

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

3.1 Introduction

This chapter focuses on the results obtained from the quantitative studies. The analysis of the quantitative data derived from two sets of questionnaires. The first one is for the long stay tourists and expatriates in Phuket for analyzing the factors influence their decision making in purchasing real estate. The second questionnaire is for the real estate developer, which was analyzed their customer's decision making in choosing their real estate. The result will be presented briefly as shown in tables and by figures. Data was analyzed using mainly descriptive statistics. Software SPSS was used to analyze and present the result.

3.2 Research findings

3.2.1 Factors that influence long stay tourists and expatriate' decision making in choosing real estate in Phuket

There were 147 questionnaires for long stay tourists and 245 questionnaires for expatriates who have been working in Phuket. The second set of questionnaires was given out to 44 real estate developers in Phuket. Therefore, the result was divided into two groups, which are long stay tourists and expatriates, and real estate developer.

Socio-demographic profile of long stay tourists and expatriates

52

The sample groups consisted of 147 long stay tourists and 245 expatriates, living or working in Phuket. The sample respondents were collected from Phuket immigration during 15 March - 16 April, 2007 belonged to these characteristics

(1) Individual factors

The primary purpose of these questionnaires were to examine the personal data of respondents in order to analyze the relation with marketing mix factors that influence long stay tourists and expatriates' decisions to choose the real estate project in Phuket. The survey showed that most of the samples were from the male gender for both long stay tourists and expatriates (Table 3.1).

In regard to the marital status of long stay tourist respondents, the result showed that single status respondents were the highest ratio at 45.58 percent whereas married 23.8 percent, and married with children 18.37 percent, and divorce or widow 12.24 percent respectively. Whereas, the marital status of expatriates respondents showed that single status was also the highest ratio at 40.00 percent, and married 34.29 percent, and married with children 13.88 percent, and divorce or widow 11.84 percent respectively

The age of long stay sample respondents were mostly over 60 years at 23.13 percent, and then 51 - 60 years at 22.45 percent, and 41 - 50 years at 20.41 percent, and 21-30 years at 19.73 percent respectively. Whereas, the age of expatriates sample respondents mostly were 31-40 years at 33.88 percent, and secondly 41-50 years at 22.45 percent, and 51-60 years at 21.22 percent, and 21-30 years at 17.14 percent respectively.

The majority of long stay tourists had an education level lower than bachelor degree at 36.05 percent, bachelor degree 33.33 percent and higher than bachelor degree 30.61 percent respectively. Whereas, the majority of expatriates had bachelor degree at 48.57 percent,

and lower than bachelor degree 26.53 percent and higher than bachelor degree 24.90 percent respectively

Moreover, most of long stay tourists' respondents were unemployed/retired at 41.50 percent, whereas self-employed at 25.17 percent, company employed at 11.56 percent and professional at 10.88 percent. Whereas, most of expatriates' respondents were company employee at 30.61 percent, self-employed at 23.27 percent, professional at 17.14 percent, company owner at 14.69 percent and unemployed at 12.65 percent.

Most of the long stay respondents had income per year between 30,001 - 40,000 US\$ at 27.21 percent, less than 30,000 US\$ per year at 21.09 percent, 40,001 - 50,000 at 20.41 percent, and more than 70,001 at 14.97 percent. Whereas, most of expatriates respondents had income per year between 40,001 - 50,000 US\$ at 24.90 percent, 30,001 - 40,000 US\$ per year at 24.08 percent, less than 30,000 us\$ at 21.22 percent and more than 70,001 at 13.06 percent.

Moreover, Table 3.2 shows respondents' behavior, the purpose of these questions is to examine the respondents' behavior. Most of long stay tourists spent more than 10-20 weeks in Thailand, accounted for 37.43 percent, less than 10 weeks at 26.52 percent, more than 20-30 weeks at 23.81 percent and more than 30 weeks for each visit at 12.24 percent.

The majority of expatriates have been working in Thailand for 1-5 years at 71.05 percent, 6-10 years at 17.96 percent, 11-15 years at 7.35 percent and more than 20 years at 1.63 percent.

Table 3.1 Social-demographic profiles of respondents

Variable	Long stay		Expatriate		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Gender						
Male	115	78.23	178	72.65	293	74.74
Female	32	21.77	67	27.35	99	25.26
Total	147	100.00	245	100.00	392	100.00
Marital status						
Single	67	45.58	98	40.00	165	42.09
Married	35	23.81	84	34.29	119	30.36
Married with child	27	18.37	34	13.88	61	15.56
Divorced/widowed	18	12.24	29	11.84	47	11.99
Total	147	100.00	245	100.00	392	100.00
Age						
20 - 30 years old	29	19.73	42	17.14	71	18.11
31 - 41 years old	21	14.29	83	33.88	104	26.53
41 - 50 years old	30	20.41	55	22.45	85	21.68
51 - 60 years old	33	22.45	52	21.22	85	21.68
Over 61 years old	34	23.13	13	5.31	47	11.99
Total	147	100.00	245	100.00	392	100.00

Table 3.1 (Continued)

Variable	Long stay		Expatriate		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Education level						
Lower than Bachelor degree	53	36.05	65	26.53	118	30.10
Bachelor degree	49	33.33	119	48.57	168	42.86
Higher than bachelor degree	45	30.61	61	24.90	106	27.04
Total	147	100.00	245	100.00	392	100.00
Occupation						
Self Employed	37	25.17	57	23.27	94	23.98
Unemployed/Retired	61	41.50	31	12.65	92	23.47
Company employee	17	11.56	75	30.61	92	23.47
Business Owner	12	8.16	36	14.69	48	12.24
Professional	16	10.88	42	17.14	58	14.80
Others	4	2.72	3	1.22	7	1.79
Volunteer	0	0.00	1	0.41	1	0.26
Total	147	100.00	245	100.00	392	100.00
Income per Year (US\$)						
Less than 30,000	31	21.09	52	21.22	83	21.17
30,001 - 40,000	40	27.21	59	24.08	99	25.26
40,001 - 50,000	30	20.41	61	24.90	91	23.21
50,001 - 60,000	12	8.16	21	8.57	33	8.42
60,001 - 70,000	12	8.16	20	8.16	32	8.16
More than 70,001	22	14.97	32	13.06	54	13.78
Total	147	100.00	245	100.00	392	100.00

Table 3.2 Tourism behaviors among long stay tourists and expatriates

Variable	Long stay	
	Frequency	(%)
Time spent each visit in Thailand		
Less than 10 weeks	38	26.52
10-20 weeks	56	37.43
20-30 weeks	34	23.81
More than 30 weeks	19	12.24
Total	147	100.00
Variable	Expatriates	
	Frequency	(%)
No: of Years working in Thailand		
1-5 years	174	71.02
6-10 years	44	17.96
11-15 years	18	7.35
16-20 years	5	2.04
More than 20 years	4	1.63
Total	245	100.00

From table 3.3, the results showed that most of long stay tourists come from Europe at 23.81 percent, USA and Canada at 16.33 percent, the same as from England at 16.33 percent. The third is from Scandinavia at 15.65 percent, Germany at 10.20 percent, Switzerland at 8.16 percent, Asia at 5.44 percent and from Australia and New Zealand at 4.08 percent. Whereas, the majority of expatriates come from UK at 26.12 percent, followed by from Asia at 15.92 percent, USA and Canada at 13.06 percent, Germany at 6.53 percent and Switzerland at 2.04 percent.

Table 3.3 Country of residence among long stay tourists and expatriates in Phuket

Variable	Long stay		Expatriate		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Country						
Asia	8	5.44	39	15.92	47	11.99
USA and Canada	24	16.33	32	13.06	56	14.29
UK	24	16.33	64	26.12	88	22.45
Switzerland	12	8.16	5	2.04	17	4.34
Germany	15	10.20	16	6.53	31	7.91
Scandinavian	23	15.65	8	3.27	31	7.91
Others in Europe	35	23.81	58	23.68	93	23.73
Australia and New Zealand	6	4.08	23	9.39	29	7.40
Total	147	100.00	245	100.00	392	100.00

Table 3.4 showed the result of the area, which area that long stay tourists and expatriates have been living. The result showed that the majority of long stay tourists stayed at Rawai and Chalong at 34.69 percent, followed by Kata and Karon at 15.65 percent matching Phuket town at 15.65 percent, Kamala and Surin at 14.29 percent and Patong and Kalim at 12.24 percent. Whereas, most of expatriates have been living in Phuket town at 25.71 percent, Rawai and Chalong at 22.04 percent, Kamala and Surin at 16.73 percent and Patong and Kalim at 12.65 percent.

Moreover, most of long stay tourists think that Rawai and Chalong is the most desire place to stay, accounted 36.05 percent, Kata and Karon at 23.13 percent, Naiyang and Maikao at 20.4 percent and Kamala and Surin at 17.01 percent. Expatriates think that the most desirable place to stay is Kamala and Surin at 28.98 percent, Rawai and Chalong at 24.08 percent, Kata and Karon at 13.47 percent and Phuket town 11.43 percent.

Table 3.4 Area of residence among long stay tourists and expatriates in Phuket

Variable	Long stay		Expatriate		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
In which area of Phuket do you live currently						
Phuket town and Kathu	23	15.65	63	25.71	86	21.94
Patong and Kalim	18	12.24	31	12.65	49	12.50
Kata and Karon	23	15.65	25	10.20	48	12.24
Kamala and Surin	21	14.29	41	16.73	62	15.82
Rawai and Chalong	51	34.69	54	22.04	105	26.79
Talang	4	2.72	20	8.16	24	6.12
Naiyang	3	2.04	5	2.04	8	2.04
Panwa and Ao-Makam	2	1.36	6	2.45	8	2.04
Others	2	1.36	0	0.00	2	0.51
Total	147	100	245	100	392	100
In which area of Phuket would you consider most desire to stay						
Phuket town	13	8.84	28	11.43	41	10.46
Patong and Kalim	14	9.52	16	6.53	30	7.65
Kata and Karon	34	23.13	33	13.47	67	17.09
Kamala and Surin	25	17.01	71	28.98	96	24.49
Rawai and Chalong	53	36.05	59	24.08	112	28.57
Talang	2	1.36	12	4.90	14	3.57
Naiyang	3	2.04	12	4.90	15	3.83
Panwa and Ao-Makam	3	2.04	13	5.31	16	4.08
Others	0	0.00	1	0.41	1	0.26
Total	147	100	245	100	392	100

Table 3.5 shows that both long stay tourists and expatriates prefer the Thai style accommodation at 50.30 percent by long stay tourists and 39.18 percent by expatriates. Second is Modern for both long stay tourists and expatriates at 15.65 percent and 20.41 percent respectively. Third is Contemporary for both groups at 12.24 percent and 19.59 percent, followed by Balinese style at 8.84 percent by long stay tourists and 10.61 percent by expatriates.

Most of long stay tourists and expatriates spend less than 15,000 baht per month for their accommodation rental, accounted to 63.95 percent by long stay tourists and 40.00 percent by expatriates. Second is the 15,001 - 30,000 baht per month bracket at 27.89 percent by long stay tourists and 24.49 percent by expatriates and 30,001 - 45,000 baht at 5.44 percent by long stay tourists and 8.16 percent by expatriates. Moreover, 21.63 percent of expatriates do not have to spend for rental as they own their own house in Phuket.

Table 3.5 Favorite styles of architecture and expense per month for accommodation

Variable	Long stay		Expatriate		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Favorite style of architecture						
Thai style	74	50.34	96	39.18	170	43.37
Modern	23	15.65	50	20.41	73	18.62
Bali	13	8.84	26	10.61	39	9.95
European	12	8.16	16	6.53	28	7.14
Country	4	2.72	6	2.45	10	2.55
Contemporary	18	12.24	48	19.59	66	16.84
Others	3	2.04	3	1.22	6	1.53
Total	147	100.00	245	100.00	392	100.00
How much rent do you pay per month (Baht)						
None (Home Owners)			53	21.63	35	8.93
less than 15,000	94	63.95	98	40.00	199	50.77
15,0001 - 30,000	41	27.89	60	24.49	110	28.06
30,001 - 45,000	8	5.44	20	8.16	29	7.40

45,0001 - 60,000	1	0.68		6	2.45		7	1.79
More than 60,001	3	2.04		8	3.27		12	3.06
Total	147	100.00		245	100.00		392	100.00

1) The access to information for accommodation

The main purpose of these questions is to examine how long stay tourists and expatriates access information relating to real estate. From Table 3.6, the result showed that most long stay tourists and expatriates found out about their accommodation from family and friends at 64.63 percent and 49.39 percent by expatriates. The second is via the Internet at 11.56 percent for long stay tourist and by driving around at 13.88 percent for expatriates. The third for long stay tourists is by driving around at 5.44 percent and 11.02 percent by Internet for expatriates. The least media access is from advertising signs for both long stay tourists and expatriates.

Table 3.6 The access to information of the accommodation by long stay tourists and expatriates

Variable	Long stay		Expatriate		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
How did you find out about your accommodation						
Friends and family	95	64.63	121	49.39	216	55.10
Internet	17	11.56	27	11.02	44	11.22
Drive around	8	5.44	34	13.88	42	10.71
Marketing staff or sale executive	6	4.08	15	6.12	21	5.36
Magazine	5	3.40	7	2.86	12	3.06
Brochure and poster	5	3.40	8	3.27	13	3.32
from work	4	2.72	3	1.22	7	1.79
Newspaper	3	2.04	15	6.12	18	4.59
others	3	2.04	10	4.08	13	3.32

Advertising sign	1	0.68	1	0.41	2	0.51
Property show	-	-	1	0.41	1	0.26
Total	147	100.00	245	100.00	392	100.00

2) The importance of marketing mix's factors that influence tourist's decision making in choosing the real estate

For product factor, The study of the long stay tourists sample shown high important level of product factors that influences long stay tourists' decision making in choosing real estate in Phuket were credibility of the developer, interior design, space in each room, telephone line, layout of the house, overall size of the house, enough parking space and own garden area (Table 3.7). In overall, the importance of product factors to long stay tourists' decision making in choosing the real estate in Phuket was high important level (Mean = 3.64) and very high important level for expatriates (Mean = 3.77). The result of independent samples T-test indicated that expatriates gave more level of important significantly difference regarding to credibility of the developer, interior design, overall size of the accommodation, space in each room and own garden area.

For price factor, the study shown that very high importance level of price factors that influence both long stay tourists and expatriates decision making in choosing real estate in Phuket was valuable for money (Table 3.8). The average importance of price factors to long stay tourists and expatriates' decision making in choosing the real estate in Phuket was high important level. The result of independent samples T-test also indicated that expatriates gave more level of important significantly difference regarding to value for money factor.

For place factor, the study of the both long stay tourists and expatriates sample showed high important level of place factors that influences their decision making in choosing real estate in Phuket was location by sea (Table 3.9). The average important of place factors to long stay tourists and expatriates' decision making in choosing the real estate in Phuket was intermediate important level. The mean scores were at 3.04 and 3.10 respectively. The result of independent samples T-test indicated that expatriates gave more level of important significantly difference regarding to location of the property near by the working place.

For promotion factor, the study showed that promotion factors which are advertising sign, knowledge and presentation of sale representative, advertising on newspaper and website promotion were the intermediate important level for both long stay tourist and expatriates' decision making in choosing real estate in Phuket (Table 3.10). Moreover, the average important of overall promotion factors to long stay tourists' decision making in choosing the real estate in Phuket was intermediate important level (Mean = 2.82) as well as expatriates (Mean = 2.79).

For people, the study showed that people factors, which are efficient/courteous of service staffs, convenience in contacting staffs and easy communication with staffs were high important level for both long stay tourist and expatriates' decision making in choosing real estate in Phuket (Table 3.11). Moreover, the important of overall people factors to long stay tourists' decision making in choosing the real estate in Phuket was also high important level (Mean = 3.79).as well as expatriates (Mean = 4.06). The result of independent samples T-test also indicated that expatriates gave more level of important significantly difference regarding to efficient/courteous of service staffs, convenience in contacting staffs and easy communication with staffs.

For physical evidence, the study showed that physical evidence factors which are atmosphere around the property and surrounding and general appearance of the property were high important level for long stay tourist and very high important level for expatriates' decision making in choosing real estate in Phuket (Table 3.12). The important of overall physical evidence factors to long stay tourists' decision making in choosing the real estate in Phuket was high important level (Mean = 4.01) and very high important level for expatriates (Mean = 4.31). The result of independent samples T-test also indicated that expatriates gave more level of important significantly difference regarding atmosphere around the property and surrounding and general appearance of the property

For process, the study showed that security service was the high important level for both long stay tourist and expatriates' decision making in choosing real estate in Phuket. Moreover, the important of overall process factors to long stay tourists' decision making in choosing the real estate in Phuket was intermediate important level (Mean = 3.25) as well as expatriates (Mean = 3.33) (Table 3.13).

Table 3.7 Importance level of Product factors among Long stay tourists and expatriates respondents

	Long Stay Tourist			Expatriate			Total			
	Mean	S.D.	Level of Importance	Mean	S.D.	Level of Importance	Mean	S.D.	Level of Importance	Sig.
Product										
Creditability of the developer	4.07	0.88	High	4.34	0.93	Very High	4.24	0.92	Very High	0.00*
Interior design	3.74	0.85	High	3.96	0.85	High	3.88	0.85	High	0.02*
Overall size of the accommodation	3.63	0.89	High	3.90	0.77	High	3.80	0.82	High	0.00*
Space in each room	3.70	0.83	High	3.98	0.76	High	3.87	0.80	High	0.00*
Telephone line connected to high speed internet	3.89	1.08	High	3.79	1.07	High	3.83	1.07	High	0.38
Enough parking	3.58	0.94	High	3.64	0.94	High	3.62	0.94	High	0.52
House included pool	3.01	1.15	Intermediate	2.92	1.18	Intermediate	2.95	1.17	Intermediate	0.47
Own garden area	3.45	0.98	High	3.65	0.96	High	3.58	0.97	High	0.04*
Layout of the house	3.73	0.92	High	3.84	0.82	High	3.80	0.86	High	0.22
Total	3.64		High	3.77		High	3.73		High	

Remark: 1. T-test was performed to identify statistically significant differences between groups.

2. * indicates statistically significant differences between groups ($p \leq 0.05$).

Table 3.8 Important level of Price factors among Long stay tourists and expatriates respondents

	Long Stay Tourist			Expatriate			Total			
	Mean	S.D.	Level of Importance	Mean	S.D.	Level of Importance	Mean	S.D.	Level of Important	Sig.
Price										
Value for money	4.14	0.84	Very High	4.42	0.80	Very High	4.32	0.83	Very High	0.00*
Availability of finance	3.33	1.12	Intermediate	3.51	1.15	High	3.44	1.14	High	0.12
Favorable payment term	3.29	1.08	Intermediate	3.44	1.10	High	3.39	1.09	Intermediate	0.18
Electric and water rate	3.57	1.03	High	3.46	1.06	High	3.50	1.05	High	0.31
Total	3.58		High	3.71		High	3.66		High	

Remark: 1. T-test was performed to identify statistically significant differences between groups.

2. * indicates statistically significant differences between groups ($p \leq 0.05$).

Table 3.9 Important level of Place factors among Long stay tourists and expatriates respondents

	Long Stay Tourist			Expatriate			Total			
	Mean	S.D.	Level of Importance	Mean	S.D.	Level of Importance	Mean	S.D.	Level of Importance	Sig
Place										
Its location by the sea or nearby	3.76	0.99	High	3.63	1.03	High	3.68	1.01	High	0.25
Its location in the golf course or nearby	2.36	1.16	Low	2.36	1.14	Low	2.36	1.14	Low	0.98
Near by working place	2.69	1.16	Intermediate	3.26	1.04	Intermediate	3.05	1.12	Intermediate	0.00*
Near by community and shopping mall	3.11	1.01	Intermediate	3.10	0.95	Intermediate	3.10	0.97	Intermediate	0.95
The convenience of transportation	3.29	1.11	Intermediate	3.16	1.06	Intermediate	3.21	1.08	Intermediate	0.28
Total	3.04		Intermediate	3.10		Intermediate	3.08		Intermediate	

Remark: 1. T-test was performed to identify statistically significant differences between groups.

2. * indicates statistically significant differences between groups ($p \leq 0.05$).

Table 3.10 Important level of Promotion factors among long stay tourists and expatriates respondents

	Long Stay Tourist			Expatriate			Total			
	Mean	S.D.	Level of Importance	Mean	S.D.	Level of Importance	Mean	S.D.	Level of Importance	Sig
Promotion										
Sale promotion ex: discount, gift voucher etc	2.52	1.15	Low	2.58	1.05	Low	2.56	1.09	Low	0.60
Advertising sign	2.61	1.05	Intermediate	2.46	1.00	Intermediate	2.51	1.02	Intermediate	0.16
Knowledge and presentation from sale representative	3.20	1.12	Intermediate	3.34	1.16	Intermediate	3.29	1.15	Intermediate	0.25
Advertising on newspaper	2.74	1.08	Intermediate	2.66	0.99	Intermediate	2.69	1.03	Intermediate	0.45
Website promotion	3.04	1.10	Intermediate	2.93	1.06	Intermediate	2.97	1.07	Intermediate	0.33
Total	2.82		Intermediate	2.79		Intermediate	2.80		Intermediate	

Remark: 1. T-test was performed to identify statistically significant differences between groups.

2. * indicates statistically significant differences between groups ($p \leq 0.05$).

Table 3.11 Important level of People factors among long stay tourists and expatriates respondents

	Long Stay Tourist			Expatriate			Total			
	Mean	S.D.	Level of Importance	Mean	S.D.	Level of Importance	Mean	S.D.	Level of Importance	Sig
People										
Efficient/courteous service staff	3.71	0.98	High	4.03	0.84	High	3.91	0.91	High	0.00
Convenience in contacting staff	3.78	0.94	High	4.00	0.86	High	3.91	0.90	High	0.02
Easy communication with staff	3.87	0.88	High	4.15	0.86	High	4.05	0.87	High	0.00
Total	3.79		High	4.06		High	3.96		High	

Remark: 1. T-test was performed to identify statistically significant differences between groups.

2. * indicates statistically significant differences between groups ($p \leq 0.05$).

Table 3.12 Important level of Physical evidence factors among long stay tourists and expatriates respondents

	Long Stay Tourist			Expatriate			Total			
	Mean	S.D.	Level of Importance	Mean	S.D.	Level of Importance	Mean	S.D.	Level of Importance	Sig.
Evidence Physical										
Atmosphere around the property and surrounding	4.10	0.81	High	4.35	0.76	Very High	4.25	0.78	Very High	0.00*
General appearance of the property	3.99	0.79	High	4.26	0.76	Very High	4.16	0.78	High	0.00*
Total	4.01		High	4.31		Very High	4.21		Very High	

Remark: 1. T-test was performed to identify statistically significant differences between groups.

2. * indicates statistically significant differences between groups ($p \leq 0.05$).

Table 3.13 Important level of Process factors among long stay tourists and expatriates respondents

	Long Stay Tourist			Expatriate			Total			
	Mean	S.D.	Level of Importance	Mean	S.D.	Level of Importance	Mean	S.D.	Level of Importance	Sig.
Process										
Cleaning service provided	3.19	1.13	Intermediate	3.20	1.15	Intermediate	3.19	1.14	Intermediate	0.96
Security service provided	3.60	0.99	High	3.61	1.06	High	3.61	1.03	High	0.90
Availability of service/maintenance	3.39	0.99	Intermediate	3.57	1.00	High	3.50	1.00	High	0.08
Spaces common area	3.11	0.97	Intermediate	3.22	0.99	Intermediate	3.18	0.99	Intermediate	0.30
Additional service	2.94	1.15	Intermediate	3.03	1.13	Intermediate	3.00	1.14	Intermediate	0.43
Total	3.25		Intermediate	3.33		Intermediate	3.30		Intermediate	

Remark: 1. T-test was performed to identify statistically significant differences between groups.

2. * indicates statistically significant differences between groups ($p \leq 0.05$).

From table 3.14, the long stay tourists were asked to range the marketing mix factors in order of what are the most important criteria effecting their decision in buying or renting the property in Phuket from 1 = most important to 7 = least important. The result showed that the first important marketing mix factor is place. Second is price factor. Third is product factor. Fourth is Physical factor. Fifth is person factor. Sixth is process factor and seventh is promotion factor.

From table 3.15, the expatriates were asked to range the marketing mix factors in order of what are the most important criteria effecting their decision in buying or renting the property in Phuket from 1 = most important to 7 = least important. The result showed that the first important marketing mix factor is place. Second is price factor. Third is product factor. Fourth is physical evidence factor. Fifth is person factor. Sixth is process factor and seventh is promotion factor. In conclusion, both groups are ranking the marketing mix factors in the same order.

Table 3.14 Important level of each marketing mix factors among long stay tourists respondents in choosing real estate in Phuket

Factors		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total	Mean	Ranking
Product	N	33	37	52	16	5	4	0	147	2.56	3
	%	22.45	25.17	35.37	10.88	3.40	2.72	-	100		
Price	N	39	53	37	16	0	0	2	147	2.27	2
	%	26.53	36.05	25.17	10.88	-	-	1.36	100		
Place	N	70	43	25	7	0	1	1	147	1.85	1
	%	47.62	29.25	17.01	4.76	-	0.68	0.68	100		
Promotion	N	0	2	4	14	23	34	70	147	5.99	7
	%	-	1.36	2.72	9.52	15.65	23.13	47.62	100		
Person	N	2	6	7	21	42	43	26	147	5.23	5
	%	1.36	4.08	4.76	14.29	28.57	29.25	17.69	100		
Physical	N	6	11	18	51	27	25	9	147	4.31	4
	%	4.08	7.48	12.24	34.69	18.37	17.01	6.12	100		
Process	N	1	4	5	20	47	35	35	147	5.40	6
	%	0.68	2.72	3.40	13.61	31.97	23.81	23.81	100		

Remark: 1. Likert scale of 1 to 7 was used to rank the level of importance
(1 = most important and 7 = least important)

Table 3.15 Important level of each marketing mix factors among expatriates respondents in choosing real estate in Phuket

Factors		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total	Mean	Ranking
Product	N	59	65	75	25	14	5	2	245	2.56	3
	%	24.08	26.53	30.61	10.20	5.71	2.04	0.82	100		
Price	N	66	89	59	25	3	2	1	245	2.27	2
	%	26.94	36.33	24.08	10.20	1.22	0.82	0.41	100		
Place	N	106	74	51	10	1	2	1	245	1.92	1
	%	43.27	30.20	20.82	4.08	0.41	0.82	0.41	100		
Promotion	N	2	1	1	22	36	51	132	245	6.14	7
	%	0.82	0.41	0.41	8.98	14.69	20.82	53.88	100		
Person	N	3	2	9	42	75	76	38	245	5.30	5
	%	1.22	0.82	3.67	17.14	30.61	31.02	15.51	100		
Physical	N	5	13	41	81	45	37	23	245	4.43	4
	%	2.04	5.31	16.73	33.06	18.37	15.10	9.39	100		
Process	N	4	1	10	40	71	71	48	245	5.36	6
	%	1.63	0.41	4.08	16.33	28.98	28.98	19.59	100		

Remark: 1. Likert scale of 1 to 7 was used to rank the level of importance

(1 = most important and 7 = least important)

3.2.2 Real Estate Developer

The sample group consists of 44 qualified real estate developments in Phuket which provide the accommodation per unit of more than 10 millions baht. The questionnaires were collected from each qualified real estate development during May 1 - May 14, 2007 belonged to these characteristics (Table 3.16).

1) Characteristic factors and motive factors

The result showed that the majority of the qualified real estate developments are located at Kamala, Surin and Chengtalay area at 22.73 percent, and Phuket town and Kathu at 20.45 percent, and Rawai, Niharn and Chalong area as well as Patong and Kalim at 13.64 percent. Panwa and Ao Makam area has least qualified real estate development which was accounted only 2 projects at 4.55 percent (Table 3.16).

Table 3.16 Data collection's areas of real estate development

Variable	Number	Percent
In which area of Phuket is your project located		
Kamala, Chengtalay and Surin	10	22.73
Phuket town and Kathu	9	20.45
Patong and Kalim	6	13.64
Rawai, Niharn and Chalong	6	13.64
Naiyang and Mai kao	5	11.36
Kata and Karon	4	9.09
Talang, Pakok and Ao-por	2	4.55
Panwa and Ao Makam	2	4.55
Total	44	100.00

Table 3.17 shows the result that the majority type of property was single house at 43.18 percent, followed by villa at 34.09 percent, and apartment or condominium at 22.73 percent, and twin house at 9.10 percent, and town house at 6.82 percent and time share at 2.27 percent. Whereas, the majority of property price was ranged between 10.1 - 15 millions baht, and 15.1 - 20 millions baht and 20.1 - 30 millions baht were 25.00 percent each, and 30.1 - 40 million baht at 11.36 percent and more than 40 million baht per unit at 6.82 percent.

Table 3.17 Characteristics of qualified real estate development in Phuket

Variable	Frequency	Percent
Type of Property		
Single house	19	43.18
Villa	15	34.09
Apartment or condominium	10	22.73
Twin house	4	9.10
Town house	3	6.82
Time share	1	2.27
Total	44	100.00
Variable		
Your property price per unit		
10.1 - 15 millions	14	31.82
15.1 - 20 millions	11	25.00
20.1 - 30 millions	11	25.00
30.1 - 40 millions	5	11.36
More than 40.1 millions	3	6.82
Total	44	100.00

Table 3.18 shows the result that the majority of architecture style of real estate project were modern style as well as contemporary style at 31.82 percent each. Second is Thai style at 15.91 percent, and Bali style at 18.18 percent, and European style at 2.27 percent.

Table 3.18 The architecture style of the qualified real estate development in Phuket

Variable	Frequency	Percent
Architecture style		
Modern	14	31.82
Contemporary	14	31.82
Bali	8	18.18
Thai style	7	15.91
European	1	2.27
Total	44	100.00

2) The advertisement methods employed by real estate companies

The main purposes of this set of questions are to examine how each real estate companies advertise their project. Table 3.19 shows the result that most of the real estate projects advertised their projects by Internet at 93.18 percent, and property show at 88.64 percent, and brochure at 70.45 percent, and magazine at 65.91 percent, and friends and family at 59.09 percent, and newspaper at 45.45 percent, and radio at 22.73 percent, and marketing staffs at 15.91 percent and television at 4.55 percent respectively.

Table 3.19 The advertisement method employed by real estate development

Variable	Frequency	Percent
Sources of Advertising		
Internet	41	93.18
Property Show	39	88.64
Poster and Brochure	31	70.45
Poster and Brochure	31	70.45
Magazine	29	65.91
Friends and family	26	59.09
Newspaper	20	45.45
Radio	10	22.73
Marketing staff or sale executive	7	15.91
Television	2	4.55

3) The importance of marketing mix's factors that influences the customer decision making when choosing the real estate project

Product

The result showed that the very high importance level of product factors that real estate developer thought influenced their customer decision making in choosing real estate in Phuket were **credibility of the developer** (Table 3.20). And high important level of product factors were **layout of the house, interior design, space in each room, enough parking, overall**

size of the house, own garden area, telephone line and house including swimming pool.

Moreover, the average important of product factors to customer decision making in choosing the real estate in Phuket was high important level

(Mean = 3.87).

Table 3.20 Important level of product factors to real estate developer

Variable	Real Estate Developer		
	Mean	Std.	Level of Importance
Product			
Credibility of the developer	4.59	0.62	Very High
Layout of the house	4.02	0.79	High
Interior design	3.98	1.00	High
Space in each room	3.89	0.75	High
Enough parking	3.86	0.90	High
Overall size of the house	3.80	0.76	High
Own garden area	3.64	1.06	High
Telephone line	3.59	0.79	High
House inc. swimming pool	3.48	1.30	High
Average	3.87		High

Price

The study showed that very high important level of price factors that influence real estate project's customer decision making in choosing real estate in Phuket were valuable for money. Whereas, high important levels was favorable payment term and availability of finance (Table 3.21).

In the consideration of importance levels of the real estate project's customer, price factors was high important level (Mean = 3.89) which influence their decision making in choosing real estate in Phuket.

Table 3.21 Important level of price factors to real estate developer

Variable	Real Estate Developer		
	Mean	Std.	Level of Importance
Price			
Value for money	4.68	0.56	Very High
Favorable payment term	3.80	0.82	High
Availability of finance	3.77	1.01	High
Electric and water rate	3.30	0.79	Intermediate
Average	3.89		High

Place

The study of the real estate developer respondents showed high important level of place factors that influences their customer decision making in choosing real estate in Phuket were the convenience of transportation, its location by sea and nearby community, shopping area and nearby working place (Table 3.22). Moreover, the average important of place factors to real estate's customer decision making in choosing the real estate in Phuket was high important level (Mean = 3.59).

Table 3.22 Important level of place factors to real estate developer

Variable	Real Estate Developer		
	Mean	Std.	Level of Importance
Place			
The convenience of transportation	4.02	0.93	High
Its location by the sea or nearby	3.93	0.95	High
Near by community and shopping mall	3.57	0.93	High

Near by working place	3.43	0.85	High
Its location in the golf course or nearby	2.98	1.05	Intermediate
Average	3.59		High

Promotion

From Table 3.23 the study showed that very high important level of promotion factors were **knowledge and presentation of sale representative**. Whereas, high important level were website promotion, advertising signs and sale promotion. Moreover, the importance of overall promotion factors to real estate's customer decision making in choosing the real estate in Phuket was high important level (Mean = 3.70).

Table 3.23 Important level of promotion factors to real estate developer

Variable	Real Estate Developer		
	Mean	Std.	Level of Importance
Promotion			
Knowledge and presentation from sale representative	4.23	0.74	Very High
Website promotion	3.89	1.02	High
Advertising sign	3.64	0.94	High
Sale promotion	3.50	1.05	High
Advertising on newspaper	3.23	1.05	Intermediate
Average	3.70		High

People

The study showed that people factors which are **efficient/courteous of service staffs, convenience in contacting staffs and easy communication with staffs** were very high important level for real estate's customer decision making in choosing real estate in Phuket (Table

3.24). Moreover, the important of overall people factors was also very high important level (Mean = 4.40).

Table 3.24 Important level of person factors to real estate developer

Variable	Real Estate Developer		
	Mean	Std.	Level of Importance
Person			
Efficient/courteous service staff	4.48	0.63	Very High
Convenience in contacting staff	4.39	0.72	Very High
Foreign language speaking staff	4.32	0.71	Very High
Average	4.40		Very High

Physical evidence

The study showed that physical evidence factors which are general appearance of the property and atmosphere around the property and surrounding were very high important level for real estate's customer decision making in choosing real estate in Phuket (Table 3.25). Moreover, the important of overall physical evidence was also very high important level (Mean = 4.50).

Table 3.25 Important level of physical evidence factors to real estate developer

Variable	Real Estate Developer		
	Mean	Std.	Level of Importance
Physical Evidence			
General appearance of the property	4.61	0.54	Very High
Atmosphere around the property	4.39	0.69	Very High
Average	4.50		Very High

Process

The study showed that very high important level of process factors were security service provided. Whereas, high important level were cleaning service provided, availability of service/maintenance, space common areas and additional service such as restaurants, spa, fitness. Moreover, the importance of overall process factors to real estate's customer decision making in choosing the real estate in Phuket was high important level (Mean = 4.11).

Table 3.26 Important level of process factors to real estate developer

Variable	Real Estate Developer		
	Mean	Std.	Level of Importance
Process			
Security service provided	4.45	0.66	Very High
Additional service	4.09	0.96	High
Spaces common area	4.09	0.77	High
Availability of service/maintenance	4.05	0.83	High
Cleaning service provided	3.89	1.02	High
Average	4.11		High

The real estate developers were asked to range the marketing mix factors in order of what they considered the most important criteria effecting their customer decision in buying or renting the property in Phuket from 1 = most important to 7 = least important. The result showed that the first important marketing mix factor is place factor. Second is product factor. Third is price factor. Fourth is physical evidence factor. Fifth is process factor. Sixth is promotion factor and seventh is person factor (Table 3.27).

Table 3.27 Important level of each marketing mix factors among real estate developer respondents toward long stay tourists and expatriates regarding choosing the real estate in Phuket

Factors		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total	Mean	Ranking
Product	N	18	6	8	4	4	1	3	44	2.66	2
	%	40.91	13.64	18.18	9.09	9.09	2.27	6.82	100		
Price	N	7	14	7	11	2	1	2	44	2.95	3
	%	15.91	31.82	15.91	25.00	4.55	2.27	4.55	100		
Place	N	14	15	9	3	1	1	1	44	2.30	1
	%	31.82	34.09	20.45	6.82	2.27	2.27	2.27	100		
Promotion	N	-	2	6	6	8	10	12	44	5.23	6
	%	0.00	4.55	13.64	13.64	18.18	22.73	27.27	100		
Person	N	-	-	3	9	13	12	7	44	5.25	7
	%	0.00	0.00	6.82	20.45	29.55	27.27	15.91	100		
Physical	N	1	5	10	3	9	10	6	44	4.55	4
	%	2.27	11.36	22.73	6.82	20.45	22.73	13.64	100		
Process	N	4	2	2	8	8	7	13	44	4.98	5
	%	9.09	4.55	4.55	18.18	18.18	15.91	29.55	100		

Remark: 1. Likert scale of 1 to 7 was used to rank the level of importance

(1 = most important and 7 = least important)

5. The relation of marketing mix factors and personal factors

To find the relationship of demographic variables (personal factors) with marketing mix, T-test and One-Way Anova were applied at 0.05 significance level.

The result from T-test showed that female long stay tourists gave high important level to place more than male long stay tourists, significantly difference at 0.00. At the same time, expatriates female gave high important level more than male to price, place, person and physical evidence factors. Moreover, both groups are most interested in physical evidence factors and promotion was least interesting marketing mix factor (Table 3.28).

For age (Table 3.29), from one way Anova testing, it found that the result of relationship between importance level of marketing mix factors and age both long stay tourists and expatriates indicated that age of long stay tourists has relationship with place factor. Long stay tourists age 31-41 years old gave high important level to place more than other age groups. Age of expatriates has relationship with product and price factor. Expatriate age 51-60 years old gave high important level to product more than other age groups and 41-50 years old age group gave high important level to price (mean = 4.19) than other age groups.

For marital status (Table 3.30), there was only significantly difference with marketing mix, that is married long stay tourists were gave high important level to price (mean=4.06) more than other marital status groups.

For education level (Table 3.31), from one way Anova testing, there was no relationship between education level with marketing mix at 0.05 significant level.

For occupation (Table 3.32), from one way Anova testing, there was no relationship between occupation level with marketing mix at 0.05 significant level.

For income per year (Table 3.33), from one way Anova testing, it found that there was one significantly difference with marketing mix, that is long stay tourists who earn more than 70,001 US\$ per year gave high important level to product factor (mean = 4.43) more than other income groups. While income per year of expatriates has relationship with product, physical evidence and process factors. Expatriates who earn more than 70,001 US\$ per year gave

high important level to product, physical evidence and process factors more than other income groups.

For country group (Table 3.34), the result of relationship between importance level of marketing mix factors and nationality/hometown both long stay tourists and expatriates indicated that nationality/hometown of expatriates has relationship with product and physical evidence factor. Expatriates who come from Oceania gave high important level to product factor (mean=4.48) and physical evidence factors (mean=4.54) more than other countries groups.

Table 3.28 The relation of important level of marketing mix factors and gender

	Gender				Total		
	Male		Female		Mean	Std.	Sig.
	Mean	Std.	Mean	Std.			
Long Stay							
Product	3.92	0.81	3.84	0.71	3.90	0.79	0.64
Price	3.84	0.76	3.91	0.76	3.86	0.76	0.68
Place	3.42	0.75	3.89	0.81	3.52	0.78	0.00
Promotion	2.78	0.96	2.80	0.79	2.78	0.93	0.92
Person	3.78	0.86	3.83	0.84	3.79	0.86	0.77
Physical	4.06	0.72	3.97	0.76	4.04	0.73	0.53
Process	3.03	0.93	3.17	0.93	3.06	0.93	0.46
Total	3.55	0.83	3.63	0.80	3.57	0.82	
Expatriate							
Product	4.08	0.70	4.11	0.70	4.0918	0.70	0.78
Price	3.83	0.67	4.23	0.76	3.9408	0.72	0.00
Place	3.33	0.76	3.58	0.81	3.398	0.78	0.02
Promotion	2.78	0.84	2.71	0.89	2.7571	0.85	0.59
Person	4.01	0.79	4.31	0.82	4.0918	0.81	0.01
Physical	4.24	0.70	4.47	0.67	4.3041	0.70	0.02
Process	3.09	0.94	3.17	0.97	3.1143	0.94	0.56
Total	3.62	0.77	3.80	0.80	3.67	0.78	

Remark: 1. T-test were performed to identify statistically significant differences between group.

2. * indicates statistically significant differences between groups ($p \leq 0.05$).

Table 3.29 The relation of important level of marketing mix factors and age of sample respondents

Marketing Mix	Age										Total		
	20 - 30 years old		31 - 41 years old		41 - 50 years old		51 - 60 years old		over 61 years old		Mean	Std.	Sig.
	Mean	Std.	Mean	Std.	Mean	Std.	Mean	Std.	Mean	Std.			
Long Stay													
Product	3.74	0.86	4.26	0.60	3.90	0.87	3.89	0.74	3.82	0.78	3.90	0.79	0.21
Price	3.91	0.70	4.19	0.77	3.92	0.70	3.70	0.78	3.71	0.80	3.86	0.76	0.12
Place	3.60	0.69	3.83	0.66	3.53	0.78	3.61	0.92	3.16	0.71	3.52	0.78	0.02*
Promotion	2.97	0.82	2.95	0.95	2.82	0.96	2.73	0.99	2.54	0.89	2.78	0.93	0.38
Person	3.93	0.85	4.05	0.80	3.70	0.82	3.88	0.86	3.50	0.88	3.79	0.86	0.12
Physical	3.98	0.74	4.21	0.56	4.03	0.66	4.12	0.82	3.91	0.77	4.04	0.73	0.58
Process	3.12	0.99	3.48	0.98	2.83	1.02	3.12	0.68	2.91	0.91	3.06	0.93	0.13
Total	3.61	0.81	3.85	0.76	3.53	0.83	3.58	0.83	3.37	0.82	3.57	0.82	
Expatriate													
Product	3.83	0.65	4.02	0.67	4.16	0.73	4.31	0.69	4.19	0.69	4.09	0.70	0.01*
Price	3.99	0.81	3.80	0.65	4.19	0.66	3.88	0.73	3.88	0.79	3.94	0.72	0.03*
Place	3.44	0.76	3.39	0.77	3.53	0.79	3.31	0.74	3.15	0.99	3.40	0.78	0.46
Promotion	2.88	0.83	2.80	0.87	2.85	0.76	2.56	0.88	2.50	0.94	2.76	0.85	0.22
Person	4.15	0.73	4.15	0.79	4.17	0.79	3.88	0.91	4.04	0.72	4.09	0.81	0.28

Physical	4.29	0.65	4.28	0.72	4.36	0.74	4.28	0.68	4.35	0.72	4.30	0.70	0.95
Process	3.24	0.76	3.07	0.96	3.21	0.98	3.02	0.99	3.00	1.15	3.11	0.94	0.07
Total	3.69	0.74	3.64	0.78	3.78	0.78	3.60	0.80	3.59	0.86	3.67	0.78	

Remark: 1. Anova test were performed to identify statistically significant differences between group

2. * indicates statistically significant differences between groups ($p \leq 0.05$).

Table 3.30 The relation of important level of marketing mix factors and marital status of sample respondents

Marketing Mix	Marital status								Total			
	Single		Married		Married with children		Divorced/widowed/separated		Mean	Std.	Sig.	
	Mean	Std.	Mean	Std.	Mean	Std.	Mean	Std.				
Long Stay												
Product	3.86	0.86	4.00	0.75	3.72	0.74	4.14	0.64	3.90	0.79	0.29	
Price	3.89	0.77	4.06	0.76	3.46	0.57	3.94	0.80	3.86	0.76	0.02*	
Place	3.60	0.77	3.46	0.86	3.37	0.56	3.56	0.98	3.52	0.78	0.57	
Promotion	2.84	1.01	2.86	0.79	2.59	0.87	2.72	0.97	2.78	0.93	0.65	
Person	3.78	0.94	3.96	0.75	3.54	0.65	3.86	0.95	3.79	0.86	0.28	
Physical	4.08	0.70	4.16	0.68	3.72	0.79	4.14	0.70	4.04	0.73	0.08	
Process	3.13	1.01	3.13	0.85	2.98	0.71	2.83	1.04	3.06	0.93	0.62	
Total	3.60	0.86	3.66	0.78	3.34	0.70	3.60	0.87	3.57	0.82		
Expatriate												

Product	4.06	0.72	4.11	0.69	4.00	0.70	4.24	0.65	4.09	0.70	0.54
Price	3.95	0.76	3.89	0.73	3.99	0.62	4.00	0.65	3.94	0.72	0.37
Place	3.42	0.79	3.36	0.83	3.44	0.64	3.40	0.76	3.40	0.78	0.94
Promotion	2.73	0.86	2.79	0.81	2.62	0.95	2.90	0.81	2.76	0.85	0.59
Person	4.21	0.77	4.00	0.84	3.93	0.93	4.16	0.64	4.09	0.81	0.19
Physical	4.35	0.64	4.27	0.75	4.22	0.75	4.33	0.70	4.30	0.70	0.77
Process	3.10	0.97	3.07	1.00	3.19	0.84	3.21	0.83	3.11	0.94	
Total	3.69	0.79	3.64	0.81	3.63	0.78	3.75	0.72	3.67	0.78	

Remark: 1. Anova test were performed to identify statistically significant differences between group

2. * indicates statistically significant differences between groups ($p \leq 0.05$).

Table 3.31 The relation of important level of marketing mix factors and education level of sample respondents

Marketing Mix	Education level						Total		
	Lower than Bachelor degree		Bachelor degree		Higher than bachelor degree		Mean	Std.	Sig.
	Mean	Std.	Mean	Std.	Mean	Std.			
Long Stay									
Product	3.78	0.81	3.89	0.81	4.06	0.74	3.90	0.79	0.23
Price	3.77	0.87	3.93	0.64	3.88	0.74	3.86	0.76	0.58
Place	3.46	0.78	3.64	0.79	3.46	0.79	3.52	0.78	0.41
Promotion	2.95	0.94	2.61	0.91	2.77	0.90	2.78	0.93	0.18

Person	3.66	0.97	3.94	0.82	3.78	0.73	3.79	0.86	0.26
Physical	3.91	0.82	4.13	0.68	4.10	0.64	4.04	0.73	0.23
Process	3.10	0.94	2.99	0.99	3.10	0.85	3.06	0.93	0.79
Total	3.52	0.88	3.59	0.81	3.59	0.77	3.57	0.82	
Expatriate									
Product	4.01	0.74	4.07	0.68	4.22	0.67	4.09	0.70	0.21
Price	3.98	0.73	3.94	0.75	3.89	0.64	3.94	0.72	0.78
Place	3.43	0.75	3.44	0.74	3.28	0.88	3.40	0.78	0.39
Promotion	2.83	0.84	2.79	0.84	2.61	0.86	2.76	0.85	0.27
Person	4.04	0.87	4.10	0.79	4.13	0.78	4.09	0.81	0.30
Physical	4.20	0.73	4.28	0.74	4.46	0.56	4.30	0.70	0.10
Process	3.15	0.92	3.12	0.92	3.07	1.03	3.11	0.94	0.37
Total	3.66	0.80	3.68	0.78	3.67	0.78	3.67	0.78	

Remark: 1. Anova test were performed to identify statistically significant differences between group

2. * indicates statistically significant differences between groups ($p \leq 0.05$).

Table 3.32 The relation of important level of marketing mix factors and occupation of sample respondents

Marketing Mix	Occupation														Total			
	Self Employed		Retired		Employee		Owner		Professional		Others,		Volunteer		Total			
	Mean	Std.	Mean	Std.	Mean	Std.	Mean	Std.	Mean	Std.	Mean	Std.	Mean	Std.	Mean	Std.	Sig.	

Long Stay																	
Product	4.05	0.86	3.85	0.73	3.88	0.76	3.54	0.89	3.94	0.77	4.25	0.87			3.90	0.79	0.43
Price	3.89	0.85	3.72	0.71	4.09	0.67	3.71	0.58	4.00	0.80	4.50	1.00			3.86	0.76	0.18
Place	3.59	0.85	3.36	0.76	3.85	0.58	3.50	0.64	3.47	0.90	4.13	0.85			3.52	0.78	0.14
Promotion	2.85	0.96	2.61	0.98	3.06	0.85	2.88	0.64	2.75	0.73	3.50	1.22			2.78	0.93	0.26
Person	3.80	1.04	3.67	0.80	3.76	0.79	3.96	0.69	4.03	0.76	4.13	1.03			3.79	0.86	0.63
Physical	4.24	0.69	3.96	0.79	4.00	0.68	3.88	0.53	4.00	0.66	4.25	0.96			4.04	0.73	0.46
Process	3.12	1.16	2.99	0.79	3.18	0.75	3.04	0.92	3.00	1.06	3.50	1.00			3.06	0.93	0.89
Total	3.65	0.92	3.45	0.79	3.69	0.73	3.50	0.70	3.60	0.81	4.04	0.99			3.57	0.82	
Expatriate																	
Product	4.05	0.69	4.15	0.78	4.09	0.67	4.15	0.72	4.10	0.71	3.50	0.50	4.50	.	4.09	0.70	0.79
Price	3.88	0.73	4.03	0.81	3.97	0.68	3.83	0.73	4.01	0.69	3.67	1.04	4.00	.	3.94	0.72	0.84
Place	3.41	0.79	3.47	0.81	3.35	0.81	3.39	0.74	3.43	0.69	3.00	1.50	4.50	.	3.40	0.78	0.75
Promotion	2.70	0.86	2.92	0.78	2.86	0.82	2.82	0.90	2.49	0.84	2.33	1.15	3.50	.	2.76	0.85	0.21
Person	3.96	0.84	3.97	0.80	4.19	0.72	4.03	0.88	4.25	0.81	3.50	1.32	5.00	.	4.09	0.81	0.24
Physical	4.36	0.72	4.23	0.75	4.32	0.68	4.26	0.68	4.32	0.67	3.67	1.26	5.00	.	4.30	0.70	0.63
Process	3.13	1.01	3.08	1.12	3.11	0.93	3.19	0.87	3.05	0.88	3.17	0.29	3.00	.	3.11	0.94	1.00
Total	3.64	0.81	3.69	0.83	3.70	0.76	3.67	0.79	3.66	0.76	3.26	1.01	4.21		3.67	0.78	

Remark: 1. Anova test were performed to identify statistically significant differences between group

2. * indicates statistically significant differences between groups ($p \leq 0.05$).

Table 3.33 The relation of important level of marketing mix factors and income per year of sample respondents

Marketing Mix	Income per year (US\$)												Total		
	Less than 30,000		30,001 - 40,000		40,001 - 50,000		50,001 - 60,000		60,001 - 70,000		More than 70,001				
	Mean	Std.	Mean	Std.	Mean	Std.	Mean	Std.	Mean	Std.	Mean	Std.	Mean	Std.	Sig.
Long Stay															
Product	3.77	0.73	3.69	0.78	3.97	0.73	3.71	0.84	4.00	1.02	4.43	0.58	3.90	0.79	0.01*
Price	3.90	0.81	3.90	0.81	3.77	0.67	3.63	0.88	3.79	0.84	4.00	0.62	3.86	0.76	0.76
Place	3.48	0.80	3.53	0.71	3.37	0.83	3.71	0.69	3.42	0.95	3.73	0.81	3.52	0.78	0.61
Promotion	2.90	0.81	2.83	0.81	2.72	1.00	2.50	1.15	3.04	0.94	2.64	1.06	2.78	0.93	0.65
Person	3.68	0.81	3.70	0.83	3.85	0.87	3.71	1.21	4.08	0.79	3.91	0.78	3.79	0.86	0.70
Physical	3.82	0.71	3.99	0.74	4.10	0.72	4.08	0.87	4.25	0.72	4.23	0.61	4.04	0.73	0.34
Process	3.03	1.01	3.10	0.83	2.97	0.79	2.96	0.94	3.50	1.02	3.00	1.11	3.06	0.93	0.65
Total	3.51	0.81	3.53	0.79	3.53	0.80	3.47	0.94	3.73	0.90	3.70	0.80	3.57	0.82	
Expatriate															
Product	3.96	0.75	3.96	0.70	4.17	0.69	4.07	0.66	4.13	0.72	4.39	0.52	4.09	0.70	0.05*
Price	4.04	0.77	4.01	0.70	3.90	0.67	3.76	0.78	3.78	0.77	3.95	0.66	3.94	0.72	0.54
Place	3.26	0.84	3.52	0.65	3.52	0.71	3.17	0.90	3.43	0.59	3.30	0.99	3.40	0.78	0.22
Promotion	2.64	0.96	2.74	0.89	2.85	0.69	2.69	0.81	2.70	0.70	2.88	0.98	2.76	0.85	0.77

Person	4.02	0.86	4.02	0.89	4.20	0.70	4.05	0.76	4.13	0.63	4.16	0.91	4.09	0.81	0.32
Physical	4.20	0.74	4.13	0.71	4.48	0.64	4.26	0.78	4.20	0.86	4.55	0.43	4.30	0.70	0.02*
Process	2.74	1.00	3.21	0.97	3.04	0.87	3.17	0.87	3.38	0.79	3.48	0.91	3.11	0.94	0.
Total	3.55	0.84	3.64	0.79	3.71	0.72	3.58	0.81	3.68	0.75	3.80	0.78	3.66	0.79	

Remark: 1. Anova test were performed to identify statistically significant differences between group

2. * indicates statistically significant differences between groups ($p \leq 0.05$).

Table 3.34 The relation of important level of marketing mix factors and nationality/hometown of sample respondents

Marketi ng Mix	Country Group																Total			
	Asia		USA Canada		UK		Switzerlan d		Germany		Scan		Others Europe		Ocenia					
	Mea n	Std. .	Mea n	Std. .	Mea n	Std. .	Mea n	Std. .	Mea n	Std. .	Mea n	Std. .	Mea n	Std. .	Mea n	Std. .	Mea n	Std. .	Sig.	
Long Stay																				
Product	3.83	0.76	3.91	0.64	4.38	0.62	4.29	0.58	4.00	0.71	3.75	0.80	3.56	0.73	4.48	0.63	3.90	0.79	0.48	
Price	4.06	0.71	3.87	0.69	3.88	0.70	3.99	0.74	4.20	0.76	3.72	0.71	3.69	0.84	4.04	0.72	3.86	0.76	0.25	
Place	3.32	0.77	3.43	0.76	3.44	0.76	3.42	0.83	2.80	0.76	3.34	0.79	3.56	0.56	3.43	0.84	3.52	0.78	0.29	
Promotio n	3.00	0.70	2.91	0.75	2.41	0.85	2.76	0.93	2.70	1.30	2.50	0.89	2.94	0.62	2.59	0.87	2.78	0.93	0.89	

Person	4.03	0.83	4.07	0.81	4.09	0.77	4.16	0.83	3.80	1.30	3.81	0.79	3.75	0.76	4.46	0.60	3.79	0.86	0.97
Physical	4.19	0.83	4.18	0.72	4.45	0.59	4.44	0.62	4.30	0.84	4.13	0.74	3.75	0.93	4.54	0.47	4.04	0.73	0.31
Process	3.45	0.75	2.97	0.88	2.98	1.07	3.14	0.99	2.60	0.96	2.78	0.84	3.69	0.88	3.17	1.03	3.06	0.93	0.31
Total	3.70	0.76	3.62	0.75	3.66	0.76	3.74	0.79	3.49	0.95	3.43	0.79	3.56	0.76	3.82	0.74	3.57	0.82	
Expatriate																			
Product	3.83	0.76	4.38	0.62	4.29	0.58	4.00	0.71	3.75	0.80	3.56	0.73	3.91	0.64	4.48	0.63	4.09	0.70	0.00*
Price	4.06	0.71	3.88	0.70	3.99	0.74	4.20	0.76	3.72	0.71	3.69	0.84	3.87	0.69	4.04	0.72	3.94	0.72	0.55
Place	3.32	0.77	3.44	0.76	3.42	0.83	2.80	0.76	3.34	0.79	3.56	0.56	3.43	0.76	3.43	0.84	3.40	0.78	0.78
Promotion	3.00	0.70	2.41	0.85	2.76	0.93	2.70	1.30	2.50	0.89	2.94	0.62	2.91	0.75	2.59	0.87	2.76	0.85	0.06
Person	4.03	0.83	4.09	0.77	4.16	0.83	3.80	1.30	3.81	0.79	3.75	0.76	4.07	0.81	4.46	0.60	4.09	0.81	0.22
Physical	4.19	0.83	4.45	0.59	4.44	0.62	4.30	0.84	4.13	0.74	3.75	0.93	4.18	0.72	4.54	0.47	4.30	0.70	0.03*
Process	3.45	0.75	2.98	1.07	3.14	0.99	2.60	0.96	2.78	0.84	3.69	0.88	2.97	0.88	3.17	1.03	3.11	0.94	0.06
Total	3.70	0.76	3.66	0.76	3.74	0.79	3.49	0.95	3.43	0.79	3.56	0.76	3.62	0.75	3.82	0.74	3.67	0.78	

Remark: 1. Anova test were performed to identify statistically significant differences between group

2. * indicates statistically significant differences between groups ($p \leq 0.05$).

6. Respondents' comments from long stay tourists and expatriates

The respondents were also asked in two open-ended questions regarding to their recommendation to real estate developer and the Thai government. The high levels of recommendation are home and garden should be spacious at 10.74 percent, followed by quality of construction at 9.73 percent, accurate detailed knowledge of sale representative at 9.06 percent and sustainable development at 8.72 percent (Table 3.35).

Table 3.35 Recommendation to real estate developer

Factor	Frequency	Percentage
Home and garden should be spacious	32	10.74
Quality of construction	29	9.73
Accurate detailed knowledge of sale representative	27	9.06
Sustainable development and Eco friendly housing	26	8.72
Be honest and straight forward	25	8.39
Sales representative should speak fluency English	24	8.05
Designed should be modern and various designs	18	6.04
Efficient service and available for contact	17	5.70
Installed electrical to international standard	17	5.70
Maintained price and one price for foreigners and Thais	13	4.36
Have a clear rented agreements	12	4.03
Not over build space between house area and green area	12	4.03
Lower running costs	8	2.68
Should not develop areas along the coastline	8	2.68
Less billboard advertising	6	2.01
More magazines advertising	6	2.01
Needed professional agents	5	1.68
Response time to customer	5	1.68
Do not clear property plots of all foliage	4	1.34
Streamline communication process	4	1.34
Total	298	

Other comments included:

“Minimize noise and dirt from nearby construction site.”

“Longer warranty on construction”

“Quite different which culture or nations to whom you are targeting. For example, Koreans are accustomed to live in modernized house so they need a minimum facilities such as Internet, car parking and interiors.”

“More objects in the north side of Phuket. More Thai/Bali style objects.”

“Silent air conditioning.”

“Think about upper and middle class instead of targeting only upper class of people.”

“They should try to make more inspections and maintain good relation between the customers and other real estates companies.”

“Some agents should work harder to meet clients wish.”

“More single floor house with larger rooms, area of greenery around house.”

“Stop producing glossy brochures with pretty pictures and little information and always no location map.”

“Phuket needs housing that is affordable to Thais as well as farang”

Some comments from long stay tourists and expatriates in Phuket to real estate developer showed the environmental awareness of the respondents toward real estate development.

“If developers does his research and know his market, all the needs to do is to act responsibly with regard to the environment and water supply.”

“Take care of the natural environment, reduce use of cemented areas. Do not cut down local trees.

“Think about the future of Phuket (many projects do not take a good care of environmental and people around the area), respect tradition (Phuket is not Bali).”

Some of the comments also showed the important of efficiency staffs in real estate business.

“Accept that when a customer gives a maximum price, this is their maximum price and not try to show/sell houses at a higher price.”

“Make sure the staff understand all aspects of the property and the law so they can explain to the customer. This also needs a high level of English language skills.”

“I think there are already a lot of advertisings. Having a good staffs who explains everything is also very important.”

The result of the recommendation from long stay tourists and expatriates in Phuket to Thai government shows that the recommendation was high on developing clarity regarding legal ownerships rules for property at 21.72 percent, followed by providing every related document to English version at 17.60 percent, maintained a consistent policy at 14.60 and offering loans to foreigner at 12.73 percent (Table 3.36).

Table 3.36 Recommendation to the Thai government

Factor	Frequency	Percentage
Developed clarity regarding legal ownerships rules	58	21.72
Provided government document in English	47	17.60
Maintained a consistent policy	39	14.60
Offered house loan to foreigners	34	12.73
Allowed foreigners to own land for residential purpose	27	10.11
Allowed foreigners to own property without Thais	18	6.74
Increased land lease agreement to 90 years	17	6.37
Law enforcement regarding to development in protected areas	15	5.62
Extended visa for long stay tourists	12	4.49
Total	267	

Moreover, many of the comments showed dissatisfaction with the present laws in Thailand regarding the real estate in Phuket.

“With the current Foreign Business Act, it is very difficult for foreigners to feel secure making a large investment in property. If foreigners have lived in Thailand for long time, they should be allowed to own their properties/land.”

“Guarantee of protection from bad/corrupt business practices.”

“Make the situation clear. Better still allow foreign ownership rather than create a confusing situation where the foreigner has to lie to own.”

“Need for proper planning, avoid incompatible developments or uncontrolled development, infrastructure needs to keep pace with development ie. Roads, electricity, telecommunications.”

Respondents' comments from real estate developer

The respondent was asked three open-end questions regarding to areas that require improvement, the recommendation to the Thai government regarding real estate issues and the respondents' opinion toward long stay tourists and expatriates market in Phuket. Table 3.37 shows the recommendation from real estate developer regarding to the real estates' issue that require improvement.

The recommendations' result was high on land ownership and illegal proprietary at 30.14 percent, set a clear policy in real estate business at 16.44 percent, following by housing loans available for foreigner at 10.96 percent, and allow long lease hold and lack of enforcement of building regulation at 9.59 percent.

Table 3.37 The recommendation from real estate developer of real estate's problem

Factor	Frequency	Percentage
Land ownership and illegal proprietary right	22	30.14
Set a clear policy in real estate business	12	16.44
Housing loans available for foreigners	8	10.96
Allows long lease hold	7	9.59
Lack of enforcement of building regulations	7	9.59
Helped in maintaining the land price	6	8.22
The difficulty in ownership transferring	5	6.85
The cost of housing materials in Phuket	3	4.11
High competition for real estate markets	3	4.11
Total	73	

Some of other comments that are concerned with the real estate issues in Phuket are as below.

“The foreigner feels insecure owning the property in Thailand.”

“The government policies and laws are unstable. Moreover, the exchange rate is unpredictably.”

“The policy of 30% money assure for the foreigner is delayed their decision in buying the real estate in Thailand.”

“The bank checks the source of income too much.”

“The government should promote more oversea marketing.”

“The government should promote Thailand as the center of real estate development in Asia and promote on advertising.”

“The government should make a clear understand of the situation in Thailand to other countries and build a positive image.”

“The government should give more confidence to the investor in purchasing and investing in Thailand.”

“TAT should actively promote Thailand as an ex-pat friendly place.”

The result of table 3.38 showed the developer opinion toward how important of long stay tourists and expatriates supported the real estate market in Phuket. The result showed both positive and negative sides. The highest result was on the positive side as long stay tourists market and expatriates helps booth up the economic at 30.67 percent, followed by the negative side of this market as it increased the real estate price at 22.67 percent, next positive side was to create more career to local at 18.67 percent, and customers have more choices at 17.33 percents, and Thais cannot effort to purchase the land at 10.67 percent was the other negative sides.

Table 3.38 The opinion of real estate developer toward long stay tourists and expatriates to real estate market in Phuket

Factor	Frequency	Percentage
Boost up the economic	23	30.67
Increased in real estate price	17	22.67
Created more career to local	14	18.67
Customers have more choices	13	17.33
Thais cannot effort to purchase the land	8	10.67
Total	75	

Moreover, many developers revealed that long stay tourists and expatriates are their potential market as below.

“The long stay markets and expatriates is a good market in Phuket as they are also our main target market too.”

“This market is good for real estate development as the market has a chance to expand more.”

“More than 80% of our customer is foreigners. Therefore, the long stay market and expatriates is our important target market. We can see that this market give many benefits to the real estate market in Phuket.”

“Real estate market in Phuket is opened for the foreigner as Phuket has a good location which attracts many investors.”

Furthermore, some of the comments showed the negative outcome of long stay tourists market and expatriates market toward the real estate in Phuket as below.

“The price of real estate has incredibly increasing which effects to Thais as

they could not afford to purchase the land.”

“We do not want the foreigner to hold the land right as it will effect to Thais in the future .”

“We should sell land to the foreigner in a good proportion as if all belong to the foreigner then Thais cannot afford the land later on. The government should set a clear policy. Although, freehold policy is good for the real estate developer but there are both good and bad foreigner. Some of them might just want to come to Thailand for illegal business.”

“Thai government needs to think much of what is the most important products of Thailand itself, why Thailand is attractive for the foreigners from developed country, and better to keep them all unspoiled so they can keep Thailand as one of the most attractive destination in the world as well.”