8
Magazines/Newspapers	4	3.4
The Internet	32	27.1
The Mass Media	2	1.7
Others	35	29.7
Total	118	100.0

Table 9 illustrates that the majority of respondents or 29.7% received travel information from other sources, such as guide books. 28.8% and 27.1% got information from friends or relatives and the internet, respectively. Surprisingly, only 0.8% received information from the Tourism Authority of Thailand. For other sources of information, please see Table 9.

**Table 10. Revisiting Tendency and Reasons**

Revisiting tendency and reasons	Frequency	Percentage (%)
<b>1. Revisiting tendency</b>		
Yes	103	87.3
No	15	12.7
Total	118	100.0
<b>2. Reasons for revisiting</b>		
Tourist attractions	43	36.4
Hospitality	10	8.5
Service Facilities	12	10.2
Low cost	12	10.2
Delicious Food	10	8.5
Climate	9	7.6
Others	7	5.9
Total	103	87.3
<b>3. Reasons for not revisiting</b>		
No interesting attractions	4	3.4
Lack of safety	0	0
Dishonesty	0	0
Poor services	2	1.7
Pollution	3	2.5
Traffic problems	4	3.4
Others	2	1.7
Total	15	12.7

Table 10 shows that the respondents had a positive attitude toward visiting Inner Rattanakosin Island. The largest group of respondents (87.3%) indicated that they would like to visit this area again. In addition, the majority of respondents (36.4%) agreed that the tourist attractions were the factor that affected their decision, followed by service facilities and the low cost of travel (10.2%). Another 8.5% mentioned hospitality and the delicious food. The rest, 7.6% and 5.9%, indicated climate and other factors, such as people's ability to speak English, respectively.

On the other hand, only 12.7% of the respondents did not desire to revisit this area due to the lack of interesting attractions and traffic problems 3.4%, followed by pollution 2.5%, poor service and other factors at 1.7%.



### 4.3 ATTITUDE TOWARD VISITING INNER RATTANAKOSIN ISLAND

This part reveals the attitude of the respondents toward the different components of Inner Rattanakosin Island: attractions, facilities, environment, and people's hospitality. The mean score of each component is summed and analyzed as follows:

**Table 11. Attitude Toward Visiting Inner Rattanakosin Island**

Attitude toward visiting Inner Rattanakosin Island	Strongly agree	Agree	Moderate ly agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total	Mean	SD	Meaning
1)The attractions are magnificent.	69 58.5%	39 33.1%	10 8.5%	0 0%	0 0%	118 100%	4.50	.650	Strongly agree
2)The maintenance of the attractions is excellent.	48 40.7%	56 47.5%	14 11.9%	0 0%	0 0%	118 100%	4.29	.668	Strongly agree
3)The attractions are too crowded.	12 10.2%	46 39.0%	43 36.4%	13 11.0%	4 3.4%	118 100%	3.42	.937	Agree
4)The ticket prices are unreasonable.	8 6.8%	17 14.4%	36 30.5%	45 38.1%	12 10.2%	118 100%	2.69	1.058	Moderately agree
5)The shop houses sell souvenirs at reasonable prices.	2 1.7%	48 40.7%	46 39.0%	22 18.6%	0 0%	118 100%	3.25	.776	Moderately agree
6)The street vendors sell souvenirs at reasonable prices.	0 0%	41 34.7%	52 44.1%	17 14.4%	8 6.8%	118 100%	3.07	.874	Moderately agree
7)There are a variety of cuisines.	22 18.6%	41 34.7%	39 33.1%	14 11.9%	2 1.7%	118 100%	3.57	.983	Agree
8)Food and beverages are unsafe and unclean.	2 1.7%	16 13.6%	23 19.5%	67 56.8%	10 8.5%	118 100%	2.43	.891	Disagree
9)The information about Inner Rattanakosin Island is useful and widely available.	22 18.6%	61 51.7%	28 23.7%	7 5.9%	0 0%	118 100%	3.83	.799	Agree

(table continued)

*Table 11. (continued)*

Attitude toward visiting Inner Rattanakosin Island	Strongly agree	Agree	Moderately agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total	Mean	SD	Meaning
10) There are enough Tourist Information Centers.	15 12.7%	54 45.8%	42 35.6%	7 5.9%	0 0%	118 100%	3.65	.778	Agree
11) The facilities such as street signs and location maps are sufficient.	16 13.6%	36 30.5%	38 32.2%	25 21.2%	3 2.5%	118 100%	3.31	1.035	Moderately agree
12) The brochures at the attractions are useful and widely available.	14 11.9%	60 50.8%	30 25.4%	10 8.5%	4 3.4%	118 100%	3.59	.927	Agree
13) It is inconvenient to travel in the area.	2 1.7%	18 15.3%	28 23.7%	53 44.9%	17 14.4%	118 100%	2.45	.975	Disagree
14) The officials are able to communicate in English.	12 10.2%	54 45.8%	35 29.7%	15 12.7%	2 1.7%	118 100%	3.50	.903	Agree
15) Street vendors and shopkeepers are able to communicate in English.	6 5.1%	28 23.7%	59 50.0%	21 17.8%	4 3.4%	118 100%	3.09	.867	Moderately agree
16) People are friendly.	58 49.2%	54 45.8%	6 5.1%	0 0%	0 0%	118 100%	4.44	.593	Strongly agree
17) People are dishonest.	1 0.8%	6 5.1%	30 25.4%	60 50.8%	21 17.8%	118 100%	2.20	.822	Disagree
18) People are helpful.	25 21.2%	79 66.9%	12 10.2%	0 0%	2 1.7%	118 100%	4.06	.683	Agree
			Total				3.41		

Table 11 shows that the respondents strongly agreed about the magnificence of the attractions (mean=4.50), the excellent maintenance (mean=4.29), and the friendliness of the people (mean=4.44). However, 39% of the respondent indicated that the attractions were too crowded (mean=3.42). Other components that



respondents had positive attitudes towards were the variety of cuisines (mean=3.57), the usefulness and availability of information regarding Inner Rattanakosin Island (mean=3.83), the number of Tourist Information Centers (mean= 3.65), the usefulness and availability of brochures at each attraction (mean=3.59), the officials' ability to use English (mean= 3.50), and lastly the helpfulness of the Thais (mean=4.06). There were some negative statements that the researcher asked about and which respondents chose, such as unsafe or unclean food and beverages (mean=2.43), inconvenient travel in the area (mean=2.45), and the dishonesty of the people (mean= 2.20). However, there were some aspects that respondents moderately agreed with: the cost of tickets (mean=2.69), the souvenir prices offered by the shop houses (mean=3.25) and street vendors (mean=3.07), the availability of facilities such as street signs and location maps (mean=3.31), and lastly the street vendors' and shopkeepers' ability to use English (mean= 3.09).

#### **4.4 RESPONDENTS' PROBLEMS AND IMPRESSIONS**

Of the 118 respondents, 60% elaborated on their inconveniences and impressions. The problems or inconveniences that they faced were mostly due to language barriers, misleading taxi drivers, and street vendors.

Regarding the language barriers, the majority of the respondents or 43 % said that there were not enough English signboards at the tourist attraction sites or on the roads, which might be problematic for non-Thai tourists. In addition, travel guides and shop vendors at the tourist spots should be better trained in English.

In relation to the language barriers, as there were not many English signboards, respondents were misled by tuk-tuk drivers, taxi drivers, or unauthorized tour guides. According to the findings, 41% of respondents complained that they were told by taxi drivers that the tourist sites were closed and the respondents were taken to jewelry shops or tailors instead. The respondents also indicated that those people took advantage of them by taking them to other places in order to get a percentage of the sales, with the respondents also being overcharged for traveling costs.

Concerning the street vendors, 16% of the respondents agreed that the street vendors in the area were annoying and aggressive. They explained that street vendors kept following them and seemed to be angry when they refused to buy.

However, there were some aspects that the majority of the respondents were impressed with.

Regarding the Thai architecture, the respondents agreed that the Grand Palace and other sites in the areas were must-see sites as the temples were beautiful and colorful from all angles. The architecture was awe-inspiring and the glittering decoration cannot be found elsewhere, which makes it unique and impressive. The hospitality, the friendly people, and the 'Thai smile' also touched the respondents' hearts.

The findings of the research will be summarized and discussed in the next chapter.

