acss Conference Proceedings

acss
acsee

2012

iafor

ISSN: 2186-2303

The Asian Conference on the Social Sciences

Osaka, Japan 2012

The Asian Conference on the Social Sciences

Conference Proceedings 2012

Dr Shamir Ali, Lecturer, National University of Modern Languages, Pakistan

Professor David N Aspin, Professor Emeritus and Former Dean of the Faculty of Education,
Monash University, Australia

Dr William Baber, Associate Professor, Kyoto University Graduate School of Management, Japan

Professor Don Brash, Former Governor of the Reserve Bank, New Zealand, Former Leader of the New National Party, New Zealand , Adjunct Professor, AUT, New Zealand & La Trobe University, Australia

Lord Charles Bruce of Elgin and Kincardine, Lord Lieutenant of Fife, Chairman of the Patrons of the National Galleries of Scotland, Trustee of the Historic Scotland Foundation, UK

Professor Judith Chapman, Professor of Education, Australian Catholic University, Australia, Fellow, St Edmund's College, Cambridge University, UK, Member of the Order of Australia

Professor Chung-Ying Cheng, Professor of Philosophy, University of Hawai'i at Manoa, USA, Editor-in-Chief, The Journal of Chinese Philosophy

Professor Tien-Hui Chiang, Professor and Chair, Department of Education, National University of Tainan, Taiwan/Chinese Taipei

Mr Marcus Chidgey, CEO, Captive Minds Communications Group, London, UK

Professor Steve Cornwell, Professor of English and Interdisciplinary Studies, Osaka Jogakuin University, Osaka, Japan

Professor Michael A. Cusumano, SMR Distinguished Professor of Management and Engineering Systems,
MIT Sloan School of Management, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, USA

Professor Dexter Da Silva, Professor of Educational Psychology, Keisen University, Tokyo, Japan

Professor Georges Depeyrot, Professor and Director of Research, French National Center for Scientific Research (CNRS)/Ecole Normale Superieure, Paris, France

Professor Sue Jackson, Professor of Lifelong Learning and Gender, Pro-Vice Master of Teaching and Learning, Birkbeck, University of London, UK

Professor June Henton, Dean, College of Human Sciences, Auburn University, USA

Professor Michael Herriman, Professor of English, Nagoya University of Commerce and Business, Japan

Vice-Consul Kathryn Kiser, Cultural Affairs Officer, Lahore, Pakistan, The United States Department of State, USA

Mr Shahzada Khalid, Deputy Director, SAARC Energy Center, Pakistan

Mrs Eri Kudo, Head Private Sector Fundraising, United Nations World Food Programme Japan, Tokyo, Japan

Professor Sing Kong Lee, Director, The National Institute of Education, Singapore

Dr Woon Chia Liu, Associate Dean, Practicum and School Partnerships, Teacher Education, The National Institute of Education, Singapore

Professor Sir Geoffrey Lloyd, Senior Scholar in Residence, The Needham Research Institute, Cambridge, UK
Fellow and Former Master, Darwin College, University of Cambridge, Fellow of the British Academy, Honorary Foreign Member, The American Academy of Arts and Sciences

Dr Robert Logie, Associate Professor of Computer Science, Osaka Gakuin University, Japan

Dr David McLoughlin, Associate Professor, Meiji University, Japan

Professor Vasile Meita, General Manager, The National Institute for Research and Development in Construction, Urban Planning and Sustainable Spatial Development (URBAN=INCERC), Romania

Professor Keith Miller, Louise Hartman Schewe and Karl Schewe Professor of Computer Science
The University of Illinois Springfield, USA, Editor-in-Chief, IEEE Technology and Society

Professor Marjo Hannele Mitsutomi, Head of English Language Teaching Practices and the Language Development Intercultural Studies Center, Akita International University, Japan

Professor Ka Ho Joshua Mok, Chair Professor of Comparative Policy, Associate Vice-President (External Relations), Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, The Hong Kong Institute of Education, Hong Kong SAR

Dr Jo Mynard, Associate Professor & Director of the SALC, Kanda University of International Studies, Japan

Professor Michiko Nakano, Professor of English, Director of the Distance Learning Center, Waseda University, Tokyo, Japan

Ms Karen Newby, Director, Par les mots solidaires, Paris, France

Professor Jerry Platt, Professor of Business, Akita International University, Japan, Dean and Professor Emeritus, College of Business, San Francisco State University, USA

Professor Michael Pronko, Professor of American Literature and Culture, Meiji Gakuin University, Tokyo, Japan

Professor Monty P. Satiadarma, Clinical Psychologist and Lecturer in Psychology, Former Deanof the Department of Psychology and Rector of the University, Tarumanugara University, Indonesia

Mr Michael Sakamoto, Interdisciplinary Artist, UCLA, USA

Mr Mohamed Salaheen, Director, The United Nations World Food Programme, Japan & Korea

Mr Lowell Sheppard, Asia Pacific Director, HOPE International Development Agency, Canada/Japan

Professor Ken Kawan Soetanto, Professor and Director of CLEDSI, Waseda University, Japan

Dr Jeffrey Sommers, Associate Professor of Economics, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, USA, Visiting Faculty, Stockholm School of Economics, Riga, Latvia

His Excellency Dr Drago Stambuk, Croatian Ambassador to Brazil, Brazil

Professor Mary Stuart, Vice-Chancellor, The University of Lincoln, UK

Professor Gary Swanson, Distinguished Journalist-in-Residence & Mildred S. Hansen Endowed Chair, The University of Northern Colorado, USA

Dr David Wilkinson, Associate Dean (International & External Programmes), Faculty of Law and Management, La Trobe University, Australia

Professor Kensaku Yoshida, Professor of English, Director of the Center for the Teaching of Foreign Languages in General Education, Sophia University, Tokyo, Japan

Mrs Ely Zaniewicka, Political Correspondent, BBC Political Programmes, London, UK

© The International Academic Forum 2012
The International Academic Forum (IAFOR)
Sakae 1-16-26-201
Naka Ward, Nagoya, Aichi
Japan 460-0008
ISSN: 2186-2303
http://iafor.org/acss_proceedings.html

Factor Analysis of Tourism Effects on People in Hua Hin Municipality, Prajuabkirikhan Province

Noppanon Homsud, Nutta Ampai , Anusra Anekpattanakit

0443

Silpakorn University, Thailand

The Asian Conference on the Social Sciences

Official Conference Proceedings 2012

Abstract:

The purpose of this research was to analyze the effects of tourism on people in Hua Hin municipality area, Prajuabkirikhan province. The sample group was 400 people living in their hometown located in Hua Hin municipality area, Prajuabkirikhan province. The sample group was selected by convenience sampling. The instrument used was questionnaire and the statistics used were frequency, percentage, average, standard deviation and factor analysis. The research results revealed factor analysis of tourism effects on people could be divided into 5 aspects including economic, social, cultural, environmental, and physical aspects. The overall variance could be described at 73.368%. The qualitative finding during collecting the questionnaires was that there were some communities opening pubs and bars for almost all of the lanes and people who were living in those areas labelled "Do not disturb". This can be believed that those people got effects directly from tourism.

1. Introduction

The tourism business is considered very important through the economic section of Thailand. The proportion of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) is around 6% and numerous incomes from tourism flows into the country in terms of foreign currency. Moreover, this originates the income distribution within the country However, economic crisis in 2007 affected all over the world as well as domestic problems no matter from politic uncertainty, conflict and violence in the country, the strong baht, these made the numbers of foreign tourists travelling to Thailand, even the Thai tourists, are decreasing consistently. Therefore, the government issued the measure to motivate tourism in several forms to help the entrepreneurs and promote both foreign and Thai tourists for travelling in Thailand (The National Statistical Office of Thailand, 2011).

Nonetheless, tourism plan must not be interested in only the development but must make understanding clearly that how society and people in the community perceive or get effects from tourism because tourism can bring both advantages and disadvantages to the people in the community (Pearce, Moscardo, and Ross, 1996), for example, tourism originated the employment which will bring income to the people in the community to have a good life. In addition, the tourism can bring the tax, constructions and facilities to the locality. On the other hand, tourism can bring negative effects as well such as the conjestion, noise pollution, murder, pollution and environmental damages in several ways (Akis, Peristianis, and Warner, 1996).

Jafari (1986) said that during the year 1960, the study of effects of tourism emphasized only the positive effects but in the year of 1970, the study focused on negative effects. Until 1980, the study of effects have been emphasized both positive and negative way. Since then, there have been a lot of theories mentioned about the tourism effects. One of those theories were Social Exchange Theory appeared in several researches, such as Juroswki, Uysal, and Williams (1997), the theory claimed that tourism could acquire benefits but also brought the costs to the people in community. Moreover, the research found that tourism caused economic benefits but negative effects in terms of social, cultural and environmental effects.

Hua Hin municipality is located in the east of Hua Hin district, Prajuabkirikhan province attached with Thai gulf. The area is in rectangle shape. The west is full of mountains and the areas leaning down to the sea at Thai Gulf. The areas are around 86.36 square kilometers or 53,975 Rai. The route is Phetkasem road (highway number 4) crossing from the north to the south around 22 kilometers long far away from Bangkok around 230 kilometers. The areas are crowded community and commerce around 3% and there are also communities scattered not crowded far away, this is the agricultural area, empty space and military areas. For the city expansion, it is expanded long through the Phetkasem road. There are a lot of tourism places such as hotel, restaurant and the establishment related to tourisms numerously. Therefore each year almost 2 million tourists visiting and this makes the amount of money spread out in the community more than 6 billion baht per year. Hua Hin municipality is a palace location, Klai Kang Wol palace where H.M. King Bhumibol Adulyadej and Her Majesty Queen Sirikit stayed for not a long time in the past. Hua Hin municipality is the pollution control area according to the announcement of the National Environment Board [NEB], 13th volume (B.E. 2539) and the area which environmental protection measure was used the measure of environment protection according to the announcement of Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment, B.E. 2547. The county of Hua Hin municipality covers 2 sub-districts, which are Hua-Hin sub-district and Hnong Kae sub-district (Hua Hin municipality, 2011).

The components of tourism effects through people in this area are not indicated clearly. Thus, the researcher has to use the technique of factor analysis which is the technique of multivariate statistics

analysis. The purpose of this technique is to explain the co-variance relationship among several variables with a few components (Wanichbancha, 2007)

With the reasons mentioned above, the research of "Factor Analysis of Tourism Effects on People in Hua Hin Municipality, Prajuabkirikhan Province" happens. This focuses on the tourism effects on people living in their hometown located in Hua Hin municipality area, Prajuabkirikhan province.

2. Research Methodology

The methods of the research were as follows:

2.1 The scope of this study was a quantitative research carried out by surveying the people living in their hometown located in Hua Hin municipality area, Prajuabkirikhan province. The content of survey was about analyzing the effect factors of tourism on the people in Hua Hin municipality, Prajuabkirikhan province.

2.2 The population used in this research was the people who the people living in their hometown (born or had the census in this area) located in Hua Hin municipality area, Prajuabkirikhan province. The population used had to have the election right which was equal to 35,255 persons (Hua Hin Municipality, 2011)

2.3 The sample group was calculated by using the Yamane Formula and got the sample size around 400 persons then using the convenience sampling between October-November, 2011.

2.4 The instrument used in this research was questionnaire which could be divided into 3 parts including 1) general data of the respondents, 2) behavioral data related to tourism and 3) opinion factors about effects of tourism on the community.

2.5 Process of the Research

2.5.1 Reviewed the literature to study the framework, theory and research contributions from related books, journals and articles to determine the issue.

2.5.2 Drafted the questionnaire in accordance with the research purposes by considering the validity of content and language.

2.5.3 Got 2 experts of behavioral science and marketing field to consider the validity of questionnaire by selecting only the question items which had the Index of Item Objective Congruence : IOC more than 0.50.

2.5.4 Got the revised questionnaire by the experts to test with the people living in their hometown located in Cha-Am Municipality, Petchaburi province for 30 persons. It was found that the Cronbach alpha coefficient of the questionnaire was equal to 0.884 which had the value nearly 1. It was indicated that the questionnaire had high reliability (Pisalboot, Yaisawang and Assawadechanukorn, 2006).

2.5.5 Got the questionnaire which had validity and reliability collected the field data through the people living in their hometown located in Hua Hin municipality, Prajuabkirikhan province for 400 sets. The data was collected between October-November, 2011.

2.6 Data analysis; the researcher examined the validity of the data and got the data analyzed by statistic program in terms of general data of the respondents and behaviors about tourism. Descriptive Statistics were used which included frequency and percentage.

For the factor analysis of opinions about effects of tourism on the community of people living in Hua Hin municipality, Prajuabkirikhan province, it is used by factor analysis by Principal Component Analysis by Varimax's method. The criteria used for considering the factors was Eigen values which had to be more than 1 and the Factor Loading value had to have the Absolute value more than 0.5 (Wanichbancha, 2007).

In addition, the calculation of mean, standard deviation and average interpretation on items in each aspect of the questionnaire were used by holding the criteria of meaning interpretation as the details as follows:

The average score of 4.51 – 5.00 means the most level

The average score of 3.51 – 4.50	means	much level
The average score of 2.51 – 3.50	means	moderate level
The average score of 1.51 – 2.50	means	little level
The average score of 1.00 – 1.50	means	the least level

3. The Results

After the researcher had collected, examined and analyzed the data, the research results were as follows:

3.1 Most of the sample group was female 274 persons (68.50%), 197 persons (49.25%) had the age between 20 – 30 years old, 231 persons (57.75%) had single status, 287 persons (71.75%) got bachelor degree, 103 persons (25.75%) worked in the private sections, 176 persons (44.00%) had income between 10,000 – 20,000 baht, 212 persons (53.00%) had the family members between 4-5 persons.

3.2 The research results of behaviors in tourism of the respondents could be concluded that 173 respondents (43.25%) felt the most regret if they had to move out of Hua Hin municipality area. 245 respondents (61.25%) had the members in the family worked for tourism business. 103 respondents (25.75%) talked to the tourists for 5 times within 12 months. 385 respondents (96.25%) never participated in the tourism development plan in Hua Hin municipality. The average of opinion that how quickly the Hua Hin municipality developed was equal to 4.27 (1 was the most slowly developed and 5 was the most quickly developed). The average of assessment on tourism development in Hua Hin municipality was equal to 3.35 (1 was the worst developed and 5 was the best developed)

3.3 The analysis results of the effects of tourism on people's opinions in Hua Hin municipality area, Prajuabkirikhan province could be concluded that for the data appropriateness examined, it was found that the KMO value (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin) was equal to 0.786, this was nearly 1 and the Bartlet's Test of Sphericity value was equal to 5837.524 (Sig = 0.000). This indicated that the appropriate data used for analyzing the factors by using the method of primary components analysis could be divided into 5 factors. This could describe the total variance at 73.368% (as shown in Table 1) as follows:

3.3.1 Component 1, the Eigenvalues value was = 6.557. It could explain the variance at 21.458 including 1) tourism brought incomes to the small-SME in the municipality area, 2) tourism helped creating work to the locality, 3) the living conditions of people in the locality better because of the tourism, 4) tourism is the main income for the development of Hua Hin municipality, 5) tourism helped attract the investment within the locality, and 6) tourism originated additional careers of people in the locality. This component was called "economic component".

3.3.2 Component 2, the Eigenvalues value was = 5.076. It could explain the variance at 17.224% including 1) tourism destroyed the traditional traditions of the locality, 2) some parts of residents got effects from tourism development, 3) tourism made the cost of living of people in the locality increase, 4) tourism damaged the public more, and 5) tourism brought murders. This component was called "social component".

3.3.3 Component 3. The Eigenvalues value was = 3.901. It could explain the variance at 14.454 including 1) tourism made traditionally cultural reservation of the locality, 2) tourism originated harmony cross-cultural communication, 3) tourism caused public relations of local culture to external parts, and 4) tourism caused income from local culture. This component was called "cultural component".

3.3.4 Component 4. The Eigenvalues value was = 2.878. It could explain the variance at 12.704% including 1) tourism caused pollution, 2) tourism caused crowded of people and traffic, and 3) the tourism entrepreneurs intruded the reserved places. This component was called "environmental component".

3.3.5 Component 5, the Eigenvalues value was = 1.916. It could explain the variance at 7.528% including 1) tourism caused reservation or development of historical places or important

places, and 2) tourism caused the development of utility system and facilities. This component was called "physical component".

Table 3: The factor analysis results of the effects of tourism on people's opinions in Hua Hin municipality area, Prajuabkirikhan province

Component	Factor Loading	Mean	S.D.	Interpretation
Component 1: Economic				
1) Tourism brought incomes to the small-SME in the municipality area	0.875	4.27	0.74	Much level
2) Tourism helped creating work to the locality	0.807	4.18	0.76	Much level
3) The living conditions of people in the locality better because of the tourism	0.712	3.97	0.94	Much level
4) Tourism is the main income for the development of Hua Hin municipality	0.661	4.02	0.69	Much level
5) Tourism helped attract the investment within the locality	0.624	3.88	0.81	Much level
6) Tourism originated additional careers of people in the locality	0.589	3.87	0.83	Much level
Component 2: Social				
1) Tourism destroyed the traditional traditions of the locality	0.814	3.45	0.67	Moderate level
2) Some parts of residents got effects from tourism development	0.797	3.62	0.71	Much level
3) Tourism made the cost of living of people in the locality increase	0.734	3.71	0.75	Much level
4) Tourism damaged the public more	0.691	3.34	0.62	Moderate level
5) Tourism brought murders	0.507	3.29	0.88	Moderate level
Component 3: Cultural				
1) Tourism made traditionally cultural reservation of the locality	0.778	3.54	0.74	Much level
2) Tourism originated harmony cross-cultural communication	0.754	3.48	0.70	Moderate level
3) Tourism caused public relations of local culture to external parts	0.721	3.57	0.87	Much level
4) Tourism caused income from local culture.	0.684	3.40	0.57	Moderate level
Component 4: Environmental				
1) Tourism caused pollution	0.784	3.78	0.64	Much level
2) Tourism caused crowded of people and traffic	0.771	4.01	0.70	Much level
3) The tourism entrepreneurs intruded the reserved places	0.696	3.52	0.59	Much level
Component 5: Physical				
1) Tourism caused reservation or development of historical places or important places	0.694	3.78	0.59	Much level
2) Tourism caused the development of utility system and facilities	0.647	3.70	0.62	Much level

4. Summary and Concluding Remarks

According to this study, the research methodology was carried out by quantitative research using the 400 questionnaires. The above conclusions can be applied to the discussions as follows:

1. For general data, it was found that most of the sample group was female age between 20 – 30 years old with single marital status. The educational degree was bachelor degree and the occupation was private section employees with monthly income between 10,000 – 20,000 baht. The members in the family were around 4-5 persons.

2. For the analysis results of tourism behaviors of the respondents, it can be concluded that most of the respondents felt regret the most if they had to move from their hometown of Hua Hin municipality. Most of the respondents had the family members working for tourism business. For 12 years so far, most of the respondents talked to the tourists for 5 times. Moreover, most of the respondents had never participated in the plan. For tourism development in the Hua Hin municipality area, the average of opinions viewed that the Hua Hin municipality developed quickly at 4.27% and the average of assessment on tourism development in the Hua Hin municipality was at 3.35%

3. For the analysis of factors of the tourism effects towards people in the Hua Hin municipality area, Prajuab Kiri Khan Province; it can be divided into 5 aspects including economic aspect, social

aspect, cultural aspect, environmental aspect, and physical aspect. The total variance could be described at 73.368%.

The recommendations from this research are as follows;

1. For the research results, it was found that the respondents rarely participated in local development. Therefore, Hua Hin municipality should build community participation from people section more, such as organizing the stage of folklores circulating in each community or organizing public hearings in the large project and important.

2. For the research results in terms of factor analysis in overall, it was found that most of the respondents focused on the economy the most. However, sustainable development should be managed mutually in every aspect no matter what the aspect is, physical, social, cultural, or even the environmental aspect.

3. For overall image of the research, it was found that people in Hua Hin municipality thought that tourism affected more positive way than negative way. Anyway, for Hua Hin municipality development, the related organization shouldn't ignore the minority in the society. And the most important, for the tourism development, no matter what its level is, the governmental organizations have to realize the perception, ideas and effects both positive and negative ways which will happened to the people in community as well.

4. During the time of data collection, the researcher noticed that most of the areas in Hua Hin municipality area had been developed very well. Most of the people weren't be affected directly by the tourism. However, there were some communities or some lanes opening pubs and bars for almost all of its areas. And the people who were living at those areas labeled "Do not disturb" there. This can be believed that those people got the effects directly from the tourism.

5. This research created the model of tourism effects happened to the people in the community. This can be applied to test another groups of people in another areas in order to generate this model to be universal model in the future. In addition, for Hua Hin municipality area according to the primary data analysis of the researcher teams, it was found that the elderly had more tendency than the younger to think that tourism had effects in a negative way. Hence, this is the interesting point that should be studied to find out the reasons towards the issue.

References

[1] Akis, S., N. Peristianis, and J. Warner, 1996. "Residents' Attitudes to Tourism Development: The Case of Cyprus." *Tourism Management* 17(7), 481-494.

[2] Jafari. J., 1986. "Systemic View of Sociocultural Dimensions of Tourism." *In the President's Commission on Americans Outdoors,* 33-50.

[3] Jurowski, C., M. Uysal, and D. R. Williams, 1997., "A Theoretical Analysis of Host Community Resident Reactions to Tourism." *Journal of Travel Research*, 36(2), 3-11.

[4] Hua Hin Municipality, 2011. "Basic Information of Hua Hin Municipality", Obtained from http://www.huahin.go.th/about_people.Php, Access on 15 October 2011.

[5] Pearce, P. L., G. Moscardo and G. F. Ross, 1996., "Tourism Community Relationship. Pergaman" *James cook University of North Queensland.*

[6] Pisalboot S., S. Yaisawang, and P. Assawadechanukorn., 2006. "Creating and Processing Data from Questionnaire", *Withayapat Co., Ltd.,* Bangkok.

[7] The National Statistical Office of Thailand., 2011. "What is the Direction of Thailand Tourism?" Obtained from http://service.nso.go.th/nso/nsopublish/citizen/news/poll_thaitravel.jsp., Access on 15 October 2011.

[8] Wanichbancha, K., 2007. "Multivariate Data Analysis 2th Edition", *Chulalongkorn University Book Center,* Bangkok.