

CHAPTER 4

RESULT

The results from the research of “Community participation model for sustainable tourism development at Koh Yao Noi, Changwat Phang-Nga would be presented by the descriptions and tables. Data analysis and presentation was facilitated by using SPSS 11.0 for windows. The results from this research were as follows:

- 1) Demographic characteristics of respondents
- 2) Classified groups of respondent
- 3) Ecotourism and sustainable tourism knowledge among classified groups of respondents
- 4) Interest levels of community participation
- 5) Important levels of community motivation
- 6) Recommendations from respondents

The 310 questionnaires were distributed, 300 sets were obtained and useable. Therefore, the analyzing based on the 300 questionnaires.

4.1 Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

The demographic characteristics of respondent were analyzed individually into frequency and percentage. There was gender, age, education level, occupation, monthly income, their hometown, and social role. From the study, the demographic characteristics of respondent could be described as follows:

1) **Gender.** The majority of the respondents were male that contributed 57.3% or 172 persons and the rest of 42.7% or 128 persons were female. This result was compatible with the general information of Yao Noi Island, that the majority of the local residents were male.

2) **Age Group.** The majority of the respondents were in the range of 26-40 years old, 128 persons or 42.7%, and 41-55 years old, 112 persons or 37.3% of total respondents. The reason was that when the researcher survey and distribute questionnaires to the sampled households, the questionnaires were carried out with adult family members who were community residents, at least 18 years old and not too old, and were able to respond to the questionnaires effectively. When there were more than one adult

in the family presented at the time of the survey, the family was free to choose the representative to answer the questionnaire. Therefore, the majority of respondents were in the 26-40 years old and 41-50 years old age group. The rest of age between 18 - 25 years old, 39 persons or 13%, and more than 55 years old, 21 persons or 7%.

3) Education Level. The majority of the respondents had education in primary school, 121 persons or 40.3%, and secondary school, 118 persons or 39.3%. The other levels were bachelor's degree or over, 29 persons or 9.7%, and diploma or vocational education, 25 persons or 8.3%. The smallest group of education level was no education, 7 persons, or 2.3% of total respondents. The majority of respondents had basic education in primary and secondary school, reading and writing, that they thought it was sufficient for their occupation in agriculture.

4) Occupation. The majority of respondent was in fishery agriculture. There were 113 persons or 37.7% of total respondent. The reason was that their early occupation, before the tourism was developed. It also represents the unique occupation of people who live near by the sea in southern part of Thailand. The workers or labors were 75 persons or 25%. The later range was commercial personnel, 67 persons or 22.3%. The number of students was a little more than the government officers or state enterprise. The unemployed or retired and other occupations were the minority groups, 5 persons or 1.7% in each occupation. The company officer or employee was in the smallest number. There were only 4 persons or 1.3% of total respondents.

5) Monthly Income. The majority of respondents earned 5,000 Baht or lower per month, 176 persons or 59.7%. This was compatible with the majority of occupations that were fishery, agriculture, worker, and labor. The later range of salary was 5,001 - 15,000 Baht and 15,001 - 25,000 Baht respectively. The smallest group of respondent, 10 persons or 3.3%, earned over 25,000 Baht and most of them were the commercial personnel.

6) Hometown. The majority of the respondents lived in Yao Noi Island, 253 persons, or 84.3%. The others were 19 people or 6.3% whose hometown was not Yao Noi Island but in the same province, Phang Nga. The rest was people who were not in Phang Nga province, 28 persons, or 9.4% of total respondent. Most of them, 12 people came from Krabi Province. The rest came from Phuket, Nakorn Sri Thammarat, Trang, Srisaket, Nakornrachasima, Chumporn and Bangkok respectively.

7) **Social Role (within community)**. The majority of the respondents were the local residents who were without social role or did not join any group within the community. Those respondents were 213 people or 71%. 50 persons or 16.7% joined occupation group, such as rubber and fishery group. Tourism related group consisted of 20 people or 6.7%. The last group were respondents who undertook local authority role, there were 14 persons or 4.7% (Table 4.1).

Table 4.1: Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Demographic Characteristics	Frequency	Percentage
1. Gender		
Male	172	57.3
Female	128	42.7
Total	300	100.0
2. Age Group		
18 - 25 years old	39	13.0
26 - 40 years old	128	42.7
41 - 55 years old	112	37.3
Over 55 years old	21	7.0
Total	300	100.0
3. Education Level		
None education	7	2.3
Primary school	121	40.3
Secondary school	118	39.3
Diploma/ Vocational	25	8.3
Bachelor's degree or over	29	9.7
Total	300	100.0

Table 4.1 (continued)

Demographic Characteristics	Frequency	Percentage
4. Occupation		
Government officer/ State enterprise	13	4.3
Commercial personnel	67	22.3
Company officer/ Employee	4	1.3
Worker/ Labor	75	25.0
Student	18	6.0
Unemployed/ Retired	5	1.7
Fishery/ Agriculture	113	37.7
Others	5	1.7
Total	300	100.0
5. Monthly Income		
5,000 Baht or lower	176	59.7
5,001 - 15,000 Baht	87	29.0
15,001 - 25,000 Baht	27	9.0
Over 25,000 Baht	10	3.3
Total	300	100.0
6. Hometown		
Yao Noi Island	253	84.3
From the other districts in Phang-Nga	19	6.3
From the other provinces	28	9.4
Total	300	100.0
7. Social Role (within community)		
Without any social role	213	71.0
Tourism groups	20	6.7
Occupation groups	50	16.7
Local authorities	14	4.7
Other social role	3	1.0
Total	300	100.0

4.2 Classified Groups of Respondent

The 300 obtained questionnaires were from 300 different households, the respondents were classified into 4 main groups for the expedient analysis and comparison. They were homestay owners, local authorities, Tourism service provider, and Local residents. Their different degree of involving in tourism may depend on their occupation and their social role.

Homestay owner group was defined as the respondents themselves who worked for homestay and the respondents whose family members worked in homestay. They were classified into homestay owner group. Question number 9 and 10 in Part 1 of Questionnaire (Appendix C) identified them.

Local authority group was defined as the respondents who undertook the social role related to local authorities. Question number 6 in Part 1 of Questionnaire (Appendix C) identified them. Local authorities who also in homestay group or others, they were classified into Local authority group.

Tourism service provider group was defined as the respondents themselves who work in the hospitality or tourism industry, but excluded homestay owner group. Question number 9 in Part 1 of Questionnaire (Appendix C) identified them.

Local resident group was defined as the respondents who did not work in the hospitality or tourism industry. Moreover, their family members did not work in hospitality or tourism industry as well. Question number 9 and 10 in Part 1 of Questionnaire (Appendix C) identified them.

The result showed that the majority of the respondents were local residents, 128 persons, or 42.7% of all respondent. They were the group that their occupations did not relate to the tourism sectors. The tourism service providers were 95 persons or up to 31.7% of all respondent. They were the people who work in hotels, restaurants, small tour operators, transportation, and related services. The homestay owners were 63 persons or 21%. They were familiar with the community-based tourism especially ecotourism that was developed within the community since 1995. Some of them were working in local authorities, the researcher focused on their familiarity in tourism, and then they were classified into homestay group. The local authority respondents were 14 persons or 4.7%. This minority group was the group that recognized the tourism development in the

community as well. This group consists of village headmen, mayor, chief of sub-district administration organization, and government officials (Table 4.2).

Table 4.2: Classification of Respondents

Groups of Respondent	Frequency	Percentage
Homestay owner	63	21.0
Local authority	14	4.7
Tourism service provider	95	31.7
Local resident	128	42.7
Total	300	100

4.3 Ecotourism and Sustainable Tourism Knowledge among Classified Groups of Respondents

The degree of knowledge on ecotourism and sustainable tourism was examined among groups of respondent, they were groups of homestay owners, local authorities, tourism service providers and local residents. There were 5 indicators of ecotourism knowledge and 5 indicators of sustainable tourism knowledge indicators. The respondents answered "Right" or "Wrong" through these indicators in questionnaire (Appendix C). The statistical comparison (testing of significance) used to examine the statistic significant among groups and knowledge. There were means, and P-standard. P-standard was used to indicate the percentage of resident amounts, who had mean score of knowledge in ecotourism and sustainable tourism above 0.75. The respondents who had mean score over 0.75 in ecotourism or sustainable tourism indicators were defined that they had well recognized to ecotourism or sustainable tourism. The objective of this indicator was to identify the respondents' knowledge of tourism, especially in ecotourism that exist in their community and in sustainable tourism that was the concern in tourism development. If the respondents recognized both types of tourism, they would make the dependable response in survey instrument.

The overall tourism knowledge of the respondents was over 0.75 P-standard. For the same reason, more than a half of respondents in each group well

recognized tourism. They had a little better recognition in sustainable tourism knowledge than the ecotourism's, except the homestay owner group. This was indicated by their average mean score. The respondents presented their average mean score of sustainable tourism knowledge at 0.79 and ecotourism knowledge at 0.78.

Local authorities had the highest mean score and P-standard, in both ecotourism and sustainable tourism, among groups of respondents. The result was that, they had 0.92 mean score and 78.57% P-standard, therefore they well recognized in ecotourism. Their sustainable mean score was 0.96 and P-standard of 92.86%, therefore they well recognized in sustainable tourism.

The later group was homestay owners, their mean score of sustainable was 0.81, and their P-standard was 52.38%. It could say that 52.38% of homestay owners well recognized in sustainable tourism. The 66.67% of people in homestay owner group well recognized in sustainable tourism at 0.77 mean score. Homestay owner was the only group that had the higher mean score of ecotourism knowledge than the sustainable tourism knowledge. This may be because they arranged the community-based ecotourism club that made them have more knowledge to ecotourism than sustainable tourism.

The mean score in both ecotourism and sustainable tourism among groups of service provider and local resident were not much different. The percentages of tourism service providers and local residents, who had well recognized in ecotourism, were not much different. Similarity, there was 51.58% of service providers and 51.56% of local residents well recognized in ecotourism. Service providers had higher percentage of P-standard than local residents did in sustainable tourism (Table 4.3).

Table 4.3: Degree in Ecotourism and Sustainable Tourism among Classified Group of Respondents

Stat. Test \ Groups	Homestay Owners	Local Authorities	Tourism Service Providers	Local Resident	Total / Average
Frequency	63	14	95	128	300
Mean					
ETI ¹	0.81	0.92	0.78	0.76	0.78
STI ²	0.77	0.96	0.80	0.78	0.79
P-Standard ³ (>0.75)					
ETI	52.38%	78.57%	51.58%	51.56%	53%
STI	66.67%	92.86%	71.58%	68.75%	70.33%

Remarks

1: ECI = Ecotourism knowledge indicators

2: STI = Sustainable tourism knowledge indicators

3: P-Standard = Percentage of residents who have mean score over 0.75

4.4 Interest Levels of Community Participation

In this part, the interest level of community participation for sustainable tourism development at Koh Yao Noi were examined by comparing the interest level among the classified group of respondents in the key participative indicator of planning, decision-making, problem solving, implementation, evaluation, and expectation in tourism benefits. The interest levels indicated the extent of their interest to participate for sustainable tourism development. They were ranged into 6 levels from the superlative to no interest as follows:

Interval Scale	Mean Scores	Interest Levels of Participation
5	4.16 – 5.00	The superlative interest
4	3.33 – 4.15	High interest
3	2.50 – 3.32	Moderate interest
2	1.67 – 2.49	Low interest
1	0.84 – 1.66	Least interest
0	0.00 – 0.83	No interest

4.4.1 The Interest Level of “Key Participative Indicators” in Sustainable Tourism Development among “Classified Group of Respondents”

Each classified group of respondent were examined their interest level of participation in the issue of planning, decision-making, implementation, problem solving, evaluation and tourism benefit gaining for sustainable tourism development. The 5 components in each key participative indicator were as follows:

“Planning” components were; propose the rules and regulations for tourism activities, propose ideas in the meeting, plan the tourism activities, prepare and organize the plan, and cooperate with other related sectors.

“Decision-making” components were; assign the plan or project, set up the rules and regulation to development activities, assign the solution to the problems, arrange persons to work and select the tourism activities. The decision-making was emphasis on set up and assigned the activities for sustainable tourism development.

“Problem solving” components were; investigate the cause of problems, survey and collecting data, analyze the problems, possibility survey the problem solving, and cooperate with other related sectors. This participation was emphasis on problem solving solutions for sustainable tourism development.

“Implementation” components were; involving in committee team, involve in tourism activities, follow the development plan, persuade other people to involve in the activities, and cooperate with other related sectors. This participation was emphasis on implementation activities for sustainable tourism development.

“Evaluation” components were; evaluate the tourism development activities, evaluate the committee’s performance, evaluate the problem in development activities, create the method to improve the performance and direct the rules and regulations of the activities. This participation was emphasis on evaluation activities for sustainable tourism development.

“Benefits gaining” components were; the local culture and way of life would be well recognize by visitors, to be the local tour guide, invest in tourism services for serving the tourists, produce the crafts and agriculture products and earn the reward or compensation from involving for tourism development activities.

Each key participative indicator comprises of 5 components. Those 5 components were grouped into a single one variable, by Principle Component Analysis

method, in order to simplify the analysis among groups (Appendix D). Therefore, the 6 keys participative indicators were obtained and used for the analysis.

The results (Table 4.4) showed that among those 6 key participative indicators, the respondents were presenting “Moderate” interest in “Planning, Problem Solving and Evaluation” and they presenting “High” interest in “Decision-making, Implementation and Benefit Gaining”.

The classified groups of respondent had “High” interest in benefit gaining, implementation, and decision-making respectively. This may be because the respondents feel that benefit gaining was the most advantage issue of participation. The participation in implementation required less skill and knowledge then, they may perceive that it was the suitable activity for them. However, the participation in decision-making required skill, knowledge, and experience but the respondents had “High” interest.

The classified groups of respondent had “Moderate” interest in planning, problem solving, and evaluation correspondingly. The respondents may see that those issues of participation required the specific skill, knowledge, and experience. Moreover, the respondents felt unsure in perceiving benefits from those issues of participation. Therefore, they presented the moderate level.

Local residents had “Moderate” interest that differed from the local authorities, tourism service providers, and homestay owners who presented “High” interest among participation activities. This may because the local residents did not have the occupation directly related to tourism. Therefore, they had less interest to participate in the activities.

The different groups of respondent presented the statistic significant difference in levels of interest among key participative indicators. It could be identified by the P-value that was not over 0.05.

Table 4.4: Statistical Comparisons of “Key Participative Indicators” among Classified Group of Respondents

Classified Groups of Respondent	Key Participative Indicators						Level of Interest
	Benefit Gaining	Implement	Decision Making	Plan	Problem Solving	Evaluate	
Homestay Owners	3.63	3.45	3.56	3.54	3.48	3.35	High
Local Authorities Tourism Service Providers	3.62	3.71	3.63	3.77	3.40	3.58	High
Local Residents	3.76	3.63	3.46	3.54	3.53	3.45	High
Average Mean Score	3.17	3.03	3.09	2.99	3.02	2.96	Moderate
	3.47	3.34	3.33	3.32	3.29	3.23	High
Level of Interest	High	High	High	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	-
P-Value (ANOVA)	0.001	0.001	0.025	0.000	0.008	0.014	-

4.4.2 Classification of Significant Group of Respondents

From table 4.4, the results showed that homestay owners, local authorities, and tourism service providers had “High” interest level in participation while local residents had “Moderate” interest level. Therefore, those groups of respondent were classified into 2 significant groups by their similarity of interest level and it also simplified the study of interest level in participation by their demographic characteristics. “Group 1” was to the respondents who were homestay owners, local authorities and tourism service providers. This group was more familiar to tourism than “Group 2”. “Group 2” was the respondents who were local residents. Their demographic characteristics were rearranged as table 4.5.

Table 4.5: Demographic Characteristics of Significant Groups of Respondent

Demographic Characteristics	Significant Groups of Respondent			
	Group 1 ¹		Group 2 ²	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
1. Gender				
Male	109	63.4	63	49.2
Female	63	36.6	65	50.8
Total	172	100	128	100.0
2. Age Group				
18 – 25 years old	19	11.0	20	15.6
26 – 40 years old	67	39.0	61	47.7
Over 40 years old	86	50	47	36.7
Total	172	100	128	100.0
3. Education Level				
Primary school or lower	70	40.7	58	45.3
Secondary school	67	39.0	51	39.8
Diploma/ Vocational or higher	35	20.3	19	14.8
Total	172	100	128	100.0
4. Monthly Income				
5,000 Baht or lower	92	53.5	84	65.6
5,001 – 15,000 Baht	61	35.5	26	20.3
Over 15,000 Baht	19	11.0	18	14.1
Total	172	100	128	100.0
5. Social Role				
Without any social role	107	62.2	106	82.8
Undertook the certain role	65	37.8	22	17.2
Total	172	100	128	100.0

Remarks 1: Group 1 = Homestay owners, local authorities and tourism service providers

2: Group 2 = Local residents

These 2 groups were separately analyzed among 6 key indicators of participation in tourism development with their demographic characteristics. The indicators of participation were the in planning, decision-making, problem solving, implementation, evaluation, and expectation in tourism benefits. Their demographic characteristics were

gender, age group, education level, monthly income, and social role. There were 6 different key participative indicators, in each indicator there were 5 different components in questionnaire. It created 30 components and may complicate the analysis. In order to simplify the analysis, the comparison and the interpretation of results, the researcher use the principle component analysis in "Data Reduction" for grouping 5 related variables into one indicator (Appendix D). The 6 key participative indicators were created and analyzed among "Group 1" and "Group 2" with 5 demographic characteristics. "Group 1" was firstly analyzed among 6 key participative indicators and the characteristics. The next was "Group 2" as the followings:

4.4.2.1 Statistical Comparisons of "Key Participative Indicators" between "Gender" of "Group 1" Respondents (homestay owners, local authorities, and tourism service providers)

Comparison of mean scores among "Group 1" respondents was to identify the interest level in participation activities for sustainable tourism development classified by their gender. The test results of independent samples t-test, degrees of freedom (d.f.), and P-value (statistically significant) were used to indicate the significant difference among genders and key indicators.

Male had "High" interest in "Benefit gaining" as well as female. Their mean score was 3.70. The lowest mean scores of both male and female were in "Evaluation". Male had "High" interest at 3.51 mean scores and female had "Moderate" interest at 3.27 mean scores in "Evaluation".

The interest level in participation did not indicate any statistically significant difference among gender of Group 1. Similarly, male and female had similar interest level in participation activities. Both male and female had "High" interest in almost activities except female presented "Moderate" interest in "Evaluation" (Table 4.6).

Table 4.6: Statistical Comparisons of “Key Participative Indicators” between “Gender” of “Group 1” Respondents (homestay owners, local authorities, and tourism service providers)

Key Participative Indicators	Demographic Characteristic: Gender		Summary of Test Results
	Male	Female	
1. Planning	3.61	3.49	T-value ¹ = 0.764, d.f. ² = 170 P-value ³ = 0.446
2. Decision-making	3.57	3.39	T-value = 1.055, d.f. = 170 P-value = 0.293
3. Problem solving	3.57	3.57	T-value = 0.005, d.f. = 155.78 P-value = 0.996
4. Implementation	3.56	3.40	T-value = 0.962, d.f. = 170 P-value = 0.338
5. Evaluation	3.51	3.27 (Moderate)	T-value = 1.369, d.f. = 170 P-value = 0.173
6. Benefit gaining	<u>3.70</u>	<u>3.70</u>	T-value = -0.044, d.f. = 156.022 P-value = 0.965

All mean scores, which were not alphabetically indicated, were in “**High**” level of interest.

Remarks

- 1: T-value = Independent-Samples T-Test (computed) value
- 2: d.f. = (degrees of freedom) the amount of information from the sample data that has been used up
- 3: P-value = Level of statistically significant (2-tailed)
- 4: The underlined numbers showed the indicator with the highest mean score within a group

4.4.2.2 Statistical Comparisons of “Key Participative Indicators” between “Gender” of “Group 2” Respondents (local residents)

Comparison of mean scores among “Group 2” respondents was to identify the interest level in participation activities for sustainable tourism development classified by their gender. The test results of independent samples t-test, degrees of freedom (d.f.) and P-value (statistically significant) were used to indicate the significant difference among genders and key indicators.

Male in “Group 2” had “Moderate” interest in “Decision-making” at 3.09 as the highest mean score among key participative indicators. Female had “Moderate” interest in “Benefit gaining” at 3.32 as the highest mean score. The lowest mean scores of male was in “Implementation” and “Evaluation”, their mean scores were 2.95 or in “Moderate” interest. The lowest mean score of female was in “Evaluation” and its mean score was 2.96 or in “Moderate” interest.

The interest level in participation did not indicate any statistic significant difference among gender of Group 2. Similarity, male and female had the same interest level of “Moderate” in all participation activities (Table 4.7).

Table 4.7: Statistical Comparisons of “Key Participative Indicators” between “Gender” of “Group 2” Respondents (local residents)

Key Participative Indicators	Demographic Characteristic: Gender		Summary of Test Results
	Male	Female	
1. Planning	2.98	3.01	T-value ¹ = -0.128, d.f. ² = 126 P-value ³ = 0.899
2. Decision-making	<u>3.09</u>	3.07	T-value = 0.085, d.f. = 126 P-value = 0.933
3. Problem solving	3.01	3.04	T-value = -0.128, d.f. = 126 P-value = 0.898
4. Implementation	2.95	3.08	T-value = -0.515, d.f. = 118.61 P-value = 0.606
5. Evaluation	2.95	2.96	T-value = -0.019, d.f. = 126 P-value = 0.985
6. Benefit gaining	3.01	<u>3.32</u>	T-value = -1.368, d.f. = 116.505 P-value = 0.174

All mean scores were in “Moderate” level of interest.

Remarks

1: T-value = Independent-Samples T-Test (computed) value

2: d.f. = (degrees of freedom) the amount of information from the sample data that has been used up

3: P-value = Level of statistically significant (2-tailed)

4: The underlined numbers showed the indicator with the highest mean score within a group

4.4.2.3 Statistical Comparisons of “Key Participative Indicators” among “Age Groups” of “Group 1” Respondents (homestay owners, local authorities, and tourism service providers)

Comparison of mean scores among “Group 1” respondents was to identify the interest level in participation activities for sustainable tourism development classified by their age group. The test results of F-value, degrees of freedom (d.f.), and P-value of one-way ANOVA (statistically significant) were used to indicate the significant difference among age groups and key indicators.

“Group 1” respondents who were 18–25 years old had 3.86 mean score or “High” interest in “Planning” as their highest mean score among key participative indicators. Respondents who were 26–40 years old had “High” interest in “Benefit gaining” at 3.72 the highest mean score among key participative indicators. Respondents who were over 40 years old had “High” interest in “Evaluation” or at 3.48 the highest mean score among key participative indicators.

The lowest mean scores of 3 sub-groups of respondents in “Group 1”, classified by their age group, were in “Evaluation”. The respondents who were 18–25 years old having mean scores at 3.36, respondents who were 26–40 years old and over 40 years having mean score of 3.38 and 3.48 respectively or “High” interest in participation activities.

Their P-values among 6 key participative indicators were over 0.05. Therefore, the interest level in participation did not indicate any statistically significant difference among age group of Group 1. For the same reason, the respondents in different age group presented their interest in different participation activities but under the same level of “High” interest (Table 4.8).

Table 4.8: Statistical Comparisons of “Key Participative Indicators” among “Age Groups” of “Group 1” Respondents (homestay owners, local authorities, and tourism service providers)

Key Participative Indicators	Demographic Characteristic: Age Groups (years old)			Summary of Test Results
	18-25	26-40	Over 40	
1. Planning	<u>3.86</u>	3.49	3.56	F-value ¹ =1.135, d.f. ² =2, 169 P-value ³ = 0.324
2. Decision-making	3.84	3.39	3.53	F-value= 1.287, d.f.= 2, 169 P-value = 0.279
3. Problem solving	3.77	3.54	3.55	F-value= 0.423, d.f.= 2, 169 P-value = 0.656
4. Implementation	3.38	3.47	3.55	F-value= 0.270, d.f.= 2, 169 P-value = 0.763
5. Evaluation	3.36	3.38	3.48	F-value= 0.021, d.f.= 2, 169 P-value = 0.818
6. Benefit gaining	3.55	<u>3.72</u>	<u>3.72</u>	F-value= 0.298, d.f.= 2, 169 P-value = 0.742

All mean scores were in “High” level of interest.

Remarks

- 1: F-value = One-Way ANOVA (computed) value
- 2: d.f. = Degrees of freedom (the amount of information from the sample data that has been used up), d.f. for numerator =2; d.f. for denominator = 169
- 3: P-value = Level of statistically significant
- 4: The underlined numbers showed the indicator with the highest mean score within a group

4.4.2.4 Statistical Comparisons of “Key Participative Indicators” among “Age Groups” of “Group 2” Respondents (local residents).

Comparison of mean scores among “Group 2” respondents identified the interest level in participation activities for sustainable tourism development classified by their age group. The test results of F-value, degrees of freedom (d.f.), and P-value of one-way ANOVA (statistically significant) were used to indicate the significant difference among age groups and key indicators.

“Group 2” respondents who were 18–25 years old had 3.49 as the highest mean score or “High” interest in “Evaluation” among key participative indicators. Respondents who were 26–40 years old had “High” interest in “Benefit gaining” at 3.38 as the highest mean score. Respondents who were over 40 years old had “Moderate” interest in “Benefit gaining” at 2.79 as a highest mean score among key participative indicators.

The lowest mean scores of respondents, 18–25 years old, were in “Planning” at 3.28 mean scores or “Moderate” interest in participation. The respondents, 26–40 years old, had mean scores at 3.05 or “Moderate” interest in “Evaluation” as the lowest mean scores in its age group. Respondents who were over 40 years old had mean score of 2.60 or in “Moderate” interest in “Implementation” as the lowest mean scores among key participative indicators.

Their P-values of the last 3 key participative indicators (implementation, evaluation and benefit gaining) were not over 0.05. Therefore, the interest level in participation indicated the statistically significant difference among age group of Group 2 respondents in implementation, evaluation, and benefit gaining. Similarly, the respondents in different age groups presented the different level of interest in implementation, evaluation, and benefit gaining. Moreover, the older respondents presented the fewer mean score than younger respondents did (Table 4.9).

Table 4.9: Statistical Comparisons of “Key Participative Indicators” among “Age Groups” of “Group 2” Respondents (local residents)

Key Participative Indicators	Demographic Characteristic: Age Groups (years old)			Summary of Test Results
	18-25	26-40	Over 40	
1. Planning	3.28	3.14	2.69	F-value ¹ =2.076, d.f. ² =2, 125 P-value ³ = 0.130
2. Decision-making	3.47 (High)	3.22	2.74	F-value= 2.833, d.f.= 2, 125 P-value = 0.063
3. Problem solving	3.46 (High)	3.12	2.74	F-value= 2.470, d.f.= 2, 125 P-value = 0.089
4. Implementation	3.30	3.25	2.60	F-value= 3.583, d.f.= 2, 125 P-value = 0.031
5. Evaluation	<u>3.49</u> (High)	3.05	2.61	F-value= 3.120, d.f.= 2, 125 P-value = 0.048
6. Benefit gaining	3.41 (High)	<u>3.38</u> (High)	<u>2.79</u>	F-value= 3.332, d.f.= 2, 125 P-value = 0.039

All mean scores, which were not alphabetically indicated, were in “Moderate” level of interest.

Remarks

- 1: F-value = One-Way ANOVA (computed) value
- 2: d.f. = Degrees of freedom (the amount of information from the sample data that has been used up), d.f. for numerator =2; d.f. for denominator = 125
- 3: P-value = Level of statistically significant. The bold numbers indicated the statistically significant differences between groups at 95% significant level ($p < 0.05$)
- 4: The underlined numbers showed the indicator with the highest mean score within a group

4.4.2.5 Statistical Comparisons of “Key Participative Indicators” among “Education Levels” of “Group 1” Respondents (homestay owners, local authorities, and tourism service providers)

Comparison of mean scores among “Group 1” respondents was to identify the interest level in participation activities for sustainable tourism development classified by their education levels. The test results of F-value, degrees of freedom (d.f.), and P-value of one-way ANOVA (statistically significant) were used to indicate the significant difference among education levels and key indicators.

“Group 1” respondents whose education level was in primary school or lower, they had the highest mean score at 3.72 among key participative indicators or “High” interest in “Benefit gaining”. Respondents whose education level was in secondary school, they had “High” interest in “Benefit gaining” at 3.69 as the highest mean score. Respondents who were in education level of diploma or higher, they had “High” interest in “Planning” at 3.93 as a highest mean score among key participative indicators.

The lowest mean scores of 3 sub-groups of respondents in “Group 1”, were as follows. The first group, respondents who were in primary school or lower education level had mean scores at 3.30 or “Moderate” in “Decision-making”. Respondents whose education levels were in secondary school and diploma or higher, they had mean score of 3.41 and 3.50 respectively or in “High” interest in “Evaluation”.

Their P-values of planning and decision-making were not over 0.05. Therefore, the interest level in participation indicated the statistically significant difference among education level of Group 1 respondents in planning and decision-making. For the same reason, the respondents in different education level had the different level of interest in planning and decision-making. The higher educated respondents presented higher mean score. This may be because they had better recognition of the benefits from participation for sustainable tourism development (Table 4.10).

Table 4.10: Statistical Comparisons of “Key Participative Indicators” among “Education Levels” of “Group 1” Respondents (homestay owners, local authorities, and tourism service providers)

Key Participative Indicators	Demographic Characteristic: Education Levels			Summary of Test Results
	Primary or lower	Secondary school	Diploma or higher	
1. Planning	3.41	3.54	<u>3.93</u>	F-value ¹ =3.763, d.f. ² =2, 169 P-value ³ = 0.025
2. Decision-making	3.30 (Moderate)	3.53	3.87	F-value=3.220, d.f.=2, 169 P-value = 0.042
3. Problem solving	3.46	3.52	3.87	F-value=2.092, d.f.=2, 169 P-value = 0.127
4. Implementation	3.42	3.53	3.59	F-value=0.381, d.f.=2, 169 P-value = 0.684
5. Evaluation	3.40	3.41	3.50	F-value=0.107, d.f.=2, 169 P-value = 0.899
6. Benefit gaining	<u>3.72</u>	<u>3.69</u>	3.70	F-value=0.019, d.f. =2, 169 P-value = 0.982

All mean scores, which were not alphabetically indicated, were in “High” level of interest.

Remarks

- 1: F-value = One-Way ANOVA (computed) value
- 2: d.f. = Degrees of freedom (the amount of information from the sample data that has been used up), d.f. for numerator =2; d.f. for denominator = 169
- 3: P-value = Level of statistically significant. The bold numbers indicated the statistically significant differences between groups at 95% significant level (p<0.05)
- 4: The underlined numbers showed the indicator with the highest mean score within a group

4.4.2.6 Statistical Comparisons of “Key Participative Indicators” among “Education Levels” of “Group 2” Respondents (local residents)

Comparison of mean scores among “Group 2” respondents was to identify the interest level in participation activities for sustainable tourism development classified by their education levels. The test results of F-value, degrees of freedom (d.f.), and P-value of one-way ANOVA (statistically significant) were used to indicate the significant difference among education levels and key indicators.

The highest mean scores of each 3 sub-group, among key participative indicators, classified by their education levels were as follows. The first group, respondents whose education level were in primary school or lower, they had 2.82 mean score or “Moderate” interest in “Benefit gaining”. Respondents whose education level was in secondary school had “High” interest in “Benefit gaining” at 3.36 mean score. Respondents who were in education level of diploma or higher had “High” interest in “Decision-making” at 3.71 mean scores.

The lowest mean scores of each 3 sub-group, among their key participative indicators, classified by their education levels were as follows. The first group, respondents who were in primary school or lower education level had mean scores at 2.61 or “Moderate” interest in “Evaluation”. Respondents whose education levels were in secondary school, they had mean score of 3.13 or in “Moderate” interest in “Problem-solving”. The last group, respondents whose education was diploma or higher had 3.35 mean scores or “High” interest in “Evaluation”.

Their P-values of planning, decision-making, implementation, evaluation and benefit gaining were not over 0.05. Therefore, the interest level in participation indicated the statistically significant difference among education level of Group 2 respondents in planning, decision-making, implementation, evaluation, and benefit gaining. Similarity, the respondents in different education level presented the different level of interest in planning, decision-making, implementation, evaluation, and benefit gaining. The higher educated respondents presented higher mean score. This may because they had better recognition of the benefits from participation for sustainable tourism development (Table 4.11).

Table 4.11: Statistical Comparisons of “Key Participative Indicators” among “Education Levels” of “Group 2” Respondents (local residents)

Key Participative Indicators	Demographic Characteristic: Education Levels			Summary of Test Results
	Primary or lower	Secondary school	Diploma or higher	
1. Planning	2.65	3.22	3.46 (High)	F-value ¹ =4.106, d.f. ² =2,125 P-value ³ = 0.019
2. Decision-making	2.77	3.22	<u>3.71</u> (High)	F-value=4.323, d.f.=2,125 P-value = 0.015
3. Problem solving	2.78	3.13	3.55 (High)	F-value=2.770, d.f.=2,125 P-value = 0.067
4. Implementation	2.63	3.22	3.64 (High)	F-value=5.190, d.f.=2,125 P-value = 0.007
5. Evaluation	2.61	3.21	3.35 (High)	F-value=3.426, d.f.=2,125 P-value = 0.036
6. Benefit gaining	<u>2.82</u>	<u>3.36</u> (High)	3.69 (High)	F-value=4.372, d.f. =2,125 P-value = 0.015

All mean scores, which were not alphabetically indicated, were in “Moderate” level of interest.

Remarks

- 1: F-value = One-Way ANOVA (computed) value
- 2: d.f. = Degrees of freedom (the amount of information from the sample data that has been used up), d.f. for numerator =2; d.f. for denominator = 125
- 3: P-value = Level of statistically significant. The bold numbers indicated the statistically significant differences between groups at 95% significant level ($p < 0.05$)
- 4: The underlined numbers showed the indicator with the highest mean score within a group

4.4.2.7 Statistical Comparisons of “Key Participative Indicators” among “Monthly Income” of “Group 1” Respondents (homestay owners, local authorities, and tourism service providers)

Comparison of mean scores among “Group 1” respondents was to identify the interest level in participation activities for sustainable tourism development classified by their monthly income. The test results of F-value, degrees of freedom (d.f.), and P-value of one-way ANOVA (statistically significant) were used to indicate the significant difference among monthly income and key indicators.

The highest mean scores of each 3 sub-group among 6 key participative indicators were as follows. The first 2 groups, respondents who had monthly income 5,000 Baht or lower and respondents who had monthly income 5,001–15,000 Baht, they had “High” interest in “Benefit gaining”. Their mean scores were 3.75 and 3.62 respectively. The last group was the respondents whose monthly income was over 15,000 Baht. Their highest mean score was 3.85 or they had “High” interest in “Problem solving”.

The lowest mean scores of 3 sub-group among key participative indicators were as followings. The first group, respondents whose monthly income was 5,000 Baht or lower, their lowest mean score was 3.44 or they had “High” interest in “Decision-making”. The last 2 groups, respondents whose monthly income was 5,001–15,000 Baht and respondents who had monthly income over 15,000 Baht, they had lowest mean scores in “Evaluation”. In addition, the interest level of participation of them was 3.24 or “Moderate” and 3.67 or “High”, respectively.

Their P-values were all over 0.05. Therefore, the interest level in participation did not indicate the statistically significant difference among monthly income of Group 1 respondents. Similarity, the respondents in different monthly income presented the similar interest level (Table 4.12).

Table 4.12: Statistical Comparisons of “Key Participative Indicators” among “Monthly Income” of “Group 1” Respondents (homestay owners, local authorities, and tourism service providers)

Key Participative Indicators	Demographic Characteristic: Monthly Income (Baht)			Summary of Test Results
	5,000 or lower	5,001 to 15,000	Over 15,000	
1. Planning	3.54	3.49	3.90	F-value ¹ =1.470, d.f. ² =2,169 P-value ³ = 0.233
2. Decision-making	3.44	3.52	3.78	F-value=0.764, d.f.=2,169 P-value = 0.468
3. Problem solving	3.54	3.48	<u>3.98</u>	F-value=1.865, d.f.=2,169 P-value = 0.158
4. Implementation	3.55	3.34	3.76	F-value=1.418, d.f.=2,169 P-value = 0.245
5. Evaluation	3.49	3.24 (Moderate)	3.67	F-value=1.537, d.f.=2,169 P-value = 0.218
6. Benefit gaining	<u>3.75</u>	<u>3.62</u>	3.72	F-value=0.351, d.f.=2,169 P-value = 0.705

All mean scores, which were not alphabetically indicated, were in “High” level of interest.

Remarks

- 1: F-value = One-Way ANOVA (computed) value
- 2: d.f. = Degrees of freedom (the amount of information from the sample data that has been used up), d.f. for numerator =2; d.f. for denominator = 169
- 3: P-value = Level of statistically significant
- 4: The underlined numbers showed the indicator with the highest mean score within a group

4.4.2.8 Statistical Comparisons of “Key Participative Indicators” among “Monthly Income” of “Group 2” Respondents (local residents)

Comparison of mean scores among “Group 2” respondents was to identify the interest level in participation activities for sustainable tourism development classified by their monthly income. The test results of F-value, degrees of freedom (d.f.), and P-value of one-way ANOVA (statistically significant) were used to indicate the significant difference among monthly income and key indicators.

The highest mean scores of each 3 sub-group among 6 key participative indicators were as follows. The first 2 groups, respondents whose monthly income were 5,000 Baht or lower and respondents whose monthly income were 5,001–15,000 Baht, they had highest mean scores in “Benefit gaining”. Their mean scores were 3.04 or “Moderate” interest and 3.46 or “High” interest in benefit gaining. The last group was the respondents whose monthly income was over 15,000 Baht. Their highest mean score was 3.37 in “Implementation” or “High” interest in implementation.

The lowest mean scores of 3 sub-groups among 6 key participative indicators were as follows. The first 2 groups, respondents whose monthly income were 5,000 Baht or lower and respondents whose monthly income were 5,001–15,000 Baht, they had lowest mean scores in “Evaluation”. Their mean scores, in that order, were 2.88 and 2.97 or “Moderate” interest in evaluation. The last group was the respondents whose monthly income was over 15,000 Baht. Their lowest mean score was 3.18 in “Problem solving” or “Moderate” interest in problem solving.

Their P-values were all over 0.05. Therefore, the interest level in participation did not indicate the statistically significant difference among monthly income of Group 2 respondents. For the same reason, most of the respondents in different monthly income presented the similar interest level (Table 4.13).

Table 4.13: Statistical Comparisons of “Key Participative Indicators” among “Monthly Income” of “Group 2” Respondents (local residents)

Key Participative Indicators	Demographic Characteristic: Monthly Income (Baht)			Summary of Test Results
	5,000 or lower	5,001 to 15,000	Over 15,000	
1. Planning	2.90	3.11	3.28	F-value ¹ =0.733, d.f. ² =2,125 P-value ³ = 0.483
2. Decision-making	2.98	3.27	3.32	F-value=0.815, d.f.=2,125 P-value = 0.445
3. Problem solving	3.00	3.02	3.18	F-value=0.132, d.f.=2,125 P-value = 0.876
4. Implementation	2.94	3.04	<u>3.37</u> (High)	F-value=0.735, d.f.=2,125 P-value = 0.482
5. Evaluation	2.88	2.97	3.31	F-value=0.685, d.f.=2,125 P-value = 0.506
6. Benefit gaining	<u>3.04</u>	<u>3.46</u> (High)	3.36 (High)	F-value=1.291, d.f.=2,125 P-value = 0.279

All mean scores, which were not alphabetically indicated, were in “Moderate” level of interest.

Remarks

- 1: F-value = One-Way ANOVA (computed) value
- 2: d.f. = Degrees of freedom (the amount of information from the sample data that has been used up), d.f. for numerator =2; d.f. for denominator = 125
- 3: P-value = Level of statistically significant
- 4: The underlined numbers showed the indicator with the highest mean score within a group

4.4.2.9 Statistical Comparisons of “Key Participative Indicators” among “Social Role” of “Group 1” Respondents (homestay owners, local authorities, and tourism service providers)

Comparison of mean scores among “Group 1” respondents was to identify the interest level in participation activities for sustainable tourism development classified by their social roles. The test results of t-value, degrees of freedom (d.f.), and P-value of (statistically significant) were used to indicate the significant difference among their social role and key indicators.

The highest mean scores of 2 sub-groups among 6 key participative indicators were in “Benefit gaining”. The respondents who were without any social role, they had mean score of 3.72 or “High” interest in benefits gaining. The respondents who undertaken the certain role had mean score of 3.67 or “High” interest.

The lowest mean scores of 2 sub-groups among 6 key participative indicators were as follows. The first group, respondents who did not take any social role, had lowest mean score in “Evaluation”. Their mean score was 3.49 or “High” interest in evaluation. The last group, respondents who undertook the certain role, had lowest mean score in “Decision-making”. Their mean score was 3.28 or “Moderate” interest in “Decision-making”.

Their P-values of “Decision-making” was not over 0.05. Therefore, the interest level in “Decision-making” indicated the statistically significant difference among social role of Group 1 respondents. For the same reason, the respondents in different social role presented the different level of interest in “Decision-making” (Table 4.14).

Table 4.14: Statistical Comparisons of “Key Participative Indicators” between “Social Roles” of “Group 1” Respondents (homestay owners, local authorities, and tourism service providers)

Key Participative Indicators	Demographic Characteristic: Social Roles		Summary of Test Results
	Without any social role	Undertaken the certain role	
1. Planning	3.61	3.50	T-value ¹ =0.738, d.f. ² = 170 P-value ³ = 0.461
2. Decision-making	3.65	3.28 (Moderate)	T-value=2.050,d.f.=115.723 P-value = 0.043
3. Problem solving	3.67	3.40	T-value=1.659, d.f. = 170 P-value = 0.099
4. Implementation	3.54	3.43	T-value= 0.698, d.f. = 170 P-value = 0.486
5. Evaluation	3.49	3.32 (Moderate)	T-value= 0.937, d.f. = 170 P-value = 0.350
6. Benefit gaining	<u>3.72</u>	<u>3.67</u>	T-value= 0.350, d.f. = 170 P-value = 0.727

All mean scores, which were not alphabetically indicated, were in “High” level of interest.

Remarks

- 1: T-value = Independent-Samples T-Test (computed) value
- 2: d.f. = (degrees of freedom) the amount of information from the sample data that has been used up
- 3: P-value = Level of statistically significant (2-tailed). The bold number indicated the statistically significant differences between groups at 95% significant level (p<0.05)
- 4: The underlined numbers showed the indicator with the highest mean score within a group

4.4.2.10 Statistical Comparisons of “Key Participative Indicators” between “Social Roles” of “Group 2” Respondents (local residents)

Comparison of mean scores among “Group 2” respondents was to identify the interest level in participation activities for sustainable tourism development classified by their social roles. The test results of t-value, degrees of freedom (d.f.), and P-value of (statistically significant) were used to indicate the significant difference among their social role and key indicators.

The highest mean scores of 2 sub-groups among 6 key participative indicators were in “Benefit gaining”. The mean score of respondents who did not take any social role was 3.07 or “Moderate” interest in benefit gaining. The mean score of respondents who undertook the certain role was 3.63 or “High” interest in benefit gaining.

The lowest mean scores of 2 sub-groups among 6 key participative indicators were as follows. The first group, respondents who did not take social role, they had lowest mean score in “Evaluation”. Their mean score of was 2.87 or “Moderate” interest in evaluation. The last group, respondents who undertook the certain role, they had lowest mean score in “Planning”. Their mean score was 3.29 or ranged in “Moderate” interest in planning.

Their P-values of “Evaluation” was not over 0.05. Therefore, the interest level in “Evaluation” indicated the statistically significant difference among social role of Group 2 respondents. Similarity, the respondents in different social role presented the different level of interest in “Evaluation”. Moreover, the respondents who undertook the certain role had higher mean score than who did not take any role (Table 4.15).

Table 4.15: Statistical Comparisons of “Key Participative Indicators” between “Social Roles” of “Group 2” Respondents (local residents)

Key Participative Indicators	Demographic Characteristic: Social Roles		Summary of Test Results
	Without any social role	Undertaken the certain role	
1. Planning	2.93	3.29	T-value ¹ = -1.171, d.f. ² = 126 P-value ³ = 0.244
2. Decision-making	3.00	3.52 (High)	T-value = -1.710, d.f. = 126 P-value = 0.090
3. Problem solving	2.96	3.39 (High)	T-value = -1.430, d.f. = 126 P-value = 0.155
4. Implementation	2.92	3.51 (High)	T-value = -1.873, d.f. = 126 P-value = 0.063
5. Evaluation	2.87	3.42 (High)	T-value = -1.686, d.f. = 126 P-value = 0.042
6. Benefit gaining	<u>3.07</u>	<u>3.63</u> (High)	T-value = -1.861, d.f. = 126 P-value = 0.065

All mean scores, which were not alphabetically indicated, were in “Moderate” level of interest.

Remarks

- 1: T-value = Independent-Samples T-Test (computed) value
- 2: d.f. = (degrees of freedom) the amount of information from the sample data that has been used up
- 3: P-value = Level of statistically significant (2-tailed). The bold number indicated the statistically significant differences between groups at 95% significant level ($p < 0.05$)
- 4: The underlined numbers showed the indicator with the highest mean score within a group

4.4.3 The Appropriate Time Participated for Sustainable Tourism Development Activities

The respondents' opinion, toward appropriate time participated for sustainable tourism development activities, was examined among their classified groups and their demographic characteristics. The four nominal scales of time were; once a week or more, one time per two or three weeks, once a month, and whenever necessary. Chi-Square test at 0.05 significant level was used in order to analyze the independency of relationship among the appropriate time and classified group of respondents as well as their demographic characteristics. Their selected time could also represent their enthusiasm of participation in sustainable tourism development.

4.4.3.1 The Appropriate Time Participated for Sustainable Tourism Development among Classified Group of Respondents

The respondents were classified into 4 groups. They were homestay owners, local authorities, tourism service providers, and local residents. P-values of 0.021 indicated that the appropriate time to participate in sustainable tourism development depended on classified groups of respondent. The distribution of percentages, among each group of respondents was different or fluctuated.

More than a half of respondents in each group, except homestay owner group, selected "Whenever Necessary" as their appropriate time of participation. The homestay owners always had the activities in their "Community-Based Ecotourism Club" and they had monthly meeting among members. Therefore, 36.5% of them selected "Once a Month" and 41.3% of them selected "Whenever Necessary" of appropriate time participated for sustainable tourism development.

However, more than a half of total respondents, or 55.3% of total respondent, selected "Whenever Necessary" as their appropriate time participated for sustainable tourism development (Table 4.16).

Table 4.16: Statistical Test of “Independency” between “Classified Groups of Respondents” and “Appropriate Time” Participated for Sustainable Tourism Development

Classified Groups of Respondents	Appropriate Time				Total
	Once a week or more	One time per 2 or 3 weeks	Once a month	Whenever necessary	
Homestay owners (%)	2 (3.2)	12 (19.0)	23 (36.5)	26 (41.3)	63 (100.0)
Local authorities (%)	2 (14.3)	1 (7.1)	2 (14.3)	9 (64.3)	14 (100.0)
Tourism service providers (%)	3 (3.2)	9 (9.5)	35 (36.8)	48 (50.5)	95 (100.0)
Local residents (%)	5 (3.9)	11 (8.6)	29 (22.7)	83 (64.8)	128 (100.0)
Total	12 (4.0)	33 (11.0)	89 (29.7)	166 (55.3)	300 (100.0)
Statistical Summary	Pearson Chi-Square (χ^2) = 19.578; d.f. = 9; P-value = 0.021				

Remarks

- 1: The bold number indicated the statistically significant differences between groups at 95% significant level ($p < 0.05$)
- 2: The underlined numbers showed the indicator with the highest percentage within a group

4.4.3.1 The Appropriate Time to Participate for Sustainable Tourism Development among Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Their demographic characteristics were gender, age, education level, monthly income, and social role. Pearson Chi-Square test at 0.05 significant level was used in order to analyze the independency of relationship among the appropriate time and demographic characteristic of respondents. The results showed that, more than a half of the respondents in each characteristic, except the respondents who were 18–25 years old, selected the time of “Whenever Necessary”. As a result, 48.7% of respondents who were 18–25 years old selected “Whenever Necessary” and 25.6% of respondents selected “Once a Month”. Moreover, their percentage in “A Time per 2 or 3 Weeks” and “Once a Week or More” was the same at 12.8%. For the same reason, the younger presented the more enthusiastic than the older. P-value of “Age Group” was 0.035. It indicated that the

appropriate time participated for sustainable tourism development activities depended on the difference in "Age Group" (Table 4.17).

Table 4.17: Statistical Test of "Independency" between "Demographic Characteristics" and "Appropriate Time" Participated for Sustainable Tourism Development

Demographic Characteristics	Appropriate Time				Total
	Once a week or more	One time per 2 or 3 weeks	Once a month	Whenever necessary	
1. Gender					
Male	9	19	52	92	172
(%)	(5.2)	(11.0)	(30.2)	(53.5)	(100.0)
Female	3	14	37	74	128
(%)	(2.3)	(10.9)	(28.9)	(57.8)	(100.0)
Total (%)	(4.0)	(11.0)	(29.7)	(55.3)	(100.0)
Statistical Summary	Pearson Chi-Square (χ^2) = 1.823; d.f. = 3; P-value = 0.610				
2. Age Group					
18 - 25 years old	5	5	10	19	39
(%)	(12.8)	(12.8)	(25.6)	(48.7)	(100.0)
26 - 40 years old	5	18	36	69	128
(%)	(3.9)	(14.1)	(28.1)	(53.9)	(100.0)
Over 40 years old	2	10	43	78	133
(%)	(1.5)	(7.5)	(32.3)	(58.6)	(100.0)
Total (%)	(4.0)	(11.0)	(29.7)	(55.3)	(100.0)
Statistical Summary	Pearson Chi-Square (χ^2) = 13.588; d.f. = 6; P-value = 0.035				
3. Education Level					
Primary school or lower	1	14	38	75	128
(%)	(0.8)	(10.9)	(29.7)	(58.6)	(100.0)
Secondary school	7	13	34	64	118
(%)	(5.9)	(11.0)	(28.8)	(54.2)	(100.0)
Diploma/ Vocational or higher	4	6	17	27	54
(%)	(7.4)	(11.1)	(31.5)	(50.0)	(100.0)
Total (%)	(4.0)	(11.0)	(29.7)	(55.3)	(100.0)
Statistical Summary	Pearson Chi-Square (χ^2) = 6.623; d.f. = 6; P-value = 0.357				

Table 4.17 (continued)

Demographic Characteristics	Appropriate Time				Total
	Once a week or more	One time per 2 or 3 weeks	Once a month	Whenever necessary	
4. Monthly Income					
5,000 Baht or lower	6	18	51	101	176
(%)	(3.4)	(10.2)	(29.0)	<u>(57.4)</u>	(100.0)
5,001 - 15,000 Baht	6	9	29	43	87
(%)	(6.9)	(10.3)	(33.3)	<u>(49.4)</u>	(100.0)
Over 15,000 Baht	-	6	9	22	37
(%)	-	(16.2)	(24.3)	<u>(59.5)</u>	(100.0)
Total (%)	(4.0)	(11.0)	(29.7)	(55.3)	(100.0)
Statistical Summary	Pearson Chi-Square (χ^2) = 6.078; d.f. = 6; P-value = 0.414				
5. Social Role					
Without any social role	8	22	59	124	213
(%)	(3.8)	(10.3)	(27.7)	<u>(58.2)</u>	(100.0)
Undertaken the certain role	4	11	30	42	87
(%)	(4.6)	(12.6)	(34.5)	<u>(48.3)</u>	(100.0)
Total (%)	(4.0)	(11.0)	(29.7)	(55.3)	(100.0)
Statistical Summary	Pearson Chi-Square (χ^2) = 2.471; d.f. = 6; P-value = 0.480				

Remarks

- 1: The bold number indicated the statistically significant differences between groups at 95% significant level ($p < 0.05$)
- 2: The underlined numbers showed the indicator with the highest percentage within a group

4.5 Important Levels of Community Motivation

In this part, the important levels of motivations for participating in sustainable tourism development based on tourism benefits and information gathering were examined between 2 significant groups of respondents. “Group 1” was defined as respondents who were homestay owners, local authorities and tourism service providers. “Group 2” was local residents. Their opinion was examined on the important level of motivation. The important level of motivation consisted of information gathering and 3 main tourism benefits. The tourism benefits were the benefits in socio-culture, environment and economic. The important levels indicated levels of motivational that influenced the respondents to participate in tourism development. They were ranged into 6 levels, from the superlative important to not important as follows:

Interval Scale	Mean Scores	Important Levels
5	4.16 - 5.00	The superlative important
4	3.33 - 4.15	High important
3	2.50 - 3.32	Moderate important
2	1.67 - 2.49	Low important
1	0.84 - 1.66	Least important
0	0.00 - 0.83	Not important

4.5.1 The Important Level in “Key Motivational Indicators” of Sustainable Tourism Development among “Classified Groups of Respondent”

Comparison of mean scores among “Classified groups of respondent” was to identify the important level of motivation to participate in sustainable tourism development activities. The key motivational indicators based on tourism benefits, those were socio-culture; environment and economic benefits, and information gathering. One-way ANOVA at 0.05 significant level was used to identify the significance of group difference. Each issue of key motivational indicators comprised of 5 components and were examined as follows:

“Socio-cultural” components were; the opportunity to learn and exchange the culture with tourists, create relationship with tourists and other people within community, pride in unique culture, preservation of the cultural heritage and to be recognized among local residents.

“Environmental benefits” components were; cleanliness of community, systematic of physical environment, environmental conservation regulation was promoted to carry out, tourism attractions were conserved and tourist’s carrying capacity was created.

“Economic benefits” components were; local employment, increase revenue, quality of life was enhanced, local economic was stimulated and diversify and the investors were attracted into community.

“Information gathering” components were; involve in training and meeting, involve in tourism exhibition, public relations through medias, directly noticed from the responsible person and directly noticed from neighbors.

Each key motivational indicator comprises of 5 components. Those 5 components were grouped into a single one variable, by Principle Component Analysis method, in order to simplify the analysis among groups (Appendix D). Therefore, the 4 keys motivational indicators were gotten and used for analyzing among groups of respondent.

The result (Table 4.18) showed that all group of respondents indicated the “High” important level among different tourism benefits and information gathering motivation.

All groups of respondent selected the environmental benefits as the most important motivation that influenced the participation in sustainable tourism development activities. This was indicated by their highest average mean score in environmental benefits. For the same reason, the respondents were sensitive to the environmental benefits.

The economic benefits and the socio-cultural benefits motivation were not much different. The respondents may feel that economy within community was not in a critical situation. Therefore, the respondents had little concern about the economic benefits and they may give less interest than other motivational indicators.

The respondents may feel that they have strong local traditions and culture. It was because of their Muslim community, they must strictly follow the moral codes of conduct. This could conserve their socio-culture. Therefore, they gave less important level to the socio-cultural benefits motivation.

The least given important score was information gathering. This was the essential tool used to motivate, but the respondents felt that information gathering was less significant than other motivations.

Among classified group of respondents, tourism service provider had higher mean scores than others. This may be because their occupations were directly involved in the tourism business and they directly gained the tourism benefits.

The later group was local authority. This may be because, they recognized the benefits of the tourism. Therefore, they give high mean score of important.

Then, the homestay owners group that was directly involved in sustainable tourism development activities. Most of them argued that they would participate in the development activities, even though, without tourism benefits or information gathering for them. Therefore, they did not give much importance to tourism benefits and information gathering.

The last group was local residents. Their occupations did not relate to tourism. Therefore, they gave the little importance of tourism benefits motivation that influenced participation in sustainable tourism development.

The different groups of respondent presented the different important level in each motivation. It was indicated by the P-value were not over 0.05 (Table 4.18).

Table 4.18: Statistical Comparisons of “Key Motivational Indicators” among “Classified Groups of Respondent”

Classified Group of Respondents	Key Motivational Indicators (Benefits & Info. Gathering)				Important Levels
	Environment	Economic	Socio-Culture	Information Gathering	
Homestay Owners	4.09	3.89	3.97	3.56	High
Local Authorities	4.12	4.03	4.00	3.68	High
Service Providers	4.23	4.14	4.17	3.65	High
Local Residents	3.65	3.60	3.51	3.27	High
Average Mean Score	3.95	3.85	3.84	3.47	High
Important Levels	High	High	High	High	-
P-Value (ANOVA)	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.014	-

4.5.2 Classification of Significant Groups of Respondents

From table 4.18, the results showed that all classified group of respondents have high important level but local residents have lowest group of mean scores. Therefore, those groups of respondent were classified into 2 significant groups by the similarity of mean score. It also simplified the study of important level of motivation by demographic characteristics. "Group 1" and "Group 2" were separately analyzed among 4 key indicators of motivation to participate in tourism development and their demographic characteristics. The 4 key indicators of motivation were the issues of tourism benefits on socio-culture benefits, environmental benefits, economic benefits and information gathering. There were 5 different components in each issue. Therefore, there were 20 components that may complicate in the analysis. In order to simplify the analysis as well as simplify the comparison and the interpretation of results, the researcher used the principle component method (Appendix D) in grouping 5 related components into one variable of motivations.

The 4 key motivational indicators of participation in sustainable tourism development were created and analyzed among "Group 1" and "Group 2" with their 5 demographic characteristics. "Group 1" was firstly analyzed among 4 key participative indicators and the characteristics. The next was "Group 2" as follows:

4.5.2.1 Statistical Comparisons of "Key Motivational Indicators" between "Gender" of "Group 1" Respondents (homestay owners, local authorities, and tourism service providers)

Comparison of mean scores among "Group 1" respondents was to identify the important level of participation in sustainable tourism development activities classified by their gender. The test results of independent samples T-value, degrees of freedom (d.f.), and P-value (statistically significant) were used to indicate the significant difference among genders and key indicators.

Male had the "Superlative" important level of motivation in "Environmental benefits" at 4.16 as the highest mean score among key motivational indicators. Female had the "Superlative" important level of participation in "Environmental benefits" at 4.17 as the highest mean score.

The lowest mean scores of both male and female was in “Information gathering”, male and female had “High” important level or 3.67 and 3.54 mean scores respectively.

Their P-values among 4 key motivational indicators were over 0.05. Therefore, key motivational indicators did not indicate any statistically significant difference among gender of “Group 1”. Similarity, male and female had similar important level to the key motivational indicators (Table 4.19).

Table 4.19: Statistical Comparisons of “Key Motivational Indicators” between “Gender” of “Group 1” Respondents (homestay owners, local authorities, and tourism service providers)

Key Motivational Indicators	Demographic Characteristic: Gender		Summary of Test Results
	Male	Female	
1. Socio-Cultural Benefits	4.09	4.08	T-value ¹ =0.117, d.f. ² =166.704 P-value ³ = 0.907
2. Environmental Benefits	<u>4.16</u> (Superlative)	<u>4.17</u> (Superlative)	T-value=-0.007, d.f.=162.830 P-value = 0.995
3. Economic Benefits	4.06	4.00	T-value=0.572, d.f.=170 P-value = 0.568
4. Information Gathering	3.67	3.54	T-value=1.190, d.f.=154.579 P-value = 0.266

All mean scores, which were not alphabetically indicated, were in “High” level of important.

Remarks

- 1: T-value = Independent-Samples T-Test (computed) value
- 2: d.f. = (degrees of freedom) the amount of information from the sample data that has been used up
- 3: P-value = Level of statistically significant (2-tailed)
- 4: The underlined numbers showed the indicator with the highest mean score within a group

4.5.2.2 Statistical Comparisons of “Key Motivational Indicators” between “Gender” of “Group 2” Respondents (local residents)

Comparison of mean scores among “Group 2” respondents was to identify the important level of motivation in sustainable tourism development activities classified by their gender. The test results of independent samples T-value, degrees of freedom (d.f.), and P-value (statistically significant) were used to indicate the significant difference among genders and key indicators.

Male had “High” important level of motivation in “Environmental benefits” at 3.62 as the highest mean score among key motivational indicators. Female had “High” important level of participation in “Economic benefits” at 3.70 as the highest mean score.

The lowest mean scores of both male and female were in “Information gathering”. Male had “Moderate” important level or 3.12 mean scores and female had “High” important level or 3.42 mean scores.

Their P-values among 4 key motivational indicators were over 0.05. Therefore, key motivational indicators were not indicating any statistically significant difference among gender of “Group 2”. For the same reason, male and female in “Group 2” respondents had similar important level to the key motivational indicators (Table 4.20).

Table 4.20: Statistical Comparisons of “Key Motivational Indicators” between “Gender” of “Group 2” Respondents (local residents)

Key Motivational Indicators	Demographic Characteristic: Gender		Summary of Test Results
	Male	Female	
1. Socio-Cultural Benefits	3.39	3.62	T-value ¹ = -1.206, d.f. ² = 116.841 P-value ³ = 0.230
2. Environmental Benefits	<u>3.62</u>	3.67	T-value = -0.317, d.f. = 126 P-value = 0.752
3. Economic Benefits	3.48	<u>3.70</u>	T-value = -1.176, d.f. = 126 P-value = 0.242
4. Information Gathering	3.12 (moderate)	3.42	T-value = -1.551, d.f. = 126 P-value = 0.123

All mean scores, which were not alphabetically indicated, were in “**High**” level of important.

Remarks

- 1: T-value = Independent-Samples T-Test (computed) value
- 2: d.f. = (degrees of freedom) the amount of information from the sample data that has been used up
- 3: P-value = Level of statistically significant (2-tailed)
- 4: The underlined numbers showed the indicator with the highest mean score within a group

4.5.2.3 Statistical Comparisons of “Key Motivational Indicators” among 3 “Age Groups” of “Group 1” Respondents (homestay owners, local authorities and tourism service providers)

Comparison of mean scores among “Group 1” respondents was to identify the important level of motivation in sustainable tourism development activities classified by their age group. The test results of F-value, degrees of freedom (d.f.), and P-value of one-way ANOVA (statistically significant) were used to indicate the significant difference among age groups and key indicators.

The highest mean scores of all 3 age groups were in “Environmental Benefits”. The mean score of respondents, who were 18-25 years old, was 4.19 or in the “Superlative” important level. Respondents, who were 26-40 years old, had mean score of 4.05 or “High” important level. Respondents, who were over 40 years old, had mean score of 4.25 or the “Superlative” important level of “environmental benefit” motivation.

The lowest mean scores of 3 age groups of respondents in “Group 1” were all in “Information gathering”. The respondents who were 18-25 years old had mean scores at 3.55, respondents who were 26-40 years old and over 40 years had mean score of 3.59 and 3.69 respectively or in “High” important levels of “Information gathering” motivation.

Their P-values among 4 key motivational indicators were all over 0.05. Therefore, key motivational indicators did not indicate any statistically significant difference among age group of “Group 1”. The respondents in different age group had similar important level in every key motivational indicator (Table 4.21).

Table 4.21: Statistical Comparisons of “Key Motivational Indicators” among 3 “Age Groups” of “Group 1” Respondents (homestay owners, local authorities and tourism service providers)

Key Motivational Indicators	Demographic Characteristic: Age Groups (years old)			Summary of Test Results
	18-25	26-40	Over 40	
1. Socio-Cultural Benefits	4.05	3.97	4.18 (Superlative)	F-value ¹ =1.954, d.f. ² =2, 169 P-value ³ = 0.145
2. Environmental Benefits	<u>4.19</u> (Superlative)	<u>4.05</u>	<u>4.25</u> (superlative)	F-value= 1.957, d.f.= 2, 169 P-value = 0.144
3. Economic Benefits	3.94	3.92	4.15	F-value= 2.563, d.f.= 2, 169 P-value = 0.080
4. Information Gathering	3.59	3.55	3.69	F-value= 0.649, d.f.=2, 169 P-value = 0.524

All mean scores, which were not alphabetically indicated, were in “**High**” level of important.

Remarks

- 1: F-value = One-Way ANOVA (computed) value
- 2: d.f. = Degrees of freedom (the amount of information from the sample data that has been used up), d.f. for numerator = 2; d.f. for denominator = 169
- 3: P-value = Level of statistically significant
- 4: The underlined numbers showed the indicator with the highest mean score within a group

4.5.2.4 Statistical Comparisons of “Key Motivational Indicators” among 3 “Age Groups” of “Group 2” Respondents (local residents)

Comparison of mean scores among “Group 2” respondents was to identify the important level of motivation in sustainable tourism development activities classified by their age group. The test results of F-value, degrees of freedom (d.f.), and P-value of one-way ANOVA (statistically significant) were used to indicate the significant difference among age groups and key indicators.

The highest mean scores of first 2 age groups were in “Environmental Benefits”. The mean score of respondents who were 18–25 years old was 3.93 or in “High” important level. Respondents, who were 26–40 years old, had mean score of 3.78 or “High” important level. Respondents who were over 40 years old had mean score of 3.36 or in “High” important level of “Economic benefit” motivation.

The lowest mean scores of 3 age groups of respondents in “Group 2” were all in “Information gathering”. The respondents who were 18–25 years old had mean scores at 3.54, respondents who were 26–40 years old had mean score of 3.46 and they were in the range of “High” important level of “Information gathering” motivation. Respondents who were over 40 years had mean score at 2.91 or in moderate important levels of “information gathering” motivation.

There were P-values among 3 key motivational indicators that were not over 0.05. They were cultural benefits, environmental benefits, and information gathering. Therefore, those 3 key motivational indicators indicated the statistically significant difference among the respondents in different age group of “Group 2”. The respondents in different age group gave the different important level in cultural benefits, environmental benefits, and information gathering (Table 4.22).

Table 4.22: Statistical Comparisons of “Key Motivational Indicators” among 3 “Age Groups” of “Group 2” Respondents (local residents)

Key Motivational Indicators	Demographic Characteristic: Age Groups (years old)			Summary of Test Results
	18-25	26-40	Over 40	
1. Socio-Cultural Benefits	3.87	3.62	3.21 (Moderate)	F-value ¹ =3.401, d.f. ² =2, 125 P-value ³ = 0.036
2. Environmental Benefits	<u>3.93</u>	<u>3.78</u>	3.35	F-value=3.442, d.f. = 2, 125 P-value = 0.035
3. Economic Benefits	3.84	3.70	<u>3.36</u>	F-value=2.005, d.f. = 2, 125 P-value = 0.139
4. Information Gathering	3.54	3.46	2.91 (Moderate)	F-value= 4.310, d.f. =2, 125 P-value = 0.015

All mean scores, which were not alphabetically indicated, were in “**High**” level of important.

Remarks

- 1: F-value = One-Way ANOVA (computed) value
- 2: d.f. = Degrees of freedom (the amount of information from the sample data that has been used up), d.f. for numerator = 2; d.f. for denominator = 125
- 3: P-value = Level of statistically significant. The bold numbers indicated the statistically significant differences between groups at 95% significant level ($p < 0.05$)
- 4: The underlined numbers showed the indicator with the highest mean score within a group

4.5.2.5 Statistical Comparisons of “Key Motivational Indicators” among 3 “Education Levels” of “Group 1” Respondents (homestay owners, local authorities and tourism service providers)

Comparison of mean scores among “Group 1” respondents was to identify the important level of motivation in sustainable tourism development activities classified by their education level. The test results of F-value, degrees of freedom (d.f.), and P-value of one-way ANOVA (statistically significant) were used to indicate the significant difference among education level and key indicators.

The highest mean scores of all 3 education levels were in “Environmental Benefits”. The mean score of respondents, their education level was in primary school or lower, was 4.19 or in the range of “Superlative” important level. Respondents whose education level was secondary school, they had mean score of 4.06 or “High” important level. Respondents who had diploma or higher education level, their mean score was 4.33 or in the “Superlative” important level of motivation in “Environmental Benefit”.

The lowest mean scores of all 3 education levels of respondents in “Group 1” were all in “Information Gathering”. The respondents who had primary school or lower education level, they had mean scores of 3.65. Respondents who were had secondary school education level, they had mean score of 3.58. The respondents who had education level in diploma or higher had 3.65 mean scores. The mean scores of these 3 groups of respondent were in the range of “High” important levels of the motivation in “Information Gathering”.

Their P-values among 4 key motivational indicators were all over 0.05. Therefore, key motivational indicators did not indicate the statistically significant difference among “Education level” of “Group 1” respondent. The respondents in different education level presented the similarity in important level of motivation (Table 4.23).

Table 4.23: Statistical Comparisons of “Key Motivational Indicators” among 3 “Education Levels” of “Group 1” Respondents (homestay owners, local authorities and tourism service providers)

Key Motivational Indicators	Demographic Characteristic: Education Levels			Summary of Test Results
	Primary or lower	Secondary school	Diploma or higher	
1. Socio-Cultural Benefits	4.13	3.99	4.17 (Superlative)	F-value ¹ =1.078, d.f. ² =2, 169 P-value ³ = 0.343
2. Environmental Benefits	<u>4.19</u> (Superlative)	<u>4.06</u>	<u>4.33</u> (Superlative)	F-value=2.073, d.f. = 2, 169 P-value = 0.129
3. Economic Benefits	4.11	3.97	4.04	F-value=0.730, d.f. = 2, 169 P-value = 0.484
4. Information Gathering	3.65	3.58	3.65	F-value=0.176, d.f. =2, 169 P-value = 0.838

All mean scores, which were not alphabetically indicated, were in “High” level of important.

Remarks

- 1: F-value = One-Way ANOVA (computed) value
- 2: d.f. = Degrees of freedom (the amount of information from the sample data that has been used up), d.f. for numerator = 2; d.f. for denominator = 169
- 3: P-value = Level of statistically significant
- 4: The underlined numbers showed the indicator with the highest mean score within a group

4.5.2.6 Statistical Comparisons of “Key Motivational Indicators” among 3 “Education Levels” of “Group 2” Respondents (local residents)

Comparison of mean scores among “Group 2” respondents was to identify the important level of motivation in sustainable tourism development activities classified by their education level. The test results of F-value, degrees of freedom (d.f.), and P-value of one-way ANOVA (statistically significant) were used to indicate the significant difference among education level and key indicators.

The highest mean scores of respondents, whose education level was in primary school or lower, was 3.47 or in the range of “High” important level in “Environmental benefits” motivation. Respondents whose education level was secondary school, they had mean score of 3.73 or “High” important level in “Economic benefits” motivation. Respondents who had diploma or higher education level, their mean score was 4.10 or in “High” important level of “Cultural benefits” motivation.

The lowest mean scores of all 3 education levels of respondents in “Group 2” were all in “Information gathering”. The respondents who had primary school or lower education level, their mean score was 3.06 or in “Moderate” important level. Respondents who had secondary school education level, they had mean score of 3.34 or in “High” important level. The respondents who had education level in diploma or higher had 3.74 mean scores or in the range of “High” important levels of “information gathering” motivation.

The P-values of “Cultural benefits” and “Economic benefits” key motivational indicators were not over 0.05. Therefore, there were the statistically significant differences among those 2 key motivational indicators and respondents in “Group 2”. The respondents in different education level had the different important level in “Cultural benefits” and “Economic benefits” (Table 4.24).

Table 4.24: Statistical Comparisons of “Key Motivational Indicators” among 3 “Education Levels” of “Group 2” Respondents (local residents)

Key Motivational Indicators	Demographic Characteristic: Education Levels			Summary of Test Results
	Primary or lower	Secondary school	Diploma or higher	
1. Socio-Cultural Benefits	3.24 (Moderate)	3.59	<u>4.10</u>	F-value ¹ = 5.115, d.f. ² = 2, 125 P-value ³ = 0.007
2. Environmental Benefits	<u>3.47</u>	3.72	3.99	F-value = 2.170, d.f. = 2, 125 P-value = 0.118
3. Economic Benefits	3.35	<u>3.73</u>	3.97	F-value = 3.246, d.f. = 2, 125 P-value = 0.042
4. Information Gathering	3.06 (Moderate)	3.34	3.74	F-value = 3.006, d.f. = 2, 125 P-value = 0.053

All mean scores, which were not alphabetically indicated, were in “**High**” level of important.

Remarks

- 1: F-value = One-Way ANOVA (computed) value
- 2: d.f. = Degrees of freedom (the amount of information from the sample data that has been used up), d.f. for numerator = 2; d.f. for denominator = 125
- 3: P-value = Level of statistically significant. The bold numbers indicated the statistically significant differences between groups at 95% significant level ($p < 0.05$)
- 4: The underlined numbers showed the indicator with the highest mean score within a group

4.5.2.7 Statistical Comparisons of “Key Motivational Indicators” among 3 “Monthly Income” of “Group 1” Respondents (homestay owners, local authorities, and tourism service providers)

Comparison of mean scores among “Group 1” respondents was to identify the important level of motivation in sustainable tourism development activities classified by their monthly income. The test results of F-value, degrees of freedom (d.f.), and P-value of one-way ANOVA (statistically significant) were used to indicate the significant difference among their monthly income and key indicators.

The highest mean scores of all 3 “Monthly incomes” were in “Environmental benefits”. The mean score of respondents, who earned 5,000 Baht or lower per month, was 4.13 or in the range of “High” important level. Respondents whose monthly income was 5,001–15,000 Baht, they had mean score 4.20 in the “Superlative” important level of motivation. Respondents whose monthly income was over 15,000 Baht, their mean score was 4.22 or in the “Superlative” important level of “Environmental benefit”.

The lowest mean scores of all 3 “Monthly income” groups of respondents were in “Information gathering”. The respondents whose monthly income was 5,000 Baht or lower, they had mean scores of 3.64. Respondents whose monthly income was 5,001–15,000 Baht, they had mean score of 3.54. Respondents whose monthly income was over 15,000 Baht having 3.76 mean scores. They had “High important level in “Cultural benefits”.

Their P-values among 4 key motivational indicators were all over 0.05. Therefore, key motivational indicators did not indicate any statistically significant difference among “Monthly income” of “Group 1”. The respondents in different monthly income had similar important level to all key motivation indicators (Table 4.25).

Table 4.25: Statistical Comparisons of “Key Motivational Indicators” among 3 “Monthly Income” of “Group 1” Respondents (homestay owners, local authorities, and tourism service providers)

Key Motivational Indicators	Demographic Characteristic: Monthly Income (Baht)			Summary of Test Results
	5,000 or lower	5,001 to 15,000	Over 15,000	
1. Socio-Cultural Benefits	4.07	4.08	4.12	F-value ¹ =0.046, d.f. ² =2, 169 P-value ³ = 0.995
2. Environmental Benefits	<u>4.13</u>	<u>4.20</u> (Superlative)	<u>4.22</u> (Superlative)	F-value=0.315, d.f. = 2, 169 P-value = 0.730
3. Economic Benefits	3.97	4.10	4.15	F-value=1.076, d.f. = 2, 169 P-value = 0.334
4. Information Gathering	3.64	3.54	3.76	F-value= 0.721, d.f. =2, 169 P-value = 0.488

All mean scores, which were not alphabetically indicated, were in “**High**” level of important.

Remarks

- 1: F-value = One-Way ANOVA (computed) value
- 2: d.f. = Degrees of freedom (the amount of information from the sample data that has been used up), d.f. for numerator = 2; d.f. for denominator = 169
- 3: P-value = Level of statistically significant
- 4: The underlined numbers showed the indicator with the highest mean score within a group

4.5.2.8 Statistical Comparisons of “Key Motivational Indicators” among 3 “Monthly Income” of “Group 2” Respondents (local residents)

Comparison of mean scores among “Group 2” respondents was to identify the important level of motivation in sustainable tourism development activities classified by their monthly income. The test results of F-value, degrees of freedom (d.f.), and P-value of one-way ANOVA (statistically significant) were used to indicate the significant difference among their monthly income and key indicators.

The highest mean scores of all 3 “Monthly” incomes were in “Environmental Benefits”. The mean score of respondents, their monthly income was 5,000 Baht or lower, was 3.70 or in the range of “High” important level. Respondents whose monthly income was 5,001-15,000 Baht, they also had mean score 3.69 in both “Environmental benefits” and “Cultural benefits” at “High” important level of motivation. Respondents whose monthly income was over 15,000 Baht, their mean score was 3.34 or in “High” important level of “Environmental benefit” motivation.

The lowest mean scores of the first 2 “Monthly” income groups of respondents in “Group 2” were all in “Information gathering”. The respondents whose monthly income was 5,000 Baht or lower, they had mean scores of 3.25. Respondents whose monthly income was 5,001-15,000 Baht, they had mean score of 3.41. The mean scores of these 2 groups of respondents were, respectively, in the range of “Moderate” and “High” important levels of “Information gathering” motivation. The last monthly income group was the respondents whose monthly income was over 15,000 Baht. They had 3.19 mean scores in “Cultural benefits” or had “Moderate” important level of “Cultural benefits” motivation.

Their P-values among 4 key motivational indicators were all over 0.05. Therefore, key motivational indicators did not indicate any statistically significant difference among “Monthly income” of “Group 2”. “Group 2” respondents in different monthly income had similar important level of motivation (Table 4.26).

Table 4.26: Statistical Comparisons of “Key Motivational Indicators” among 3 “Monthly Income” of “Group 2” Respondents (local residents)

Key Motivational Indicators	Demographic Characteristic: Monthly Income (Baht)			Summary of Test Results
	5,000 or lower	5,001 to 15,000	Over 15,000	
1. Socio-Cultural Benefits	3.52	<u>3.69</u>	3.19 (moderate)	F-value ¹ =1.170, d.f. ² =2, 125 P-value ³ = 0.314
2. Environmental Benefits	<u>3.70</u>	<u>3.69</u>	<u>3.34</u>	F-value=0.937, d.f. = 2, 125 P-value = 0.395
3. Economic Benefits	3.65	3.67	3.27 (moderate)	F-value=1.004, d.f. = 2, 125 P-value = 0.369
4. Information Gathering	3.25 (moderate)	3.41	3.20 (moderate)	F-value=0.252, d.f. =2, 125 P-value = 0.778

All mean scores, which were not alphabetically indicated, were in “High” level of important.

Remarks

- 1: F-value = One-Way ANOVA (computed) value
- 2: d.f. = Degrees of freedom (the amount of information from the sample data that has been used up), d.f. for numerator = 2; d.f. for denominator = 125
- 3: P-value = Level of statistically significant
- 4: The underlined numbers showed the indicator with the highest mean score within a group

4.5.2.9 Statistical Comparisons of “Key Motivationale Indicators” between “Social Role” of “Group 1” Respondents (homestay owners, local authorities, and tourism service providers)

Comparison of mean scores among “Group 1” respondents was to identify the important level of motivation in sustainable tourism development activities classified by their social role. The test results of T-value, degrees of freedom (d.f.), and P-value of (statistically significant) were used to indicate the significant difference among their social role and key indicators.

The highest mean scores of respondents among 4 key motivational indicators were in “Environmental benefits” motivation. The mean score of respondents who were without any social role was 4.17 or the “Superlative” important in “Environmental benefits”. The mean score of respondents who undertook the certain role was 4.16 or also in the “Superlative” in “Environmental benefits”.

The lowest mean scores of respondents among 4 key motivational indicators were in “Information gathering”. The respondents who were without any social role, their mean score of was 3.64 or “High” important level of motivation. The respondents who undertook the certain role, their mean score was 3.60 or ranged in “High” important level of “Information gathering” motivation.

Their P-values among 4 key motivational indicators were all over 0.05. Therefore, key motivational indicators did not indicate any statistically significant difference among social role of “Group 1”. The respondents, both who undertook the certain role and without social, had similar important level of motivation (Table 4.27).

Table 4.27: Statistical Comparisons of “Key Motivational Indicators” between “Social Role” of “Group 1” Respondents (homestay owners, local authorities, and tourism service providers)

Key Motivational Indicators	Demographic Characteristic: Social Role		Summary of Test Results
	Without any social role	Undertaken the certain role	
1. Socio-Cultural Benefits	4.10	4.05	T-value ¹ =0.454, d.f. ² = 170 P-value ³ = 0.650
2. Environmental Benefits	<u>4.17</u> (Superlative)	<u>4.16</u> (Superlative)	T-value= 0.052, d.f. = 170 P-value = 0.958
3. Economic Benefits	4.08	3.98	T-value= 0.999, d.f. = 170 P-value = 0.319
4. Information Gathering	3.64	3.60	T-value= 0.326, d.f. = 170 P-value = 0.745

All mean scores, which were not alphabetically indicated, were in “High” level of important.

Remarks

1: T-value = Independent-Samples T-Test (computed) value

2: d.f. = (degrees of freedom) the amount of information from the sample data that has been used up

3: P-value = Level of statistically significant (2-tailed)

4: The underlined numbers showed the indicator with the highest mean score within a group

4.5.2.10 Statistical Comparisons of “Key Motivational Indicators” between “Social Role” of “Group 2” Respondents (local residents)

Comparison of mean scores among “Group 2” respondents was to identify the important level of motivation in sustainable tourism development activities classified by their social role. The test results of T-value, degrees of freedom (d.f.), and P-value of (statistically significant) were used to indicate the significant difference among their social role and key indicators.

The highest mean scores, among 4 key motivational indicators, of respondents who were without any social role was in “Environmental benefits” motivation. The mean score was 3.59 or in “High” important level of motivation. The mean score of respondents who were undertaken the certain role was in “Cultural benefits” motivation. The mean score was 3.96 or in “High” important level of “Environmental benefits” motivation.

The lowest mean scores of respondents among 4 key motivational indicators were in “Information gathering” motivation. The respondents who were without any social role, their mean score of was 3.19 or “High” important level of motivation. The respondents who undertook the certain role, their mean score was 3.69 or ranged in “High” important level of “Information gathering” motivation.

The P-values of “Cultural benefits” were not over 0.05. Therefore, “Cultural benefits” indicated the statistically significant difference in social role of “Group 2” respondents. The respondents, both who undertook the certain role and without social, had different important level of motivation in “Cultural benefits” (Table 4.28).

Table 4.28: Statistical Comparisons of “Key Motivational Indicators” between “Social Role” of “Group 2” Respondents (local residents)

Key Motivational Indicators	Demographic Characteristic: Social Role		Summary of Test Results
	Without any social role	Undertaken the certain role	
1. Socio-Cultural Benefits	3.41	<u>3.96</u>	T-value ¹ = -2.212, d.f. ² = 126 P-value ³ = 0.029
2. Environmental Benefits	<u>3.59</u>	3.92	T-value = -1.366, d.f. = 126 P-value = 0.174
3. Economic Benefits	3.53	3.93	T-value = -1.647, d.f. = 126 P-value = 0.102
4. Information Gathering	3.19 (Moderate)	3.69	T-value = -1.972, d.f. = 126 P-value = 0.051

All mean scores, which were not alphabetically indicated, were in “**High**” level of important.

Remarks

- 1: T-value = Independent-Samples T-Test (computed) value
- 2: d.f. = (degrees of freedom) the amount of information from the sample data that has been used up
- 3: P-value = Level of statistically significant (2-tailed). The bold number indicated the statistically significant differences between groups at 95% significant level ($p < 0.05$)
- 4: The underlined numbers showed the indicator with the highest mean score within a group

4.6 Recommendations from Respondents

The respondents were classified into 2 groups. "Group 1" was defined as the respondents who were homestay owners, local authorities and tourism service providers. "Group 2" was defined as the respondents who were local residents. These 2 groups of respondents were compared their opinion through their recommendations and suggestions.

The recommendations were divided into 2 parts. The first part was the ways that could influence their participation in planning, decision-making, problem solving, implementation, evaluation and investment and tourism benefit gaining. The recommendations and suggestions were grouped into 5 main methods. They were education for local people on tourism, arrangement of the right and willing person to work, arrangement of meeting for inducing further participation, governmental authorities' support in tourism and enhancement of public relation in order to motivate local residents.

The second part was the reasons for no participation in sustainable tourism development. The reasons were grouped into 5 reasons. Those were the lack of cooperation within community, their lack of tourism knowledge, the tourism creates costs rather than benefits, and they did not have enough time or have to work and lack of public relations.

4.6.1 The Recommendations of the Ways that influence the Participation on "Planning" for Sustainable Tourism Development

The majority of respondents in both of Group 1 and Group 2 gave recommendations, of the ways that influenced the participation on planning that was an arrangement of meeting for inducing further participation. The percentages were 41.9 and 53.8 respectively. The next recommendation from both of Group 1 and Group 2 was the tourism education for local people, at the percentage of 33.3 and 25.6 respectively. The latter important recommendation from both of group 1 and 2 was the arrangement of the right and willing person to work at the percentage of 12.9 and 10.3 respectively (table 4.29).

Table 4.29: Displaying the Statistical Comparisons of Recommendations in “Planning” between “Group 1” and “Group 2” Respondents

Recommendations in Planning	Group 1 ¹	Group 2 ²
	Frequency (Valid%)	Frequency (Valid%)
Education for local people on tourism	31 (33.3)	10 (25.6)
Arrangement of the right and willing person	12 (12.9)	4 (10.3)
Arrangement of meeting for further participation	39 (<u>41.9</u>)	21 (<u>53.8</u>)
Governmental authorities' support	4 (4.3)	1 (2.6)
Enhancement of PR	7 (7.5)	3 (7.7)
Total	93 (100.0)	39 (100.0)
Not Recommend	79	89
Total Respondents	172	128

Remarks

1: Group 1 = Homestay owners, local authorities and tourism service providers

2: Group 2 = Local residents

3: The underlined numbers showed the indicator with the highest percentage within a group

4.6.2 The Recommendation of the Ways that influence the Participation on “Decision-making” for Sustainable Tourism Development

The majority of respondents in both of Group 1 and Group 2 gave recommendations, of the ways that influence the participation on decision-making that was education for local people on tourism. The percentages were 38.8 and 32.1 respectively. The next recommendation from Group 1 and Group 2 was governmental authorities' support at the percentage of 20.9 and 21.4 respectively. The latter important recommendation from both of group 1 and 2 was arrangement of meeting to get the participation at the percentage of 19.4 and 17.9 respectively. In addition, Group 2 gave recommendation on assignment the right and willing person to work at the percentage of 17.9 as well (table 4.30).

Table 4.30: Displaying the Statistical Comparisons of Recommendations in “Decision-making” between “Group 1” and “Group 2” Respondents

Recommendations in Decision-making	Group 1 ¹	Group 2 ²
	Frequency (Valid%)	Frequency (Valid%)
Education for local people on tourism	26 (<u>38.8</u>)	9 (<u>32.1</u>)
Arrangement of the right and willing person	8 (11.9)	5 (17.9)
Arrangement of meeting for further participation	13 (19.4)	5 (17.9)
Governmental authorities' support	14 (20.9)	6 (21.4)
Enhancement of PR	6 (9.0)	3 (10.7)
Total	67 (100.0)	28 (100.0)
Not Recommend	105	100
Total Respondents	172	128

Remarks

1: Group 1 = Homestay owners, local authorities and tourism service providers

2: Group 2 = Local residents

3: The underlined numbers showed the indicator with the highest percentage within a group

4.6.3 The Recommendation of the Ways that influence the Participation on “Problem Solving” for Sustainable Tourism Development

There were the different recommendations of the ways to influence the participation on problem solving between groups. The majority of respondents in Group 1 gave recommendation on arrangement of meeting for further participation. Its percentage was 35.5, most of them thought that this was the way to influence the participation. The majority of respondents in Group 2 recommend that arrangement of the right and willing person could influence the participation, at the percentage of 46.4. The latter important recommendation from Group 1 was arrangement of the right and willing person to work at the percentage of 32.3. Group 2 gave recommendation on enhancing public relation at the percentage of 25.0. The last important recommendation of Group 1 was enhancing public relation at percentage of 19.4. Group 2 recommend the arrangement of meeting at the percentage of 17.9 (table 4.31).

Table 4.31: Displaying the Statistical Comparisons of Recommendations in “Problem Solving” between “Group 1” and “Group 2” Respondents

Recommendations in Problem Solving	Group 1 ¹	Group 2 ²
	Frequency (Valid%)	Frequency (Valid%)
Education for local people on tourism	6 (9.7)	1 (3.6)
Arrangement of the right and willing person	20 (32.3)	13 (<u>46.4</u>)
Arrangement of meeting for further participation	22 (<u>35.5</u>)	5 (17.9)
Governmental authorities' support	2 (3.2)	2 (7.1)
Enhancement of PR	12 (19.4)	7 (25.0)
Total	62 (100.0)	28 (100.0)
Not Recommend	110	100
Total Respondents	172	128

Remarks

1: Group 1 = Homestay owners, local authorities and tourism service providers

2: Group 2 = Local residents

3: The underlined numbers showed the indicator with the highest percentage within a group

4.6.4 The Recommendation of the Ways that influence the Participation on “Implementation” for Sustainable Tourism Development

The majority of respondents in Group 1 gave recommendation on the ways that influence the participation on implementation. That was the enhancement of public relations. The percentage was 24.6 as the highest within group. The majority of respondents in Group 2 recommended the arrangement of the right and willing person to work and arrangement of meeting for further participation at the same percentage of 25.9. The next recommendation from Group 1 was arrangement of the right and willing person to work at the percentage of 21.1. Group 2 recommended the education to local people on tourism and enhancing public relation at the equal percentage of 18.5. The last important recommendation from group 1 was tourism education for local people, at the percentage of 15.8. Group 2 gave recommendation on governmental authorities’ support at the percentage of 11.1 (table 4.32).

Table 4.32: Displaying the Statistical Comparisons of Recommendations in “Implementation” between “Group 1” and “Group 2” Respondents

Recommendations in Implementation	Group 1 ¹	Group 2 ²
	Frequency (Valid %)	Frequency (Valid %)
Education for local people on tourism	9 (15.8)	5 (18.5)
Arrangement of the right and willing person	12 (21.1)	7 (<u>25.9</u>)
Arrangement of meeting for further participation	11 (19.3)	7 (<u>25.9</u>)
Governmental authorities’ support	11 (19.3)	3 (11.1)
Enhancement of PR	14 (<u>24.6</u>)	5 (18.5)
Total	57 (100.0)	27 (100.0)
Not Recommend	115	101
Total Respondents	172	128

Remarks

1: Group 1 = Homestay owners, local authorities and tourism service providers

2: Group 2 = Local residents

3: The underlined numbers showed the indicator with the highest percentage within a group

4.6.5 The Recommendation of the Ways that influence the Participation on “Evaluation” for Sustainable Tourism Development

The majority of respondents in both of Group 1 and Group 2 gave the same recommendation on the ways that influence participation on implementation. That was an arrangement of meeting for further participation. The percentages were 39.6 and 46.4 respectively. The next recommendation from Group 1 and Group 2 was education for local people on tourism. The percentages were 24.5 and 21.4 respectively. The last important recommendation from group 1 was enhancing public relation at the percentage of 13.2. Group 2 gave recommendation on enhancing public relations and governmental authorities' support at the equal percentage of 14.3 (table 4.33).

Table 4.33: Displaying the Statistical Comparisons of Recommendations in “Evaluation” between “Group 1” and “Group 2” Respondents

Recommendations in Evaluation	Group 1 ¹	Group 2 ²
	Frequency (Valid%)	Frequency (Valid%)
Education for local people on tourism	13 (24.5)	6 (21.4)
Arrangement of the right and willing person	6 (11.3)	1 (3.6)
Arrangement of meeting for further participation	21 (<u>39.6</u>)	13 (<u>46.4</u>)
Governmental authorities' support	6 (11.3)	4 (14.3)
Enhancement of PR	7 (13.2)	4 (14.3)
Total	53 (100.0)	28 (100.0)
Not Recommend	119	100
Total Respondents	172	128

Remarks

1: Group 1 = Homestay owners, local authorities and tourism service providers

2: Group 2 = Local residents

3: The underlined numbers showed the indicator with the highest percentage within a group

4.6.6 The Recommendation of the Ways that influence the Participation on “Investment and Benefits Gaining” for Sustainable Tourism Development

Group 1 and Group 2 had similar recommendations on the ways that could influence the community participation on investment and benefits gaining. The majority of respondents in both of Group 1 and Group 2 thought that was governmental authorities' support could influence them to participate. The percentages were 44.6 and 46.7 respectively. The next recommendation from Group 1 and Group 2 was arrangement of the right and willing person to work. The percentages were 23.2 and 26.7 respectively. The last important recommendation from Group 1 and Group 2 was tourism education for local people, at the percentage of 16.1 and 13.3 respectively (table 4.34).

Table 4.34: Displaying the Statistical Comparisons among Recommendations in “Investment and Benefits Gaining” between “Group 1” and “Group 2” Respondents

Recommendations in Investment and Benefit Gaining	Group 1 ¹	Group 2 ²
	Frequency (Valid%)	Frequency (Valid%)
Education for local people on tourism	9 (16.1)	4 (13.3)
Arrangement of the right and willing person	13 (23.2)	8 (26.7)
Arrangement of meeting for further participation	7 (12.5)	2 (6.7)
Governmental authorities' support	25 (<u>44.6</u>)	14 (<u>46.7</u>)
Enhancement of PR	2 (3.6)	2 (6.7)
Total	56 (100.0)	30 (100.0)
Not Recommend	116	98
Total Respondents	172	128

Remarks

- 1: Group 1 = Homestay owners, local authorities and tourism service providers
- 2: Group 2 = Local residents
- 3: The underlined numbers showed the indicator with the highest percentage within a group