

Chapter 4

Research Findings and Discussions

The purpose of this chapter is to present research findings, hypothesis tests, and discussions. This chapter consists of seven sections. Section one (4.1) presents descriptive statistics providing the profile of research respondents and their travel behaviors. Section two (4.2) shows the results of push and pull factor analysis. Section three (4.3) presents the results of travel behavior differences among different demographic subgroups. Section four (4.4) presents the results of differences in push and pull factors across demographic variables. Section five (4.5) provides the findings of tourist satisfaction. Section six (4.6) presents the research hypotheses. Finally, section seven (4.7) discusses the research results. It should be noted that the level of significance at 0.05 was employed in all of the statistical assessments in this study.

4.1 Profile of Respondents and Travel Behavior Characteristics

The first section presents profile or general information of research respondents and their travel behaviors and trip characteristics.

Profile of Research Respondents

Table 4.1: Demographic characteristics of respondents

Characteristics	Descriptions	Number (n=400)	Percent (100%)
Gender	Male	216	54.0%
	Female	184	46.0%
Age	20 - 30 years	104	26.0%
	31 - 50 years	264	66.0%
	51 years or older	24	8.0 %
Marital status	Single	168	42.0%
	Married	192	48.0%
	Divorced/Separated/Widowed	40	10.0%
Education	High school or lower	80	20.0%
	Bachelor degree	220	55.0%
	Master degree or higher	100	25.0%

Characteristics	Descriptions	Number (n=415)	Percent (100%)
Occupation	Company employee	152	38.0%
	Government officer	64	16.0%
	Business owner	44	11.0%
	Student	40	10.0%
	Independent/self-employed	28	7.0%
	Unemployment	24	6.0%
	Housewife	24	6.0%
	Retired	20	5.0%
	Others	4	1.0%
Monthly Income	US\$ 2,500 or lower	124	31.0%
	US\$ 2,501 – 4,000	180	45.0%
	US\$ 4,001 – or higher	96	24.0%

From table 4.1, the proportion of male respondents (54%) was slightly higher than females (46%). Most of the respondents were in the age group of 31 - 50 years (66.0%). Almost half of them are married (48.0%), and approximately 55% had education at the college level. The respondents come from different occupations, for example, 38.0% are company employees, 16% are government officers, 11.0% are business owners and 10.0% are students. Approximately 31.0% of the respondents had monthly income in the range of US\$ 2,500 or lower while 45.0% earned between US\$ 2,501 – 4,000, and 24.0% earned US\$ 4,001 or more, respectively.

Travel Behaviors and Trip Characteristics

Table 4.2: Travel behaviors and trip characteristics of respondents

Travel behaviors/trip characteristics	Number (n=400)	Percent (100%)
Number of overseas travel (within 1 year)		
1 times	132	33.0%
2-3 times	108	27.0%
4 times or more	44	11.0%
Not sure, depending on opportunity	116	29.0%
Trip arrangement to Thailand		
Buy package tours (e.g. air ticket, accommodation)	120	30.0%
Travel with a tour company	220	55.0%
Travel independently	60	15.0%

Travel behaviors/trip characteristics	Number (n=400)	Percent (100%)
Number of visits to Thailand		
1 times	240	60.0%
2-3 times	140	35.0%
4 times	20	5.0%
Length of stay in Thailand		
5 days or less	112	28.0%
6-8 days	236	59.0%
9 days ore more	52	13.0%
Person influencing the decisions to visit Thailand		
Own decision	108	27.0%
My friends	100	25.0%
My couple (husband/wife)	84	21.0%
My boy or girl friend	68	17.0%
My relatives	16	8.0%
Others	4	2.0%
Person accompanying the trip to Thailand		
Friends or relatives	140	35.0%
Husband or wife	120	30.0%
Family members	80	20.0%
Traveling alone	60	15.0%
Preferred destination/region, except Bangkok (can be more than one answer)		
East (e.g. Pattaya)	172	43.0%
South (e.g. Phuket, Samui)	160	40.0%
North (e.g. Chiang Mai)	140	35.0%
Central (e.g. Ayuthhaya, Kancanaburi)	40	10.0%
Northeast (e.g. Nakornratchasrima, Khon Kaen)	32	8.0%
Preferred leisure activities (can be more than one answer)		
Sightseeing	152	38.0%
Visiting beaches/islands	80	20.0%
Visiting cultural/historical sites	72	18.0%
Visiting natural-based areas	68	17.0%
Shopping	60	15.0%
Urban traveling	48	12.0%
Visiting rural areas	8	2.0%
Others	20	5.0%
Average daily accommodation expense		
Baht 1,000 or less	88	22.0%
Baht 1,001 – 3,000	172	43.0%
Baht 3,001 or more	140	35.0%

Travel behaviors/trip characteristics	Number (n=400)	Percent (100%)
Preferred accommodation		
Luxury hotel (e.g. 5-star hotel)	60	15.0%
First class hotel (e.g. 4-star hotel)	160	40.0%
Budget hotel (e.g. 3-star-hotel)	100	25.0%
Guest house	64	16.0%
Friend/relative's house/others	12	3.0%
Average daily food and beverage expenses		
Baht 300 or less	68	17.0%
Baht 301 – 700	276	69.0%
Baht 701 or more	56	14.0%
Average daily shopping expenses		
Baht 1,000 or less	140	35.0%
Baht 1,001 – 2,000	152	38.0%
Baht 2,001 or more	108	27.0%
Source of travel information motivating to visit Thailand (can be more than one answer)		
Media (e.g. TV, magazines, brochures, newspaper)	120	30.0%
Internet	260	65.0%
Friends/relatives	68	17.0%
Travel agents/tour companies	52	13.0%
Travel books	20	5.0%
Thailand's tourism office	60	15.0%
Others	28	7.0%
What would be recommended to family/friends/relatives about Thailand (can be more than one answer)		
Thai culture	132	33.0%
Thai food	116	29.0%
Beaches	92	23.0%
Tourism attractions	84	21.0%
Thai people	72	18.0%
Natural areas	24	6.0%
Others	12	3.0%
Chance to revisit Thailand in next 1-5 years		
Yes	248	62.0%
No	92	23.0%
Not sure	60	15.0%

Travel behaviors/trip characteristics	Number (n=400)	Percent (100%)
What would motivate revisitation to Thailand (based on yes-answer and can be more than one answer)		
Thai culture	204	51.0%
A variety of tourism attractions	152	38.0%
Low cost of goods & services	120	30.0%
A variety of leisure activities & entertainment	108	27.0%
Friendly & nice people	36	9.0%
Nature & beautiful environment	32	8.0%

With regard to travel behaviors and trip characteristics (table 4.2), the findings show that approximately one-third of the respondents (33.0%) traveled abroad once a year while 27.0% traveled 2-3 times a year and 11% traveled 4 times or more. However, it should be noted that almost one-third (29.0%) traveled abroad depending on the opportunities. More than half of them (55.0%) traveled to Thailand with tour companies (e.g. inclusive tours) while 30% traveled on the basis of package tours (e.g. hotel and air tickets), and 15% were independent travelers (own arrangement). Most of the respondents (66.0%) were first-time travelers to Thailand, whereas 40.0% were repeat visitors. Most of them (59.0%) stayed in Thailand approximately 6-8 days, followed by the trip of 5 days or less (28.0%), and the trip of 9 days or more (13.0%), respectively. It is interesting to note that many respondents (27.0%) traveled to Thailand by their own decisions while 25.0% were influenced by their friends, 21.0% by their couples (husband or wife) and 17.0% by their boy or girl friends. The findings also reveal that 35.0% traveled to Thailand with their friends or relatives while 30.0% traveled with their couples and some respondents (20.0%) traveled with family members.

In addition to visiting Bangkok, many respondents chose to visit the eastern region such as Pattaya (43.0%) and the southern region such as Phuket or Samui (40.0%). While 35.0% chose to visit the northern region such as Chiang Mai (35.0%). Major leisure activities may include sightseeing (38.0%), visiting beaches/islands (20.0%), visiting cultural/historical sites (18%), visiting natural-based areas (17.0%) and shopping (15.0%), respectively. The study also found that almost half of them (43.0%) spent around Baht 1,000 – 3,000 for their accommodation and they seemed to prefer first class hotels (40.0%) and budget hotels (25.0%), respectively. Approximately 69.0% spent around Baht 301 -700 for their daily food and beverage while shopping expenditures could vary from Baht 1,001 – 2000 (38.0%), Baht 1,000 or less (35.0%) and Baht 2,001 or more (27.0%). In terms of source of travel information motivating the respondents to Thailand, the study found that most of them were motivated by Internet (65.0%),

followed by media such TV, magazines, and brochure (30.0%). It is also interesting to note Thai culture, Thai food, beaches and tourism attractions were regarded as the major things that the respondents would recommend to their family, friends and relatives about Thailand. More importantly, the majority (62.0%) said that they would come back to Thailand again in the near future. In particular, Thai culture (51.0%) was regarded as the major attraction drawing them back to Thailand again. It should be noted that some results here are partially correspond to the data from the Tourism Authority of Thailand (2007) as previously addressed such as trip characteristics, tour arrangement, length of stay, and preferred places/cities.

4.2 Analysis of Push and Pull Factors

This second part presents the results of major motives (push items) that stimulate the respondents to travel abroad (as shown in table 4.3), and to identify the important destination attributes (pull items) that attract them to Thailand (table 4.4). These results are based on mean ranking of push and pull motivational items which are reported in table 4.3 and 4.4, respectively. Table 4.5 and 4.6 are the results of factor analysis of push and pull factors, respectively.

Mean Ranking of Push and Pull Items

Table 4.3: Mean ranking of push motivational items

Push motivational items	Mean (S.D.)	Rank
I want to see something new and exciting.	3.08 (0.82)	1
I want to experience cultures that are different from mine.	3.05 (0.89)	2
I want to seek fun or adventure.	3.02 (0.97)	3
I want to escape from busy job or stressful work.	2.98 (0.85)	4
I want to escape from routine or ordinary environment.	2.95 (0.72)	5
I want to learn new things from a foreign country.	2.92 (0.88)	6
I want to fulfill my dream of visiting a new country.	2.88 (0.78)	7
I want to see and meet different groups of people.	2.81 (0.98)	8
I want to improve my health and well-being.	2.78 (0.77)	9
I want to rest and relax.	2.72 (0.98)	10
I want to travel to a country I have not visited before.	2.68 (0.81)	11
I want to spend more time with my couple or family members while traveling.	2.61 (0.78)	12
I can talk to everybody about my trips when I get home.	2.45 (0.97)	13
Overall mean	2.89 (0.85)	

Table 4.3 shows the mean ranking of push motivational items as rated by the respondents. The results indicated that the major motives (push items) for the respondents to

travel abroad were ‘I want to see something new and exciting’ (M=3.08), followed by ‘I want to experience cultures that are different from mine’ (M=3.05), and ‘I want to seek fun or adventure’ (M=3.02). It should be noted that these three push items scored above 3.0 in a 5-point scale (with 5.0 being extremely important) while the rests scored below 3.0. As all items scored between 3.08 – 2.45, this suggests that these items are deemed fairly important motives to the respondents. For the least important push motivational items, they include ‘I want to travel to a country I have not visited before’ (M=2.68), ‘I want to spend more time with my couple or family members while traveling’ (M=2.61), and ‘I can talk to everybody about my trips when I get home’ (M=2.45).

Table 4.4: Mean ranking of pull motivational items

Pull motivational items	Mean (S.D.)	Rank
Thai culture	3.09 (0.86)	1
Cultural & historical attractions	3.05 (0.85)	2
Beach/seaside	3.01 (0.86)	3
A variety of tourism attractions	2.99 (0.88)	4
Natural attractions	2.97 (0.85)	5
A variety of leisure activities and entertainment	2.95 (0.88)	6
Low cost of goods and services	2.90 (0.78)	7
Travel costs to Thailand	2.82 (0.88)	8
A variety of shopping places	2.84 (0.88)	9
Thai food	2.81 (0.84)	10
Safety and security	2.77 (0.95)	11
Tourists’ travel information	2.67 (0.92)	12
Hygiene and cleanliness	2.52 (0.99)	13
Overall mean	2.95 (0.96)	

Table 4.4 represents the mean ranking of pull motivational items. The results indicated that the respondents perceived ‘Thai culture’ (M=3.09), ‘cultural or historical attractions’ (M=3.05), and ‘beaches/seasides’ (M=3.01) as the major attractions drawing them to Thailand. These three pull items scored above 3.0 in a 5-point scale while the rests scored between 2.99 – 2.52; indicating fair destination attributes. The least attractive attributes are ‘safety & security’ (M=2.77), ‘tourists’ travel information’ (M=2.67), and ‘hygiene and cleanliness’ (M=2.52).

Factor Analysis of Push and Pull Factors

In addition to ranking the mean of push and pull motivational items, it is more important to analyze the dimension or the grouping of the push and pull items in order to better understand the principal driving forces of the travelers than looking at individual motivational items (Jang & Wu, 2006). In this section, factor analysis with varimax rotation was performed to group the push and pull motivational items with similar characteristics to identify a set of push and pull factor dimensions. The results of push and pull factor analysis are presented in tables 4.5 and 4.6, respectively.

Table 4.5: Factor analysis of push factors

Push factor dimensions (<i>reliability alpha</i>)	Factor loading	Eigenvalue	Variance explained	Factor mean
Factor 1: Fun & relaxation ($\alpha = 0.86$)		6.39	49.15	2.79
I want to seek fun and adventure.	0.77			
I want to rest and relax.	0.75			
I want to see something new and exciting.	0.65			
I want to escape from routine or ordinary environment.	0.64			
I want to escape from busy job or stressful work.	0.66			
I want to improve my health and well-being.	0.55			
Factor 2: Novel experience ($\alpha = 0.80$)		1.08	8.29	2.74
I want to travel to a country I have not visited before.	0.81			
I want to experience culture that is different from mine.	0.80			
I want to learn new things from a foreign country.	0.75			
I want to fulfill my dream of visiting a new country.	0.53			
Factor 3: Socialization ($\alpha = 0.77$)		1.01	7.79	2.49
I want to see and meet different groups of people.	0.77			
I want to spend time with my family members while traveling.	0.74			
I can talk to everybody about my trips when I get home.	0.55			
Total variance explained	65.23%			

As shown in table 4.5, three factor dimensions were derived from the factor analysis of 13 push motivational items, and were categorized into 3 push factor dimensions: (1) ‘fun & relaxation’, (2) ‘novel experience’, and (3) ‘socialization’. Each factor dimension was named based on the common characteristics of the variables it included. The three push factor dimensions explained 65.23 percent of the total variance. Among them, ‘fun & relaxation’ and

‘novel experience’ emerged as the most important push factors motivating the respondents to travel abroad with mean scores of 2.79 and 2.74, respectively.

According to Kaiser’s (1974) criterion, a factor dimension with an eigenvalue greater than 1.0 would be reported in the final factor structure, and only items with factor loading greater than 0.4 (indicating a good correlation between the items and the factor grouping they belong to) would be retained for each factor grouping. Factor loading represents the degree of correlation between an individual variable and a given factor (Bogari et al., 2003). A high factor loading indicates a reasonably high correlation between the delineated factors and their individual items (Lee, 2000). In this study, all the push factor dimensions had a eigenvalue greater than 1.0, and the items in each dimension had a factor loading greater than 0.4. This means that all the push factor dimensions and their items met Kaiser’s (1974) criterion. In addition, Cronbach’s alpha was calculated to test the internal consistency of items within each factor dimension. The results showed that the alpha coefficients for all the three factor dimensions ranged from 0.77 to 0.86 well above the minimum value of 0.6 as an indication of reliability (Hair et al., 2006). Therefore, all the three push factor dimensions (factor 1 – factor 3) were maintained in the final factor structure.

Table 4.6: Factor analysis of pull factors

Pull factor dimensions (<i>Cronbach's alpha</i>)	Factor loading	Eigenvalue	Variance explained	Factor Mean
Factor 1: Attraction variety & costs ($\alpha = 0.89$)		5.66	43.51	2.86
Natural attractions	0.81			
Beach/seaside	0.78			
Thai culture	0.75			
Low cost of living	0.73			
Travel cost to Thailand	0.70			
Thai food	0.65			
Cultural and historical places	0.64			
A variety of tourism attractions	0.60			
A variety of shopping place	0.57			
A variety of leisure activities and entertainment	0.55			
An availability of travel information	0.51			
Factor 2: Safety & cleanliness ($\alpha = 0.70$)		1.47	11.33	2.61
Safety and security	0.68			
Hygiene and cleanliness	0.65			
Total variance explained	54.85%			

With regard to pull factors, a similar factor analysis with varimax rotation was performed to group the pull motivational items. As shown in table 4.6, two factor dimensions were derived from the factor analysis of 13 pull motivational items, and were named: (1) 'attraction variety & costs', and (2) 'safety & cleanliness'. These two factor dimensions explained 54.85 percent of the total variance. Based on the result, 'attraction variety & costs' was considered the most important pull factors attracting the respondents to Thailand with the mean score of 2.86.

All the pull factor dimensions had eigenvalues greater than 1.0, and their items had factor loadings greater than 0.4. Cronbach's alpha was also calculated to test the internal consistency of items within each factor. The results showed that the alpha coefficients for all pull factor dimensions ranged from 0.70 to 0.89, well above the minimum value of 0.6 as an indication of reliability (Hair et al., 2006). Thus, all the two pull factor dimensions were retained for the final factor structure.

Relationship between Push and Pull Factor Dimensions

In addition to identifying the push and pull factors, it is important to examine how the push and pull factors are related to each other. Their relationships can provide an important clue to tourism marketers in developing appropriate marketing strategies. Table 4.7 shows the results of bivariate correlation analysis conducted to examine the relationships among the push and pull factor dimensions derived from factor analysis. In this study Pearson's correlation coefficient (r), which indicates the strength and direction of the relationship between two variables (Cavana et al., 2001), were determined to measure the association between push and pull factor dimensions. The results showed that Pearson's correlation coefficient (r) of all push and pull factors are greater than zero, indicating that all the push factors have a positive relationship with all of the four pull factors. In other words, the motives to travel abroad (push factors) of the respondents are significantly related to the destination attractions of Thailand (pull factors). Moreover, Pearson's correlation coefficient (r) between each push and pull factor ranged from 0.20 to 0.79, indicating fair to moderate relationship (Cavana et al., 2001). Since the values of correlation coefficient of push 1, 2 and 3 and pull factor 1 (attraction variety & costs) are higher than that of pull factor 2 (safety & cleanliness). This suggests that the travel motive of the respondents is highly related to the 'attraction variety and costs' of Thailand. Based on these findings, it provides an evidence to support hypothesis 1 arguing that the travel motives (push factors) of the Korean travelers are related to the destination attractions of Thailand (pull factors).

Table 4.7: Correlation analysis of push and pull factor dimensions

<u>Pull factors</u>			
	(1) Attraction variety & costs	(2) Safety & cleanliness	Sig.
<u>Push factors</u>			
(1) Fun & relaxation	0.79*	0.30*	0.00
(2) Novel experience	0.73*	0.20*	0.00
(3) Socialization	0.76*	0.42*	0.00

* Correlation coefficient (r) is significance at the 0.05 level

4.3 Analysis of Differences in Travel Behaviors and Trip Characteristics

Comparison of Travel Behaviors/Trip Characteristics by Demographic Subgroups

This section aims to compare the findings of travel behaviors and trip characteristics based on different demographic subgroups by using chi-square tests (χ^2). Among six demographic variables, the study found some statistical differences of travel behaviors and trip characteristics based on certain demographic variables which are genders, education and income. These results are presented as follows:

Table 4.8: Cross-tabulation of travel behaviors/ trip characteristics and gender subgroups

Travel behaviors/trip characteristics	Males	Females	(χ^2)	Sig.
Number of overseas travel (within 1 year)			10.804	0.013*
1 times	22.5%	44.7%		
2-3 times	39.1%	22.0%		
4 times	13.5%	10.5%		
Not sure, depending on opportunity	24.9%	22.8%		
Trip arrangement to Thailand			0.786	0.675
Buy package tours (e.g. air ticket, accommodation)	28.1%	31.6%		
Travel with a tour company	53.9%	55.3%		
Travel independently	18.0%	13.2%		
Number of visits to Thailand			10.202	0.006**
1 times	30.3%	48.1%		
2-3 times	46.1%	31.6%		
4 times	23.6%	20.3%		
Length of stay in Thailand			3.951	0.413
5 days or less	29.8%	28.5%		
6-8 days	61.2%	58.7%		
9 days or more	9.0%	12.8%		

Travel behaviors/trip characteristics	Males	Females	(χ^2)	Sig.
Person influencing the decisions to visit Thailand			2.155	0.455
My self	30.3%	21.3%		
My couple (husband/wife)	15.7%	26.7%		
My boy or girl friend	15.7%	18.7%		
My friends	23.6%	26.7%		
My relatives	9.0%	6.7%		
Others	6.7%	1.3%		
Person accompanying the trip to Thailand			7.449	0.059
Traveling alone	37.1%	33.3%		
Husband or wife	19.1%	31.3%		
Friends or relatives	32.6%	22.7%		
Family members	11.2%	6.7%		
Preferred destination/region, except Bangkok (can be more than one answer)			17.885	0.003**
North (e.g. Chiang Mai)	30.0%	31.6%		
Northeast (e.g. Nakornratchasima, Khon Kaen)	5.7%	2.6%		
Central (e.g. Ayuthhaya, Kancanaburi)	7.1%	9.2%		
East (e.g. Pattaya)	64.5%	37.5%		
South (e.g. Phuket, Samui)	48.4%	39.8%		
Preferred leisure activities (can be more than one answer)			10.588	0.688
Sightseeing	47.2%	37.3%		
Shopping	14.6%	20.0%		
Visiting cultural/historical sites	20.2%	16.0%		
Visiting natural-based areas	13.5%	12.0%		
Beaches/islands	20.2%	15.3%		
Urban traveling	15.2%	21.3%		
Visiting rural areas	1.1%	2.7%		
Others	5.7%	4.0%		
Average daily accommodation expense			8.549	0.073
Baht 1,000 or less	24.6%	22.8%		
Baht 1,001 - 3,000	43.3%	44.7%		
Baht 3,001 or more	32.1%	32.5%		
Average daily food and beverage expense			5.631	0.228
Baht 300 or less	21.8.0%	19.8%		
Baht 301 – 700	67.5%	62.8%		
Baht 701 or more	10.7%	17.4%		
Average daily shopping expense			6.891	0.075
Baht 1,000 or less	35.7%	37.9%		
Baht 1,001 – 2,000	38.1%	39.7%		
Baht 2,001 or more	26.2%	22.4%		

Travel behaviors/trip characteristics	Males	Females	(χ^2)	Sig.
Preferred accommodation			12.358	0.015*
Luxury hotel (e.g. 5-star hotel)	15.7%	10.6%		
First class hotel (e.g. 4-star hotel)	16.6%	47.6%		
Budget hotel (e.g. 3-star-hotel)	45.7%	21.0%		
Guest house	16.9%	14.2%		
Friend/relative's house/others	5.1%	6.6%		
Source of travel information motivating to visit Thailand (can be more than one answer)			7.787	0.458
Media (e.g. TV, magazines, brochures, newspaper)	24.7%	51.3%		
Internet	56.2%	64.5%		
Friends/relatives	19.1%	18.4%		
Travel agents/tour companies	18.0%	19.2%		
Travel books	7.9%	7.5%		
Thailand's tourism office	13.5%	15.4%		
Others	1.7%	2.1%		
What would be recommended to family/friends/relatives about Thailand (can be more than one answer)			16.887	0.875
Thai food	28.19%	35.5%		
Thai people	25.5%	13.2%		
Thai culture	22.5%	32.2%		
Tourism attractions	27.0%	26.3%		
Beaches	21.3 %	26.3%		
Natural areas	7.9%	5.6%		
Chance to revisit Thailand in next 1-5 years			11.510	0.334
Yes	64.0%	58.7%		
No	18.7%	13.5%		
Not sure	17.3%	27.8%		
What would motivates your visitation to Thailand (based on yes-answer)			8.553	.0445
Thai culture	87.5%	78.6%		
Nature & beautiful environment	7.7%	4.8%		
Friendly & nice people	3.7%	4.8%		
Low cost of goods & services	4.2%	5.1%		
A variety of leisure activities & entertainment	3.8%	3.3%		
A variety of tourism attractions	4.2%	3.8%		

* significance at 0.05 level

** significance at 0.01 level

Table 4.8 shows that significant differences were found for number of overseas travel, number of visits to Thailand, preferred destinations/regions, and preferred accommodation. According to the result, it appears that almost half of female respondents (44.7%) traveled

abroad on the average of 1 time per year while many male respondents (39.1%) traveled abroad on the average of 2-3 times a year. Likewise, almost half of female respondents (48.1%) were first-time travelers to Thailand while approximately the same proportion of male respondents (46.1%) was repeat visitors. It is interesting to note that more than half of male respondents (64.5%) preferred to visit the eastern part (e.g. Pattaya) than any other parts of Thailand. The first-class hotels appear to be appreciated by female respondents (47.6%) rather than its counterparts (45.7%) who prefer to stay in budget hotels.

Table 4.9: Cross-tabulation of travel behaviors/ trip characteristics and education subgroups

Travel behaviors/trip characteristics	E1	E2	E3	(χ^2)	Sig.
Number of overseas travel (within 1 year)				17.848	0.007**
1 times	58.1%	23.6%	17.1%		
2-3 times	12.9%	32.6%	40.0%		
4 times	8.4%	13.5%	17.1%		
Not sure, depending on opportunity	20.2%	30.3%	25.8%		
Trip arrangement to Thailand				1.761	0.780
Buy package tours (e.g. air ticket, accommodation)	32.3%	28.1%	29.3%		
Travel with a tour company	45.2%	57.3%	26.1%		
Travel independently	22.5%	14.6%	14.6%		
Number of visits to Thailand				8.790	0.021
1 times	54.8%	38.2%	24.4%		
2-3 times	25.8%	22.5%	34.1%		
4 times	19.4%	39.3%	41.5%		
Length of stay in Thailand				4.794	0.939
5 days or less	24.8%	29.4%	28.8%		
6-8 days	46.1%	42.5%	44.4%		
9 days or more	29.0%	28.1%	26.8%		
Person influencing the decisions to visit Thailand (can be more than one answer)				3.794	0.852
My self	33.3%	26.4%	19.5%		
My couple (husband/wife)	13.3%	24.1%	22.0 %		
My boy or girl friend	13.3%	9.2%	34.1%		
My friends	26.7%	27.6%	19.5%		
My relatives	6.7%	8.0%	7.3%		
Others	6.7%	4.6%	2.4%		
Person accompanying the trip to Thailand				3.317	0.768
Traveling alone	41.9%	33.0%	31.7%		
Husband or wife	32.3%	27.3%	24.4%		
Friends or relatives	16.1%	30.7%	34.1%		
Family members	9.7%	9.1%	9.8%		

Travel behaviors/trip characteristics	E1	E2	E3	(χ^2)	Sig.
Preferred destination/region, except Bangkok (can be more than one answer)				5.889	0.458
North (e.g. Chiang Mai)	30.0%	39.1%	22.0%		
Northeast (e.g. Nakornratchasima, Khon Kaen)	6.7%	3.4%	4.9%		
Central (e.g. Ayuthhaya, Kancanaburi)	13.3%	9.2%	7.3%		
East (e.g. Pattaya)	43.3%	48.3%	61.0%		
South (e.g. Phuket, Samui)	43.3%	40.2%	39.0%		
Preferred leisure activities (can be more than one answer)				10.458	0.238
Sightseeing	30.0%	51.7%	29.3%		
Shopping	6.7%	19.5%	22.0%		
Visiting cultural/historical sites	20.0%	13.8%	24.4%		
Visiting natural-based areas	3.3%	16.1%	14.6%		
Beaches/islands	20.0%	19.5%	4.9%		
Urban traveling	20.0%	11.5%	20.4%		
Visiting rural areas	6.7%	0.0%	2.40%		
Others	20.0%	10.3%	0.0%		
Average daily accommodation expense				22.392	0.00**
Baht 1,000 or less	29.0%	18.0%	3.0%		
Baht 1,001 – 3,000	48.4%	33.1%	26.8%		
Baht 3,001 or more	22.6%	44.9%	70.2%		
Average daily food and beverage expense				19.395	0.001**
Baht 300 or less	35.5%	20.8%	11.2%		
Baht 301 – 700	48.4%	23.6%	36.6%		
Baht 701 or more	12.9%	47.7%	46.3%		
Average daily shopping expense				2.004	0.735
Baht 1,000 or less	30.5%	27.8%	25.0%		
Baht 1,001 – 2,000	48.6%	43.6%	40.8%		
Baht 2,001 or more	20.9%	28.6%	34.2%		
Type of preferred accommodation				7.070	0.314
Luxury hotel (e.g. 5-star hotel)	12.9%	10.0%	14.6%		
First class hotel (e.g. 4-star hotel)	35.5%	37.2%	31.7%		
Budget hotel (e.g. 3-star-hotel)	18.5%	21.3%	26.8%		
Guest house	29.3%	25.8%	21.9%		
Friend/relative's house	1.8%	2.2%	1.9%		
Others	2.0%	3.5%	3.1%		
Source of travel information motivating to visit Thailand (can be more than one answer)				8.010	0.244
Media (e.g. TV, magazines, brochures, newspaper)	40.0%	29.5%	24.4%		
Internet	60.0%	70.5%	73.2%		
Friends/relatives	23.3%	13.6%	17.1%		
Travel agents/tour companies	16.7%	13.6%	14.6%		
Travel books	0.0%	4.5%	9.8%		
Thailand's tourism office	26.7%	15.9%	7.3%		
Others	1.8%	2.2%	1.3%		

Travel behaviors/trip characteristics	E1	E2	E3	(χ^2)	Sig.
What would be recommended to family/friends/relatives about Thailand (can be more than one answer)				5.025	0.089
Thai food	30.0%	29.5%	36.6%		
Thai people	6.7%	18.2%	36.6%		
Thai culture	36.7%	33.0%	17.1%		
Tourism attractions	26.7%	20.5%	17.1%		
Beaches	23.7%	28.4%	12.2%		
Natural areas	2.5%	4.8%	4.2%		
Others	1.5%	2.4%	1.9%		
Chance to revisit Thailand in next 1-5 years				5.783	0.216
Yes	45.2%	62.9%	72.5%		
No	32.3%	23.6%	17.5%		
Not sure	22.6%	13.5%	10.0%		
What would motivates your visitation to Thailand (based on yes-answer)				4.588	0.578
Thai culture	85.6%	70.5%	89.7%		
Nature & beautiful environment	6.2%	7.8%	8.5%		
Friendly & nice people	3.4%	3.9%	4.6%		
Low cost of goods & services	4.5%	5.5%	4.3%		
A variety of leisure activities & entertainment	2.5%	3.4%	3.8%		
A variety of tourism attractions	4.6%	5.8%	7.7%		

* significance at 0.05 level

E1 = higher school or lower

E2 = bachelor degree

** significance at 0.01 level

E3 = master degree or higher

Table 4.9 shows that significant differences were found for number of overseas travel, average daily accommodation expense and food and beverage expense among education subgroups. According to the result, it appears that the majority of group E1 (high school) traveled abroad on the average of 1 time a year while the majority of group E2 (Bachelor degree) and E3 (Master degree or higher) traveled abroad on the average of 2-3 times a year. In relation to travel expense, it is found that almost half of the members of group E1 were likely to spend around Baht 1,001 – 3,000 for their accommodation whereas the majority of group E2 and E3 were more likely to spend around Baht 3,001 or more for their accommodation. Likewise, the majority of E1 appear to spend at Baht 301 – 700 for food and beverage while the majority of E2 and E3 seem to spend around Baht 701 for their food and beverage.

Table 4.10: Cross-tab of travel behaviors/ trip characteristics and income subgroups

Travel behaviors/trip characteristics	I 1	I 2	I 3	(χ^2)	Sig.
Number of overseas travel (within 1 year)				9.704	0.033*
1 times	37.4%	14.2%	15.2%		
2-3 times	27.0%	40.5%	45.8%		
4 times	5.5%	25.6%	29.0%		
Not sure, depending on opportunity	30.1%	19.7%	10.0%		
Trip arrangement to Thailand				3.512	0.476
Buy package tours (e.g. air ticket, accommodation)	26.1%	34.0%	30.4%		
Travel with a tour company	62.3%	46.0%	52.2%		
Travel independently	11.6%	20.0%	17.4%		
Number of visits to Thailand				2.930	0.587
1 times	43.5%	34.0%	32.6%		
2-3 times	26.1%	24.0%	32.6%		
4 times	30.4%	42.0%	34.8%		
Length of stay in Thailand				8.078	0.078
5 days or less	35.7%	45.2%	38.9%		
6-8 days	40.5%	32.7%	46.5%		
9 days or more	23.8%	22.1%	33.5%		
Person influencing the decisions to visit Thailand (can be more than one answer)				3.455	0.556
My self	26.1%	22.0%	31.1%		
My couple (husband/wife)	23.2%	20.0%	17.8%		
My boy or girl friend	15.9%	20.0%	15.6%		
My friends	27.5%	24.0%	15.6%		
My relatives	4.3%	8.0%	13.3%		
Others	2.9%	6.0%	4.4%		
Person accompanying the trip to Thailand				6.456	0.374
Traveling alone	43.5%	28.0%	31.1%		
Husband or wife	24.6%	26.0%	33.3%		
Friends or relatives	21.7%	34.0%	31.1%		
Family members	10.1%	12.0%	4.4%		
Preferred destination/region, except Bangkok (can be more than one answer)				3.055	0.485
North (e.g. Chiang Mai)	33.3%	36.7%	26.1%		
Northeast (e.g. Nakhonratchasima, Khon Kaen)	4.3%	2.0%	6.5%		
Central (e.g. Ayuthaya, Kanchanaburi)	8.7%	6.1%	13.0%		
East (e.g. Pattaya)	50.9%	44.9%	39.1%		
South (e.g. Phuket, Samui)	36.2%	42.9%	47.8%		

Travel behaviors/trip characteristics	I 1	I 2	I 3	(χ^2)	Sig.
Preferred leisure activities (can be more than one answer)				8.755	0.078
Sightseeing	42.0%	36.7%	50.0%		
Shopping	13.0%	16.3%	23.9%		
Visiting cultural/historical sites	15.9%	16.3%	23.9%		
Visiting natural-based areas	14.5%	10.2%	13.0%		
Beaches/islands	13.0%	20.4%	13.0%		
Urban traveling	23.2%	14.3%	6.5%		
Visiting rural areas	1.4%	2.0%	2.2%		
Others	2.5%	1.8%	1.5%		
Average daily accommodation expense				3.396	0.004**
Baht 1,000 or less	35.8%	17.0%	12.9%		
Baht 1,001 – 3,000	48.1%	38.9%	37.4%		
Baht 3,001 or more	15.1%	44.1%	48.5%		
Average daily food and beverage expense				21.027	0.000**
Baht 300 or less	50.0%	43.2%	19.0%		
Baht 301 – 700	29.3%	30.3%	32.7%		
Baht 701 or more	20.7%	26.5%	48.3%		
Average daily shopping expense				10.335	0.035*
Baht 1,000 or less	48.6%	20.3%	14.8%		
Baht 1,001 – 2,000	29.8%	37.7%	35.7%		
Baht 2,001 or more	21.6%	42.0%	49.5%		
Type of preferred accommodation				18.358	0.005**
Luxury hotel (e.g. 5-star hotel)	4.3%	10.0%	21.7%		
First class hotel (e.g. 4-star hotel)	33.3%	34.2%	45.7%		
Budget hotel (e.g. 3-star-hotel)	43.9%	24.0%	19.6%		
Guest house	17.4%	30.0%	11.9%		
Friend/relative's house/others	1.1%	1.8%	1.1%		
Source of travel information motivating to visit Thailand (can be more than one answer)				10.855	0.488
Media (e.g. TV, magazines, brochures, newspaper)	49.3%	36.0%	19.6%		
Internet	60.9%	64.0%	54.3%		
Friends/relatives	18.8%	14.2%	23.9%		
Travel agents/tour companies	11.6%	10.0%	21.7%		
Travel books	5.8%	8.0%	10.9%		
Thailand's tourism office	33.3%	16.2%	8.7%		
Others	1.7%	2.1%	1.8%		

Travel behaviors/trip characteristics	I 1	I 2	I 3	(χ^2)	Sig.
What would be recommended to family/friends/relatives about Thailand (can be more than one answer)				3.487	0.808
Thai food	21.7%	28.0%	50.0%		
Thai people	15.9%	14.0%	32.6%		
Thai culture	33.3%	36.0%	17.4%		
Tourism attractions	15.9%	18.0%	28.3%		
Beaches	20.3%	30.0%	21.7%		
Natural areas	10.1%	2.0%	2.2%		
Others	1.8%	1.0%	2.0%		
Chance to revisit Thailand in next 1-5 years				2.855	0.687
Yes	59.4%	57.1%	69.6%		
No	27.5%	26.5%	17.4%		
Not sure	13.0%	16.3%	13.0%		
What would motivates your visitation to Thailand (based on yes-answer)				4.789	0.158
Thai culture	80.7%	75.6%	72.8%		
Nature & beautiful environment	4.7%	5.8%	3.8%		
Friendly & nice people	3.5%	4.2%	3.3%		
Low cost of goods & services	4.1%	3.1%	3.8%		
A variety of leisure activities & entertainment	3.4%	3.1%	4.2%		
A variety of tourism attractions	4.8%	3.9%	3.3%		
* significance at 0.05 level I1 = US\$ 2,500 or lower I2 = US\$ 2,501 – 4,000 ** significance at 0.01 level I3 = US\$ 4,001 or higher					

Table 4.10 shows that significant differences were found for number of overseas travel, travel expense for accommodation, food & beverage, and shopping expense as well as type of accommodation among income subgroups. According to the result, it appears that the majority of group I2 (\$ 2,501-4,000) and I3 (\$4,001 or higher) tended to travel abroad frequently than those in group I1 (\$ 2,500 or lower) as well as they were more likely to spend higher rate for their accommodation (Baht 3,001 or more). In relation to travel expense, it is found that almost half of the members of group I3 were likely to spend around Baht 701 or more for their food and beverage expense whereas the majority of group I1 and I2 tended to spend around Baht 300 or less. For shopping expense, it seemed that the majority of group I2 and I3 were more likely to around Baht 2,000 or more while many member of group I1 spent around Baht 1,000 or less. Likewise, the members of group I2 and I3 (higher income) tended to choose first class hotels while group I1 (lower income) preferred to stay at Budget hotels.

4.4 Analysis of Differences in Push and Pull Factors

In this section, analysis of variance (ANOVA) was employed to examine if there are statistical differences in the push and pull factor dimensions among different demographic variables (i.e. gender, age, marital status, education, occupation and income). Based on the results, the study revealed some statistical differences in the push and pull factors across certain demographics variables which are gender and education while non-significant differences were found for the remaining demographics variables (i.e. age, marital status, occupation, and income). The results of statistical differences in the push and pull factors across gender (t-test) and education variables (ANOVA) are presented in tables 4.11 and 4.12.

Comparison of Push and Pull Factors by Gender

Table 4.11: T-test for comparison of push and pull factors by gender

		<u>Gender</u>		T-value	p-value
		Male	Female		
<u>Push and Pull Factor Dimensions</u>					
<i>Push factor</i>					
(1)	Fun & relaxation	2.93	2.66	1.75	0.081
(2)	Novel experience	2.72a	2.25b	2.93	0.004**
(3)	Socialization	2.90a	2.55b	2.37	0.019*
<i>Pull Factor</i>					
(1)	Attraction variety & costs	2.85	2.66	1.44	0.16
(2)	Safety & cleanliness	2.64	2.57	1.39	0.69

* The value of F-statistics is significant at the 0.05 level (p-value <0.05)

** The value of F-statistics is significant at the 0.01 level (p-value <0.01)

a and b show the source of significant mean differences based on the Duncan's multiple range test ; a > b

From table 4.11, the t-test revealed statistically significant differences ($p < 0.05$) existed between male and female respondents in push factor 2 'novel experience' and push 3 'socialization'. In push factor 2 'novel experience', male respondents ($M=2.72$) showed the higher mean score than female respondents ($M=2.25$). Likewise, in push factor 3 'socialization' the male respondents ($M=2.90$) showed the higher mean score than its counterparts ($M=2.55$). This means that the male respondents were more likely to be motivated by 'novel experience' and 'socialization' when traveling than females respondents. However, there is no difference in pull factors.

Comparison of Push and Pull Factors by Education

Table 4.12: ANOVA for comparison of push and pull factors by education

		<u>Education groups</u>				
		E 1	E 2	E 3	F-value	p-value
<u>Push and Pull Factor Dimensions</u>						
<i>Push factor</i>						
(1)	Fun & relaxation	2.86a	2.92a	2.45b	3.63	0.02*
(2)	Novel experience	2.58a	2.62a	2.18b	2.56	0.08*
(3)	Socialization	2.68	2.87	2.46	2.79	0.06
<i>Pull Factor</i>						
(1)	Attraction variety & costs	2.46b	2.76a	2.86a	3.21	0.04*
(2)	Safety & cleanliness	2.41	2.72	2.48	2.75	0.26

* The value of F-statistics is significant at the 0.05 level (p-value <0.05)

E 1=higher school or lower, E 2= bachelor degree, and E 3=master degree or higher

a and b show the source of significant mean differences based on the Duncan's multiple range test; a > b

From table 4.12 the ANOVA revealed statistically significant differences ($p < 0.05$) in education groups among push and pull factors. For push factor 1 'fun & relaxation', the respondents with education in high school or lower (E1) and bachelor degree (E2) had higher mean scores ($M=2.86$ and $M=2.92$) than those who had master degree or higher (E 3). This suggests that the respondents in group E1 and E2, who had been educated at the bachelor degree level or lower, are more likely to be motivated by 'fun & relaxation' and 'novel experience' to travel to a foreign country than those in group E 3.

When considering pull factor, the respondents in group E2 and E3 (bachelor degree or higher) appeared to rate pull factor 1 'attraction variety & costs' higher than the respondents in group E1. This suggests that the respondents in group E2 and E3, who had bachelor degree or higher, are more likely to be attracted by a variety of attractions in Thailand and competitive travel costs than those in group E1.

4.5 Analysis of Tourist Satisfaction

This part aims to present the results of tourist satisfaction with Thailand's destination attributes. The result of table 4.10 is based on individual destination attributes while table 4.11 will present the result if there are any statistical differences of tourist satisfaction among respondent subgroups.

Table 4.13: Level of tourist satisfaction with Thailand's destination attributes

Destination attributes	Level of satisfaction	Standard deviation
1 Taste of Thai food	3.05	0.89
2 Variety of tourism attractions and activities	3.03	0.98
3. Prices of goods and services	3.01	0.88
4. Shopping facilities	2.98	0.78
5. Attractiveness of Thai culture	2.95	0.98
6. Accommodation (quality and services)	2.87	0.94
7. Attractiveness of cultural and historical places	2.85	0.87
8. Friendliness of Thai people	2.82	0.77
9. Restaurants and food shops (quality and services)	2.78	0.89
10. Quality and cleanliness of food	2.75	0.84
11. Attractiveness of natural attractions	2.73	0.78
12. Quality of tourism attractions	2.69	0.98
13. Cleanliness of tourism attractions	2.49	0.85
14. Tourist safety	2.47	0.92
15. Public transportation (convenience and service)	2.42	0.87
Overall mean	2.81	0.91

Level of tourist satisfaction is based on 5-point Likert scale (1= very dissatisfied to 5=very satisfied)

Table 4.13 shows the mean ranking of tourist satisfaction with Thailand's destination attributes as rated by the respondents. Based on the results, taste of Thai food (M=3.05), variety of tourism attractions & activities (M=3.03), and prices of goods & services (M=3.01) received higher scores than other attributes; suggesting that the respondents may be more satisfied with these attributes than other items. While the least satisfied attributes include cleanliness of tourism attractions (M=2.49), tourist safety (M=2.47), and public transportation (M=2.42). It should be noted that these three attributes received score below 2.50 on the 5-point scale; suggesting poor performance in respondents' opinions. This should provide implication for concerned parties to enhance the level of tourist satisfaction.

Table 4.14: Statistical tests of tourist satisfaction across demographic variables

Average score of tourist satisfaction				F-value	p-value	
Demographic variables						
(1)	Gender	male (2.75)	female (2.57)	1.46	0.144	
(2)	Age	20-30 (2.59)	31-50 (2.62)	51 or older (2.78)	1.12	0.327
(3)	Marital status	single (2.55)	married (2.68)	separated (2.67)	0.95	0.387
(4)	Education	higher school (2.47)	bachelor (2.65)	master/higher (2.54)	1.78	0.172
(5)	Income	\$ 2,500/lower (2.61)	\$ 2,500-4,000 (2.64)	\$ 4,000/higher (2.73)	0.30	0.740

Table 4.14 presents the results of t-test and analysis of variance (ANOVA) to examine if there are statistical differences in tourist satisfaction among different subgroups (i.e. gender, age, marital status, education, occupation and income). Based on the results, the study revealed that there are no statistical differences in tourist satisfaction among different respondent subgroups. This finding should help explain hypothesis 4 arguing that Korean travelers with different demographic characteristics have no differences in the level of satisfaction with Thailand's destination attributes.

4.6 Hypotheses Testing

This part aims to present the results of research hypotheses which have been developed from the literature review. There are four research hypotheses relevant to the current study regarding Korean travelers to Thailand. The results of hypotheses testing are presented as follows:

Hypothesis 1

H1o: Korean travelers with different demographic characteristics may have no differences in push and pull factors.

H1a: Korean travelers with different demographic characteristics may have differences in push and pull factors.

To test hypothesis 1, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was employed to examine if there were significant differences in the push and pull factors across different demographic subgroups. Based on the results (table 4.11 and 4.12), there were some significant differences found in the push and pull factors among gender and education subgroups ($p < 0.05$). Table 4.11 (t-test)

showed that male and female respondents had different motivations in push and pull factors ($p < 0.05$). The male respondents were more likely to be motivated by ‘novel experience’ and ‘socialization’ when traveling abroad than females respondents. Another finding (table 4.12) indicates that the respondents who had education at the bachelor degree level or lower, were more likely to be motivated by ‘fun & relaxation’ and ‘novel experience’ to travel to a foreign country than those who had education level at the master degree or higher. In terms of pull factor (table 4.12), the respondents who had bachelor degree or higher, were more likely to be attracted by a variety of attractions in Thailand and competitive travel costs than those who had education in high school or lower. Based on these results, this suggests that Korean travelers with different demographic characteristics may have differences in push and pull factors. Therefore, the findings are supportive of alternative hypothesis 1 (H1a).

Hypothesis 2

H2o: The motives to travel abroad (push factors) of Korean travelers are not related to destination attractions of Thailand (pull factors).

H2a: The motives to travel abroad (push factors) of Korean travelers are related to destination attractions of Thailand (pull factors).

To test hypothesis 2, bivariate correlation analysis was used to examine the relationships between the push and pull factors dimensions. The results from table 4.7 indicated that Pearson’s correlation coefficient (r) of all push and pull factor dimensions were greater than zero, and all ranged from 0.20 to 0.79, indicating a fair to moderate relationship. In addition, all of the correlation coefficient values were significant at the 0.05 level ($p < 0.05$). This indicates that the push factor dimensions have a significant positive relationship with the pull factor dimensions. Thus, it can be concluded that the motives of Korean travelers to travel abroad (push factors) are related to the destination attractions of Thailand (pull factors). Therefore, the findings support the alternative hypothesis 2 (H2a).

Hypothesis 3

H3o: Korean travelers with different demographic characteristics may not have different travel behaviors and trip characteristics.

H3a: Korean travelers with different demographic characteristics may have different travel behaviors and trip characteristics.

To test hypothesis 3, chi-square tests were employed to examine if there were differences in travel behaviors and trip characteristic across different demographic subgroups. Based on the results (table 4.8 and 4.9), there were some statistical differences of travel behaviors and trip characteristics based on genders and education subgroups ($p < 0.05$). Based table 4.8, significant differences were found between male and female respondents in number of visits to Thailand, preferred destinations/regions, and preferred accommodation. While table 4.9 shows significant differences for number of overseas travel, accommodation expenses, and food & beverage expenses among different education subgroups. Table 4.10 also indicates significant differences for number of overseas travel, travel expense for accommodation, food & beverage, and shopping expense as well as type of accommodation among income subgroups. Based on these findings, this indicates that Korean travelers with different demographic characteristics may have different travel behaviors and trip characteristics. Therefore, the findings support the alternative hypothesis 3 (H3a).

H4o: Korean travelers with different demographic characteristics may have no differences in level of satisfaction with Thailand's destination attributes.

H4a: Korean travelers with different demographic characteristics may have differences in level of satisfaction with Thailand's destination attributes.

To test hypothesis 4, t-test and analysis of variance (ANOVA) were used to examine if there were differences in level of satisfaction among different demographic subgroup. Based on the results (table 4.14), it showed that there were no differences in level of satisfaction among different demographic subgroup (all $p > 0.05$). This indicates that Korean travelers with different demographic characteristics have no different level of satisfaction with Thailand's destination attributes. Therefore, the finding does not support the hypothesis 4. In other words, the hypothesis 4 was rejected (reject H4a).

4.7 Research Discussions

Discussion of Travel Behaviors and Trip Characteristics across Different Demographic Subgroups

According to table 4.8, 4.9 and 4.10, it showed that there were some differences of travel behaviors and trip characteristics among Korean travelers, particularly based on gender, education, and income subgroups. It was found that female and male respondents may have some differences in terms of frequencies of overseas travel, number of visits to Thailand, destination choices, and accommodation. The results also revealed that Korean travelers with different education levels may have differences in frequencies of overseas travel and travel expenses. Furthermore, it was found that travelers with different incomes may have differences in frequencies of overseas travel, travel expenses (e.g. food, shopping), and type of accommodation. These findings seem to be similar to several studies (e.g. Baloglu & Uysal, 1996; You & O'Leary, 1999; Horneman et al., 2002) indicating that tourists with different demographic characteristics may have differences in travel behaviors, trip characteristics and travel patterns. The literature indicates that tourists' behaviors are heterogeneous in nature, and people travel for various reasons (Crompton, 1979; Baloglu & Uysal, 1996). Tourists are consumers who buy a number of diverse and different products and services, and it is important for marketers to recognize that not all tourists travel for the same reasons (Horneman et al., 2002). According to the literature, tourists' behaviors may vary depending on several factors such as gender, life style, people's travel tastes and preferences (Romsa et al., 1980; You et al., 2001). Kozak (2002) argued that travel motivation as well as tourist behavior is a dynamic concept, it may differ from one person to another because people have different reasons for travel as well as the differences of an individual. Different characteristics of an individual may bring different consumption and diversified travel behaviors (Moschis, 1997 cited in You & O'Leary, 2000). With these arguments, it could help justify that Korean travelers with different demographic characteristics may have different travel behaviors and trip characteristics with the above reasons. This should help destination marketers and tourism operators be aware of customers' travel preferences, though they come from the same country/nationality.

Discussion of Mean Ranking of Push and Pull Motivational Items

By ranking the mean of push and pull motivational items as shown in tables 4.3 and 4.4, the results from table 4.3 indicated that major push motivational items motivating the respondents to travel abroad are ‘I want to see something new and exciting’, ‘I want to experience cultures that are different from mine’, and ‘I want to seek fun or adventure’, respectively. The findings show some partial similarities with previous studies (e.g. Zhang & Lam, 1999; Heung et al., 2001; Jang & Wu, 2006). In the studies of Zhang and Lam (1999), and Jang and Wu (2006), they found that ‘I want to see something different or the things I don’t normally see’ was the most important push motivations (highest mean score) among mainland Chinese and Taiwanese travelers, while Heung et al. (2001) reported that ‘I want to experience cultures that are different from mine’ was one of the major push items for Japanese leisure travelers. In the studies of travel motivations, it should be noted that travelers with different cultural backgrounds or nationalities may have different travel motives (Kim, 1999; Kozak, 2002). In this study, the findings seem be similar to the above research in that one of the major motives for Korean travelers to travel abroad is related to the need to experience or to see something that is new, exciting or different from their usual culture or environment. This presents interesting result for those who target Korean travelers with better understanding of the travel needs of their target customers.

In the case of pull motivational items as shown in table 4.4, ‘Thai cultural’, ‘cultural & historical attractions’, and ‘beaches/seasides’ are the major pull motivations attracting the respondents to Thailand. The results are somewhat similar to previous studies indicating that many international tourists are attracted to visit a particular destination because of the culture attractions and/or natural attractions of a particular destination. For example, Morris (1990) found that historical and cultural attractions are preferred places among Japanese travelers. Likewise, Jang and Cai (2002) reported that British travelers seemed to prefer cultural or exotic places when traveling overseas. Yavuz et al. (1998) also found that European travelers perceived cultural attractions of Cyprus as the major destination attributes. In addition to Thai cultural attractions, Thailand is also well-known for the beauty of natural attractions, particularly the beaches and islands. Several studies have revealed that one of the major destination attributes attracting international tourists to Thailand are beaches or what we call sea, sand, and sun tourism – 3S (Laksanakan, 2003; Sansartji, 2005). Million of international tourists visit the world’s famous beaches cities in Thailand such as Pattaya and Phuket (Sansartji, 2005). Based on these reasons, it could help justify why cultural attractions as well as natural attractions such as beach tourism are major pull factors drawing Korean travelers to Thailand. These results

could help tourism business to carefully design the tour programs corresponding to the needs and wants of the target market (e.g. where the targets want to go in Thailand).

Discussion of Push and Pull Factor Analysis

In addition to discussing the push and pull motivational items, this part will also discuss the results of push and pull factor analysis (grouping items). Based on the results of push factor analysis as shown in table 4.5, push factor dimensions ‘fun & relaxation’ and ‘novel experience’ were regarded as the major push factors stimulating Korean travelers to travel abroad. The current finding is somewhat similar to previous studies. For example, Hanqin and Lam (1999) found that ‘relaxation’ emerged as one of the push factors among Chinese travelers visiting Hong Kong. While Lee (2000) revealed that ‘novelty’ was regarded as one of the major push factors among international tourists visiting South Korea. Though the results of the current study seem to correspond to previous literature, it should be noted that push factors (motives to travel) could be different from one group of sample to another (Zhang & Lam, 1999; Bogari et al., 2003). This is because people travel for many reasons, and people with different cultural backgrounds or nationalities may have different travel motives (Reisinger & Turner, 1997; Kozak 2002). It is interesting to note that the major push factor identified in this study (fun & relaxation) seems to correspond to the information given by the Tourism Authority of Thailand (2007) in that most Korean travelers came to Thailand for holiday and relaxation purposes. The current research helps confirm the information that we have regarding Korean travelers, and this should benefit tourism business who target the Korean travel market.

Regarding the results of pull factor analysis (table 4.6), the present study found that the pull factor dimension ‘attraction variety & costs’ (e.g. natural attractions, cultural attractions, leisure activities) is the most important destination attribute attracting Korean traveler to Thailand. The result seems to be similar to Hanqin and Lam (1999) who found that mainland Chinese travelers perceived sightseeing variety (including historical/cultural attractions and beautiful scenery) as the major destination attraction drawing them to Kong Hong. Likewise, Sirakaya and McLellan (1997) discovered that trip costs, recreation activities, and cultural/historical attractions were major pull factors among international college students. Based on these studies, it suggests that a variety of destination attractions and travel costs could be the common pull factors among international travelers when traveling abroad. Thus, the reason that Korean travelers chose to visit Thailand could be due to a variety of Thailand’s destination attractions such as natural attractions, Thai culture, historical sites, and beautiful beaches. However, it should be advised that the result of pull factors (destination attractions) could be

different from country to country depending on the image and perception of travelers toward a particular destination (Zhang & Lam, 1999; Kozak 2002; Bogari et al., 2003). The results from this study should contribute to Thai tourism operators to develop attractive and interesting tour programs for Korean travelers to Thailand.

Discussion of the Relationships between Push and Pull Factors

Based on the correlation analysis (as shown in table 4.7), significant correlations were observed among all the push and pull factor dimensions. The value of all correlation coefficients (r) between push and pull factors were greater than zero, and ranged from 0.20 to 0.79. This indicates moderately positive relationships between push and pull factor dimensions. It was observed that the correlation between the three push factors ('fun & relaxation', 'novel experience' and 'socialization') and the pull factor 'attraction variety & costs' was relatively high ($r > 0.70$), suggesting that these internal motives (push factors) of the Korean travelers are significantly related to the destination attributes of Thailand (pull factors). This relationship could provide important implications to industry practitioners for developing tourism products and services corresponding to the needs of the targets.

In overall, the results support the findings of previous studies conducted by Uysal and Jurowski (1994) and Kim et al. (2003) who reported that there were relationships emerged among the push and pull factors. These studies indicated that push factors are fundamentally related to pull factors, and they should not be viewed as being entirely independent of each other. This is because while the internal motives push people to travel (push factors), the external forces of the destination itself (pull factors) simultaneously pull them to choose that particular destination. In addition, push factors help identify different forces that influence people to consider taking a vacation, at the same time, pull factors can determine the forces that attract them to select a destination (Klenosky, 2002). When considering their interaction, these forces can help explain what motivates people to travel and where they choose to go (Dann, 1977; Crompton, 1979; Yoon & Uysal, 2005). In other words, both push and pull factors can help us understand why people travel and where they go. Thus, the results of the current study has reconfirmed the relationship of push and pull factors in which people's travel motivations is driven by their internal forces (push factors) and attracted by external factors (pull factors) to a particular destinations.

Discussion of Comparisons of Push and Pull Factors across Different Demographic Characteristics

By using a t-test and an analysis of variance (ANOVA) to examine if there were statistical differences in the push and pull factors among different demographic subgroups of Korean travelers, the study found some significant differences across gender and education subgroups (table 4.11 and 4.12). These results are consistent to previous studies examining push and pull factors among international tourist groups such as Chinese, Korean, Japanese, American and European tourists (Zhang & Lam, 1999; Lee, 2000; Kim et al., 2003). A recent study by Kim et al. (2003), for example, revealed that Korean travelers with different gender, age, income and occupation had different perceptions of push and pull factors when visiting the national parks. The study further suggested that park managers need to understand these differences among Korean travelers in order to enhance tourist satisfaction and repeat visit. Several researchers (Goodall & Ashworth, 1988; Zhang & Lam 1999; Kozak, 2002; Kim et al., 2003) identified common demographic variables that make travelers, though the same group or nationality, differ in the perceptions of push and pull factors including gender, age, education, income, retirement status, and travel frequency. They argued that it is common for people with different demographic characteristics would have differences in travel motives and behaviors because these demographic variables could affect people's internal needs and perceptions as well as choice of tourism destinations. The literature also indicates that different characteristics of an individual may bring different consumption and diversified travel perceptions and behaviors (Moschis, 1997 cited in You and O'Leary 2000). In this regard, it is not surprising if there are some differences in the perception of push and pull factors among Korean travelers (i.e. gender and education subgroups) with the above reasons. This result may provide some implications for tourism business who cater for the Korean travel market in that Korean travelers may not need the same tourism products and services, and this suggests a variety of products available for this market.

Discussion of Tourist Satisfaction

In addition to understanding travel motivations and tourist behaviors, this study also surveyed Korean travelers' satisfaction with Thailand's destination attributes. Based on the result of tourist satisfaction (table 4.13), it was found that the respondents seemed to be satisfied with Thai food, variety of tourism attractions and prices of goods/services rather than other attributes ($M > 3.00$). Other major destination attributes such as shopping facilities, accommodation, restaurants/food shops, cultural & natural attractions appeared to be moderately satisfied because

these attributes scored between 2.98 to 2.69. However, destination attributes, namely, public transportation, tourist safety and cleanliness of tourism scored below 2.50 on a 5-point scale; suggesting less satisfactory attributes as perceived by the respondents.

The result seems to be partially similar to some previous studies. For instance, Danaher and Arweiler (1996) found that tourists visiting New Zealand had different satisfaction levels with New Zealand's destination attributes such as public transportation, accommodation, outdoor activities and tourism attractions. Some of these attributes received different levels of satisfaction, and some could be more satisfied or less satisfied than the others, depending on its performance and tourists' expectation. Similarly, Prideaux (2000) revealed that Taiwanese tourists had different levels of satisfaction toward Southeast Queensland's destination attributes such as the attractiveness of local culture, accommodation, quality of services, transportation, local tour services and shopping facilities. Based on the current result, many Korean travelers seemed to be satisfied with Thai food, variety of tourism attractions and low costs of goods/services rather than other attributes. These three attributes could be widely argued that they are the highlights (strengths) of Thailand's tourism industry (TAT, 2003). Thai food is claimed to be one of the world's popular cuisine in many countries (Cummings, 2000). When international tourists come to Thailand, they will have a chance to experience traditional and original Thai cuisine. With a variety of ingredients, good taste/favors, and different styles of cooking, many Koreans may appreciate Thai food and its taste while they were in Thailand. Furthermore, Thailand also has a variety of tourism attractions including cultural/historical attractions, natural and scenery attractions, shopping facilities, and a lot of leisure activities and entertainment. With these attractive destination attributes, Thailand is regarded as one of the most popular destinations in the Asia Pacific region (TAT, 2003). More importantly, one of the major factors attracting international tourists to Thailand is the low costs of living and goods and services (TAT, 2003; Sangpikul, 2007). Some studies revealed that many international tourists come to Thailand because of competitive travel costs, costs of living and beautiful natural attractions (Laksanakan, 2003; Sansartji, 2005). Furthermore, it is often argued that Thailand has been regularly voted as the best value destination (best value for money) in the region (TAT, 2003; Traveler Counsellors, 2007). With these reasons, it could be possible that Korean travelers might be satisfied with the mentioned attributes of Thailand (i.e. Thai food, variety of tourism attractions, prices of goods) than other items/attributes, and help justify the above result. This result should be useful for Thai tourism business to design the products and services responding to the needs and expectations of Korean travelers and enhance their travel satisfaction when visiting Thailand.

