CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This study aims to investigate domestic tourists' satisfaction towards homestay accommodations in Chiang Mai Province. The researcher collected data by using questionnaires distributed to the domestic tourists who visited homestay accommodations in Chiang Mai Province. Data analysis is shown in 5 parts as follows:

Part 1: General information of domestic tourists

Part 2: Domestic tourists' satisfaction towards the services of homestay accommodations

Part 3: Domestic tourists' satisfaction towards homestay accommodations in Chiang Mai Province

Part 4: The problems and requirements of domestic tourists towards homestay accommodations in Chiang Mai Province

Part 5: Hypothesis testing

1. General information of domestic tourists

1.1 Personal information

In this study, there were the demographic factors of respondents that used to prove the hypotheses including gender, age, educational level, occupation, and income (baht per month). The results are shown on table 6.

Table 6 Percentage Distribution of Domestic Tourists by Personal Information

Personal Information	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender		
Male	204	51
Female	196	49
Total	**400**	**100.0**
Age		
Less than 20 years	87	21.8
20 – 29 years	89	22.3
30 – 39 years	102	25.5
40 – 49 years	100	25.0
50 – 59 years	17	4.3
More than 60 years	5	1.3
Total	**400**	**100.0**
Education Level		
Secondary school	137	34.3
High school	103	25.8
Diploma	37	9.3
Graduate	68	17.0
Others	55	13.8
Total	**400**	**100**
Occupation		
Government Official	76	19.0
Private Fire Employee	15	3.8
Business Owner	46	11.5
Agriculturist	116	29.0
Self - Employee	35	8.8
Unemployed	9	2.3
Retired	4	1.0
Student	85	21.3
Others	14	3.5
Total	**400**	**100.0**

Table 6 (Cont.)

Income per month		
Lower than 5,000 baht	176	44.0
5,000 – 10,000 baht	92	23.0
10,001 – 15,000 baht	46	11.5
15,001 – 20,000 baht	36	9.0
20,001 – 25,000 baht	21	5.3
More than 25,001 baht	29	7.3
Total	400	100.0

According to the table 6, it was found that the number of domestic tourist males was 204 persons (51%), and female was 196 persons (49%).

In term of age, most respondents were between 30 – 39 years (25.5%) and 40 – 49 years (25%), next was 20 – 29 years (22.3%), less than 20 years (21.8%), 50 – 59 years (4.3%), and more than 60 years (1.3%).

The study on education level of respondents, it found that the most of domestic tourists had completed at the secondary school (34.3%), next was high school (25.8%), graduated from university (17.0%), others such as the master degree and doctoral degree (13.8%), and the least was the diploma (9.3%).

Concerning the occupation, the most common occupation was agriculturist (29.0%), next was student (21.3%), government official (19%), business owner (11.5%), self - employed (8.8%), private firm employee (3.8%), others (3.5%), unemployed (2.3%) and retired (1%).

Almost half the domestic tourists have an income per month lower than 5,000 baht (44%), next the groups between 5,000 - 10,000 baht (23%), 10,001 – 15,000 baht (11.5%), 15,001 – 20,000 baht (9%), more than 25,001 baht (7.3%), and 20,001 – 25,000 baht (5.3%).

1.2 Traveling Characteristic

Table 7 Percentage Distribution of Domestic Tourists by Traveling Characteristics

Personal Information	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Traveled duration		
1 – 2 days	392	98
3 - 4 days	8	2
Total	400	100.0
Traveled arrangement		
Alone	9	2.3
Family	25	6.3
Friends	223	55.8
Travel Agency	40	10.0
Others	103	25.8
Total	400	100.0
Traveled information		
By relative / friends	80	20.0
By travel agent	39	9.8
By advertising	46	11.5
By Internet	67	16.8
By Guide Book	117	29.3
Others	51	12.8
Total	400	100.0

According to traveling characteristic of domestic tourists, it was found that most of the tourists stayed at homestay in Chiang Mai Province for 1 - 2 nights (98%), and only 2 persons stayed for 3 – 4 nights (2%).

For the traveling arrangement, more than a half of the tourists traveled with a group of friends (55.8%), then others such as a group of colleagues (25.8%), and

traveled with travel agency (10%). The least was traveled with family and alone, 6.3 percent and 2.3 percent, respectively

For the traveling information of tourists, the most tourists who stayed overnight at homestays in Chiang Mai Province received information from guide book (29.3%) and from their relatives or friends (20%). There are 16.8 percent and 12.8 percent of tourist who received information by internet and others, respectively. While some of them received information by advertising (11.5%) and travel agents (9.8%) (see table 7).

Table 8 Percentage Distribution of Domestic Tourists by the Factors that Most Important in Choosing Homestay Accommodations

Level	Factor	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Clean	211	52.8
2	Environment	109	27.3
3	Traditions / Culture	107	26.8

Refer to table 8, the result showed that the factors that most important for domestic tourists in choosing homestay accommodations in Chiang Mai Province were the cleanliness of homestay (52.8%). It can see that more than a half of tourists satisfied in the cleanliness of homestay. Next, the percentage showed that the factor second most important to choose homestay accommodations was the environment of the homestay (27.3%) which was quite similar to the importance of traditions and culture of local people (26.8%).

Table 9 Percentage Distribution of Domestic Tourists by the Likelihood for Returning to Stay at Homestay Accommodations in Chiang Mai in the Future

Level of Likely	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Very likely	85	21.3
Likely	149	37.3
Don't Know	145	36.3
Unlikely	18	4.5
Very unlikely	3	0.8
Total	400	100.0

According to table 9, domestic tourists were likely to comeback to stay at homestay accommodations in the future at a rate of 37.3% (149 persons). Next was don't know (36.3%), very likely (21.3%), unlikely (4.5%), and very unlikely (0.8%).

2. Domestic Tourists' Satisfaction towards the Services of Homestay Accommodations

In this study, the services consist of facilities, food, and activities. The results of these are shown as follows:

2.1 Facilities

The researcher divided facilities of homestay accommodations in Chiang Mai Province into 5 categories: bedrooms, bathrooms, traditional Thai massage, sauna facilities, and shops.

Table 10 Domestic Tourists' Satisfaction towards Facilities of Homestay

        Accommodations in Chiang Mai Province

Facility	N	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	Meaning	Satisfaction Level				
					Very good	Good	Average	Low	Very Low
- Bathrooms	392	4.11	0.74	Good	*				
- Bedrooms	400	3.91	0.81	Good		*			
- Traditional Thai massage	158	3.75	0.88	Good		*			
- Sauna facilities	69	3.67	0.65	Good		*			
- Shops	372	3.55	0.70	Good		*			

        The overall tourists' satisfaction towards facilities of homestay accommodations was good ($\bar{x}$ = 3.79). The tourists are highly satisfied with bathrooms ($\bar{x}$ = 4.11), and bedrooms ($\bar{x}$ = 3.91). Moreover, they have good satisfaction with traditional Thai massage ($\bar{x}$ = 3.75) while the lowest satisfaction came from sauna facilities ($\bar{x}$ = 3.67) and shops ($\bar{x}$ = 3.55) in homestays, respectively (see table 10).

2.2 Food

        Food consists of Thai food and northern food. The results of this part are shown on table 11.

Table 11 Domestic Tourists' Satisfaction towards Food of Homestay Accommodations in

        Chiang Mai Province

Food	N	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	Meaning	Satisfaction Level				
					Very good	Good	Average	Low	Very Low
- Thai food	394	3.65	0.74	Good		*			
- Northern food	396	3.65	0.74	Good		*			

The overall satisfaction of domestic tourists towards food of accommodations was good satisfaction ($\bar{x}$ = 3.65). The mean score showed that the tourists' satisfaction with northern food ($\bar{x}$ = 3.65) was very similar to Thai food ($\bar{x}$ = 3.65) (see table 11).

2.3 Activities

The results of activities satisfaction are shown on table 12.

Table 12 Domestic Tourists' Satisfaction towards Activities of Homestay

Accommodations in Chiang Mai Province

Activities	N	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	Meaning	Satisfaction Level				
					Very good	Good	Average	Low	Very Low
- Sightseeing to waterfall	307	4.26	0.70	Very Good	*				
- Northern Thai music performance	391	4.24	0.73	Very Good	*				
- Participating Thai traditional welcome ceremony	345	4.16	0.73	Good	*				
- Alms offering	275	4.10	0.75	Good	*				
- Leaning in local agriculture	391	3.99	0.77	Good		*			
- Trekking	394	3.91	0.77	Good		*			
- Learning the way of life of hill-tribes	310	3.91	0.75	Good		*			

According to table 12, the overall tourist' satisfaction towards activities of homestay was good ($\bar{x}$ = 4.08). Regarding the sightseeing received the highest score ($\bar{x}$ = 4.26). Next was seeing Northern Thai music performance ($\bar{x}$ = 4.24), participating in Thai traditional welcome ceremony ($\bar{x}$ = 4.16), the giving of alms to monks ($\bar{x}$ = 4.10), and learning local agriculture ($\bar{x}$ = 3.99). The tourists had the least satisfaction with learning the way of life of hill-tribe ($\bar{x}$ = 3.91) and trekking ($\bar{x}$ = 3.91).

2.4 Domestic tourists' never used services of homestay accommodations

There were some domestic tourists who never used some services as shown on table 13.

Table 13 Domestic Tourists' Never Used the Service of Homestay Accommodations

Never use this service	Frequency
Facilities	
Bathrooms	8
Traditional Thai massage	242
Sauna facilities	304
Shops	28
Food	
Thai food	6
North food	4
Activities	
The giving of alms to monks	125
Sightseeing	93
Seeing Northern Thai music performance	9
Participating Thai traditional welcome ceremony	55
Leaning in local agriculture	9
Trekking	6
Learning the way of life of hill-tribe	90

According to table 13, the result showed that the high number of domestic tourists who stayed overnight and never used sauna facilities and traditional Thai massage at homestay accommodations in Chiang Mai Province was 304 and 242 persons, respectively. In terms of food, the number of tourists who didn't eat Thai food and northern food was 6 persons and 4 persons, respectively. In term of activities, the

highly number of tourists did not give alms to monks and those who did not sightseeing were 125 and 93 persons, respectively.

3. Domestic Tourists' Satisfaction towards Homestay Accommodations in Chiang Mai Province.

For the study of tourists' satisfaction towards homestay accommodations in Chiang Mai Province, the researcher divided homestay accommodations into the 5 dimensions: tangibility, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy. The results of each term as follows:

3.1 Homestay accommodations in the dimensions of tangibility

The homestay accommodations in the dimensions of tangibility concerns the appearance of physical facilities and equipment. It also includes the physical surroundings and the cleanliness, etc. The researcher divided the term tangible as shown in the table 14.

Table 14 Domestic Tourists' Satisfaction towards Tangibility of Homestay

Accommodations in Chiang Mai Province

Tangibility	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	Meaning	Satisfaction Level				
				Very good	Good	Average	Low	Very Low
- This accommodation has air ventilation.	4.34	0.60	Very good	*				
- There are comfortable places to sleep.	4.30	0.59	Very good	*				
- This accommodation has clean rooms.	4.26	0.63	Very good	*				
- The environment is always clean.	4.05	0.70	Good		*			
- There are clean bedclothes.	3.98	0.75	Good		*			
- Eating utensils are clean.	3.93	0.81	Good		*			
- The kitchen is clean without bad smells.	3.89	0.85	Good		*			
	3.86	0.77	Good		*			
- Food is clean.	3.75	0.79	Good		*			
- Kitchen's utensils and seasoning such chili, fish sauce and salt are clean.								

* N = 400

According to table 16, the overall satisfaction towards homestay accommodations in dimensions of tangibility of homestay accommodations in Chiang Mai Province was good ($\bar{x}$ = 4.04). The domestic tourists who stayed overnight are highly satisfied with the air ventilation of accommodations ($\bar{x}$ = 4.34), the comfortable of accommodations ($\bar{x}$ = 4.30), and room cleanliness ($\bar{x}$ = 4.26), respectively. In term of

tangibility, the tourists are least satisfied with the cleanliness of kitchen utensils and seasoning like chili, fish sauce and salt ($\bar{x} = 3.75$), and cleanliness of food within the homestay ($\bar{x} = 3.86$), respectively.

3.2 Homestay accommodations in the dimensions of reliability

Dimension of reliability of homestay accommodations involves the performance of the promised service both dependably and accurately. The researcher divided reliability as follows:

Table 15 Domestic Tourists' Satisfaction towards Reliability of Homestay

Accommodations in Chiang Mai Province

Reliability	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	Meaning	Satisfaction Level				
				Very good	Good	Average	Low	Very Low
- There are local guides to communicate with tourists.	3.86	0.75	Good		*			
- This accommodation is reasonably priced.	3.78	0.73	Good		*			
- There is enough clear information of activities.	3.77	0.73	Good		*			
- The information provided by the villagers during the first contact.	3.64	0.82	Good		*			

* N = 400

The overall satisfaction of reliability was good ($\bar{x} = 3.77$), especially with the communication of local guide with tourists ($\bar{x} = 3.86$). Next was the amount of information of activities ($\bar{x} = 3.78$) and the reasonable price of accommodations ($\bar{x} = 3.77$). In term of reliability, the tourists have least satisfaction with the information provided by the villagers during the first contact ($\bar{x} = 3.64$) (see table 15).

3.3 Homestay accommodations in the dimensions of responsiveness

The dimension of responsiveness concerns the willingness to help tourists and to provide prompt service. In this dimension, it measures of the villagers helping tourists in solving problems and villagers willing to help tourists.

Table 16 Domestic Tourists' Satisfaction towards Responsiveness of Homestay Accommodations in Chiang Mai Province

Responsiveness	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	Meaning	Satisfaction Level				
				Very good	Good	Average	Low	Very Low
- The villagers are willing to help you.	4.04	0.76	Good		*			
- The villagers help you in solving problems.	3.91	0.77	Good		*			

* N = 400

Refer to the table 16, the overall tourists' satisfaction in dimension of responsiveness was good ($\bar{x} = 3.98$). The domestic tourists are very satisfied with the willingness of villagers to help them ($\bar{x} = 4.04$). Furthermore, they agreed that the villagers help them in solving problems ($\bar{x} = 3.91$) as well.

3.4 Homestay accommodations in the dimensions of assurance

Table 17 Domestic Tourists' Satisfaction towards Assurance of Homestay

Accommodations in Chiang Mai Province

Assurance	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	Meaning	Satisfaction Level				
				Very good	Good	Average	Low	Very Low
- You are satisfied the security system.	3.80	0.81	Good		*			
- The villagers made you feel safe and comfortable.	3.63	0.77	Good		*			
- There is equipment to contact authorities such as police, nurse or fireman when an accident arises.	3.53	0.89	Good		*			

* N = 400

Refer to table 17, the overall satisfaction towards dimension of assurance was good ($\bar{x}$ = 3.66). The tourists are highly satisfied with the security system of accommodations ($\bar{x}$ = 3.80) and the villagers made them feel safe and comfortable ($\bar{x}$ = 3.63). The equipment to contact authorities also received good satisfaction from the tourists ($\bar{x}$ = 3.53).

3.5 Homestay accommodations in the dimensions of empathy

Table 18 Domestic Tourists' Satisfaction towards Empathy of Homestay
Accommodations in Chiang Mai Province

Empathy	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	Meaning	Satisfaction Level				
				Very good	Good	Average	Low	Very Low
- The villagers are friendliness.	4.34	0.71	Very good	*				
- The villagers always take care of your anytime.	4.06	0.73	Good	*				

* N = 400

The overall satisfaction towards the dimension of empathy of homestay accommodations was high ($\bar{x}$ = 4.20) regarding the friendliness of villagers of each homestay in Chiang Mai Province ($\bar{x}$ = 4.34) while they felt the villagers always take care them anytime ($\bar{x}$ = 4.06) (see table 18).

3.6 The overall satisfaction of tourists of homestay accommodations in the five dimensions

The overall satisfaction of tourists of homestay accommodations in five dimensions: tangibility, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy as can be seen in table 19 as follows:

Table 19 The Overall Tourists' Satisfaction towards Homestay Accommodations in
Chiang Mai Province

	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	Meaning	Satisfaction Level				
				Very good	Good	Average	Low	Very Low
Empathy	4.20	0.64	Very Good	*				
Tangibility	4.04	0.53	Good	*				
Responsiveness	3.98	0.67	Good		*			
Reliability	3.76	0.56	Good		*			
Assurance	3.65	0.70	Good		*			

* N = 400

According to table 19, the overall tourists' satisfaction towards homestay accommodations in dimension of empathy was high satisfaction ($\bar{x}$ = 4.20). Therefore, it means that tourists had very good satisfaction with service in terms of empathy, while they were also satisfied with tangibility ($\bar{x}$ = 4.04), responsiveness ($\bar{x}$ = 3.98), and reliability ($\bar{x}$ = 3.76). Moreover, they had satisfaction with assurance of service quality ($\bar{x}$ = 3.64) as well.

3.7 The correlation between the five dimensions of homestay accommodations

Table 20 Correlation between Domestic Tourists Satisfaction towards the Five
Dimensions of Homestay Accommodations

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Tangibility	4.0447	0.53994	400
Reliability	3.7681	0.56319	400
Responsiveness	3.9800	0.67879	400
Assurance	3.6566	0.70168	399
Empathy	4.2055	0.64123	399

Table 20 (Cont.)

		Tangibility	Reliability	Responsiveness	Assurance	Empathy
Tangibility Person Correlation		1				
	Sig. (2-tailed)					
	N	400				
Reliability Person Correlation		.586**	1			
		.000				
	Sig. (2-tailed)					
	N	400	400			
ResponsivenessPerson Correlation		.544**	.506**	1		
		.000	.000			
	Sig. (2-tailed)					
	N	400	400	400		
Assurance Person Correlation		.652**	.608**	.509**	1	
		.000	.000	.000		
	Sig. (2-tailed)					
	N	400	399	399	399	
Empathy Person Correlation		.348**	.412**	.443**	.433**	1
		.000	.000	.000	.000	
	Sig. (2-tailed)					
	N	400	399	399	398	399

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Pearson correlation was used to examine the results of table 4.15. The findings revealed that there were significant relationships between tangibility and reliability ($r = 0.586$, $p < 0.01$), between tangibility and responsiveness ($r = 0.544$, $p < 0.01$), between tangibility and assurance ($r = 0.652$, $p < 0.01$), between tangibility and empathy ($r = 0.348$, $p < 0.01$), between reliability and responsiveness ($r = 0.506$, $p < 0.01$), between reliability and assurance ($r = 0.608$, $p < 0.01$), between reliability and empathy ($r = 0.412$, $p < 0.01$), between responsiveness and assurance ($r = 0.509$, $p < 0.01$), between

responsiveness and empathy($r = 0.443$, $p < 0.01$), and between assurance and empathy ($r = 0.433$, $p < 0.01$). It can be seen that the five dimensions of service quality had relationships between all of them. Furthermore, all dimensions were correlations in the positive and the Pearson coefficients were average.

4. Problems and Requirements of Domestic Tourists towards Homestay Accommodations in Chiang Mai Province

The problems and requirements for improving the service of homestay accommodations in Chiang Mai Province of domestic tourists as follows:

4.1 Facilities

Most of tourists who stayed overnight at homestay in Chiang Mai complained that the water electronic appliance of each homestay is not hot because the water supply is so cool. Tourists felt uncomfortable when they took a bath. Beside, some tourists criticized that there are not enough the bathrooms of each homestay for a big group of tourists when they stayed overnight at homestay.

In addition, there are not adequate shops and store for tourists. Some homestay in Chiang Mai Province have no shop for tourists. They recommended that each homestay should have more food shops and souvenir shops.

Moreover, some tourists commended some homestay have few facilities to serve tourists, they required the variety of facilities such as tradition Thai massage, sauna, etc. Furthermore, there are not enough traditional Thai massages of some homestays for a high number of tourists.

4.2 Food

Some tourists commented that homestay has few kinds of food. They required the variety of food within accommodations. There are not also adequate the table of restaurant in homestay when a high number of tourists visited. Moreover, services in the restaurant of some homestays are quite slow because the cooker and waiter in restaurant is no enough to serve tourists.

4.3 Activities

Some domestic tourists commended that the rate of some activities within homestays are expensive. Examples here include participating in the Thai traditional welcome ceremony and seeing northern Thai music performance. In addition, some homestays have a few activities for tourists. Tourists also complained that there is not enough clear information of activities for them. They requested more information from local people for each activity.

4.4 Security

The tourists had opinions about the security systems within homestay. They asked for some fire protection equipment and equipment incase of other accidents. Some of them required a regular checking of locks inside some accommodations.

4.5 People

Some tourists criticized that homestays should provide people who can give detailed information during the first contact and during the stay at homestay accommodations. Furthermore, the villagers should set the clear programs of any activities on time.

5. Hypothesis Testing

In this study, the researcher set five hypotheses to investigate whether the domestic tourists who have different personal characteristics will have different satisfaction towards homestay accommodations in Chiang Mai Province. To analyze the tourists' satisfaction towards homestay accommodations, the independent variables were gender, age, educational level, occupation, and income of domestic tourists who visit homestay accommodations in Chiang Mai Province. The service quality of homestay accommodations was divided into 5 dimensions tangibility, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy.

To study the different level of service quality of respondent, the mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

The researcher used the above independent variables to analyze the tourists' satisfaction towards homestay accommodations in Chiang Mai Province by using t-test and one-way ANOVA test. The results are shown as follows:

5.1 Hypotheses 1: The domestic tourists of different genders will have different levels of satisfaction towards homestay accommodations in Chiang Mai Province.

Concerning the gender of respondents in dimension of tangibility, an independent T-test was used to examine the first hypotheses. The result showed that the mean score of males ($\bar{x}$ = 4.02) was very similar to that of females ($\bar{x}$ = 4.06) with respect to their satisfaction in this dimension. The null hypothesis was not rejected. The finding revealed that there is no significant difference at 0.536 ($t_{1,2}$ = -0.619, p > 0.05) of satisfaction of homestay accommodations based on tangibility. Therefore, it means that difference in gender was not related to tourists' satisfaction towards homestay accommodations in term of tangibility. The result was analyzed on table 21.

Table 21 Analysis of Domestic Tourists' Satisfaction towards Homestay Accommodations in the Dimension of0 Tangibility: Gender Difference

Group Statistics

Service	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Tangibility	Male	204	4.0283	0.56595	0.03962
	Female	196	4.0618	0.51236	0.03660

Independent Sample Test

Service		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
Tangibility	Equal variances assumed	-0.619	398	0.536	-0.03347	0.05405

In term of reliability, the result was analyzed by using T-test. The mean score showed that females ($\bar{x}$ = 3.80) were more satisfied with this service than males ($\bar{x}$ = 3.73).

The null hypothesis was not rejected. The finding revealed that there is no significant difference at 0.218 ($t_{1,2}$ = -1.235, p > 0.05) of homestay accommodations in dimension of reliability. Therefore, it means that differences in gender were not related to tourists' satisfaction towards homestay accommodations based on reliability. The result is summarized on table 22.

Table 22 Analysis of Domestic Tourists' Satisfaction towards Homestay Accommodations in the Dimension of Reliability: Gender Difference

Group Statistics

Service	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Reliability	Male	204	3.7341	0.53630	0.03755
	Female	196	3.8036	0.58916	0.04208

Independent Sample Test

Service		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
Reliability	Equal variances assumed	-1.235	398	0.218	-0.06950	0.05629

Concerning the gender of respondents in the dimension of responsiveness, an independent T-test was used in examination. Refering to table 23, the mean score showed that males ($\bar{x}$ = 4.00) were very similar to female ($\bar{x}$ = 3.95) with respect to their satisfaction of service quality in the dimension of responsiveness.

The null hypothesis was not rejected. The finding revealed that there is no significant difference at 0.500 ($t_{1,2}$ = 0.674, p > 0.05) in the dimension of responsiveness. Therefore, it means that differences in gender were not related to

tourists' satisfaction towards homestay accommodations in the dimension of responsiveness. The result is analyzed on table 23.

Table 23 Analysis of Domestic Tourists' Satisfaction towards Homestay Accommodations in the Dimension of Responsiveness: Gender Difference

Group Statistics

Service	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Responsiveness	Male	204	4.0025	0.70273	0.04920
	Female	196	3.9566	0.65391	0.04671

Independent Sample Test

Service		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
Responsiveness	Equal variances assumed	0.674	398	0.500	0.04582	0.06794

An independent T-test was used to examine the assurance of service. The mean score of males ($\bar{x}$ = 3.68) was very similar to that of female ($\bar{x}$ = 3.63) with respect to their satisfaction in this dimension.

The null hypothesis was not rejected. The finding revealed that there is no significant difference at 0.473 ($t_{1,2}$ = 0.718, p > 0.05). Therefore, it means that difference in gender was not related to tourists' satisfaction towards homestay accommodations in the dimension of assurance. The result was summarized on table 24.

Table 24 Analysis of Domestic Tourists' Satisfaction towards Homestay Accommodations

in the Dimension of Assurance: Gender Difference

Group Statistics

Service	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Assurance	Male	203	3.6814	0.73667	0.05170
	Female	196	3.6310	0.66442	0.04746

Independent Sample Test

Service		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
Assurance	Equal variances assumed	0.718	397	0.473	0.05049	0.07031

In term of empathy of service, the result was analyzed by using an independent t-test. It was found that the mean score of females ($\bar{x}$ = 4.23) was higher than that of males ($\bar{x}$ = 4.17) (see table 25).

The null hypothesis was not rejected. The finding revealed that there is no significant difference at 0.398 ($t_{1, 2}$ = -0.847, p > 0.05) in empathy of homestay accommodations. Therefore, it means that gender was not related to tourists' satisfaction towards homestay accommodations in the dimension of empathy. The result is analyzed on table 25.

Table 25 Analysis of domestic tourists' satisfaction towards homestay accommodations

in dimension of empathy: Gender difference

Group Statistics

Service	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Empathy	Male	204	4.1789	0.65923	0.04616
	Female	195	4.2333	0.62232	0.04457

Independent Sample Test

Service		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
Empathy	Equal variances assumed	-0.847	397	0.398	-0.05441	0.06424

In conclusion, gender was not related to tourists' satisfaction towards homestay accommodations in the five dimensions of service because the results indicated that there were no statistically significant differences in the scores on all five dimensions of homestay accommodations.

5.2 Hypotheses 2: The domestic tourists of different ages will have different levels of satisfaction towards homestay accommodations in Chiang Mai Province.

Concerning the age of respondents in the tangibility dimension, the result was analyzed by using a one-way ANOVA test. It found that the ANOVA was not statistically significant at 0.117 ($F_{5, 394} = 1.777$, $p > 0.05$) (see table 26). The results indicated that there was no statistical difference in the score on the dimension of tangibility among the six age groups of respondents. Therefore, it means that difference in age was not related to tourists' satisfaction towards homestay accommodations in the dimension of tangibility. Table 26 shows the mean scores and the statistical results of the ANOVA among the six age groups of respondents.

Table 26 ANOVA Analysis of Domestic Tourists' Satisfaction towards Homestay

Accommodations in the Dimension of Tangibility: Age Difference

Service	Age	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Tangibility	Less than 20	87	3.9860	.054269	0.05818
	20 -29 years	89	3.9463	0.56609	0.06001
	30-39 years	102	4.1100	0.58388	0.05781
	40-49 years	100	4.1022	0.47079	0.04708
	50-59 years	17	4.0261	0.42949	0.10417
	More than 60	5	4.4000	0.47532	0.21257
	Total	400	4.0447	0.53994	0.02700

	Sum of Squares	Df.	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2.565	5	0.513	1.777	0.117
Within Groups	113.759	394	0.289		
Total	116.323	399			

In terms of reliability of service in homestay accommodations, the result was analyzed by using a one-way ANOVA test. The ANOVA was statistically significant at 0.006 ($F_{5,\ 394}$ = 3.301, p > 0.01). The results indicated that there was a statistical difference in the score on the dimension of reliability among six groups of age of respondents. Therefore, it means that age difference was related to tourists' satisfaction towards homestay accommodations in the dimension of reliability. In addition, the mean score showed that the group of tourists who were 50-59 years old were highly satisfied in the reliability dimension of homestay accommodations ($\bar{x}_5$ = 4.02). Next were those who were 30-39 years ($\bar{x}_3$ = 3.83) and 40-49 years ($\bar{x}$ 4 = 3.83), respectively. The results are analyzed on table 27.

Table 27 ANOVA Analysis of Domestic Tourists' Satisfaction towards Homestay

Accommodations in the Dimension of Reliability: Age Difference

Service	Age	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Reliability	Less than 20	87	3.6121	0.59156	0.06342
	20 -29 years	89	3.7444	0.64069	0.06791
	30-39 years	102	3.8382	0.49956	0.04946
	40-49 years	100	3.8300	0.50861	0.05086
	50-59 years	17	4.0294	0.48317	0.11719
	More than 60	5	3.3500	0.41833	0.18708
	Total	400	3.7681	0.56319	0.02816

	Sum of Squares	Df.	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	5.088	5	1.018	3.301	0.006
Within Groups	121.468	394	0.308		
Total	126.556	399			

Concerning the age of respondents in the responsiveness dimension of service in homestay accommodations, the results were analyzed by using a one-way ANOVA test. It found that the ANOVA was statistically significant at 0.000 ($F_{5, 394}$ = 6.985, p < 0.01) (see table 28). The results indicated that there was a statistical difference in the score on dimension of responsiveness among the six age groups of respondents. Therefore, it means that age difference was related to tourists' satisfaction towards homestay accommodations in the dimension of responsiveness.

The post hoc test, the Scheffe test of significance, was later conducted to test all pairwise comparisons between group means. The Scheffe test showed that there are statistically significant differences between the group of tourists who were less than 20 and those who were 30-39 ($\bar{x}_1$ = 3.66 vs. $\bar{x}_3$ = 4.20), and between the group of tourists who were less than 20 and those who were 40-49 ($\bar{x}_1$ = 3.66 vs. $\bar{x}_4$ = 4.07). In other

words, the groups of domestic tourists who were 30-39 and 40-49 have higher satisfaction in homestay accommodations in dimension of reliability than those who were less than 20. Results are summarized on table 28 as follows:

Table 28 ANOVA Analysis of Domestic Tourists' Satisfaction towards Homestay
Accommodations in the Dimension of Responsiveness: Age Difference

Service	Age	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Responsiveness	Less than 20	87	3.6667	0.71393	0.07654
	20 -29 years	89	3.9101	0.72127	0.07645
	30-39 years	102	4.2010	0.59810	0.05922
	40-49 years	100	4.0700	0.59041	0.05904
	50-59 years	17	4.0882	0.53722	0.13029
	More than 60	5	4.0000	1.00000	0.44721
	Total	400	3.9800	0.67879	0.03394

	Sum of Squares	Df.	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	14.968	5	2.994	6.985	0.000
Within Groups	168.872	394	0.429		
Total	183.840	399			

Dependent Variable: Responsiveness

(I) age	(J) age	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Less than 20	30 - 39 years	-0.53431*	0.09554	0.000
	40 – 49 years	-0.40333*	0.09598	0.004

In terms of assurance of service in homestay accommodations, the result was analyzed by using a one-way ANOVA test. It found that the ANOVA was statistically significant at 0.006 ($F_{5, 393}$ = 3.306, p < 0.01) (see table 4.24). The results indicated that

there was a statistical difference in the score on the dimension of assurance among the six age groups of respondents. Therefore, it means that different age was related to tourists' satisfaction towards homestay accommodations in the dimension of assurance.

The post hoc test, the Tukey (HSD) test of significance, was later conducted to test all pairwise comparisons between group means. The Tukey test showed that there are statistically significant differences between the group of tourists who were less than 20 years and those who were 40-49 ($\bar{x}_1$ = 3.53 vs. $\bar{x}_4$ = 3.83). In other words, the group of domestic tourists who were 40-49 had higher satisfaction in the dimension of responsiveness than those who were less than 20. Table 29 shows the mean scores and the statistical results of the ANOVA among six groups of age of respondents.

Table 29 ANOVA Analysis of Domestic Tourists' Satisfaction towards Homestay
Accommodations in the Dimension of Assurance: Age Difference

Service	Age	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Assurance	Less than 20	87	3.5326	0.81564	0.08745
	20 -29 years	89	3.5506	0.60323	0.06394
	30-39 years	102	3.7063	0.65877	0.06555
	40-49 years	100	3.8333	0.68739	0.06874
	50-59 years	17	3.7059	0.73487	0.17823
	More than 60	5	3.0000	0.00000	0.00000
	Total	400	3.6566	0.70168	0.03513

	Sum of Squares	Df.	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	7.909	5	1.582	3.306	0.006
Within Groups	188.051	393	0.479		
Total	195.960	398			

Table 29 (Cont.)

Dependent Variable: Assurance

(I) age	(J) age	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Less than 20	40 - 49 years	-0.30077 *	0.10142	0.037

Concerning the age of respondents in the empathy dimension of service in homestay accommodations, the result was analyzed by using a one-way ANOVA test. It found that the ANOVA was not statistically significant at 0.385 ($F_{5, 393}$ =1.054, p > 0.05). The results indicated that there was no statistical difference in the score on dimension of empathy among the six age groups of respondents. Therefore, it means that different age was not related to tourists' satisfaction towards homestay accommodations in the dimension of empathy. The results are summarized on table 30.

Table 30 ANOVA Analysis of Domestic Tourists' Satisfaction towards Homestay

Accommodations in the Dimension of Empathy: Age Difference

Service	Age	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Empathy	Less than 20	87	4.0920	0.72147	0.07735
	20 -29 years	89	4.2191	0.66553	0.07055
	30-39 years	102	4.2921	0.59694	0.05940
	40-49 years	100	4.2050	0.61585	0.06158
	50-59 years	17	4.2647	0.53379	0.12946
	More than 60	5	4.0000	0.00000	0.00000
	Total	400	4.2055	0.64123	0.03210

	Sum of Squares	Df.	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2.166	5	0.433	1.054	0.385
Within Groups	161.482	393	0.411		
Total	163.648	398			

In conclusion, difference in age was related to tourists' satisfaction towards homestay accommodations in the dimensions of reliability, responsiveness, and assurance of service because the results indicated that there were statistically significant differences in the scores on dimensions of reliability, responsiveness, and assurance.

5.3 Hypotheses 3: The domestic tourists of different education levels will have different levels of satisfaction towards homestay accommodations in Chiang Mai Province.

Concerning the education level of respondents in tangibility dimension of service, the result was analyzed by using a one-way ANOVA test. It found that the ANOVA was statistically significant at 0.001 ($F_{4, 395}$ = 4.803, p < 0.01) (see table 31). The results indicated that there was a statistical difference in the score in the dimension of tangibility among the education level groups of respondents. Therefore, it means that different education level was related to tourists' satisfaction towards homestay accommodations in the dimension of tangibility.

The post hoc test, the Tukey (HSD) test of significance, was later conducted to test all pairwise comparisons between group means. The Tukey test showed that there are statistically significant differences between the group of tourists who responded "other" as the level of education and those who completed secondary school ($\bar{x}_o$ = 3.82 vs. $\bar{x}_s$ = 4.11), and between those who responded "other" as the level of education and those who completed high school ($\bar{x}_o$ = 3.82 vs. $\bar{x}_h$ = 4.13).

In other words, the groups of domestic tourists who completed secondary school and high school have higher satisfaction in the tangibility dimension of homestay accommodations than those who completed other education levels of responded "other" as the level of education. Table 31 shows the mean scores and the statistical results of the ANOVA among the education level of respondents.

Table 31 ANOVA Analysis of Domestic Tourists' Satisfaction towards Homestay

Accommodations in the Dimension of Tangibility: Education Level Difference

Service	Education level	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Tangibility	Secondary School	137	4.1184	0.53308	0.04554
	High School	103	4.1370	0.49427	0.04870
	Diploma	37	4.0751	0.48929	0.08044
	Graduate	68	3.9167	0.61831	0.07498
	Others	55	3.8263	0.49310	0.06649
	Total	400	4.0447	0.53994	0.02700

	Sum of Squares	Df.	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	5.395	4	1.349	4.803	0.001
Within Groups	110.928	395	0.281		
Total	116.323	399			

Dependent Variable: Tangibility

(I) Education level	(J) Education level	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Others	Secondary school	-0.29215*	0.08459	0.006
	High school	-0.31074*	0.08850	0.005

In terms of the reliability dimension of service in homestay accommodations, the result was analyzed by using a one-way ANOVA test. It found that the ANOVA was statistically significant at 0.018 ($F_{4, 395}$ = 3.007, p > 0.01). The results indicated that there was a statistical difference in the score on the dimension of reliability among the education level of respondents. Therefore, it means that different education level was related to tourists' satisfaction towards homestay accommodations in the reliability dimension.

The post hoc test, the Tukey (HSD) test of significance, was later conducted to test all pairwise comparisons between group means. The Tukey test showed that there are a significant statistical differences between the group of tourist who completed high school and those who completed diploma level ($\bar{x}_h = 3.89$ vs. $\bar{x}_d = 3.57$) (see table 32).

In other words, the group of domestic tourists who completed high school has a higher level of satisfaction in the reliability dimension of homestay accommodations than those who completed diploma level. The results are summarized on table 32.

Table 32 ANOVA Analysis of Domestic Tourists' Satisfaction towards Homestay

Accommodations in the Dimension of Reliability: Education Level Difference

Service	Education level	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Reliability	Secondary School	137	3.7755	0.59585	0.05091
	High School	103	3.8956	0.58528	0.05767
	Diploma	37	3.5743	0.56784	0.09335
	Graduate	68	3.7537	0.50463	0.06120
	Others	55	3.6591	0.44970	0.06064
	Total	400	3.7681	0.56319	0.02816

	Sum of Squares	Df.	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	3.740	4	0.935	3.007	0.018
Within Groups	122.816	395	0.311		
Total	126556	399			

Dependent Variable: Reliability

(I) Education level	(J) Education level	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
High school	Diploma	0.32131*	0.10687	0.023

Concerning the education level of respondents in the responsiveness dimension, the result was analyzed by using a one-way ANOVA test. It found that the ANOVA was not statistically significant at 0.214 ($F_{4, 395}$ = 1.460, p > 0.05). The results indicated that there was no statistical difference in the score on responsiveness dimension among the education level of respondents. Therefore, it means that different education level was not related to tourists' satisfaction towards homestay accommodations in responsiveness dimension. The results are summarized on table 33.

Table 33 ANOVA Analysis of Domestic Tourists' Satisfaction towards Homestay Accommodations in the Dimension of Responsiveness: Education Level Difference

Service	Education level	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Responsiveness	Secondary School	137	3.9964	0.69265	0.05918
	High School	103	4.0922	0.70969	0.06993
	Diploma	37	3.8649	0.58510	0.09619
	Graduate	68	3.8750	0.71433	0.08662
	Others	55	3.9364	0.5779	0.07791
	Total	400	3.9800	0.67879	0.03394

	Sum of Squares	Df.	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2.679	4	0.670	1.460	0.214
Within Groups	181.161	395	0.459		
Total	183.840	399			

In the dimension of assurance of service, the results were analyzed by using a one-way ANOVA test. It found that the ANOVA was statistically significant at 0.000 ($F_{4, 394}$ = 6.042, p < 0.01) (see table 34). The results indicated that there was a statistical difference in the score on the dimension of assurance among the education levels of

respondents. Therefore, it means that different education level was related to tourists' satisfaction towards homestay accommodations in the assurance dimension.

The post hoc test, the Tukey (HSD) test of significance, was later conducted to test all pairwise comparisons between group means. The Tukey test showed that there are significant statistical differences between the group of tourist who completed secondary school and those who completed graduate school ($\bar{x}_s = 3.79$ vs. $\bar{x}_g = 3.44$), between the group of tourist who completed secondary school and those who completed other level ($\bar{x}_s = 3.79$ vs. $\bar{x}_o = 3.42$), between the group of tourist who completed high school and those who completed graduate degrees ($\bar{x}_h = 3.79$ vs. $\bar{x}_g = 3.44$), and between the group of tourists who completed high school and those who completed other levels ($\bar{x}_h = 3.79$ vs. $\bar{x}_o = 3.42$).

In other words, the groups of domestic tourists who completed secondary school and high school have a higher level of satisfaction in the assurance dimension of homestay accommodations than those who completed graduate and others level such as higher than graduate and post graduate. The results are showed on table 34.

Table 34 ANOVA Analysis of Domestic Tourists' Satisfaction towards Homestay
Accommodations in the Dimension of Assurance: Education Level Difference

Service	Education level	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Assurance	Secondary School	137	3.7956	0.76296	0.06518
	High School	103	3.7908	0.69877	0.06919
	Diploma	37	3.5045	0.74793	0.12296
	Graduate	68	3.4461	0.52027	0.06309
	Others	55	3.4242	0.57540	0.07759
	Total	400	3.6566	0.70168	0.03513

Table 34 (Cont.)

	Sum of Squares	Df.	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	11.325	4	2.831	6.042	0.000
Within Groups	184.635	394	0.469		
Total	195.960	398			

Dependent Variable: Assurance

(I) Education level	(J) Education level	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Secondary school	Graduate	0.34954*	0.10155	0.006
	Others	0.37138*	0.10927	0.007
High school	Graduate	0.34477*	0.10717	0.012
	Others	0.36661*	0.11452	0.013

In the service dimension of empathy of homestay accommodations, the result was analyzed by using a one-way ANOVA test. It found that the ANOVA was statistically significant at 0.011 ($F_{4, 394}$ = 3.312, p > 0.01). The results indicated that there was a statistical difference in the score in the empathy dimension among the education level of respondents. Therefore, it means that different education level was related to tourists' satisfaction towards homestay accommodations in the empathy dimension. In addition, the mean score showed that the group of tourists who completed other levels ($\overline{x}_o$ = 4.36) such as higher than graduate and post graduate were highly satisfied in the empathy dimension of service quality. Next were those who completed high school ($\overline{x}_h$ = 4.33) and secondary school ($\overline{x}_s$ = 4.15), respectively. The results are analyzed on table 35.

Table 35 ANOVA Analysis of Domestic Tourists' Satisfaction towards Homestay

Accommodations in the Dimension of Empathy: Education Level Difference

Service	Education level	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Empathy	Secondary School	137	4.1507	0.66477	0.05700
	High School	103	4.3301	0.58809	0.05795
	Diploma	37	4.0405	0.77619	0.12761
	Graduate	68	4.0882	0.64612	0.07835
	Others	55	4.3636	0.50419	0.06799
	Total	400	4.2055	0.64123	0.03210

	Sum of Squares	Df.	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	11.325	4	2.831	6.042	0.000
Within Groups	184.635	394	0.469		
Total	195.960	398			

In conclusion, the difference in education level was related to tourists' satisfaction towards the service quality dimensions of tangibility, reliability, assurance, and empathy of homestay accommodations because the results indicated that there were statistically significant differences in the score in the dimensions of tangibility, reliability, assurance, and empathy.

5.4 Hypotheses 4: The domestic tourists of different occupations will have different levels of satisfaction towards homestay accommodations in Chiang Mai Province.

Concerning the occupation of respondents in the service quality dimension of tangibility, the result was analyzed by using a one-way ANOVA test. It found that the ANOVA was statistically significant at 0.000 ($F_{8, 391} = 6.422$, $p < 0.01$) (see table 36). The results indicated that there was a statistical difference in the score in the dimension of

tangibility among the occupation of respondents. Therefore, it means that different occupations were related to tourists' satisfaction towards homestay accommodations in the tangibility dimension.

The post hoc test, the Tukey (HSD) test of significance, was later conducted to test all pairwise comparisons between group means. The Tukey test showed that there are significant statistical differences between government officials and the agriculturists ($\bar{x}_g = 3.94$ vs. $\bar{x}_a = 4.19$), between government officials and those self-employed ($\bar{x}_g = 3.94$ vs. $\bar{x}_{s-e} = 4.27$), between students and business owners ($\bar{x}_{st} = 3.76$ vs. $\bar{x}_b = 4.11$), between students and agriculturists ($\bar{x}_{st} = 3.76$ vs. $\bar{x}_a = 4.19$), between students and those self-employed ($\bar{x}_{st} = 3.76$ vs. $\bar{x}_{s-e} = 4.27$), and between students and those who are retired ($\bar{x}_{st} = 3.76$ vs. $\bar{x}_r = 4.61$)

In other words, the groups of agriculturists and those self-employed have a higher level of satisfaction in homestay accommodations in the dimension of tangibility than government officials. The business owners, agriculturists, self-employees, and retried have higher satisfaction in the tangibility dimension than the student group. The results are summarized on table 36.

Table 36 ANOVA Analysis of Domestic Tourists' Satisfaction towards Homestay
Accommodations in the Dimension of Tangibility: Occupation Difference

Service	Occupation	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Tangibility	Government Official	76	3.9415	0.56757	0.06510
	Private Firm Employee	15	4.0074	0.59014	0.15237
	Business Owner	46	4.1159	0.51902	0.07653
	Agriculturist	116	4.1916	0.51067	0.04741
	Self-Employed	35	4.2794	0.50371	0.08514
	Unemployed	9	3.9506	0.69857	0.23286
	Retired	4	4.6111	0.06415	0.03208
	Student	85	3.7699	0.42752	0.04637

Table 36 (Cont.)

	Others	14	4.1746	0.53857	0.14394
	Total	400	4.0447	0.53994	0.02700

	Sum of Squares	Df.	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	13.509	8	1.689	6.422	0.000
Within Groups	102.814	391	0.263		
Total	116.323	399			

Dependent Variable: Tangibility

(I) Occupation	(J) Occupation	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Government Official	Agriculturist	-0.25005*	0.07568	0.029
	Self-Employee	-0.33784*	0.10475	0.036
Student	Business Owner	-0.34601*	0.09386	0.008
	Agriculturist	-0.42164*	0.07321	0.000
	Self-Employed	-0.50943*	0.10299	0.000
	Retired	-0.84118*	0.26236	0.039

Concerning the occupation of respondents to reliability dimension of service quality, the result was analyzed by using a one-way ANOVA test. It found that the ANOVA was statistically significant at 0.005 ($F_{8, 391}$ = 2.790, $p < 0.01$). The results indicated that there was a statistical difference in the score on the dimension of reliability among the occupation of respondents. Therefore, it means that difference in occupation was related to tourists' satisfaction towards homestay accommodations in the reliability dimension of service quality.

The post hoc test, the Tukey (HSD) test of significance, was later conducted to test all pairwise comparisons between group means. The Tukey test showed that there

are statistically significant differences between the agriculturists and the students ($\bar{x}_a$ = 3.86 vs. $\bar{x}_{st}$ = 3.60).

In other words, the agriculturists had greater satisfaction in the reliability dimension of service quality of homestay accommodations than the students. Results are summarized on table 37.

Table 37 ANOVA Analysis of Domestic Tourists' Satisfaction towards Homestay Accommodations in the Dimension of Reliability: Occupation Difference

Service	Occupation	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Reliability	Government Official	76	3.7533	0.48733	0.05590
	Private Firm Employee	15	3.4500	0.55259	0.14268
	Business Owner	46	3.7500	0.65192	0.09612
	Agriculturist	116	3.8685	0.57621	0.05350
	Self-Employed	35	3.9357	0.49387	0.08348
	Unemployed	9	3.7222	0.52208	0.17403
	Retired	4	3.7500	0.57735	0.28868
	Student	85	3.6059	0.52664	0.05712
	Others	14	4.0179	0.65387	0.17475
	Total	400	3.7681	0.56319	0.02816

	Sum of Squares	Df.	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	6.833	8	0.854	2.790	0.005
Within Groups	119.723	391	0.306		
Total	126.556	399			

Dependent Variable: Reliability

(I) Occupation	(J) Occupation	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Agriculturist	Student	0.26265*	0.07901	0.027

Concerning the occupation of respondents to the responsiveness dimension of service quality of homestay accommodations, the result was analyzed by using a one-way ANOVA test. According to table 3.33, it was found that the ANOVA was statistically significant at 0.000 ($F_{8, 391}$ = 5.712, p < 0.01). The results indicated that there was a statistical difference in the score on the dimension of responsiveness among the occupation of respondents. Therefore, it means that a difference in occupation was related to tourists' satisfaction towards homestay accommodations in the responsiveness dimension of service quality.

The post hoc test, the Tukey (HSD) test of significance, was later conducted to test all pairwise comparisons between group means. The Tukey test showed that there are statistically significant differences between the group of students and the government officials ($\bar{x}_{st}$ = 3.62 vs. $\bar{x}_g$ = 4.05), between students and the agriculturists ($\bar{x}_{st}$ = 3.62 vs. $\bar{x}_a$ = 4.13), between the students and those self-employed ($\bar{x}_{st}$ = 3.62 vs. $\bar{x}_{s-e}$ = 4.25), and between the students and the other occupations ($\bar{x}_{st}$ = 3.62 vs. $\bar{x}_o$ = 4.28).

In other words, the groups of government officials, agriculturists, self-employees and other occupations have higher level of satisfaction in homestay accommodations in the responsiveness dimension than the group of students. Results are summarized on table 38.

Table 38 ANOVA Analysis of Domestic Tourists' Satisfaction towards Homestay

Accommodations in the Dimension of Responsiveness: Occupation Difference

Service	Occupation	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Responsiveness	Government Official	76	4.0592	0.59982	0.06880
	Private Firm Employee	15	3.8333	0.52327	0.12511
	Business Owner	46	3.9348	0.62011	0.09143
	Agriculturist	116	4.1336	0.67036	0.06224
	Self-Employed	35	4.2571	0.59867	0.10119

Table 38 (Cont.)

	Unemployed	9	3.7222	0.75462	0.25154
	Retired	4	3.7500	0.86603	0.43301
	Student	85	3.6235	0.68097	0.07386
	Others	14	4.2857	0.72627	0.19410
	Total	400	3.9800	0.67879	0.03394

	Sum of Squares	Df.	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	19.239	8	2.405	5.712	0.000
Within Groups	164.601	391	0.421		
Total	183.840	399			

Dependent Variable: Responsiveness

(I) Occupation	(J) Occupation	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Student	Government official	-0.43568*	0.10243	0.001
	Agriculturist	-0.51009*	0.09264	0.000
	Self-Employed	-0.63361*	0.13031	0.000
	Others	-0.66218*	0.18714	0.013

Concerning the occupation of respondents to the assurance dimension of service quality, the result was analyzed by using a one-way ANOVA test. According to table 39, it found that the ANOVA was statistically significant at 0.000 ($F_{8, 390} = 7.500$, $p < 0.01$). The results indicated that there was a statistical difference in the score on homestay accommodations in assurance dimension among the occupation of respondents. Therefore, it means that difference in occupation was related to tourists' satisfaction towards homestay accommodations in this dimension.

The post hoc test, the Tukey (HSD) test of significance, was later conducted to test all pairwise comparisons between group means. The Tukey test showed that there are statistically significant differences between the agriculturists and the government

officials ($\bar{x}_a$ = 3.93 vs. $\bar{x}_g$ = 3.55), between the agriculturists and the unemployed ($\bar{x}_a$ = 3.93 vs. $\bar{x}_u$ = 3.11), between the agriculturists and the students ($\bar{x}_a$ = 3.93 vs. $\bar{x}_{st}$ = 3.32), between those self-employed and the unemployed ($\bar{x}_{s-e}$ = 3.91 vs. $\bar{x}_u$ = 3.11), and between the self-employees and the students ($\bar{x}_{s-e}$ = 3.91 vs. $\bar{x}_{st}$ =3.32).

In other words, the agriculturists had a higher level of satisfaction in service quality in term of assurance than the groups of government officials, unemployed, and students. The self-employed had higher satisfaction in the assurance dimension than the unemployed, and students. Results are summarized on table 39.

Table 39 ANOVA Analysis of Domestic Tourists' Satisfaction towards Homestay Accommodations in the Dimension of Assurance: Occupation Difference

Service	Occupation	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Assurance	Government Official	76	3.5570	0.59725	0.06851
	Private Firm Employee	15	3.3778	0.75453	0.19482
	Business Owner	46	3.6741	0.57948	0.08638
	Agriculturist	116	3.9397	0.73898	0.06861
	Self-Employed	35	3.9143	0.82977	0.14026
	Unemployed	9	3.1111	0.23570	0.07857
	Retired	4	3.8333	0.96225	0.48113
	Student	85	3.3216	0.56682	0.06148
	Others	14	3.7857	0.54861	0.14662
	Total	400	3.6566	0.70168	0.03513

	Sum of Squares	Df.	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	26.129	8	3.266	7.500	0.000
Within Groups	169.831	390	0.435		
Total	195.960	398			

Table 39 (Cont.)

Dependent Variable: Assurance

(I) Occupation	(J) Occupation	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Agriculturist	Government official	0.38264*	0.09738	0.003
	Unemployed	0.82854*	0.22834	0.010
	Student	0.61809*	0.09422	0.000
Self-Employee	Unemployed	0.80317*	0.24663	0.033
	Student	0.59272*	0.13253	0.000

Concerning the occupation of respondents to the empathy dimension of service quality, the result was analyzed by using a one-way ANOVA test. According to table 40, it found that the ANOVA was statistically significant at 0.000 ($F_{8, 390}$ = 6.126, p < 0.01). The results indicated that there was a statistical difference in the score on the dimension of empathy among the occupation of respondents. Therefore, it means that difference in the occupation was related to tourists' satisfaction towards homestay accommodations in empathy dimension.

The post hoc test, the Tukey (HSD) test of significance, was later conducted to test all pairwise comparisons between group means. The Tukey test showed that there are statistically significant differences between the students and the government officials ($\bar{x}_{st}$ = 3.82 vs. $\bar{x}_g$ = 4.38), between the students and the business owners ($\bar{x}_{st}$ = 3.82 vs. $\bar{x}_b$ = 4.18), between the students and the agriculturists ($\bar{x}_{st}$ = 3.82 vs. $\bar{x}_a$ = 4.31), between the students and those self-employed ($\bar{x}_{st}$ = 3.82 vs. $\bar{x}_{s-e}$ = 4.32), and between the students and the other occupations ($\bar{x}_{st}$ = 3.82 vs. $\bar{x}_o$ =3.46).

In other words, the government officials, business owners, agriculturists, self-employees and other occupations have a higher level of satisfaction in homestay accommodations in the empathy dimension than the students. Results are analyzed as shown on table 40.

Table 40 ANOVA Analysis of Domestic Tourists' Satisfaction towards Homestay

Accommodations in the Dimension of Empathy: Occupation Difference

Service	Occupation	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Empathy	Government Official	76	4.3816	0.54079	0.6203
	Private Firm Employee	15	4.0000	0.68129	0.17593
	Business Owner	46	4.1889	0.74077	0.11043
	Agriculturist	116	4.3147	0.56542	0.05250
	Self-Employed	35	4.3286	0.66358	0.11217
	Unemployed	9	4.2778	0.44096	0.14699
	Retired	4	4.5000	0.57735	0.28868
	Student	85	3.8294	0.64804	0.07029
	Others	14	4.4643	0.49862	0.13326
	Total	400	4.2055	0.64123	0.03210

	Sum of Squares	Df.	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	18.269	8	2.284	6.126	0.000
Within Groups	145.379	390	0.373		
Total	163.648	398			

Dependent Variable: Empathy

(I) Occupation	(J) Occupation	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Student	Government official	-0.55217*	0.09639	0.000
	Business Owner	-0.35948*	0.11256	0.040
	Agriculturist	-0.48524*	0.08717	0.000
	Self-Employed	-0.49916*	0.12262	0.002
	Others	-0.63487*	0.17610	0.011

In conclusion, the difference in occupation was related to tourists' satisfaction towards homestay accommodations in the five dimensions because the results indicated that there were statistically significant differences in the scores on homestay accommodations in all five dimensions.

5.5 Hypotheses 5: The domestic tourists of different incomes will have different levels of satisfaction towards homestay accommodations in Chiang Mai Province.

Concerning the income of respondents in the tangibility dimension of homestay accommodations, the result was analyzed by using a one-way ANOVA test. It found that the ANOVA was not statistically significant at 0.980 ($F_{5, 394}$ = 0.149, p > 0.05). The results indicated that there was no statistical difference in the score on homestay accommodations in the tangibility dimension among the six income groups of tourists. Therefore, it means that difference income was not related to tourists' satisfaction towards homestay accommodations in the tangibility dimension. The results are summarized on table 41.

Table 41 ANOVA Analysis of Domestic Tourists' Satisfaction towards Homestay Accommodations in the Dimension of Tangibility: Income Difference

Service	Income per month	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Tangibility	Under 5,000 baht	176	4.0335	0.54414	0.04102
	5,000–10,000 baht	92	4.0411	0.58534	0.06103
	10,001-15,000 baht	46	4.0604	0.53143	0.07836
	15,001-20,000 baht	36	4.0154	0.49202	0.08200
	20,001-25,000 baht	21	4.1164	0.44372	0.09683
	Higher than 25,000 baht	29	4.0843	0.54324	0.09921
	Total	400	4.0447	0.53994	0.02700

Table 41 (Cont.)

	Sum of Squares	Df.	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	0.219	5	0.044	0.149	0.980
Within Groups	116.104	394	0.295		
Total	116.323	399			

In term of reliability dimension, the result was analyzed by using a one-way ANOVA test. It found that the ANOVA was not statistically significant at 0.447 ($F_{5, 394}$ = 0.953, p > 0.05). The results indicated that there was no statistical difference in the score on the dimension of reliability among the six income groups of tourists. Therefore, it means that difference income was not related to tourists' satisfaction towards homestay accommodations in the reliability dimension. The results are analyzed as shown on table 42.

Table 42 ANOVA Analysis of Domestic Tourists' Satisfaction towards Homestay Accommodations in the Dimension of Reliability: Income Difference

Service	Income per month	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Reliability	Under 5,000 baht	176	3.7784	0.56749	0.04278
	5,000–10,000 baht	92	3.6685	0.64206	0.06694
	10,001-15,000 baht	46	3.8098	0.53016	0.07817
	15,001-20,000 baht	36	3.7986	0.45442	0.07574
	20,001-25,000 baht	21	3.9048	0.40679	0.08877
	Higher than 25,000 baht	29	3.8190	0.53409	0.09918
	Total	400	3.7681	0.56319	0.02816

	Sum of Squares	Df.	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1.512	5	0.302	0.953	0.447
Within Groups	125.044	394	0.317		
Total	126.556	399			

Refer to table 43, the result was analyzed by using a one-way ANOVA test. It found that the ANOVA was not statistically significant at 0.032 ($F_{5, 394}$ = 2.477, p < 0.05). The results indicated that there was no statistical difference in the score on homestay accommodations in the dimension of responsiveness among the six income groups of tourists. Therefore, it means that difference income was not related to tourists' satisfaction towards the responsiveness dimension of homestay accommodations. The results are analyzed as shown on table 43.

Table 43 ANOVA Analysis of Domestic Tourists' Satisfaction towards Homestay
Accommodations in Dimension of Responsiveness: Income Difference

Service	Income per month	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Responsiveness	Under 5,000 baht	176	3.8835	0.71858	0.05416
	5,000–10,000 baht	92	4.0543	0.68523	0.07144
	10,001-15,000 baht	46	4.1739	0.55993	0.08256
	15,001-20,000 baht	36	3.8750	0.52610	0.08768
	20,001-25,000 baht	21	3.9286	0.74642	0.16288
	Higher than 25,000 baht	29	4.1897	0.60376	0.11212
	Total	400	3.9800	0.67879	0.03394

	Sum of Squares	Df.	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	5.604	5	1.121	2.477	0.032
Within Groups	178.236	394	0.452		
Total	183.840	399			

In dimension of assurance of homestay accommodations, the result was analyzed by using a one-way ANOVA test. It found that the ANOVA was not statistically significant at 0.786 ($F_{5, 393}$ = 0.487, p > 0.05). The results indicated that there was no statistical difference in the score on the dimension of assurance among the six income

groups of tourists. Therefore, it means that difference income was not related to tourists' satisfaction towards the assurance dimension of homestay accommodations. The results are analyzed on table 44.

Table 44 ANOVA Analysis of Domestic Tourists' Satisfaction towards Homestay Accommodations in the Dimension of Assurance: Income Difference

Service	Income per month	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Assurance	Under 5,000 baht	176	3.6439	0.76311	0.05752
	5,000–10,000 baht	92	3.6232	0.69924	0.07290
	10,001-15,000 baht	46	3.6667	0.64406	0.09496
	15,001-20,000 baht	36	3.6019	0.69383	0.11564
	20,001-25,000 baht	21	3.7778	0.57090	0.12458
	Higher than 25,000 baht	29	3.8095	0.48371	0.09141
	Total	400	3.6566	0.70168	0.03513

	Sum of Squares	Df.	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1.207	5	0.241	0.487	0.786
Within Groups	194.753	393	0.496		
Total	195.960	398			

Concerning the income of respondents to homestay accommodations in the dimension of empathy of service quality, the result was analyzed by using a one-way ANOVA test. It found that the ANOVA was not statistically significant at 0.329 ($F_{5, 393}$ = 1.159, p > 0.05). The results indicated that there was no statistical difference in the score on the dimension of empathy among the six income groups of tourists. Therefore, it means that difference income was not related to tourists' satisfaction towards the empathy dimension of homestay accommodations. The results are summarized on table 45.

Table 45 ANOVA Analysis of Domestic Tourists' Satisfaction towards Homestay

Accommodations in the Dimension of Empathy: Income Difference

Service	Income per month	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Empathy	Under 5,000 baht	176	4.1420	0.68012	0.05127
	5,000–10,000 baht	92	4.2228	0.60385	0.06296
	10,001-15,000 baht	46	4.2174	0.69644	0.10268
	15,001-20,000 baht	36	4.3333	0.52099	0.08683
	20,001-25,000 baht	21	4.4286	0.61818	0.13490
	Higher than 25,000 baht	29	4.1964	0.55007	0.10395
	Total	400	4.2055	0.64123	0.03210

	Sum of Squares	Df.	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups Within Groups	2.378	5	0.476	1.159	0.329
	161.270	393	0.410		
Total	163.648	398			

In conclusion, income was not related to tourists' satisfaction towards homestay accommodations in the five dimensions of service because the results indicated that there were no statistically significant differences in the scores on all five dimensions of homestay accommodations.

Summary

Analyzing the results above, it can be concluded that the first and fifth hypotheses were rejected. That the domestic tourists with different genders did not express different level of satisfaction towards homestay accommodations and the domestic tourists with different incomes per month did not express different level of satisfaction towards homestay accommodations in Chiang Mai Province.

However, the other hypotheses were supported. The domestic tourists with different personal characteristics, such as ages, education levels, and occupations expressed different level of satisfaction towards homestay accommodations in Chiang Mai Province.