

CHAPTER 4

Data Analysis and Research Findings

The primary objectives of this study are (1) to determine factors affecting the choice of low-cost airlines and full-service carriers and (2) to compare the behavior of ASEAN tourists, who travel by low-cost airlines and full-service airlines regarding choice of airline, expenditure, and length of stay.

4. Data Analysis and Research Findings

4.1. General Information and Travel Behavior of ASEAN Tourists

4.1.1. Socio-economic characteristics

Table 4.1 shows the socio-economic characteristics of the respondents. The proportions of the gender of the respondents who travel with low-cost airlines and full-service airlines are almost equal. The proportion gender of the respondents in low-cost airlines tourists ($n = 845$) is 50.7% female and 49.3 % male. The proportion of gender of the respondents in full-service airlines ($n = 1,579$) is 54.1% female and 45.9 % male. Most of the respondents aged between 26 to 35 years in both low-cost airlines and full-service airlines. In low-cost airlines, the age of the respondents ($n = 839$) is categorized into under 25 years (26.5%), 26-35 (42.9%), 36-45 (18.7%), 46-60 (9.9%), and over 60 (2%). In full-service airlines, the age of the respondents ($n = 1,577$) is categorized into under 25 years (10.9%), 26-35 (47.9%), 36-45 (28%), 46-60 (12.4%), and over 60 (0.8%). The average age of low-cost airlines tourist (age = 32 years) is less than those in full-service carriers tourist (age = 35 years). Most of the various marital status categories amongst respondents in low-cost airlines ($n = 841$) are married and a couple (54.7%); however, most of the marital status in full-service airlines' respondent ($n = 1,579$) are single (54.4%).

In term of respondents' religion, the majority of ASEAN tourist is Buddhist, representing 36.9 percent of total low-cost airline respondents and 56.4 percent

of full-service airlines respondents. Most of the respondents' educational level is Bachelor degree, which is 52.5% in low-cost airlines and 80.5% in full-service airlines. In term of the country of residence, the proportions of the respondents are distributed evenly because of quota sampling in this study, excepting the respondent of Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar, and the Philippines in low-cost airlines due to lack of information. However, Most of the respondents' residence who travels with low-cost airlines is Indonesian (35.7%), and most of the respondents' residence who travels with full-service airlines are Filipinos (25.6%).

Within the respondents, there are 11 primary classifications of occupation including (1) professional; (2) administrative and managerial; (3) clerical, salesperson, and commercial personnel; (4) laborer (5) agricultural worker; (6) government and military personnel; (7) housewife; (8) student; (9) retired; (10) other occupation; (11) business owner. Most of the respondents' main occupation in low-cost airlines are administrative and managerial (25.5%), professional (25%), clerical, salesperson, and commercial personnel (20.6%). Most of the respondents' primary occupation in full-service airlines are clerical, salesperson, and commercial personnel (33.5%), professional (20.3%), and administrative and managerial (18.3%).

The personal income per year of the respondents in low-cost airlines (n = 846) is categorized into under 5,000 US dollars (23.8%), 5,001-10,000 US dollars (15.2%), 10,001-25,000 US dollars (28%), 25,001-50,000 US dollars (15.1%), 50,001-100,000 US dollars (5.1%), 100,001-200,000 US dollars (1.1%) and over 200,000 US dollars (11.7%). Most of respondents' personal income in low-cost airlines is in range of 10,001 to 25,000 US dollars, representing 28 percent. The personal income per year of the respondents in full-service airlines (n = 1,577) is categorized into under 5,000 US dollars (11.4%), 5,001-10,000 US dollars (35.5%), 10,001-25,000 US dollars (40.3%), 25,001-50,000 US dollars (6.7%), 50,001-100,000 US dollars (3.4%), 100,001-200,000 US dollars (1.2%) and over 200,000 US dollars (1.5%). Within respondents' full-service airlines, the highest proportion personal income is in range of 10,001-25,000 US dollars, representing 40.3 percent. The average family income per year in low-cost airlines respondents (income = 24,632 US dollars) is more than those in full-service airlines respondents (income = 20,475 US dollars).

The family income per year of the respondents in low-cost airlines (n = 776) is categorized into under 10,000 US dollars (32.1%), 10,001-25,000 US dollars (21%), 25,001-50,000 US dollars (29.3%), 50,001-100,000 US dollars (10.6%), 100,001-200,000 US dollars (5.5%), 200,001-400,000 US dollars (0.8%) and over 400,000 US dollars (0.8%). Due to sample size in low-cost airlines, most of respondents' family income in low-cost airlines is less than 10,000 US dollars, representing 32.1 percent. The family income per year of the respondents in full-service airlines (n = 1,577) is categorized into under 10,000 US dollars (7.6%), 10,001-25,000 US dollars (35.3%), 25,001-50,000 US dollars (46.9%), 50,001-100,000 US dollars (5.3%), 100,001-200,000 US dollars (3.6%), 200,001-400,000 US dollars (0.6%) and over 400,000 US dollars (0.3%). Within respondents' full-service airlines, the highest proportion family income is in range of 25,001-50,000 US dollars, representing 46.9 percent. The average family income per year in low-cost airlines respondents (income = 37,827 US dollars) is less than those in full-service airlines respondents (income = 41,210 US dollars).

Table 4.1: Socio-economic characteristics of ASEAN tourists traveling by air

Personal information	Low-cost airlines tourist		Full-service airlines tourist	
	N	%	N	%
1. Gender				
- Female	428	50.7	854	54.1
- Male	417	49.3	725	45.9
Total	845	100.0	1,579	100.0
2. Age (years)				
- Under 25	222	26.5	172	10.9
- 26 - 35	360	42.9	756	47.9
- 36 - 45	157	18.7	441	28.0
- 46 - 60	83	9.9	195	12.4
- Over 60	17	2.0	13	0.8
- Total	839	100.0	1,577	100.0
Average age (years)	32		35	
3. Marital status				
- Married/ Couple	460	54.7	699	44.3
- Single	365	43.4	859	54.4
- Divorced/ Widowed	16	1.9	21	1.3
Total	841	100.0	1,579	100.0

Table 4.1: Socio-economic characteristics of ASEAN tourists traveling by air

Personal information	Low-cost airlines tourist		Full-service airlines tourist	
	N	%	N	
4. Religion				
- Buddhist	308	36.2	891	56.4
- Christian	175	21.0	562	35.6
- Muslim	273	32.7	118	7.5
- Other	79	1.9	8	0.5
Total	835	100.0	1,579	100.0
5. Highest education completed				
- Primary education or less	11	1.3	3	0.2
- Secondary education/ High school	127	15.2	50	3.2
- Bachelor	438	52.5	1,268	80.5
- Graduate or more	237	28.4	253	16.1
- Other	22	2.6	2	0.1
Total	835	100.0	1,576	100.0
6. Country of residence				
- Cambodia	1	0.1	209	13.2
- Indonesia	297	35.7	98	6.2
- Laos	2	0.2	90	5.7
- Myanmar	1	0.1	378	23.9
- Malaysia	156	18.4	41	2.6
- Philippines	1	0.1	405	25.6
- Singapore	207	24.5	170	10.8
- Vietnam	181	21.4	188	11.9
Total	846	100.0	1,579	100.0
7. Main occupation				
- Professional	211	25.0	320	20.3
- Administrative and managerial	215	25.5	288	18.3
- Clerical, Salesperson, Commercial personnel	174	20.6	528	33.5
- Laborer	11	1.3	10	0.6
- Agricultural workers	8	1.0	9	0.6
- Government and Military personnel	36	4.3	98	6.2
- Housewife	46	5.5	63	4.0
- Student	87	10.3	136	8.6
- Retired	18	2.1	23	1.5
- Other	23	2.7	29	1.8

Table 4.1: Socio-economic characteristics of ASEAN tourists traveling by air

Personal information	Low-cost airlines tourist		Full-service airlines tourist	
	N	%	N	
- Business owner	15	1.8	73	4.6
Total	844	100.0	1,577	100.0
8. Personal income per year (USD)				
- Under 5,000	201	23.8	180	11.4
- 5,001-10,000	129	15.2	561	35.5
- 10,001-25,000	237	28.0	636	40.3
- 25,001-50,000	128	15.1	106	6.7
- 50,001-100,000	43	5.1	53	3.4
- 100,001-200,000	9	1.1	19	1.2
- Over 200,000	99	11.7	24	1.5
Total	846	100.0	1,579	100.0
Average income (USD)	24,632		20,475	
9. Family income per year (USD)				
- Under 10,000	249	32.1	120	7.6
- 10,001-25,000	163	21.0	564	35.3
- 25,001-50,000	227	29.3	739	46.9
- 50,001-100,000	82	10.6	83	5.3
- 100,001-200,000	43	5.5	56	3.6
- 200,001-400,000	6	0.8	10	0.6
- Over 400,000	6	0.8	5	0.3
Total	776	100.0	1,577	100.0
Average income (USD)	37,827		41,210	

Source: Survey data from Public Policy Studies Institute Foundation and Faculty of Economics, Chiang Mai University (2015)

4.1.2. Travel behavior

The travel behavior of ASEAN tourists is presented in table 4.2. During the last five years, most of ASEAN respondents both in low-cost airlines and full-service airlines travel to abroad 3 times per year (24.5% of low-cost airlines respondents and 36 % of full-service airlines respondents), followed by 2 times per year (23.9% of low-cost airlines respondents and 24.6 % of full-service airlines respondents). The average time per year of international travel is 3.54 times in low-cost airlines respondents and 3.30 time in full-service airlines respondents. In term of travel in AEC member countries, most of ASEAN respondents in low-cost airlines travel to AEC member countries one

time per year (30.3%), followed by two times per year (30.1%). Most of full-service airlines respondents travel to AEC member countries two times per year (43.9%) and followed by three times per year (25.4%). The average times per year of AEC travel are 2.59 times in low-cost airlines respondents and 2.57 times in full-service airlines respondents.

In term of domestic travel, both in low-cost airlines and full-service airlines respondents travel domestically two times (23.9% of low-cost airlines respondents and 28.5% of full-service respondents), followed by three times (22.4% of low-cost airlines respondents and 20.6% of full-service airlines respondents). The average times per year of domestic travel are 3.32 times in low-cost airlines respondents and 3.37 times in full-service airlines respondents.

61.4% of low-cost airlines respondents and 90% of full-service airlines respondents have been traveling to Thailand. The average times that respondents visited Thailand in 2013 are 2.24 times in low-cost airlines respondents and 1.87 times in full-service airlines respondents. The average times that respondents planned to visit Thailand in 2014 are 1.96 times in low-cost airlines respondents and 1.37 times in full-service airlines respondents. The average time of low-cost airlines respondents plan to visit Thailand in 2014 is more than those of full-service airlines respondents plan to visit Thailand in 2014.

Table 4.2: Travel behavior of ASEAN tourists traveling by air

Travel information	Low-cost airlines tourist		Full-service airlines tourist	
	N	%	N	%
1. Average times per year tourists travel internationally (time(s))				
- 1	139	16.7	85	5.4
- 2	199	23.9	389	24.6
- 3	204	24.5	569	36.0
- 4	108	13.0	309	19.6
- 5	127	15.3	150	9.5
- More than 5	55	6.6	77	4.9
Total	832	100.0	1,579	100.0
Average (times)	3.54		3.30	

Table 4.2: Travel behavior of ASEAN tourists traveling by air

Travel information	Low-cost airlines tourist		Full-service airlines tourist	
	N	%	N	%
2. Average times per year tourists travel AEC (time(s))				
- 1	245	30.3	250	15.8
- 2	243	30.1	693	43.9
- 3	156	19.3	401	25.4
- 4	66	8.2	150	9.5
- 5	73	9.0	42	2.7
- More than 5	25	3.1	43	2.7
Total	808	100.0	1,579	100.0
Average (times)	2.59		2.57	
3. Average times per year tourists travel domestically (time(s))				
- 1	143	19.3	193	12.3
- 2	177	23.9	446	28.5
- 3	166	22.4	322	20.6
- 4	99	13.3	202	12.9
- 5	114	15.4	285	18.2
- More than 5	43	5.8	115	7.4
Total	742	100.0	1,563	100.0
Average (times)	3.32		3.37	
4. The proportion of first trip to Thailand (Percentage)				
- No	519	61.4	1,421	90.0
- Yes	326	38.6	158	10.0
Total	845	100.0	1,563	100.0
5. Average times that tourists visited Thailand in 2013 (time(s))				
		2.24		1.87
6. Average times that tourists plan to visit Thailand in 2014 (time(s))				
		1.96		1.37

Source: Survey data from Public Policy Studies Institute Foundation and Faculty of Economics, Chiang Mai University (2015)

4.1.3. Travel behavior of ASEAN tourist on this trip

Table 4.3 shows the travel behavior of ASEAN tourists on this trip. The most frequent source of decision-making categories amongst low-cost airlines respondents are friends (24.6%) and medial social application (13.8%). Therefore, friends and medial social application (such as Facebook and Instagram) can be used to promote ASEAN tourism in term of low-cost airlines tourist. Within full-service airlines re-

spondents, the most proportion of source of decision-making are friends (15.9%) and relatives (15.5%), so friends and relatives can be used to promote ASEAN tourism in term of full-service airlines tourist. As table 4.3 indicates that guidebook, the posters, brochures, and TV have a small proportion of source of decision-making amongst low-cost airlines respondents, and Tourism Authority of Thailand website and tourist agency have a small proportion of source of decision-making for full-service airlines respondents.

This study emphasizes ASEAN tourists who are traveling by air. The majority of respondents fly with full-service airlines (such as Thai Airways, Singapore Airlines), representing 65.1 percent ($n = 1,579$), and other respondents fly with low-cost airlines (such as Air Asia and Lion Air), representing 34.9 percent ($n = 846$). In term of arrival and departure port, a significant proportion of low-cost airlines respondents travel through Don Mueang international airport, representing 65.1% of arriving passengers and 66.1% of departing passengers. Don Mueang international airport is the airlines' hub for many low-cost carriers. Within full-service airlines respondents, Suvarnabhumi airport has the highest proportion of respondents both in arrival and in departure port, representing 95.9% of arriving passengers and 96.4% of departing passengers. Suvarnabhumi airport is Bangkok's main airport and the airline's hub for many airlines especially full-service airlines. In term of length of stay, low-cost airlines respondents stayed 4.10 nights on average, and full-service airlines respondents stayed 3.87 nights on average.

By classifying the destinations on this trip, all respondents in low-cost airlines and full-service airlines have a single destination. It indicates that ASEAN tourist visit only in Thailand.

There are seven primary purposes of this trip including (1) vacation; (2) visiting family and friends; (3) health checking and surgery; (4) honeymoon; (5) study trip and education, and (6) another purpose. Within low-cost airlines respondents, approximately three-quarters of main purposes are a vacation (84.6%) and followed by health checking and surgery (6.1%). The most frequent primary purposes of full-service airlines respondents are a vacation (77.5%) and followed by health checking and surgery (9.4%). Thailand is the leading destination for a vacation.

Trip descriptions are categorized as follows: backpack, budget travel, regular travel, and luxury travel. The highest proportion of trip description is regular travel within both in low-cost airlines respondents (59.5%) and full-service airlines respondents (86.1%).

The information of fellow travel within the low-cost airline's respondents indicates that the most ASEAN tourists are traveling with a fellow traveler, representing 86.2 of respondents. Of the type of fellow traveler in the respondents, 40.9 percent of tourists are traveling with friends, and 33.4 percent of tourists are traveling with family and relatives. The proportion of children on this trip is 65.6 percent. Within full-service airlines respondents, the highest proportion of fellow travel information is traveling with friends (45.5%). The most fellow traveler are friends (45.5%) followed by family and relatives (35.1%). The proportion of children on this trip is 34.4 percent of full-service airlines respondents. The average number of fellow traveler is 4.5 person for low-cost airlines tourist and 2.8 people for full-service airlines tourist.

The ASEAN tourists travel to the 1-2 destination(s) in Thailand. Bangkok is a trendy destination for tourist respondents who are traveling with low-cost airlines and full-service airlines.

Among low-cost airlines respondents, the most frequent of favorite vacation activities on this trip are shopping (28.1%), sightseeing/ excursion (20.7%), and spa/ massage (15.4%). Within full-service airlines respondents, the most frequent of favorite vacation activities are sun/ sand/ sea activities (26.2%), shopping (25.6%), and sightseeing/ excursion (18.4%). Shopping as a factor that can be used to promote Thailand tourism.

Within ASEAN tourist respondents, most of them are comfortable while traveling in Thailand. However, 21.9 percent of low-cost airlines respondents and 13.2 percent of full-service airlines respondents have encountered problems. The highest proportion of problems encountered is cheating (32.3%) within low-cost airlines respondents, and violence (30.5%) and traffic accidents (30.5%) within regular airlines tourist respondents.

Table 4.3: Travel behavior of ASEAN tourist traveling by air on this trip

Travel information	Low-cost airlines tourist		Full-service airlines tourist	
	N	%	N	%
A. Source of decision-making*				
- Tourist agency	151	9.1	188	5.3
- Friends	409	24.6	569	15.9
- Relatives	140	8.4	556	15.5
- Guidebook	71	4.3	239	6.7
- Travel magazines	129	7.8	390	10.9
- TAT website	132	7.9	137	3.8
- Other website	131	7.9	412	11.5
- Posters/ Brochures/ TV	88	5.3	408	11.4
- Social medial application	230	13.8	358	10.0
- Already know Thailand	180	10.8	320	8.9
B. Travel information on this trip				
1. Arrival port				
- Suvarnabhumi Airport	139	16.4	1,514	95.9
- Don Mueang International Air- port	551	65.1	0	0.0
- Chiang Mai International Air- port	18	2.1	5	0.3
- Phuket International Airport	135	16.0	58	3.7
- Other	2	0.4	2	0.1
Total	846	100.0	1,579	100.0
2. Departure port				
- Suvarnabhumi Airport	139	16.4	1,521	96.4
- Don Mueang International Air- port	559	66.1	0	0.0
- Chiang Mai International Air- port	14	1.7	5	0.3
- Phuket International Airport	134	15.8	50	3.2
- Other	0	0.0	1	0.1
Total	846	100.0	1,577	100.0
3. Length of stay (nights)	4.10		3.87	
4. Destination				
- Single destination	846	100.0	1,579	100.0
C. The main purpose of this trip				
- Vacation	716	84.6	1,224	77.5
- Visit family and friend(s)	34	4.0	38	2.4
- Health check/surgery	52	6.1	149	9.4
- Honeymoon	24	2.8	27	1.7

Table 4.3: Travel behavior of ASEAN tourist traveling by air on this trip

Travel information	Low-cost airlines tourist		Full-service airlines tourist	
	N	%	%	N
- Study trip/education	7	0.8	122	7.7
- Shopping	13	1.5	19	1.2
- Other	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	846	100.0	1,579	100.0
D. Trip description				
- Backpack	90	10.6	14	0.9
- Budget travel	215	25.4	189	12.0
- Regular travel	504	59.5	1,359	86.1
- Luxury travel	37	4.4	17	1.1
Total	846	100.0	1579	100.0
E. Fellow traveler information				
- Travel alone	117	13.8	298	18.9
- Fellow traveler	729	86.2	1,281	81.0
1. Partner	132	18.0	208	15.6
2. Friends	300	40.9	606	45.5
3. Business partners/ Colleagues	52	7.1	49	3.7
4. Family and/ or relatives	245	33.4	468	35.1
- The proportion of children (%)	65.6		34.4	
5. Other	4	0.5	2	0.2
- Number of fellow traveler (average)	4.5	Person	2.8	Person
Total	846	100.0	1,579	100.0
F. Travel information in Thailand				
1. Number of destination	1.6	Places	1.4	Places
2. Destination name				
- Bangkok	1,099		946	
- Chonburi	114		320	
- Phuket	347		129	
- Krabi	241		177	
- Prachuap Khiri Khan	86		108	
- Surat Thani	20		103	
- Chiang Mai	65		57	
- Rayong	39		48	
- Trat	13		34	
- Petchaburi	6		31	

Table 4.3: Travel behavior of ASEAN tourist traveling by air on this trip

Travel information	Low-cost airlines tourist		Full-service airlines tourist	
	N	%	%	N
G. Favorite vacation activities on this trip*				
- Shopping	558	28.1	829	25.6
- Sight-seeing/ Excursion	412	20.7	596	18.4
- Spa/ Massage	306	15.4	354	10.9
- Nightlife	265	13.3	315	9.7
- Sun/ Sand/ Sea activities	242	12.2	846	26.2
- Adventurous	114	5.7	85	2.6
- Others	46	2.3	157	4.9
- Thai boxing	23	1.2	37	1.1
- Other sport	20	1.0	16	0.5
H. Uncomfortable situation while in Thailand				
- No problems encountered	661	78.1	1,370	86.8
- Problems encountered	185	21.9	209	13.2
- Traffic accidents	35	16.1	87	30.5
- Cheated	57	26.3	33	11.6
- Violence	14	6.5	87	30.5
- Lost/ Misplaced belongings	24	11.1	41	14.4
- Theft	24	11.1	19	6.7
- Gastric problems	17	7.8	12	4.2
- Others	46	21.2	6	2.1
Total	846	100.0	1,579	100.0

Note: * More than one answer possible

Source: Survey data from Public Policy Studies Institute Foundation and Faculty of Economics, Chiang Mai University (2015)

Copyright© by Chiang Mai University
All rights reserved

4.1.4. Travel information for ASEAN and Thailand

4.1.4.1. Favorite cities in ASEAN countries

Table 4.4 shows the favorite cities in ASEAN countries. Within low-cost airlines respondents, the favorite cities are Singapore (25.5%), Bangkok (15.3%), Chonburi (6.2%), Phuket (5.7%) and Kuala Lumpur (4.8%). Within full-service airlines respondents; however, favorite cities are categorized as follows: Bangkok (15.7%), Singapore (13.8%), Kuala Lumpur (5.4%), Phuket (2.6%) and Chonburi (1.2%). As tables 4.4, cities in Thailand are the most attractive destination for ASEAN tourists.

Table 4.4: Favorite cities in ASEAN countries

City	Low-cost airlines tourist			Full-service airlines tourist		
	N	%	No.	N	%	No.
Singapore (Singapore)	657	25.5	1	356	13.8	2
Bangkok (Thailand)	394	15.3	2	406	15.7	1
Kuala Lumpur (Malaysia)	123	4.8	5	140	5.4	3
Phuket (Thailand)	146	5.7	4	68	2.6	4
Chonburi (Thailand)	161	6.2	3	32	1.2	5

Source: Survey data from Public Policy Studies Institute Foundation and Faculty of Economics, Chiang Mai University (2015)

4.1.4.2. Tourism preference

Table 4.5 shows the tourism preference. There are five levels of influence as follows: (1) no influence (zero points), (2) low influence (one points), (3) medium influence (two points), (4) high influence (three points), and (5) very high influence (four points). The items influence of low-cost airlines respondents on the decision to travel to Thailand are shopping (3.41), followed by helpful and friendly people (3.24), massage and spa (3.14), sun sand sea (3.02), overall safety (2.88), other natural attractions (2.77), weather (2.73), quality of accommodation (2.70), availability of medical service (2.67), food (2.59), reasonable prices (2.58), overall cleanliness (2.56), no visa requirement (2.54), convenient for international transportation and communication (2.44), nightlife (2.41), convenient for domestic transportation and communication (2.15), low cost airfares (1.93), festivals (1.79), other cultural attractions (1.70), religion relation (1.40), and world heritage sites (1.29).

While the items influence of full-service airlines respondents are shopping (3.1), followed by helpful and friendly people (2.87), overall safety (2.86), low cost airfares (2.83), reasonable prices (2.83), food (2.79), convenient for international transportation and communication (2.74), massage and spa (2.71), quality of accommodation (2.69), overall cleanliness (2.66), convenient for domestic transportation and communication (2.62), nightlife (2.55), no visa requirement (2.55), other natural attractions (2.49), other cultural attractions (2.38), sun sand sea (2.29), festivals (2.27), world heritage sites (2.23), availability of medical service (2.23), weather (2.18), and religion relation (2.08).

To summarise, shopping is the first rank preference for both types of tourists in Thailand.

Table 4.5: The items influence of ASEAN tourists on the decision to travel to Thailand

Tourism preference	Level of preference	
	Low-cost airlines tourist	Full-service airlines tourist
1. Sun sand sea	3.02	2.29
2. Weather	2.73	2.18
3. Other natural attractions	2.77	2.49
4. World heritage sites	1.29	2.23
5. Festivals	1.79	2.27
6. Other cultural attractions	1.70	2.38
7. Food	2.59	2.79
8. Nightlife	2.41	2.55
9. Shopping	3.41	3.10
10. Massage/spa	3.14	2.71
11. Nice and friendly people	3.24	2.87
12. Quality of accommodation	2.70	2.69
13. Overall cleanliness	2.56	2.66
14. Overall safety	2.88	2.86
15. Convenient for "international" transportation/communication	2.44	2.74
16. Convenient for "domestic" transportation/communication	2.15	2.62
17. Low cost airfares	1.93	2.85
18. Reasonable prices	2.58	2.83
19. Religion relation	1.40	2.08
20. Availability of medical services	2.67	2.23

Table 4.5: The items influence of ASEAN tourists on the decision to travel to Thailand

Tourism preference	Level of preference	
	Low-cost airlines tourist	Full-service airlines tourist
21. No visa requirement	2.67	2.23

Source: Survey data from Public Policy Studies Institute Foundation and Faculty of Economics, Chiang Mai University (2015)

4.1.4.3. Substitute destination for Thailand of ASEAN tourists

Table 4.6 shows substitute destinations for Thailand of ASEAN tourists. Within ASEAN respondents who fly with low-cost airlines, the substitute destinations for Thailand of ASEAN respondents (n = 842) are Hong Kong (26.6%), followed by Singapore (21.1%), Malaysia (12.2%), China (8.3%), and the Philippines (7.4%). Within full-service airlines respondents (n = 1,579), the substitute destinations for Thailand of ASEAN respondents are Singapore (25.0%), followed by Malaysia (25%), Hong Kong (18.4%), Vietnam (10.6%), and Lao (8.7%). As table 2.6, ASEAN member countries are top-rated for an substitute destination, so regional tourism can be promoted as a single tourism destination.

Table 4.6: Substitute destination for Thailand of ASEAN tourists

Country	Low-cost airlines tourist		Full-service airlines tourist	
	N	%	N	%
1. Brunei	13	1.5	4	0.3
2. Cambodia	30	3.6	19	1.2
3. China	70	8.3	95	6.0
4. Hong Kong	224	26.6	291	18.4
5. India	13	1.5	9	0.6
6. Lao	13	1.5	137	8.7
7. Myanmar	33	3.9	46	2.9
8. Malaysia	103	12.2	300	19.0
9. Philippines	62	7.4	45	2.8
10. Singapore	178	21.1	394	25.0
11. Vietnam	58	6.9	167	10.6
12. Others	45	5.3	72	4.6
Total	842	100.0	1,579	100.0

Source: Survey data from Public Policy Studies Institute Foundation and Faculty of Economics, Chiang Mai University (2015)

4.1.4.4. The decision when encountering political unrest in Thailand

Table 4.7 shows the decision when encountering political unrest in Thailand. The proportion of coming to Thailand for low-cost airlines respondents (38%) is very close to those of postponing the trip for low-cost airlines respondents (37.8%). Within full-service airlines respondents, they will postpone the trip when encountering political unrest, representing 49.7 percent. To summarize; however, full-service airlines respondents is more politically sensitive than low-cost airlines respondents.

Table 4.7: The decision of ASEAN tourists when encountering political unrest in Thailand

Decision	Low-cost airlines tourist		Full-service airlines tourist	
	N	%	N	%
1. Come to Thailand	321	38.0	450	28.5
2. Postpone the trip	319	37.8	784	49.7
3. Cancel the trip	205	24.3	344	21.8
Total	845	100.0	1,578	100.0

Source: Survey data from Public Policy Studies Institute Foundation and Faculty of Economics, Chiang Mai University (2015)

4.1.5. Travel expenditure of ASEAN

Table 4.8 shows the travel expenditure of ASEAN tourists. The average total expenditure per trip of respondents to Thailand is approximately 3,167.08 US dollars for low-cost airlines respondents (n = 705) and 1,538.27 US dollars for full-service airlines respondents (n = 879). The average total expenditure per person in low-cost airlines respondents (expense = 1,951.79 US dollars) is more than those in full-service airlines respondents (expense=1,017.62 US dollars), so the average total expenditure per person/ day in low-cost airlines respondents (expense = 578.51 US dollars) is more than those in full-service airlines respondents (expense = 294.72 US dollars).

In term of group tourists, the average travel agency service fee per person is approximately 283.72 US dollars for low-cost airlines respondents and approximately 213.28 US dollars for full-service airlines respondents. It indicates that low-cost airlines respondents spend on cost of international transportation per person more than full-

service airlines respondents. The low-cost airline's respondents stay 3.42 nights on average; however, full-service airlines respondents stay 2.81 nights on average in Thailand.

In term of individual tourist, the average cost of international transportation per person is approximately 517.99 US dollars for low-cost airlines respondents and approximately 294.72 US dollars for full-service airlines respondents. It indicates that low-cost airline respondents spend on cost of international transportation per person more than full-service airlines respondents.

Regarding low cost airlines respondents in term of the expenditure while traveling in Thailand, other significant expenditure (1,404.17 US dollars) is the most significant expenditure item, followed by local product (209.36 US dollars), accommodation (177.68 US dollars), food and beverage (131.52 US dollars), local transportation (130.66 US dollars), international brand-name (127.65 US dollars), and entertainment and entrance fee (79.42 US dollars). Within full-service airlines respondent, local product (740.06 dollars) is the most significant expenditure item, followed by other relevant expenditure (535.98 US dollars), international brand-name (242.24 US dollars), accommodation (123.28 US dollars), food and beverage (85.7 US dollars), entertainment and entrance fee (71.56 US dollars), and local transportation (51.39 US dollars). The total expenditure for this entire trip (exclude international transportation cost and package tour) is approximately 1,504.32 US dollars for low-cost airlines respondents and approximately 728.84 US dollars for full-service airlines respondents.

ลิขสิทธิ์มหาวิทยาลัยเชียงใหม่
Copyright© by Chiang Mai University
All rights reserved

Table 4.8: Travel expenditure of ASEAN tourists traveling by air

Expenditure	Low-cost airlines tourist		Full-service airlines tourist	
	N	Expenses (USD)	N	Expenses (USD)
1. Average total expense		3,167.08		1,538.27
- Number of traveler (per trip)	705		879	
2. Average total expense (per person)		1,951.79		1,017.62
3. Average total expense (per person/per day)		578.51		294.72
4. Cost of international transportation for group tourists				
- Average travel agency service fee (per person)		283.72		213.28
- Number of night(s) in the package tour		3.42		2.81
5. Cost of international transportation for individual tourists				
- Cost of international transportation (per person)		517.99		294.72
6. Expenditure while traveling in Thailand				
- Local transportation		130.66		51.39
- Accommodation		177.68		123.28
- Food and beverage		131.52		85.70
- Local product		209.36		740.06
- Food	1575		54	
- Garment (s)	199		25	
- Handicraft (s)	95		27	
- Other	32		4	
- International brand-named		127.65		242.24
- Entertainment/ entrance fee		79.42		71.56
- Other important expenditure		1,404.17		535.98
- Total expenses for this entire trip (exclude international transportation cost and pack- age tour)		1,504.32		728.84

Source: Survey data from Public Policy Studies Institute Foundation and Faculty of Economics, Chiang Mai University (2015)

4.1.6. The information of accommodation, food and beverage, and flight reservation

Table 4.9 presents information on accommodation, food and beverage, and flight reservations. Based on the type of accommodation, the respondents have a higher proportion of hotel, representing 77.1 percent of low-cost airlines respondents and 67.7 percent of full-service airlines respondents.

Among low-cost airlines respondents, the highest proportion of the type of food and beverage service is restaurant, café, and bar, representing 47.6% of respondents. The most frequent type of food and beverage service categories amongst full-service airlines tourist respondents is food shop, representing 66.4%.

Most ASEAN respondents make the flight reservation directly with the airline (website/ phone), representing 61.9 percent of low-cost airlines respondents and 67.4 percent of full-service airlines respondents.

The most common accommodation reservation amongst all respondents is directly contacting the accommodation by website and phone, representing 38.4 percent of low-cost airlines respondents and 43.2 percent of full-service airlines respondents.

Table 4.9: The information of accommodation, food and beverage, and flight reservation

Travel information	Low-cost airlines tourist		Full-service airlines tourist	
	N	%	N	%
1. Type of accommodation*				
- Hotel	690	77.1	1,207	67.7
- Guest house	84	9.4	381	21.4
- Homestay	16	1.8	56	3.1
- Service apartment	27	3.0	12	0.7
- Rented house/ condo	18	2.0	2	0.1
- Own rented house/ condo	7	0.8	0	0.0
- Friend/ relatives' house	42	4.7	96	5.4
- Other	11	1.2	30	1.7
2. Type of food and beverage service				
- Restaurant/ cafe/ bar	401	47.6	397	25.2
- Food shop	170	20.2	1,047	66.4
- Supermarket	72	8.6	27	1.8
- Street food	195	23.2	103	6.7
- Other	4	0.4	3	0.1
Total	842	100.0	1,577	100.0
3. Flight reservation to Thailand*				
- Offline travel agency	81	11.0	87	5.7
- Online travel agency (tour operator/search engine)	161	21.9	213	13.7
- At the airport	35	4.8	198	12.8
- Direct with the airline (website/phone)	455	61.9	1,046	67.4
- Other	3	0.4	7	0.4
Total	735	100.0	1,551	100.0
4. Accommodation reservation				
- Offline travel agency	69	9.1	63	4.0
- Online travel agency (tour operator/search engine)	258	33.9	406	25.7
- Walk-in	103	13.5	358	22.6
- Direct with the accommodation (website/phone)	292	38.4	683	43.2
- Other	39	5.1	72	4.6

Note: *More than one answer possible

Source: Survey data from Public Policy Studies Institute Foundation and Faculty of Economics, Chiang Mai University (2015)

4.2. The Behavior of ASEAN Tourists, Who Travel by Low-Cost Airlines and Full-Service Airlines in Terms of Choice of Airline, Expenditure, and Length of Stay

Table 4.10 presents a probit model employed to analyze the choice of airline. In terms of socio-economic characteristics and travel information, the parameter estimated coefficient for highly educated respondents, married respondents, Christian respondents, residents in Indonesia, residents in Malaysia, residents in Singapore, residents in Vietnam, highly family income respondents, first time respondents, individual respondents, respondents whose primary purpose is vacation, and respondents whose primary purpose is honeymoon show a significantly influence on choice of airline.

The finding indicates that socio-economic characteristics variables and travel information variables are the significant determinants of choice of airline. Regarding to country of residence, a one-unit increase (decrease) in residents in Indonesia will produce a 0.918 increase (decrease) in the probability of traveling with low-cost airlines. The marginal effect of residents in Malaysia on choice of airlines is a one-unit increase (decrease) in residents in Malaysia will produce a 0.912 increase (decrease) in the probability of traveling with low-cost airlines. While a one-unit increase (decrease) in residents in Singapore will produce a 0.872 increase (decrease) in the probability of traveling with low-cost airlines, and a one-unit increase (decrease) in residents in Vietnam will produce a 0.744 increase (decrease) in the probability of traveling with low-cost airlines. In term of first time tourists, a one-unit increase (decrease) in respondents who travel to Thailand for the first time will produce a 0.152 increase (decrease) in the probability of low-cost airlines.

On the other hand, a one-unit increase (decrease) in highly family income respondents will produce a 0.041 decrease (increase) in the probability of low-cost airlines. Regarding to purpose of trip, a one-unit increase (decrease) in respondents whose primary purpose is vacation will produce a 0.073 decrease (increase) in the probability of traveling with low-cost airlines while a one-unit increase (decrease) in respondents whose primary purpose is honeymoon will produce a 0.106 decrease (increase) in the probability of traveling with low-cost airlines. In term of marital status, a one-unit in-

crease (decrease) in married respondents will produce a 0.084 decrease (increase) in the probability of traveling with low-cost airlines. Regarding to religion, a one-unit increase (decrease) in Christian respondents will produce a 0.084 decrease (increase) in the probability of traveling with low-cost airlines. Regarding to size of traveling party, a one-unit increase (decrease) in individual respondents will produce a 0.188 decrease (increase) in the probability of traveling with low-cost airlines. In term of education level, a one-unit increase (decrease) in undergraduate degree and above will produce a 0.308 decrease (increase) in the probability of traveling with low-cost airlines.

Table 4.10: Probit model estimated coefficient for low-cost airlines function

Models:	Model 1 All variables			Model 2 Significant variables		
	Coefficient	p-value	Marginal effect (%)	Coefficient	p-value	Marginal effect (%)
Dependent variable: <i>Low-cost airlines</i>						
Independent variables						
Gender	-0.043	0.612	-0.009			
Age	-0.065	0.259	-0.001			
Undergraduate and above	-1.059	0.000	-0.338	-1.080	0.000***	-0.308
Status: Single	-0.153	0.642	-0.034			
Status: Married	-0.552	0.084	-0.123	-0.467	0.000***	-0.084
Religion: Buddhist	-0.112	0.329	-0.024			
Religion: Christian	-0.338	0.005	-0.071	-0.265	0.007***	-0.084
White-collar worker	0.056	0.637	-0.012			
Country: Cambodia	(omitted)					
Country: Indonesia	3.113	0.000	0.879	3.491	0.000***	0.918
Country: Myanmar	-0.332	0.488	-0.066			
Country: Malaysia	3.164	0.000	0.874	3.517	0.000***	0.912
Country: Philippines	-0.275	0.591	-0.056			
Country: Singapore	2.771	0.000	0.828	3.110	0.000***	0.872
Country: Vietnam	2.093	0.000	0.676	2.440	0.000***	0.744
Family income	-0.233	0.000	-0.052	-0.232	0.000***	-0.041
First time	0.685	0.000	0.166	0.665	0.000***	0.152
Individual tourist	-0.714	0.000	-0.212	-0.730	0.000***	-0.188
Purpose: vacation	-0.685	0.072	-0.187	-0.359	0.003***	-0.073
Purpose: honeymoon	-0.269	0.534	-0.523	-1.153	0.000***	-0.106
Purpose: visit family	-0.527	0.197	-0.091			

Table 4.10: Probit model estimated coefficient for low-cost airlines function

Models:	Model 1 All variables			Model 2 Significant variables		
	Coefficient	<i>p</i> -value	Marginal effect (%)	Coefficient	<i>p</i> -value	Marginal effect (%)
Purpose: study	-0.115	0.812	-0.024			
Purpose: health check	-1.435	0.002	-0.151			
Constant	2.801	0.000		1.665	0.001	
LR Chi ²	1,398.53			1,564.39		
Prob>chi ²	0.000			0.000		
Log likelihood	-622.619			-630.862		
Pseudo R ²	0.529			0.553		
N	2,056			2,273		

Note: *, ** and *** indicate significance at the 0.1, 0.05 and 0.01 levels, respectively.

The expenditure function is estimated using Tobit, which is presented in table 4.11. In term of socio-economic characteristics and travel information, the parameter estimated coefficient for female respondents, highly educated respondents, resident in Myanmar, resident in Malaysia, Resident in Vietnam, highly family income respondents, individual respondents, and low-cost airlines respondents show a significantly influence on the expenditure.

The finding indicates that socio-economic characteristics variables and travel information variables are the significant determinants of expenditure. In term of choice of airlines, respondents who travel by low-cost airlines tend to spend more 34% on expenditure relative to those who travels by full-service airlines. Regarding to gender, female respondents tend to spend more on expenditure by 9.2%, compared to male respondents. In term of family income, highly family income respondents tend to spend more 8.6% on travel expenditure relative to lower family income respondents.

On the other hand, respondents who had undergraduate degree and above tend to spend less on expenditure by 17.6% relative to respondents who had lower education level. Regarding to country of residence, residents in Vietnam tend to spend less 23.9% on expenditure, compared to the others, while residents in Malaysia tend to spend less 25.1% on expenditure, compared to the others. Moreover, residents in Myanmar tend to spend on expenditure by 25.2% relative to the others. In contrast, resident in Laos,

Cambodia, Indonesia, the Philippines, and Singapore tend to spend on travel expenditure in a similar pattern. Regarding to size of traveling party, individual respondents tend to spend less on expenditure by 32.9% of total expenditure, compared to group respondents.

Table 4.11: Tobit model estimated coefficient for expenditure function

Models:	Model 1 All variables		Model 2 Significant variables	
	Coefficient	p-value	Coefficient	p-value
Dependent variable: <i>Expenditure</i>				
Independent variables				
Female	0.084	0.029	0.092	0.018**
Age	0.007	0.006		
Undergraduate and above	-0.159	0.024	-0.176	0.012**
Status: Single	0.180	0.237		
Status: Married	0.061	0.679		
Religion: Buddhist	-0.030	0.646		
Religion: Christian	0.077	0.255		
White-collar worker	0.096	0.054		
Country: Cambodia	-0.180	0.065		
Country: Indonesia	-0.217	0.080		
Country: Myanmar	-0.405	0.000	-0.252	0.000***
Country: Malaysia	-0.422	0.000	-0.251	0.000***
Country: Philippines	-0.263	0.013		
Country: Singapore	-0.198	0.068		
Country: Vietnam	-0.412	0.001	-0.239	0.002***
Family income	0.076	0.000	0.086	0.000***
First time	0.011	0.813		
Individual tourist	-0.349	0.000	-0.329	0.000***
Low-cost airlines	0.345	0.000	0.357	0.000***
Constant	4.952	0.000	5.117	0.000
LR Chi ²	220.06		195.61	
Prob>chi ²	0.000		0.000	
Log likelihood	-1,556.594		-1,611.3521	
Pseudo R ²	0.000		0.057	
/sigma	0.711		0.729	
N	1,453		1,461	

Note: *, ** and *** indicate significance at the 0.1, 0.05 and 0.01 levels, respectively.

The length of stay is analyzed by Poisson regression model as shown in table 4.12. In term of socio-economic characteristics and travel information, the parameter estimated coefficient for female respondents, older respondents, highly educated respondents, residents in Cambodia, residents in Indonesia, residents in Myanmar, residents in Malaysia, residents in the Philippines, residents in Singapore, residents in Vietnam, highly family income respondents, respondents whose primary purpose is honeymoon, respondents whose primary purpose is study, respondents whose primary purpose is health check, respondents who describe their trip as regular and budget trip, respondents whose tourist lifestyle as fun lovers and N-ertainers, and low-cost airlines respondents show a significantly influence on the length of stay.

The finding indicates that socio-economic characteristics variables and travel information variables are the significant determinants of length of stay. Regarding to primary purpose, respondents whose primary purpose is study tend to stay longer on travel by 89.7% relative to the others, and respondents whose primary purpose is health check tend to stay longer on travel by 26.2% relative to the others. Moreover, respondents whose primary purpose is honeymoon tend to stay longer on travel by 15.6% relative to the others. Regarding to country of residence, residents in Vietnam tend to stay longer on travel by 30.1% relative to the others. Residents in Cambodia tend to stay longer on travel by 24.5%, compared to the others, while residents in the Philippines tend to stay longer on travel by 24.2% relative to the others. Additionally, residents in Myanmar tend to stay longer on travel by 19.7% relative to the others, and residents in Indonesia tend to stay longer on travel by 15.8%, compared to the others. Residents in Malaysia tend to stay longer on travel by 12.3% relative to the others. In term of tourist lifestyle, respondents whose tourist lifestyle as N-ertainers tend to stay longer on travel by 7.4% relative to the others, whereas respondents whose tourist lifestyle as survival, escape, discovery, control, and enlightenment tend to stay longer on travel in a similar pattern. In term of choice of airlines, respondents who travel by low-cost airlines tend to stay longer on travel by 5.5% relative to those who travels by full-service airlines. Regarding to age, older respondents tend to stay longer on travel by 3.0%, compared to younger respondents. In term of family income, highly family income respondents tend to stay longer on travel by 2.5% relative to lower family income respondents.

On the other hand, female respondents tend to stay shorter on travel by 3.5%, compared to male respondents. Regarding to tourist lifestyle, respondents whose tourist lifestyle as fun lovers tend to stay shorter on travel by 11.2% relative to the others. In term of education level, respondents who had undergraduate degree and above tend to stay shorter on travel by 12.1% relative to respondents who had lower education level. In term of trip descriptive, respondents who describe their trip as budget trip tend to stay shorter on travel by 12.7%, compared to respondents who describe their trip as regular and luxury trip while respondents who describe their trip as regular trip tend to stay shorter on travel by 18.7% relative to the others.

Table 4.12: Poisson model estimated coefficient for length of stay

Models:	Model 1 All variables		Model 2 Significant variables	
	Coefficient	p-value	Coefficient	p-value
Dependent variable: <i>Length of stay</i>				
Independent variables				
Female	-0.043	0.043	-0.035	0.095*
Age	0.003	0.045	0.003	0.015**
Undergraduate and above	-0.133	0.002	-0.121	0.002***
Status: Single	0.148	0.098		
Status: Married	0.080	0.353		
Religion: Buddhist	0.039	0.318		
Religion: Christian	0.066	0.112		
White-collar worker	-0.025	0.383		
Country: Cambodia	0.244	0.000	0.245	0.000***
Country: Indonesia	0.177	0.019	0.158	0.021**
Country: Myanmar	0.199	0.002	0.197	0.002***
Country: Malaysia	0.148	0.059	0.123	0.094*
Country: Philippines	0.224	0.002	0.242	0.000***
Country: Singapore	0.203	0.005	0.219	0.001***
Country: Vietnam	0.317	0.000	0.301	0.000***
Family income	0.027	0.016	0.025	0.014**
First time	-0.025	0.413		
Individual tourist	0.064	0.272		
Purpose: vacation	0.158	0.150		
Purpose: honeymoon	0.328	0.012	0.156	0.011**
Purpose: visit family	0.188	0.102		
Purpose: study	1.107	0.000	0.897	0.000***

Table 4.12: Poisson model estimated coefficient for length of stay

Models:	Model 1 All variables		Model 2 Significant variables	
	Coefficient	p-value	Coefficient	p-value
Purpose: health check	0.423	0.000	0.262	0.000***
Trip: backpack	-0.057	0.550		
Trip: budget	-0.144	0.087	-0.127	0.008***
Trip: regular	-0.193	0.019	-0.187	0.000***
Nature fans	0.017	0.760		
Golden oldies	-0.043	0.527		
Fun lovers	-0.079	0.082	-0.112	0.000***
N-tertainers	0.106	0.015	0.074	0.005***
Greeners	0.003	0.959		
Tradition entertainers	0.115	0.019		
Value lovers	0.057	0.218		
Low-cost airlines	0.085	0.017	0.055	0.093*
Constant	0.639	0.002	0.973	0.000***
Iteration 0: log likelihood	-4,750.260		-4,935.773	
Iteration 1: log likelihood	-4,747.539		-4,933.751	
Iteration 2: log likelihood	-4,747.531		-4,933.747	
Iteration 3: log likelihood	-4,747.531		-4,933.747	
Log likelihood	-4,747.531		-4,933.747	
LR Chi ²	428.45		421.76	
Prob>chi ²	0.000		0.000	
Pseudo R ²	0.043		0.041	
N	2,264		2,343	

Note: *, ** and *** indicate significance at the 0.1, 0.05 and 0.01 levels, respectively.

ลิขสิทธิ์มหาวิทยาลัยเชียงใหม่
Copyright© by Chiang Mai University
All rights reserved