

## CHAPTER FOUR

### RESULTS

The previous chapter explained the subject, materials, procedure and data analysis. This chapter reports the results of the study which is divided into 4 parts based on the data collected from 150 questionnaires.

The findings analyzed are divided into 4 parts:

- 4.1) Personal data of respondents
- 4.2) The characteristics of visitors in the park
- 4.3) The degree of attractions in terms of services, facilities, activities and scenery
- 4.4) Problems and Suggestions

#### 4.1 PERSONAL DATA

There were 6 questions asking about the respondent's personal data. The information containing the gender, age, level of education, occupation, average monthly income and residential area of respondents. The 150 respondents were requested to complete questionnaire at Wachirabenchatat Park.

Table 1 shows the total number of 150 respondents. Most of the visitors in this survey were female (103), accounting for 68.7%. The rest of the respondents were male. The number of male respondents were (47), accounting for 31.3%.

*Table 1. Gender of Respondents*

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	47	31.3
Female	103	68.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table 2 indicates that the most of the respondents were between 21-30 years old, accounting for 36.7%. Followed by the respondents whose age was less than 20 years old (46) for 30.7% then aged of 31-40 years old (28) accounting for 18.7%.

The rest of the respondents were 41-50 years old and more than 50 years old at 8.7% and 5.3% respectively.

**Table 2. Age of Respondents**

<b>Age</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
less than 20 years old	46	30.7
21-30 years old	55	36.7
31-40 years old	28	18.7
41-50 years old	13	8.7
More than 50 years old	8	5.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table 3 illustrates the majority of the respondents' educational level was a bachelor degree (84), accounting for 56%. Followed by the respondents whose educational level were upper secondary school at 20.7% (31). The rest of the respondents' educational level was lower than secondary school, higher than a bachelor degree and primary school accounting for 11.3% (17), 7.3%(11), 4.7% (7) respectively.

**Table 3. Educational Level of Respondents**

<b>Education</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Primary school	7	4.7
Lower secondary school	17	11.3
Upper secondary school	31	20.7
Bachelor degree	84	56.0
Higher than bachelor degree	11	7.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table 4 shows that the most of the respondents were private company officer at 47.3% (71), followed by students at 32% (48). The rest of the respondents were vendors or business owners at 8% (12), government officers at 7.3% (11), state

enterprise officers at 4% (6), and the last group were housewives/unemployed at 1.3% (2).

**Table 4. Occupations of Respondents**

<b>Occupation</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Student	48	32.0
Private company officer	71	47.3
Government officer	11	7.3
State enterprise officer	6	4.0
Vendors/ business owner	12	8.0
Housewife/ unemployed	2	1.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table 5 indicates the average monthly income of the respondents. Most of them earn 10,001-20,000 baht per month at 30% (45), followed by the respondents who earn 5,001-10,000 baht per month at 27.3% (41) then the respondents earning less than 5,000 baht per month at 26.7% (40). The rest of the respondent's monthly income levels were 20,001-40,000 baht and more than 40,000 baht which accounted for 13.3% (20) and 2.7% (4) respectively.

**Table 5. Monthly Income of Respondents**

<b>Average monthly income</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Less than 5000 baht	40	26.7
5001-10000 baht	41	27.3
10001-20000 baht	45	30.0
20001-40000 baht	20	13.3
More than 40000 baht	4	2.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table 6 shows that the majority of respondents visiting the Wachirabenchatat Park reside out of the Chatuchak area at 88% (132). On the other hand, respondents reside in the Chatuchak area were only 12% (18) of the respondents.

**Table 6. Residential Area of Respondents**

<b>Residential area</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Chatuchak area	18	12.0
Outside Chatuchak area	132	88.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>100.0</b>

#### **4.2 THE CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS**

The part describes the characteristics of the visitors who visit Wachirabenchatat Park such as the visiting frequency, companions of respondents, transportation use, visiting time and the purpose of visiting the park.

Table 7 indicates that most of the respondents visited the park many how many times per year at 26% (39), followed by 1-2 times per month at 25.3% (38), first time at 21.3% (32). The rest of the respondents visited the park every month at 18.7% (28) and 1-2 times per week at 8.7% (13).

**Table 7. Visiting Frequency of Respondents**

<b>Visiting frequency</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
First time	32	21.3
1-2 times/week	13	8.7
1-2 times/month	38	25.3
Every month	28	18.7
Many times per year	39	26.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table 8 shows that the majority of the respondents visited the Wachirabenchatat Park with their friends (71), accounting for 47.3%, followed by respondents who visited with their family/relatives at 40% (60). The rest visited the park with an organization, alone and with a spouse/lover at 7.3% (11), 3.3% (5) and 2% (3) respectively.

**Table 8. Companions of Respondents**

<b>Accompanying</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Alone	5	3.3
Family/relatives	60	40.0
Friends	71	47.3
Organization	11	7.3
Spouse/Lover	3	2.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table 9 shows that most respondents used private cars to visit the park at 40% (60). The second rank of transportation use was a bus at 25.3% (38), followed by taxi, motorcycle and on foot at 22.7% (34), 10% (15), and 2% (3) respectively.

**Table 9. Transportation used by Respondents**

<b>Transportation</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
On foot	3	2.0
Taxi	34	22.7
Motorcycle	15	10.0
Private car	60	40.0
Bus	38	25.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table 10 indicates that the visiting time of the respondents was mostly between 14.01-17.00 (74), accounting for 49.3% of all respondents. The second highest visiting time was during 11.01-14.00 at 24.7% (37). The rest of the respondents visited the park between 17.01-21.00 then 8.01-11.00, and 5.00-8.00 at 13.3% (20), 10.7% (16) and 2% (3) respectively.

**Table 10. Visiting Time of Respondents**

<b>Visit time</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
5.00-8.00	3	2.0
8.01-11.00	16	10.7
11.01-14.00	37	24.7
14.01-17.00	74	49.3
17.01-21.00	20	13.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table 11 shows that the most of respondents' visited the park for scenery at 74% (111), followed by park activities at 17.3% (26). The rest of respondents visited the park for other reasons such as a well-known meeting point, travel convenience and event participation at 4% (6), park facilities at 3.3% (5) and park service at 1.3% (2)

**Table 11. Visiting Reason of Respondents**

<b>Visiting reason</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Park scenery	111	74.0
Park services	2	1.3
Park activities	26	17.3
Park facilities	5	3.3
Others	6	4.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>100.0</b>

#### **4.3 THE DEGREE OF ATTRACTIONS OF THE PARK**

This part summarized the degree of the attractions of Wachirabenchatat Park divided into four categories in terms of services, facilities, activities and scenery in the Wachirabenchatat Park.

Table 12 indicates the degree of attractions to the park service comprised 5 aspects. For service time, it is shown that 94% respondents feel good with the service time, 4.7% feel neutral, and 1.3% respondents feel that it was poor. The second aspect

is staff service. Most respondents also feel good with staff service at 59.3%, followed by the respondents who feel neutral at 29.3%, and 11.3% respondents who feel that it was poor. The third aspect is security service within the park. 64% respondents feel good, 28.7% feel neutral, and 7.3% feel that it was poor. The fourth aspect is maintenance service, the result shows that 76.7% respondents feel good with it, 20% respondents feel neutral and the rest of them feel that it was poor. The last one is the number of the park staff who give services to visitors within the park. Most respondents feel good with the number of staff (50.7%), followed by the respondents who feel neutral (35.3%), and the rest feel that it was poor (14%).

**Table 12. Attractions of the park services**

Park service	Good		Neutral		Poor	
	Fq	Percent	Fq	Percent	Fq	Percent
<b>1. Service time</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4.7%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1.3%</b>
<b>2. Staff service</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>59.3%</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>29.3%</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>11.3%</b>
<b>3. Security service</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>64%</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>28.7%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>7.3%</b>
<b>4. Maintenance service</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>76.7%</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3.3%</b>
<b>5. The Number of park staff</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>50.7%</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>35.3%</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>14%</b>

Table 13 shows the degree of attractions in terms of facilities in the park by dividing them into ten items. It is found that most respondents feel good with the facilities within the park such as path/road, parking lots, restaurants, trash cans, directions/signs, sport fields, sport equipment and playground equipment. On the other hand, the toilet, parking lots and public phones were excluded. The respondents feel that the park toilets, parking lots and public phones were poor, accounting for 36.7%, 39.3% and 36% respectively.

*Table 13. Attractions of the facilities*

Facilities	Good		Neutral		Poor	
	Fq	Percent	Fq	Percent	Fq	Percent
<b>1. Path and road</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>84.7%</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>12.7%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2.7%</b>
<b>2. Toilets</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>35.3%</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>28.0%</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>36.7%</b>
<b>3. Parking lots</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>37.3%</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>23.3%</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>39.3%</b>
<b>4. Restaurants</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>26.7%</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>15.3%</b>
<b>5. Public phones</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>32.7%</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>31.3%</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>36.0%</b>
<b>6. Trash cans</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>24.7</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>13.3%</b>
<b>7. Clear directions and signs</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>25.3%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>8.7%</b>
<b>8. Sport fields</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>69.3%</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6.7%</b>
<b>9. Sports equipment</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>36.7%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5.3%</b>
<b>10. Playground equipment</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>69.3%</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>24.7%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>6%</b>

Table 14 indicates the degrees of attraction toward activities in the park. The majority of respondents feel good with activities such as picnics, outdoor sports, bicycling and kayaking, swimming and playing in the playground, as well as camping and bird watching. More than half of the respondents rated highly in picnics (84.7%), swimming and playing in the playground (79.3%), and camping and bird watching (65.3%). Outdoor sport was also at 35.3% as well as bicycling and kayaking at 48% of the respondents.

*Table 14. Attractions of the activities*

Activities	Good		Neutral		Poor	
	Fq	Percent	Fq	Percent	Fq	Percent
<b>1. Picnic</b>	127	84.7%	19	12.7%	4	2.7%
<b>2. Outdoor sports</b>	53	35.3%	50	33.3%	47	31.3%
<b>3. Bicycling and kayaking</b>	72	48%	41	27.3%	37	24.7%
<b>4. Swimming and playing in playground</b>	119	79.3%	29	19.3%	2	1.3%
<b>5. Camping and bird watching</b>	98	65.3%	50	33.3%	2	1.3%

Table 15 shows the degrees of attraction toward the scenery within the park. Most of respondents highly rated scenery such as scenic beauty within the park (88.7%), the size of the park (80.7%), the varieties of trees and flowers (66.7%), peacefulness (78.8%), park's cleanliness (68.7%), and park decoration (76.7%).

*TABLE 15. Attractions of the scenery*

Scenery	Good		Neutral		Poor	
	Fq	Percent	Fq	Percent	Fq	Percent
<b>1. Scenery beauty within the park</b>	133	88.7%	9	6%	8	5.3%
<b>2. The size of the park</b>	121	80.7%	29	19.3%	-	-
<b>3. The varieties of trees and flowers</b>	100	66.7%	27	18%	23	15.3%
<b>4. Peacefulness</b>	118	78.7%	23	15.3%	9	6%
<b>5. Park's cleanliness</b>	103	68.7%	21	14%	26	17.3%
<b>6. Park decoration</b>	115	76.7%	27	18%	8	5.3%

#### 4.4 PROBLEMS AND SUGGESTIONS OF THE PARK

This part found out the problems and suggestions gathered from the open-ended questions for park improvement in terms of park services, facilities, activities and scenery. From 150 respondents, there were 94 visitors who shared the problems and suggestions for this part. The results are as follows:

##### 1. The Problems of the Park Services

On park service problems, most respondents found that this park lacks an information center when they need to contact for park information such as park map, recreation spots, service hour. For example, the visitors don't even know the service time of the park. Moreover, the number of staff is insufficient comparing to the size of the park. The visitors noticed that there was no staff in some parts of the park, especially in less people areas. Sometimes they saw teenagers fighting in the park and no staff to take care of this incident. Some security guards and toilet staff in the park talk to the visitors impolitely and in an unfriendly manner. Also, the visitors think that park maintenance is not enough because they found some areas had dead trees and grass. Besides, the visitors complained that maintenance services should not be done during service hours because they feel uncomfortable and the inconvenience of having to move.

The visitors suggested that the park should increase the number of park staff to provide information for visitors, take care of security in the park, and give park maintenance regularly. Moreover, the staff should improve their manners, especially their impolite and unfriendly tone of speaking.

##### 2. The Problems of Park Facilities

As the result shows in table 13, the degrees of attraction to facilities such as parking lots, toilets and public phone got low scores. Most respondents complained that the parking lots, toilets and public phones were not enough compared to the large number of visitors to the park. The toilet and public phones were too far from the park as well.

The toilets were dirty and smelly. Some toilets are located in unsafe areas. Visitors also commented that the number of trash cans was insufficient because they often saw overflowing rubbishes in trash cans. Some respondents gave comments on restaurants. The restaurants within the park were not well-organized because many restaurants are located on footpaths, resulting in congestion. Besides, the directions and sign in the park were hard to find and were unclear.

In order to solve the problems, the facilities should be improved. The park should increase the number of toilets, public phones, trash cans and provide more space for parking lots in the park. The directions and signs should be clear so visitors can go to places in the park easily. Moreover, the visitors suggested that the park should provide more facilities such as service bus within the park, benches, sport field, free drinking water spots, wi-fi, nightlights, and playground equipment.

### 3. The Problems of Park Activities

For the park activities, most visitors commented about outdoor sports and bicycling in the park. The park had a small number of outdoor sports, and the bicycling in the park was not well-organized because the numbers of the traffic police was insufficient. Moreover, many riders did not follow the riding regulations. As a result, accidents happened all the time.

The visitors suggested that the park should increase the variety of outdoor sports. For bicycling, the number of the traffic police should be increased to take care of children's safety.

### 4. The Problems of Scenery

For the park scenery, the major problems the respondents faced are the varieties of trees and flowers and the cleanliness of the park. Most respondents commented that there was no variety in the trees and flowers of the park. Cleanliness was another point that the park should pay attention to. The visitors found rubbish dropped on the grass and dead fish floating in the ponds. Also, some grass areas had big holes.

For scenic improvement, the visitors suggested the park should plant more kinds of trees and flowers as well as the wastewater treatment.

#### 4.5 TESTING HYPOYHESIS

Hypothesis 1 There is difference in factors attracting visitors to Wachirabenchatat Park

Table 16 shows no significant difference between male and female in factors attracting visitors to Wachirabenchatat Park. However, the results show that male are more slightly attracted by the attractions of Wachirabenchatat Park in all aspects, except scenery. Therefore, all factors of attractions show no significant difference according to the constructed hypothesis.

*Table 16. Testing Hypothesis 1 (T-test)*

Gender	n	Mean	S.D.	t	(n=150) Sig.
<b>Services</b>					
Male	47	4.08	0.690	.162	.872
Female	103	4.06	0.573		
<b>Facilities</b>					
Male	47	4.14	0.701	1.933	.055
Female	103	3.90	0.735		
<b>Activities</b>					
Male	47	4.67	0.302	1.973	.051
Female	103	4.55	0.402		
<b>Scenery</b>					
Male	47	4.34	0.759	-1.251	.215
Female	103	4.50	0.583		
<b>Overall</b>					
Male	47	<b>4.31</b>	0.479	.735	.464
Female	103	<b>4.25</b>	0.417		

Hypothesis 2: Older visitors are more attracted by the attractions of Wachirabenchatat Park than younger visitors

Table 17 shows no significant differences in visitor degrees of attraction to Wachirabenchatat Park. However, the overall results show that the older visitors who were more than 40 years old were more slightly attracted to the attractions of Wachirabenchatat Park than younger visitors who were under 40 years old, but only insignificantly. Thus, the results show a different outcome that older visitors are more attracted by the attractions of the park than younger visitors.

**Table 17. Testing Hypothesis 2 (F-test)**

(n=150)					
Age	n	Mean	S.D.	F	Sig.
<b>Services</b>					
less than 20 years old	46	4.15	0.620	1.715	.150
21-30 years old	55	4.04	0.569		
31-40 years old	28	3.85	0.639		
41-50 years old	13	4.31	0.520		
More than 50 years old	8	4.15	0.739		
<b>Facilities</b>					
less than 20 years old	46	4.06	0.774	.691	.599
21-30 years old	55	3.94	0.660		
31-40 years old	28	3.81	0.776		
41-50 years old	13	4.05	0.785		
More than 50 years old	8	4.16	0.767		
<b>Activities</b>					
less than 20 years old	46	4.61	0.344	.342	.849
21-30 years old	55	4.61	0.441		
31-40 years old	28	4.52	0.349		
41-50 years old	13	4.62	0.249		
More than 50 years old	8	4.56	0.377		
<b>Scenery</b>					
less than 20 years old	46	4.53	0.616	1.147	.337
21-30 years old	55	4.40	0.683		
31-40 years old	28	4.29	0.707		
41-50 years old	13	4.64	0.456		
More than 50 years old	8	4.65	0.507		
<b>Overall</b>					
less than 20 years old	46	4.34	0.474	1.626	.171
21-30 years old	55	4.25	0.391		
31-40 years old	28	4.12	0.467		
41-50 years old	13	4.40	0.364		
More than 50 years old	8	4.38	0.431		

**Hypothesis 3:** Visitors with a lower education are more attracted by attractions of Wachirabenchatat Park than those with a higher education

Table 18 presents statistically significant differences on factors of attraction, classified by the level of the visitors' education. Overall, visitors who hold lower than a bachelor degree are more attracted by the attractions of Wachirabenchatat Park than visitors who hold a bachelor degree and higher. The results found that the factors having significant differences were with regard to facilities. Therefore, the results reveal that visitors with a lower education are more attracted by the attractions of Wachirabenchatat Park than those with a higher education according to the constructed hypothesis.

**Table 18. Testing Hypothesis 3 (F-test)**

(n=150)					
Level of Education	n	Mean	S.D.	F	Sig.
<b>Services</b>					
Primary school	7	4.43	0.647	1.537	.194
Lower secondary school	17	4.07	0.707		
Upper secondary school	31	4.21	0.566		
Bachelor degree	84	3.98	0.599		
Higher than bachelor	11	4.11	0.568		
<b>Facilities</b>					
Primary school	7	4.70	0.493	3.395	.011*
Lower secondary school	17	4.14	0.777		
Upper secondary school	31	4.15	0.759		
Bachelor degree	84	3.84	0.689		
Higher than bachelor	11	3.79	0.711		
<b>Activities</b>					
Primary school	7	4.62	0.393	1.871	.119
Lower secondary school	17	4.73	0.333		
Upper secondary school	31	4.60	0.384		
Bachelor degree	84	4.53	0.384		
Higher than bachelor	11	4.79	0.259		
<b>Scenery</b>					
Primary school	7	4.86	0.378	3.195	.015
Lower secondary school	17	4.71	0.415		
Upper secondary school	31	4.59	0.503		
Bachelor degree	84	4.30	0.710		
Higher than bachelor	11	4.59	0.625		

*(Table continues)*

**Table 18. Testing Hypothesis 3 (F-test)(continued)**

(n=150)

---

<b>Overall</b>					
Primary school	7	4.65	0.354	3.885	.005*
Lower secondary school	17	4.41	0.430		
Upper secondary school	31	4.39	0.433		
Bachelor degree	84	4.16	0.425		
Higher than bachelor	11	4.32	0.365		

---

\* P&lt;0.05.