# THE STUDY OF CUSTOMER'S CHOICE CRITERIA IN CHOOSING MANDARIN LANGUAGE INSTITUTION IN BANGKOK



# THE STUDY OF CUSTOMER'S CHOICE CRITERIA IN CHOOSING MANDARIN LANGUAGE INSTITUTION IN BANGKOK

Dan Huang

This Independent Study Manuscript Presented to The Graduate School of Bangkok University in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree Master of Business Administration



©2016

Dan Huang

All Rights Reserved

This Independent Study has been approved by the Graduate School Bangkok University

# Title: THE STUDY OF CUSTOMER'S CHOICE CRITERIA IN CHOOSING MANDARIN LANGUAGE INSTITUTION IN BANGKOK

Author: Miss Dan Huang

Independent Study Committee:



Dan, H. M.B.A., April 2016, Graduate School, Bangkok University.

The Study of Customer's Choice Criteria in Choosing Mandarin Language Institution in Bangkok (87 pp.)

Advisor: Sumas Wongsunopparat, Ph.D.

## ABSTRACT

This study aims to examine and identify factors which significantly influence customer's choice criteria in choosing Mandarin Language Institution in Bangkok. This study is a quantitative study based on the concept of 7Ps, customer's lifestyle and brand, which used samples from customers of ECC, Pro Language and JCS located in Bangkok. Questionnaire has been used as an instrument to collect data. The questionnaire has been examined within two importance aspects which are content validity and reliability. In addition, Multinomial logistic Regression method were employed for hypothesis testing process and generating results in accordance with purposes of this study.

According to the data analysis, consumer emphasizing on the importance of personnel, process, physical asset of 7Ps part, and the word of mouth communication when selecting Mandarin language institution to study Mandarin.

Keywords: Choice criteria, Mandarin language institution, 7Ps, Customer's lifestyle, Brand

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

There are many people involved in the process of this Independent Study and motivated the author in one way or another as well as make this academic work more fruitful.

First, I'm grateful to my kind advisor, Dr. Sumas Wongsunopparat who have helped, guided and gave comments on this Study. It will not be possible for me to work on my own on this Study and I'm really grateful and thankful for all the valuable discussions I had with my advisor.

Thank you for the supports from my friends. All of the motivations, critiques and humors all of you have gave me during this research time are priceless and I'm so thankful.

In addition, I would like to express my sincere thanks towards the respondents who devoted their valuable time answering the questionnaire of this study.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Page                                       |
|--|
| ABSTRACT iv                                |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENT v                          |
| LIST OF TABLES viii                        |
| LIST OF FIGURES x                          |
| CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION 1                  |
| 1.1 Background1                            |
| 1.2 Problem Stament                        |
| 1.3 Purposes of Study                      |
| 1.4 Score of Study                         |
| 1.5 Significant of Study 4                 |
| 1.6 Definition of Terms5                   |
| 1.7 Focus and Limitation                   |
| CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW               |
| 2.1 Marketing of Language Institution7     |
| 2.2 Theoretical Foundation                 |
| 2.2.1 Customer Demographic Characteristic9 |
| 2.2.2 Marketing Mix10                      |
| 2.2.3 Customer's Lifestyle16               |
| 2.2.4 Brand17                              |
| 2.3 Consumer Choice                        |
| 2.4 Consumer Behavior                      |
| 2.5 Consumer Decision Making21             |
| 2.6 Multinomial Logistic Regression21      |

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

| CHAPTER 2: | LITERATURE REVIEW (Continued)                     |      |
|------------|---|------|
|            | 2.7 Conceptual Framework                          | 23   |
|            | 2.8 Variables and Hypotheses                      | 24   |
| CHAPTER 3: | METHODOLOGY                                       | . 29 |
|            | 3.1 Research Strategy                             |      |
|            | 3.2 Questionnaire Design                          | 29   |
|            | 3.3 Population and Samples                        | . 30 |
|            | 3.4 Survey Instruments                            | . 33 |
|            | 3.5 Content Validity and Reliability              | . 41 |
|            | 3.6 Data Collection.                              | . 46 |
|            | 3.7 Statistic for Data Analysis                   | . 46 |
| CHAPTER 4: | RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DATA ANALYSIS               | . 48 |
|            | 4.1 The Analytical Results for Hypothesis Testing | 48   |
|            | 4.2 The Analysis of Demographic Information       | 67   |
| CHAPTER 5: | DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION                         |      |
|            | 5.1 Conclusion                                    |      |
|            | 5.2 Discussion                                    | 81   |
|            | 5.3 Managerial Implications                       | . 85 |
|            | 5.4 Recommendation for Future Research            | . 86 |
| BIBLIOGRA  | РНҮ   | 88   |
| APPENDIX   |   | 96   |
| BIODATA    |   | 133  |
| LICENSE AG | REEMENT   | 134  |

Page

## LIST OF TABLES

| Page   |
|--|
| Table 2.1: The Research Summary of Students Choice Criteria  8                   |
| Table 2.2: Customer's Lifestyle Relevant Researches  17                          |
| Table 2.3: Dependent Variables and Independent Variables of this Study           |
| Table 3.1: Amount of Questionnaire   |
| Table 3.2: Level of Information Measurement and Criteria for Institution         |
| Brand  |
| Table 3.3: Level of Information Measurement and Criteria for Institution         |
| Table 3.4: Criteria of Reliability   |
| Table 3.5: The Result of Cronbach's Alpha Test with Pre-Test for 30 Respondents: |
| Factors  |
| Table 3.6: The Result of Cronbach's Alpha Test with Pre-Test for 30 Respondents: |
| 7Ps Marketing Mix45  |
| Table 3.7: The Result of Cronbach's Alpha Test with Pre-Test for 30 Respondents: |
| Customer's Lifestyle and Brand   |
| Table 4.1: Multinomial Logistic Regression of all Factors  48                    |
| Table 4.2: The Factors Which Influence Customer's Choice in ECC, Pro Language    |
| and JCS  |
| Table 4.3: The Factors of 7Ps Marketing Mix: Product  54                         |
| Table 4.4: The Factors of 7Ps Marketing Mix: Place  55                           |
| Table 4.5: The Crosstab Analysis for Factors of 7Ps Marketing Mix: Place         |
| (Transport)  |
| Table 4.5: The Crosstab Analysis for Factors of 7Ps Marketing Mix: Place         |
| (Distance)   |
| Table 4.7: The Factors of 7Ps Marketing Mix: Price  57                           |
| Table 4.8: The Factors of 7Ps Marketing Mix: Promotion                           |

## LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

|  | Page |
|--|------|
| Table 4.9: The Factors of 7Ps Marketing Mix: Personnel                     | 59   |
| Table 4.10: The Crosstab Analysis for Factors of 7Ps Marketing Mix:        |      |
| Personnel  | 61   |
| Table 4.11: The Factors of 7Ps Marketing Mix: Process                      | 63   |
| Table 4.12: The Factors of 7Ps Marketing Mix: Physical Asset               | 64   |
| Table 4.13: The Factors of Customer's Lifestyle                            | 65   |
| Table 4.14: The Factors of Brand   | 66   |
| Table 4.15: The Crosstab Analysis of General Information and Demographic:  |      |
| Gender   | 67   |
| Table 4.16: The Crosstab Analysis of General Information and Demographic:  |      |
| Age  | 68   |
| Table 4.17: The Crosstab Analysis of General Information and Demographic:  |      |
| Relationship Status  | 68   |
| Table 4.18: The Crosstab Analysis of General Information and Demographic:  |      |
| Educational Level  | 69   |
| Table 4.19: The Crosstab Analysis of General Information and Demographic:  |      |
| Occupation   | 70   |
| Table 4.20: The Crosstab Analysis of General Information and Demographic:  |      |
| Monthly Income   | 70   |
| Table 4.21: The Crosstab Analysis of General Information and Demographic:  |      |
| Frequency of Learning  | 71   |
| Table 4.22: The Crosstab Analysis of General Information and Demographic:  |      |
| Purpose of Learning  | 72   |
| Table 4.23: The Summary of General Information and Demographic by Crosstab |      |
| Analysis   | 73   |

# LIST OF FIGURES

| Figure 2.1: 7Ps Marketing Mix Model                                    | 11 |
|--|----|
| Figure 2.2: Student Choice Model                                       | 19 |
| Figure 2.3: Consumer Behavior Model                                    | 20 |
| Figure 2.4: Conceptual Framework                                       |    |
| Figure 3.1: Total Number of Branches from ECC, Pro Language and JCS in |    |
| Thailand   |    |
| Figure 3.2: Total Number of Branches from ECC, Pro Language and JCS in |    |
| Bangkok  | 32 |
|  |    |



Page

#### CHAPTER 1

#### INTRODUCTION

In terms of chapter one, the author will introduce background which is related to the subject of this research, that is consumer's choice criteria in choosing mandarin training institution in Bangkok. The problem statement and purposes of study will be following. Meanwhile, the author will introduce briefly scope of study, significance of the study, definition of terms and focus and limitation.

## 1.1 Background

With the further development of Chinese economic, and the ever broadening of international communication all over the world, more and more people is getting to realize the essential of being skill of communicating in Mandarin. As everybody knows, China is the country with richest continuous cultures and over 5000 years old history. Meanwhile, one fifth of all over the world speaks Mandarin, more than 873 million people use Mandarin as their mother tongue language, therefore, and it is the most widely spoken first language all over the world. Besides mainland China, many countries like Taiwan, Malaysia and Singapore also are influence by Mandarin. In addition, China has become the second largest economic center in the world, and many Europe companies do business in China and have long-term cooperate here.

Thailand is the country with advance with the times, it has become diversified country which can adopt new languages and cultures all over the world. Language as an essential communication tools spread various cultures. Therefore, learning foreign language has become a fashionable trend. In recent year, with China has become the member of WTO and its economy has outperformed most other developed countries. China's booming economy and its status which is becoming a rising global superpower. Just because of this, many Thai people is going to learning Mandarin for attracting hire, doing business with Chinese, making Chinese friend and so on. Due to the potential Mandarin marketing demand, various Mandarin training institution has been established one after another, from kid's Mandarin teaching to adult's Mandarin training, from Mandarin training for exam to Mandarin training for working.

ECC institution as a leading language institute was establish in 1983 and is now the largest private language school in Thailand, it has many branches not only in Bangkok but also all over the Thailand from North to South. There are more than fifty branches in Bangkok, it cover more than forty five percent market share. ECC's branches in Bangkok are normally located in modern shopping mall or some busy commercial streets so that it is convenient for both customer and staff. Especially, the curriculum of ECC is wide ranging and more focus on Mandarin language. Unlike ECC language institution, Pro language institution still focus on language teaching, but it does education visa for customer who register for a 400 lessons course. That's the important reason why Pro language can attract many customer can to learn although only two branches in Bangkok. Compare with ECC language school and Pro language school, JCS was opened 6 years only, but it still attracts many customer come to learn for locating nearby residential area (Ministry of Education, 2008).

Mandarin training language institution like ECC, Pro language and JCS aim to use effective management in order to expand more branches in the future. However, there are many newly competitive language school is getting more and more, they are looking for other good opportunity which let them success. Although, these language school have their different technical management and other advantages, they have the same target group. Therefore, language institution owners should adapt and fit in the marketing change and master clearly customer's demand.

#### **1.2 Problem Statement**

The successful language institution brand like ECC, Pro language and JCS had make author to explore about what are the factors which influence the customer's choice criteria in choosing Mandarin language institution and how does these factors affect the customer's making decision. This issue is getting to new challenge for scholars.

A UK and European marketing academics survey by Mohammed Rafiq Pervaiz K(1995) mentioned that it isn't working through 4Ps framework for academic, it should be 7Ps. According to Janet A. Harvey (1996) finding, he mentioned "marketing for education" this concept which means school has to fit in well with the marketing change and attract and keep student clients by 7Ps. He also referred to the 7Ps that are product, place, promotion and price these original marketing mix as well as other three Ps people, process and the physical evidence of production for satisfied school clients. In addition, the research by West (2001), Ungerleider (2004), Bosetti (2004) as well as Jackson,C. &Bisset, M. (2005) pointed out the reputation of the school is the key factor guiding customer's choice criteria. Meanwhile, Kieran Clarke (2009) mentioned that brand plays very important role in high education. Besides that, a study undertaken by Chia-Hung Chen (2006) mentioned word of mouth is the cost effective promotion platform to attract more and more student come to this school.

So far, many researches for customer's choice criteria in selecting language institution just only focus on 4Ps, 7Ps, brand and reputation some factors of them. However, there has been limited study related to combine all of them. On the other hand, there isn't research which related to customer's lifestyle and customer learning trial experience, they also can be the essential factors in selecting language training institution.

#### 1.3 Purposes of Study

1. To examine 7Ps are the key factors which can influence customer's choice criteria in choosing Mandarin language institution.

2. To examine lifestyle is the key factor which can influence customer's choice criteria in choosing Mandarin language institution.

3. To examine brand is the key factor which can influence customer's choice criteria in choosing Mandarin language institution.

#### 1.4 Scope of Study

This research studied about what are the factors which influence customer's choice criteria in choosing Mandarin language institution in Bangkok area. Meanwhile, the questionnaire is the key method.

## 1.4.1 Scope of Content

In this research, the author use quantitative as a survey tool to examine what are the factors which influence customer's choice criteria in choosing Mandarin language institution in Bangkok area. There are three main language institution which are ECC, Pro language and JCS was chosen.

## 1.4.2 <u>Scope of Samples</u>

In this research, the author chosen customers who are learning Mandarin from ECC, Pro language and JCS that are located in Bangkok only as the sample.

## 1.4.3 Scope of Duration

In this research, the author collected data from December to January.

#### 1.5 Significance of the Study

The author gathered useful data by surveying existing customers, and analyze the factors which influence customer's choice criteria in selecting language training institution and how does they effect. This research will contribute for two aspects that are marketing aspect as well as academic aspect. In terms of marketing aspect, many people who has work for language training institution like business owner, business partner, manager, teacher and staff can use these output as a reference, and trying to fit in

with this trend and meet customer's need quickly. In addition, this research also can be a good example for investor who wants to invest a new language school, they can benefit from this research and don't need to waste time investigating again. On the other hand, this result also benefit for experts who are doing relevant research, it will help them how to combine business and school these two things.

#### 1.6 Definition of Terms

1.6.1 <u>Choice criteria:</u> can be defined as: the measurement when the customer evaluate products and services (Jobber, 2013)

1.6.2 <u>Brand:</u> means can be a name, term, design, mark or mix them together to add the value of product and give it a personality (Farquhar, 1990)

1.6.3 <u>Reputation:</u> can be defined as collective beliefs that exist in the organizational field about a company's identity and prominence (Rao, 1994).

1.6.4 <u>Lifestyle</u>: is the term that is living model adopted by an individual, a group, a nation or a commonwealth of nations (Plummer, 1974).

1.6.5 <u>Word of mouth:</u> is an informal communication process by person to person of information searching between a perceived non-commercial communicator and third parties about consumer's feeling after services post consumption (Arndt, 1967)

1.6.6 <u>Marketing mix</u>: is the set of actions which help company to promote its brand or product to the market (McCarthy, 1960).

1.6.7 <u>7P's Marketing mix</u>: Product, Price, Place, Promotion, Personnel, Procedure management and Physical assets (Bitner & Booms, 1981).

1.6.8 <u>Product:</u> is all necessary factors to deal with actual things to be finished goods (Bitner & Booms, 1981).

1.6.9 <u>Price</u>: covers any pricing issues that is relevant to product (Bitner & Booms, 1981).

1.6.10 <u>Place</u>: deal with questions on where customer should be provided with service and channels of distribution (Bitner & Booms, 1981).

1.6.11 <u>Promotion:</u> is in the benefits achieved from buying their services (Bitner & Booms, 1981).

1.6.12 Personnel: provides service to customer (Bitner & Booms, 1981).

1.6.13 <u>Procedure management:</u> ensures and superior quality of service (Bitner & Booms, 1981).

1.6.14 <u>Physical assets:</u> refer to environment and facilities needed from customer (Bitner & Booms, 1981).

#### 1.7 Focus and limitation

In order to make the research within the specific research structure, the author has to focus on the topic and relevant key factors as well as limitations. Therefore, in this research, author has to focus on three language training institutions in Bangkok only. According to the data, these three institutions have many branches which are normally located in modern shopping mall or some busy commercial streets so that the customers are very representative in Bangkok. On the other sides, the market share for these three language training institution are more than 55% following the fact so that they can be a good example. Unlike other language training institution like Ma-ed language school, zhong tai tong language school is located on university or near school so that the customer just student only, it is too circumscribed.

In this study, the selected language training institution is limited in Bangkok, so it just can show out the personal preference who are working and living in Bangkok only, therefore perhaps some customers aren't living in Bangkok will be ignore.

## CHAPTER 2

### LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter, the author explained the theoretical foundation related to the topic firstly, and then explored the concept and framework of this research. Finally, the summary of this chapter as following:

2.1. Marketing of Language Institution

2.2. Theoretical Foundation

2.2.1. Customer's demographics characteristics

2.2.2. 7P's marketing mix

2.2.3. Customer's lifestyle

2.2.4. Brand

2.3. Concepts of customer's choice criteria and choice model

2.4. Concepts of consumer behavior

2.5. Marking decision

2.6 Multinomial logistic regression

2.7. Conceptual Framework

2.8. Interrelationship and Hypotheses

## 2.1 Marketing of language institution

In terms of educational marketing, it formed between 1980 years to 1990 years in Western countries, and then it formed in ASIAN countries between 2000 years to 2010 years (Jinliang, 2011), he also mentioned that the language training institution can be define as a school which teach language only. Mandarin language institution has seen an explosive growth in Thailand education market in the last ten years. Meanwhile, there are more than fourth language training institution brands around Bangkok. Many people wants to study or work in China but in order to do this, they have to increase their Mandarin language abilities (Office of Education Council, 2004). Therefore, it fuel the demand for Mandarin training institution. At the same time, due to the Thailand economy increase so that the customer's paying ability also increase for learning language. Since the satisfaction of customer is very important to recognize, thus, analyze their choice criteria should be primary purpose of school. Many researchers have been research the student choice criteria before.

| Reference       | Country    | Factors which influence choice |                           |  |
|-----------------|------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| Al Jamil (2012) | Bangladesh | 1. Teaching quality            | 2. Cost                   |  |
| An (2009)       | USA        | 1. Good reputation             | 2.Currium design          |  |
|                 |            | 3.Adequate Facilities          |                           |  |
| James (1999)    | Australia  | 1. The reason of learning      | 2. Location and Parking   |  |
|                 |            | 3. Course and Institutional    | 4. E-learning Course      |  |
|                 |            | 5. Reputation                  | 6. Teaching Quality       |  |
| Joseph (2012)   | USA        | 1. Personnel                   | 2. Reputation             |  |
|                 |            | 3. Facilities                  | 4. Cost                   |  |
| Kusumawati      | Indonesia  | 1. Cost Factor                 | 2.Word of Month           |  |
| (2010)          |            | 3. Reputation                  | 4.Recommrndation          |  |
| Mohar Yusof     | Malaysia   | 1. Promotion                   | 2. Location               |  |
| (2008)          |            | 3. Design of Curium            | 4. Teacher Characteristic |  |
|                 |            | VDFD V                         |                           |  |
| Raposo & Alves  | Portugal   | 1. Personal                    | 2. Branding               |  |
| (2007)          |            |                                |                           |  |
| Samsinar Md.    | Malaysia   | 1. Teaching quality            | 2. Income                 |  |
| Sidin (2003)    |            | 3. Facilities                  | 4. Process                |  |
|                 |            | 5. Learning environment        | 6. Occupation             |  |
|                 |            | 7. Personal                    |                           |  |
| Soutar &Turner  | Australia  | 1. Promotion                   | 2. Branding               |  |
| (2002)          |            | 3. Reputation                  | 4. Teaching Quality       |  |

Table 2.1: The research summary of student's choice criteria

#### 2.2 Theoretical Foundation

#### 2.2.1 Customer's demographics characteristics

There are many past researches pointed out that customer's demographic characteristics play am very important role in choosing school. Van Pelt and Allison (2007) found that the educational level becomes the key factor which influence customer's choice decision, the customer who has high educational level pay more attention for themselves education or children's education than others. The literature by Scottish Executive (2006) also mentioned that some parents can use their personal knowledge to persuade their children's choice. In addition, according to Rehman, Khan, Triq, and Tasleem (2010), they pointed out occupation status plays a very important role in choosing school, the parents who has higher status or occupational prestige select school very careful and strict. Hence, they also mentioned that income level becomes a key factor which can influence which institution they selects. According Jinliang (2011) for the research of the marketing mix for English language training institution in China, he pointed out language as an important communication tool has to spend long period to learn, therefore, the customer who has high income level may pay more attention for themselves language learning or children's language learning than others. In certain cases, many middle income level family who have better educated background are willing try their best to best private institution. According to the research by Dronkers J. & S. Avram (2010) wealthy family with high education as well as high occupational prestige show delegate the customer's social-economic background.

## 2.2.2 Marketing Mix

At the beginning, there was a debate whether educational institutions related to marketing, the research by Dirks (1998), Bartlett, et al. (2002), Bok (2003), and Newman et al. (2004). On the other side, Sharrock (2000) pointed out whether students can be regard as customers. However, someone who holds different idea believes that it isn't good to consider students as customer or customers in the first place, it is even not suitable. Sharrock (2000) introduced the idea that education isn't to be marketed since this will create major social and economic problems. In fact, the marketing mix is a model of marketing strategy which with a set of controllable element for an institution to shape the nature of its offer to customers. Many researchers have been developed marketing mix in education before, such us Gray (1991) and Coleman (1994) research 5Ps in educational marketing mix. The research by Mehrdad Alipour (2012) also pointed out the 6Ps for educational marketing mix, he has summarized that these six factors significantly influence customer's choice decision in private school. Chung-kai & Chia hung (2008) introduced 5Ps which include people, price, place, promotion and product for primary schools. In addition, they also pointed out these five factors play an important role in parent loyalty.

Base on the research by palmer, Kotler and Fox (1995) have developed an educational marketing mix that is designed specifically for educational institutions only. In Kotler and Fox's (1995) model introduced that the educational marketing mix context to be consisting for 7Ps marketing tools which are programme, price, place promotion, processes, physical facilities, and people. However, some researched mentioned other elements for the 7Ps educational marketing mix like Ivy &Naude (2004), they introduced 7Ps educational marketing mix include programme, prospectus, price, prominence, people, promotion and premiums. Although, all these models have some similar elements variables; nonetheless, these researches are clustered and grouped differently. Jinliang (2011) also mentioned that 7Ps marketing mix as an important tool can significantly analysis customer's choice decision. The author followed the definition defined by

Cowell (1994), as he mention that 7Ps include product, place, promotion, price, people, process and physical asset. This model is also more highlighted in the literature. The 7Ps marketing mix model as following:



Figure 2.1: 7P's Marketing Mix model

Source: Cowell, D.W., (1994). 7P's Marketing Mix Model. Oxford: Butterworth.

The 7P's marketing mix in the education was definite as following:

#### 2.2.2.1 Product

According to Lovelock and Wright (2003), Product is all important elements to do a service that produce value for the consumer. According to the research by Jinliang (2011), teaching quality is the most important factor which significantly influence customer's choice criteria, whether students understand or not is a benchmark in terms of teaching quality. Marland and Rogers (1991) introduced that the school's product is intangible, for the product development, the duty for the school in establishing what would benefit the pupil and researching and planning it, such as the teaching or tutoring quality, how to structure and design the curriculum. In addition, how to teach by using different method and how to make an enjoyable lesson. They also suggested that product in educational marketing mix is shorthand for preparation, such as : design of curriculum, planning for teaching, and any other forward planning that has to use while teaching. The research by Donaldson and McNicholas (2004) pointed out programme structure and flexible schedule as the two important factors influence customer choice of this institution since they have to work and do other things apart from learning. Besides that, Sreasser (2002) who summarized the student's choice criteria mentioned that the enjoyable or funny lesson not only could regards as the institution's product, but also can significantly influence student's choice decision.

### 2.2.2.2 Price

Price and other service cost show the management which customer have to endure various costs, according to the research by Lovelock and Wright (2003). The price in educational marketing is related to tuition fees offered, and any other monetary related issues. Price always related to promotion. Since all the institution are toe cost center and have to balance their budgets, thus they need to offer commercial service. Davies and

Ellison (1991) pointed out that schools must try the best to attract enough students to produce sufficient income and then survive in order to cover their costs. In addition, price can significantly influence marketing strategies since most of customers are concerned about the financial before attending the class (Connor & Institute for Employment Studies, 1999, 47; Pugsley, 2004, p.125). Eckel (2007) also mentioned that since customers are currently cost-conscious, they tend to take full advantage of the tuition fees and get maximizing returns. According to the research by Jinliang (2011), competitive price can affects the customers' choices decision while compare with other training institution as they may pay more attention into institutions with the most suitable offer.

#### 2.2.2.3 Place

Place deal with questions on where customer should be provided with service and channels of distribution and it may include electronic and physical distribution channels, the research by Lovelock and Wright (2003). The difference between the popularity and unpopularity of school depends on the location area where there is a balance between supply and demand, as highlighted by Flatley (2001), he also pointed out the planning of schools' location will be changing base on demographic area. In addition, the convenient transportation as the important factor which customer considered when they make a decision, because the location of most school just have public bus transportation only, according to Jinliang (2011), he also mentioned that the distance between the school and home is essential element for customer since they need to have adequate resources to go and back. Besides that, Zheng Zhang (2004) found that the customer who has to take their children go to learn many subjects prefer a cluster with many other educational institution nearby so that they can master their timing and learn many things at the same building. In addition, the research by Yang (2005) said that the institution place also have to involve distribution channels, with the intense of competition, online teaching course as a new way is accepted by customer who doesn't have time go to language training institution.

## 2.2.2.4 Promotion

Lovelock and Wright (2003) mentioned that the value and importance of promotion for service organization is in the benefits achieved from buying their services. Attracting target customer is the purpose of promotion. Promotion should be the important factor in the school marketing mix. Hence, most marketing efforts which are performed at schools are classified as promotion, according to research by Oplatka and Jane (2004). In addition, Zeng (2009) introduced that "group purchasing" as a new promotion activity can attract customer come to institution, he mentioned that group purchasing promotion is the key factor which can be an efficient development strategies for language training institution, because the ASIAN people more prefer working or learning together than individual. It make sense that competitive price plays a significant role in increasing competitive advantage among the other language training institution. However, television and advertising doesn't work in the educational marketing (Bell & Rowley, 2002).

## 2.2.2.5 Personnel

Personnel is a main element in providing services, and it is the only component that provides customers with services (Pheng and Martin, 1995). According to research by Jinliang (2011), teachers experience and teachers language skill are associated with language institution, in the other side, with regards to teachers qualification, he pointed out that the most of teachers who have more than three years teaching experience and language qualification can attracted more customer come to learn. Personnel factor in the educational sector can be involved in all staffs, employees, teachers, managers and principal, it introduced by Kotler and Fox (1995). On the other side, Soedijati and Pratminingsih (2011) emphasized that personnel factor plays a significant role for successful delivery of the service. They also mentioned that the personnel related to teacher's teaching experience, teacher's qualification and teacher's skill, therefore, the reason which led the customer come to this institution is personnel factor. A research

which was developed by Zeng (2009) pointed out the customer very care about the staff's attitude when they enter and leave, they prefer the staff with enthusiasm.

#### 2.2.2.6 Process

Process ensures availability and proper quality of services. The purpose of process of this component is to balance service demand and supply (Rusta, Venus & Ebrahimi, 2005). Kotler (2002) pointed that Processes refer to the way an institution does business, and this relates the whole administrative system to this element. Process is how things happen in the institution, such as the process of management, the problem resolving and feedback conducting, as the Keith, Paul & Ruxin (2012) mentioned, hence, service also can be included in process factor since customer really care about what level service they get during this process. For this reason, school is recommended to take into consideration how their service is to be offered. For example, assessment system and evaluation department are the very important points for the customer enquiries (Ivy & Naude, 2004)

## 2.2.2.7 Physical assets

Physical assets is related to necessary environment and facilities which companies can provide services to their customers (Goldsmith, 1999). The research by Jinliang (2011) introduced that cleaning classroom and free wifi can increase customer's satisfaction, hence, it's important to prevent customer defections by offering convenient parking place. According to the research by Kotler & Fox (1995) mentioned that the first impression in the student's mind is the Physical assets of this school. Ivy & Naude (2004) also descripted the video projector, whiteboard, table and other necessary facilities can support lessons as physical assets. Gibbs & Knapp (2002) argued that the physical assets include facilities and surrounding environment, therefore, the beautiful decoration should be the very important factor which can influence customer's choice decision. A research by Zeng (2009) pointed out that the stationery like pencil and paper also as vital factor in choosing language training institution apart from facilities and surrounding environment, because most of student doesn't bring anything come when they come to learn, hence, some free stuff like wifi, reading materials should be offered.

#### 2.2.3 Customer's lifestyle

Although it seems obviously that many industrial focus on affluent customers while competing with all over the world, it is important to mention that the affluent customer isn't necessarily one single market segment. A lifestyle analysis perspective could serve such a purpose, as the lifestyle concept provides an approach to understand consumers' everyday needs and wants (Michman & Mazze, 2009), and he also pointed out the lifestyle concept is one of the most useful method in modern marketing activities. Since lifestyle provides a way to understand customer's needs and wants, hence, it is a mechanism which can position a product or service in terms of how can a person towards to a desired lifestyle (Plummer, 1974).

In terms of the customer's lifestyle in choosing language school, Erin (2012) introduced that lifestyle can influence consumer choice since people change their mind and select the "light weight" lifestyle as their goal, For instance, people are increasingly conscious of the fact that they all sort themselves and each other get together as the things they like to do, and how they like to spend their spare time and how they choose to spend their disposable income. Besides that, he also mentioned reading habits as one kind of the lifestyle relate to consumer's choice, someone who likes reading book of language is strict for choosing language school, especially for teacher's qualification.

| Factors identified from | researchers               | Conduct Country/Region |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|
| findings                |                           |                        |
| Quality of life         | Bodyeoll, 2009;           | НК                     |
|                         | Mazzarol and Soutar, 2002 | Australia              |
|                         |                           |                        |
|                         | Mazzarol and Soutar, 2002 | Australia              |

## Table 2.2: Customer's Lifestyle relevant researches:

## 2.2.4 Brand

Brand plays a very important role in high education. In addition, the brand as an essential bridge connect prospective student and the institution. According to research by Ivy (2008), in the case of education, the service is not only a simple set of tangible but also is a complex set of benefits which can meet customer's needs. The level of customer's satisfaction will significantly influence the level of brand. Meanwhile, brand awareness and reputation help to can affect customer's choice decision, as Nguyen & LeBlanc (2001) mentioned that brand awareness and reputation are critical in attracting customer and developing customer's brand loyalty in the educational market. Therefore, the definitions of reputation is that public perceptions of the institution shared by its multiple constituents over time (Sung and Yang, 2008). According to the research by Wagner & Fard (2009), he mentioned that reputation which include provider of content and performance is a main factor in the customer's choice criteria,

Lige (2012) also pointed out reputation and word of mouth these two point as the most important aspects for customer in selecting language school, she mentioned that most of customer are willing to accept the new institution from their friend's recommendation instead of advertising. Swan and Oliver (1989) introduced the concept that word of mouth communication is an essential decision making factors in the purchase decision, however, both individuals and organizations still cannot control it.

According to the research by Andreassen (2000), Word of mouth communication is an effective and useful marketing tool, hence, customers can be a significant influence and preferable source for customers with a high level of information satisfaction in terms of information reliability. Murray (1991) also mentioned that consumers have greater confidence in word of mouth communication, especially when it sources have subjective and experiential information about service consumption from others.

#### 2.3 Choice

Choice is the output of a process which refers to assessment and judgement, it not only means the evaluation level of different choice, but also means making a decision relate to option which they choose. It should have two or more options from which to choose so that the choice can be made. Literature on how customer make a decision or make a choice includes a range of different customer in different situation. However, it pointed out that different customer in different situations usually use the same way to think about decisions, it reflected that customers have a common sense of cognitive skills (Hastie & Dawes, 2001).

According to the research by Litten (1982), the student choice process is a complex and difficult set of activities since it is different in individuals participating and acting. A need and motive, is the primary process for the student choice. When the customers realizes that they want to pursue higher education, they start to search for information that is associate with potential suppliers. And then establish an evaluation between two or more alternatives. Finally, the student through their evaluation of the experience and goes to attend the class. According to the research by Anas Al-Fattal (2010), he concluded that there are five steps of student choice from the researches highlighted, they are needs and motives, information gathering, evaluating alternatives, decision and post-choice evaluation.



Figure 2.2: The Student Choice Model by Anas Al-Fattal (2010)

Source: Anas, A. (2010). Understanding Student Choice of University and Marketing Strategies in Syrian Private Higher Education. UK: University of Leeds School of Education.

## 2.4 Consumer Behavior

Smith (1937) introduced that Consumer behavior is a new issue in marketing, no matter what the industrial field is. The consumer behavior can be defined as: Consumer behavior is a type of behavior which include physical, mental activity and emotional that customer use while choose, purchase and dispose of products and services that satisfy their needs and desires (Kotler, 1999).



Figure 2.3: Consumer Behavior Model

Source: Kotler, P. (1999). Principles of marketing. Toronto: Pearson Prentice Hall.

According to figure, it shown that the marketing stimuli relate to other stimulants and go into the consumer's black box together, after that, this situation cause a response in the black box. And then marketers could be known what is happening in that black box. This Black Box can be divided into two parts. One part is personal characteristics of consumers on how to understand and respond to stimuli affect, the other part is the consumer's making decision process which can significantly influence on their behavior (Shahrzad Jeddi, 2013)

In terms of consumer behavior in educational market, the main marketing questions such as following: what does student want to learn, how do they learn and why does student choose a specific supplier? The Answers of these questions could guide marketers to make more effective strategies (Blackwell, Miniard, & Engel, 2001). There are more literature concerning about consumer buyer behavior in educational market such us: Paulsen (1990), Kotler and Fox (1995), and Cabrera and Nasa (2000), they pointed out students behaviour play an important role since marketers can understand and predict their purchasing behaviour of customers in the marketplace.

## 2.5 Consumer Decision Making

Consumers are usually purchase impulsively since influences by family and friends, advertisers, role models as well as their mood, situation, and emotions (Alan & William, 2003). After trial experiencing and gathering information for this institution, a student usually evaluate whether the product and service satisfy their expectations in the earlier stages of the process (Brassington, 2006, p.109). In short, there is a kind of comparison with their standards, judgement and opinion about the experience (Lovelock & Wirtz, 2004, 44). After that, the student set up an attitude which can be negative attitude towards to dissatisfaction, or positive attitude towards to satisfaction, the student who holds the satisfying attitude will attend the class (Keith, Paul & Ruxin, 2012).

## 2.6 Multinomial logistic regression

Multinomial Logistic Regression is useful for this situations in which have to classify subjects based on values of a set of predictor variables. In addition, Multinomial Logistic Regression can be used when the categorical dependent variable more than two categories. Multinomial logistic regression is used to predict categorical placement in or the probability of category membership on a dependent variable based on multiple independent variables. The independent variables can be either dichotomous like binary, or continuous like ratio in scale. Multinomial logistic regression is a simple extension of binary logistic regression that allows for more than two categories of the dependent or outcome variable. Like binary logistic regression, multinomial logistic regression uses maximum likelihood estimation to evaluate the probability of categorical membership.

Logistic Regression analysis does not require the restrictive assumptions regarding normality distribution of independent variables or equal dispersion matrices nor concerning the prior probabilities of failure (Ohlson, 1980; Zavgren, 1985). Rather, logistic regression is based on two assumptions; (1) it requires the dependent variable to be dichotomous, with the groups being discrete, non-overlapping and identifiable and (2) it considers the cost of type I and type II error rates in the selection of the optimal cut-off probability.  $\beta$ s are the regression coefficients that are estimated through an iterative maximum likelihood method.

For this research used Multinomial logistic regression because the dependent variable in question is nominal (Mandarin training language in ECC, Pro language and JCS in Bangkok, Thailand) and for which there are more than two categories. In order to educational marketing more efficient, language institution can predict what factors can significantly influence customer's choice criteria. By performing a Multinomial Logistic Regression, the language institution may determine the strength of influence customer's age, income, and educational level has upon the type of language institution which they prefer.



## 2.7 Conceptual Framework

**Demographics** \*Gender, \*age, \*income, \*educational level, \*relationship status, \*occupation

1. Product \*Curriculum design \*Funny lesson \*Good understanding \*Good preparation \*textbook

**2. Place** \*Convenient transportation

\*distance

\*offer consulting service

\*e-learning teaching \*other institution nearby

## 3. Price

\*competitive price \*discount with price \*installment plan \*varied payment service

4. Promotion \*awards deadline \*incentive \*group purchase

9. Brand \*word of mouth \*reputation \*trial experience \*brand awareness

Customer's choice criteria in choosing Mandarin language institution in ECC, Pro language and JCS 8. Customer's lifestyle

\*working hour's \*family influence \*reading habit

# 7. Physical

assets \*parking place \*adequate stuff \*free stationery \*good decoration \*cleanness \*toilet

6. Personnel \*teaching \*experience \*qualification \*language skill \*responsibility \*attitude \*respond \*related knowledge

**5. Process** \*resolving problem \*conduct feedback \*communicate \*frequently

Figure 2.4: Conceptual Framework

## 2.8 Variables and Hypothesis of this research study

Hypothesis is an assumption to define the explanation of research problem, and provide educated prospect of research outcome (Sarantakos, 2012). In order to do experiment with the research study, it needs to set 2 hypothesis that are the research hypothesis (H1) and the null hypothesis (H0) (Shuttleworth, 2009).

Ho: mean to there is no relationship between independent variable and dependent variable

Ha: mean at least one independent variable relate to dependent variable

So in this study has shown **dependent variable** is choice decisions in choosing Mandarin training language in ECC, Pro language and JCS in Bangkok, Thailand

**Independent variables** are product, price, place, promotion, personnel, process, physical assets, customer's lifestyle and brand.

| Dependent Variable    | Independent<br>Variable | Independent Variable of each factor                |  |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|--|--|
| institution (ECC,     | Product                 | 1. Curriculum design2. Funny lesson                |  |
| Pro language , JCS)   |                         | 3. Good understanding 4. Good preparation          |  |
|                       |                         | 5. Textbook  |  |
| institution (ECC, Pro | Place                   | 1. Convenient transportation 2. Distance           |  |
| language, JCS)        |                         | 3. Offer consulting service 4. E-learning teaching |  |
|                       |                         | 5. Other institution nearby                        |  |
| institution (ECC, Pro | Price                   | 1. Competitive price2. Discount with price         |  |
| language, JCS)        |                         | 3. Installment plan varied 4. Payment service      |  |

Table 2.3: Dependent variables and Independent variables of this study

(Continued)

| Dependent Variable    | Independent    | Independent Variable of each factor      |                       |
|-----------------------|----------------|--|-----------------------|
|                       | Variable       |  |                       |
| institution (ECC, Pro | Promotion      | 1. Awards                                | 2. Deadline incentive |
| language, JCS)        |                | 3. Group purchase                        |                       |
| institution (ECC, Pro | Personnel      | 1. Teaching experience                   | 2. Qualification      |
| language , JCS)       | AK             | 3. Language skill                        | 4. Responsibility     |
|                       |                | 5. Attitude                              | 6. Respond            |
| (C.                   |                | 7. Related knowledge                     |                       |
| institution (ECC, Pro | Process        | 1. Resolving problem 2. Conduct feedback |                       |
| language , JCS)       |                | 3. Communicate frequently                |                       |
| institution (ECC, Pro | Physical asset | 1. Parking place                         | 2. Adequate stuff     |
| language , JCS)       |                | 3. Free stationery                       | 4. Good decoration    |
|                       |                | 5. Cleanness                             | 6. Toilet             |
| institution (ECC, Pro | Customer's     | 1. Working hour's                        | 2. Family influence   |
| language, JCS)        | lifestyle      | 3. Reading habit                         |                       |
| institution (ECC, Pro | Brand          | 1. Word of mouth                         | 2. Reputation         |
| language, JCS)        |                | 3. Trial experience                      | 4. Brand awareness    |

Table 2.3 (Continued): Dependent variables and Independent variables of this study

Therefore, the Hypotheses are set as following:

Part I: 7Ps Marketing Mix

**H1. Product** significantly influence customer's choice decisions in choosing Mandarin training language in ECC, Pro language and JCS in Bangkok, Thailand
**H10**:  $\beta$  product (curriculum design, funny lesson, understanding, preparation and textbook) = 0

**H1a**: At least one of  $\beta$  product (curriculum design, funny lesson, understanding, preparation and textbook)  $\neq 0$ 

**H2. Price** significantly influence customer's choice decisions in choosing Mandarin training language in ECC, Pro language and JCS in Bangkok, Thailand

**H2o**:  $\beta$  price (competitive price, discount with price, Installment and varied payment service) = 0

**H2a**: At least one of  $\beta$  price (competitive price, discount with price, Installment and varied payment service)  $\neq 0$ 

**H3**: **Place** significantly influence customer's choice decisions in choosing Mandarin training language in ECC, Pro language and JCS in Bangkok, Thailand

**H30**:  $\beta$  place (convenient transportation, distance, offering consulting service, offering elearning teaching and other institution nearby) = 0

**H3a**: At least one of  $\beta$  price (convenient transportation, distance, offering consulting service, offering e-learning teaching and other institution nearby)  $\neq 0$ 

**H4: Promotion** significantly influence customer's choice decisions in choosing Mandarin training language in ECC, Pro language and JCS in Bangkok, Thailand

**H4o**:  $\beta$  promotion (awards, deadline incentive and group purchase) = 0

**H4a**: At least one of  $\beta$  promotion (awards, deadline incentive and group purchase)  $\neq 0$ 

**H5**: **Personnel** significantly influence customer's choice decisions in choosing Mandarin training language in ECC, Pro language and JCS in Bangkok, Thailand

**H50**:  $\beta$  personnel (teaching experience, qualification, language skill, responsibility, attitude, respond and related knowledge) = 0

**H5a**: At least one of  $\beta$  personnel (teaching experience, qualification, language skill, responsibility, attitude, respond and related knowledge)  $\neq 0$ 

**H6. Process** significantly influence customer's choice decisions in choosing Mandarin training language in ECC, Pro language and JCS in Bangkok, Thailand

H60:  $\beta$  process (resolving problem, conduct feedback and communicate frequently)= 0

**H6a**: At least one of  $\beta$  process (resolving problem, conduct feedback and communicate frequently)  $\neq 0$ 

**H7. Physical assets** significantly influence customer's choice decisions in choosing Mandarin training language in ECC, Pro language and JCS in Bangkok, Thailand

**H70**:  $\beta$  physical assets (parking place, adequate stuff, free stationery, good decoration and cleanness toilet) = 0

**H7a**: At least one of  $\beta$  physical assets (parking place, adequate stuff, free stationery, good decoration and cleanness toilet)  $\neq 0$ 

Part II: Customer's lifestyle

**H8**. **Customer's lifestyle** significantly influence customer's choice decisions in choosing Mandarin training language in ECC, Pro language and JCS in Bangkok, Thailand

**H80**:  $\beta$  customer's lifestyle (working hours, family influence and reading habit) = 0

**H8a**: At least one of  $\beta$  customer's lifestyle (working hours, family influence and reading habit)  $\neq 0$ 

## Part III: Brand

**H9. Brand** significantly influence customer's choice decisions in choosing Mandarin training language in ECC, Pro language and JCS in Bangkok, Thailand

**H90**:  $\beta$  brand (word of mouth, reputation, trial experience and brand awareness) = 0

**H9a**: At least one of  $\beta$  brand (word of mouth, reputation, trial experience and brand awareness)  $\neq 0$ 



## CHAPTER 3

#### METHODOLOGY

This research base on quantitative methodology to collect data in order to attain the aims and objectives. Research strategy and approach were explain as following. Questionnaire as the main survey tool has been distributed to the customers.

#### 3.1 Research Strategy

In this study, author gathered data and analyzed data thought using questionnaire, the aim of this research is to explain the factors which influence customer choice criteria in choosing Mandarin language institution and how do these factors effect. As Aliaga and Gunderson (2000) mentioned:

Quantitative research is 'Explaining phenomena by collecting numerical data that are analyzed using mathematically based methods (in particular statistics)'. It means that the professional quantitative research has based on accurate data. Therefore, the questionnaire setting, population and sampling designing and data collection has been set reasonably.

#### 3.2 Questionnaire Design

According to review researches, most previous research of customer's choice criteria in higher education has used questionnaire to conducted information. In addition, a concept has been pointed out by Uma Sekaran &Roger Bougie (2013), questionnaire as a very important tool for investigating patterns with numerical data and has adopted by many successful management, marketing and consumer research.

In this study, the questionnaire was designed to gather general demographic data, 7P's marketing mix data, branding data and customer lifestyle data which related to customer's choice criteria in selecting Mandarin language institution. Meanwhile, each factor which related to customer's choice criteria was divided into three to five detail questions so that can explain clearly how does these factor effect customer's choice criteria. Besides that, the length of each question and content are preferable to respondents. As Horst (1968) finding, more than 20 words in the questionnaire doesn't accept by respondents.

#### 3.3 Population and Samples

Sampling begins with precisely defining the target population. The target population must be defined in terms of elements, geographical boundaries and times. Therefore, the research objective and the scope of the study play a crucial role in defining the target population (Uma Sekaran &Roger Bougie, 2013)

Population: in this study, the population who ever have learnt Mandarin was selected from ECC, Pro language and JCS these three Mandarin training institution in Bangkok.

Sample: the customer who is learning Mandarin in these three training institution in Bangkok is a huge population, therefore, author just has chosen some of them as the sample.

According to Taro Yamane (1973) formula at confidences level of 95% and precision levels = 0.05

$$n = \frac{1}{\left[\frac{4e^2}{Z^2}\right]}$$

Where n =sample size

e =the level of precision (in this study the author specified the level of precision = 0.05 at the confidence level of 95 %) Z = the abscissa of the normal curve that cuts off an area  $\alpha$  at the tails. The value for Z is found in statistical tables which contain the area under the normal curve.

Z = 1.96 (at the confidence level of 95 %)

Applied the formula

n = 
$$\frac{1}{\left[\frac{4(0.05)^2}{(1.96)^2}\right]}$$

```
= 385 customers
```

Therefore, the sample size in this study is 385 people who are the customers from ECC, Pro language and JCS which can increase the reliability by putting into 400 respondents

## 3.3.1 Sampling Design

In order to calculate appropriate data, author has chosen each language training institution by people surrounding so that can cover varied customer. According to the official website from these three institution, ECC has 24 branches in Bangkok and more than 50 branches all over Thailand, meanwhile, Pro language has 3 branches in Bangkok and more than 6 branches in Thailand, even JCS also has 2 branches in Bangkok and 5 branches in Thailand. The illustration is following:



Figure 3.1: Total Number of Branches from ECC, Pro language and JCS in Thailand.

The figure above shows the ECC, Pro language and JCS these three institution's branch all of Thailand. According to this graph, ECC coves the largest portion 82% for more than 50 branches all over the Thailand, the share portion of Pro language and JCS auure similar, respectively 10% share for Pro language and 8% share for JCS. However, this research has been focus on the branches of these three brand in Bangkok only, therefore, the illustration for Bangkok branch should be this as following:



Figure 3.2: Total Number of Branches from ECC, Pro language and JCS in Bangkok.

Due to the questionnaire is in total 400 copies, it has been divided into three portion, it means that 83% questionnaire comes from ECC, 10% and 8% questionnaire has been distributed to respondents respectively. Therefore, amount of questionnaire has shown below:

| Brand's Name | Branch's Share | Number of Questionnaire |
|--------------|----------------|-------------------------|
| ECC          | 83%            | 332                     |
| Pro language | 10%            | 40                      |
| JCS          | 7%             | 28                      |
| Total        | 100%           | 400                     |

Table 3.1: Amount of questionnaire

As a result, 332 copies questionnaires has been distributed by ECC, and 40 questionnaires has been gather by Pro language, just only 28 questionnaires has been conducted by JCS.

#### 3.4 Survey Instruments

As the author mentioned above, the questionnaire for this research is based on the topic which is the customer's choice criteria in choosing Mandarin training institution in ECC, Pro language and JCS in Bangkok, therefor, the questionnaire totally has five portions as following:

Part 1. It refers to the Mandarin Training Institution brand which the customer most often go to learn.

| Variable                         | Level of    | Criteria Classification |
|----------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|
|                                  | Measurement | $\prec$                 |
| 1. Which language training       | Nominal     | 1. ECC                  |
| institution do you most often go |             | 2. Pro language         |
| to learn                         |             | 3. JCS                  |

Table 3.2: Level of Information Measurement and Criteria for Institution Brand

Part 2. It related to factors which influence customer's choice criteria in choosing Mandarin language school in ECC, Pro language and JCS in Bangkok.

It consist of 2 aspects: Internal factors and External factors

- 1. Internal factors aspect includes 5 questions that are
  - 1. Income
  - 2. Education Level
  - 3. Occupation
  - 4. Consumer's Lifestyle
  - 5. Trial Experience

- 2. External factors aspect includes 10 questions that are
  - 1. Product (teaching quality)
  - 2. Place
  - 3. Price
  - 4. Promotion
  - 5. Personnel (teacher & staff)
  - 6. Process (problem solving)
  - 7. Physical Assets (facility, atmosphere and cleanliness)
  - 8. Reputation
  - 9. Word of Mouth
  - 10. Brand Awareness

All items were weighted by target respondents on a seven-point Likert scale. In each questions are scaled by Number 0 means "Not any effect" to number 7 means "Extremely important". The weight (scores) are fixed in each level as below:

> Extremely important = 7 points Very important = 6 points Moderately important = 5 points Neutral = 4 points Slightly important = 3 points Low important = 2 points Not at all important = 1 point Not any effect = 0 point

For the measurement analysis the author use mean and interval class formula to calculate the range of information in each level as followed;

Interval class =  $\underline{\text{Range (Max value - Min Value)}}$ Number of Interval =  $\underline{(8-1)}$ 8 = 0.86

Therefore, the analysis and interpretation of factors in each aspects will use the average score interpretation that are

Average score of 6.03 - 7.00 refers to Extremely Important Level Average score of 5.17 - 6.02 refers to Very Important Level Average score of 4.31 - 5.16 refers to Moderately Important Level Average score of 3.45 - 4.30 refers to Neutral Level Average score of 2.58 - 3.44 refers to Slightly Important Level Average score of 1.73 - 2.58 refers to Low Important Level Average score of 0.87 - 1.72 refers to Not at All Important Level Average score of 0.00 - 0.86 refers to Not Any Effect Level

Part 3. It related to General Information and Demographic consist of screen of using choice criteria in choosing Mandarin language school in ECC, Pro language and JCS in Bangkok, Gender, Age, Relationship Status, Educational level, Occupation, Monthly income, Frequency of learning and Purpose of learning by use close-end questionnaire

| Variable  | Level of    | Criteria Classification |
|-----------|-------------|-------------------------|
|           | Measurement |                         |
| 1. Gender | Nominal     | 1. male                 |
|           |             | 2. female               |

Table 3.3: Level of Information Measurement and Criteria for demographic

| Variable               | Level of    | Criteria Classification   |
|------------------------|-------------|---------------------------|
|                        | Measurement |                           |
| 2. Age                 | Ordinal     | 1. <12 years              |
|                        |             | 2. 12-17 years            |
|                        |             | 3. 18-24 years            |
|                        |             | 4. 25-34 years            |
|                        | / LING      | 5. 35-45 years            |
|                        |             | 6. over 45 years          |
| 3. Relationship Status | Nominal     | 1. single                 |
|                        |             | 2. in a relationship      |
|                        |             | 3. married                |
|                        |             | 4. divorced               |
|                        |             | 5. others                 |
| 4. Educational level   | Ordinal     | 1. primary school         |
|                        |             | 2. secondary school       |
|                        |             | 3. bachelor degree        |
|                        |             | 4. master degree          |
|                        |             | 5. doctor degree          |
| 5. Occupation          | Nominal     | 1. government working     |
|                        | DLV         | 2. freelance              |
|                        |             | 3. business owner         |
|                        |             | 4. student                |
|                        |             | 5. housewife              |
| 6. Monthly income      | Ordinal     | 1. less than 20,000 Baht  |
|                        |             | 2. 20,000-40,000 Baht     |
|                        |             | 3. 40,000-60,000 Baht     |
|                        |             | 4. 60,000-100,000         |
|                        |             | 5. more than 100,000 Baht |

Table 3.3 (Continued): Level of Information Measurement and Criteria for demographic

| Variable                 | Level of Measurement | Criteria Classification     |
|--------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|
| 7. Frequency of learning | Ordinal              | 1. Once a week              |
|                          |                      | 2. Twice a week             |
|                          |                      | 3. 3 times a week           |
|                          |                      | 4. 4 times a week           |
|                          | VIIN                 | 5. more than 4 times a week |
| 8. Purpose of learning   | Nominal              | 1. to get more language     |
|                          |                      | skills                      |
|                          |                      | 2. to pass HSK/IGCSE test   |
|                          |                      | 3. to do business with      |
|                          |                      | Chinese                     |
|                          |                      | 4. to make a Chinese friend |
|                          |                      | 5. to find a satisfied job  |

Table 3.3 (Continued): Level of Information Measurement and Criteria for demographic

Part 4. It related to factors of 7P's Marketing Mix which influence customer's choice criteria in choosing Mandarin language school in ECC, Pro language and JCS in Bangkok.

It consist of 7 aspects: Product, Place, Price, Promotion, Personnel, Process and physical assets (facility).

1. Product factors aspect includes 6 questions that are

- 1. Diversity of curriculum
- 2. Flexible schedule
- 3. The class is so funny, I can enjoy
- 4. I can understand very well when teacher explain to me
- 5. Teacher make a good preparation
- 6. I can make a best of my textbook and exercise book

- 2. Place factors aspect includes 5 questions that are
  - 1. Easy access to training institution by BTS/MRT transportation
  - 2. The training institution near my home or school
  - 3. Varied consulting service
  - 4. Offering e-learning teaching course
  - 5. There are cluster with many other educational institution nearby
- 3. Price factors aspect includes 4 questions that are
  - 1. Competitive price compared with other training institution
  - 2. Discount with price
  - 3. Installment plan
  - 4. Varied payment service
- 4. Promotion factors aspect includes 3 questions that are
  - 1. Using awards to encourage members, such as coupon for other shop
  - 2. Using deadline incentive to encourage members
  - 3. Group purchase price
- 5. Personnel factors aspect includes 7 questions that are
  - 1. Teacher's teaching experience
  - 2. Teacher's qualification
  - 3. Teacher's language skill
  - 4. Teachers have more patience and responsibility
  - 5. Staffs pay attention when I enter and leave
  - 6. Staffs' enthusiasm to respond my questions
  - 7. Staffs' related skill and knowledge to recommend course
- 6. Process factors aspect includes 3 questions that are
  - 1. Staffs resolve clients' problem immediately
  - 2. Staffs conduct my feedback

## 3. Teachers communicate clients frequently in terms of teaching

## 7. Physical assets factors aspect includes 5 questions that are

1. Offering convenient parking place

2. Offering adequate stuff for customers who are waiting, such as free

wifi, reading materials, drinking water ect.

3. Offering free stationery for customers such as pencil, paper

4. School is clean and well decorated

5. School has enough and cleanness toilet by itself

All items were weighted by target respondents on a five-point Likert scale. In each questions are scaled by Number 1 means "Strongly Disagree" to number 5 means "Strongly Agree". The weight (scores) are fixed in each level as below

| Strongly Agree    | = 5 points |
|-------------------|------------|
| Agree             | = 4 points |
| Neutral           | = 3 points |
| Disagree          | = 2 points |
| Strongly Disagree | = 1 point  |

For the measurement analysis the author use mean and interval class formula to calculate the range of information in each level as followed;

Interval class =  $\underline{\text{Range}}$  (Max value – Min Value)

Number of Interval

$$=$$
 (5-1)  
5  
 $=$  0.8

Therefore, the analysis and interpretation of factors in each aspects will use the average score interpretation that are

Average score of 4.21 - 5.00 refers to Strongly Agree Level

Average score of 3.41 - 4.20 refers to Agree level

Average score of 2.61 - 3.40 refers to Neutral level

Average score of 1.81 - 2.60 refers to Disagree level

Average score of 1.00 – 1.80 refers to Strongly Disagree Level

Part 5. It related to factors of Lifestyle and Brand which influence customer's choice criteria in choosing Mandarin language school in ECC, Pro language and JCS in Bangkok.

It consist of 2 aspects: Lifestyle and Brand.

1. Lifestyle factors aspect includes 3 questions that are

1. The duration of working hours (for worker)/ learning hours (for student) influence my choice decision.

2. I could be influence by friends, family in making decision

3. I like reading books which related to language

2. Brand factors aspect includes 4 questions that are

1. I would choose this institution according to my friend's recommendations

- 2. I would choose this institution if they have good reputation
- 3. I would choose this institution if I enjoy trial experience class
- 4. I would choose this institution if they are very famous

All items were weighted by target respondents on a five-point Likert scale. For the each questions, the scaled from Number 1 which means "Strongly Disagree" to number 5 which means "Strongly Agree". The weight (scores) are fixed in each level as below

| Strongly Agree    | = 5 points |
|-------------------|------------|
| Agree             | = 4 points |
| Neutral           | = 3 points |
| Disagree          | = 2 points |
| Strongly Disagree | = 1 point  |

For the measurement analysis the author use mean and interval class formula to calculate the range of information in each level as followed

```
Interval class = \underline{\text{Range}(\text{Max value} - \text{Min Value})}
```

=

Number of Interval (5-1) 5 0.8

Therefore, the analysis and interpretation of factors in each aspects will use the average score interpretation that are

Average score of 4.21 - 5.00 refers to Strongly Agree Level

Average score of 3.41 - 4.20 refers to Agree Level

Average score of 2.61 - 3.40 refers to Neutral Level

Average score of 1.81 - 2.60 refers to Disagree Level

Average score of 1.00 - 1.80 refers to Strongly Disagree Level

## 3.5 Content Validity and Reliability

The survey examines to two significant aspects, which are content validity and reliability to make sure that the respondents have a same frequent understanding of questionnaire. After that they can retort based on reality, emotion and knowledge as statistical reliability of the questionnaire.

#### 3.5.1 Content validity

Each questions be on questionnaires are from previous works and literature. Even though the writer submitted this questionnaire to an independent study advisor and five experienced experts who have experience in related field in order to make sure content validity.

1. Mr. Wang Yangming ---Principal of Ming Yan Education Co. Ltd

2. Ms. Wei Qingzi---Managing Director of JCS Language School

3. Ms. Raenu Tantiviwat ---Managing Director of Toma Chinese School

4. Ms. Jing He ---Managing Director of Hantang Education Co.Ltd (Guangzhou Branch)

5. Ms. Tingting Li ---Manging Director of Hantang Education Co.Ltd (Shenzhen Branch)

To establish the constancy of questions, the researcher uses Index of Item Objective Congruence (IOC) method to calculate the consistency between the objective and content or questions and objective.

$$IOC = \frac{\Sigma R}{N}$$

Where

IOC = consistency between the objective and content or questions and objective.

 $\Sigma R$  = total assessment points given from all qualified experts.

N = number of qualified experts.

The consistency index value must have the value 0.5 or above to be accepted.

After measurement result, the questions have misused and have adapted to make sure that each question has the constancy index value more than 0.5. Therefore,

$$IOC = \frac{63.4}{64}$$
$$= 0.99$$

According to IOC result of 30 questions on this questionnaire has value index of item objective congruence (IOC) equal to 0.99 without any question has IOC index less than 0.5. Thus, all questions are reasonable.

### 3.5.2 Reliability

The researcher chooses the questionnaire to samples as a show experiment to examine the questionnaire's reliability. In this research, the reliability test processes on SPSS statistic program by using Cronbach's alpha coefficient.

Table 3.4: Criteria of reliability

|                  | 7                 |                    |
|------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| Cronbach's alpha | Reliability level | Desirability level |
| coefficient      |                   |                    |
| 0.80-1.00        | Very high         | Excellent          |
| 0.70-0.79        | High              | Good               |
| 0.50-0.69        | Medium            | Fair               |
| 0.30-0.49        | Low               | Poor               |
| Less than 0.30   | Very low          | Unacceptable       |

Meanwhile, Cronbach's alpha coefficient is more than 0.70, therefore, the questionnaire reliability is acceptable (Cronbach, 1951; Olorunniwo el al., 2006).

Table 3.5: The Result of Cronbach's Alpha Test with pre-test for 30 respondents: Factors

| All Variables | Cronbach's Alpha |
|---------------|------------------|
| All Parts     | .801             |
| Income        | .785             |

| All Variables   | Cronbach's Alpha |
|---|------------------|
| Education level   | .780             |
| Occupation  | .779             |
| Consumer's lifestyle                                    | .786             |
| Trial Experience  | .787             |
| Product (teaching quality)                              | .776             |
| place   | .788             |
| price   | .787             |
| promotion   | .788             |
| personnel (teacher & Staff)                             | .810             |
| Process(problem solving)                                | .784             |
| Physical assets (facility, atmosphere<br>and cleanness) | .783             |
| reputation  | .800             |
| Word of mouth   | .806             |
| Brand awareness   | .807             |

# Table 3.5 (Continued): The Result of Cronbach's Alpha Test with pre-test for 30 respondents: Factors

The value of Cronbach's alpha coefficient of the 30 pre-test questionnaire of factor is 0.801 so that the result is very high level.

| All Variables   | Cronbach's Alpha |
|-----------------|------------------|
| All Parts       | .896             |
| Product         | .847             |
| Place           | .845             |
| Price           | .828             |
| Promotion       | .821             |
| Personnel       | .805             |
| Process         | .920             |
| Physical assets | .800             |

Table 3.6: The Result of Cronbach's Alpha Test with pre-test for 30 respondents: 7Ps Marketing Mix

The value of Cronbach's alpha coefficient of the 30 pre-test questionnaire of marketing mix is 0.896 so that the result is very high level

Table 3.7: The Result of Cronbach's Alpha Test with pre-test for 30 respondents:

| Customer's lifestyle and Brand |  |
|--------------------------------|--|

| All Variables        | Cronbach's Alpha |
|----------------------|------------------|
| All Parts            | .777             |
| Customer's lifestyle | .909             |
| Brand                | .834             |

The value of Cronbach's alpha coefficient of the 30 pre-test questionnaire of customer's lifestyle and brand is 0.777 so that the result is high level

#### 3.6 Data Collection

The data has been collected on December of 2015 year and throughout the Bangkok. Some related correlation data and related statistical function were conducted and analyzed through SPSS.

In this study, data used within this research comprise of two types of data which are primary data and secondary data.

1. Primary Data are data received form questionnaire instruments that has been self-administered by sample group which are customers from ECC, Pro language and JCS. Total number of questionnaire is 400 copies consist of customers from ECC 332copies, Pro language 40 copies and JCS 28 copies.

2. Secondary Data are information that has been collected, analyzed and organized throughout this research from the review of literature in related topics such as international journal, local journal, articles, books, research and the Internet.

Data collection process has been done in the December to January of 2015 by distributing a self-administered questionnaire to sample group in prominent area of Bangkok such as office building and shopping complex. The author selected 10 different locations for data collecting process as follows; 8 branches of ECC, that are the Mall Bangkapi, Tesco lotus Pinklao, Central Pinklao, Siam Paragon, Central Bangna, Big C Extra Lardprao, Central Rama 2 and Central Rama 3 respectively. 1 branches of Pro language where located in Times square Asok. And then 1 JCS branches is The Paseo.

#### 3.7 <u>Statistic for Data Analysis</u>

Data analyzing process for this research is processed on a computer program and presented on a format of table of content along with description on each table. As for the statistic for data analysis, the author use; multinomial logistic regression

1. Demographic data which consist of gender, status, age, nationality, education level, occupation and income by using crosstab to analysis.

2. Using Multinomial Logistic Regression method to analyze the factors which can influence customer's choice criteria in choosing Mandarin language institution, because it is a statistical technique that permits to forecast other one's score on one variable on the basis of their scores on several other variables. In additional, this statistical can identify a set of forecaster variables along with giving a useful estimation of a participant's score on a criterion variable.



## CHAPTER 4

## RESEACH FINDINGS AND DATA ANALYSIS

# 4.1 The analytical results for hypothesis testing

| Table 4.1: Multinomia | l Logistic l | Regression a | analysis of    | <sup>2</sup> factors ( | 7 Likert Scale) |
|-----------------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| 10010                 |              |              | 11001 9 010 01 | 10001010               |                 |

| Model Fitting        |   |  |  |
|----------------------|---|--|--|
| Criteria             | Likelihoo   | od Ratio '   | Fests  |
| -2 Log Likelihood    |   |  |  |
| of Reduced Model     | Chi-Square  | df   | Sig.   |
| 294.782 <sup>a</sup> | 29.347  | 12   | 0.003  |
| 289.758 <sup>a</sup> | 24.323  | 14   | 0.042  |
| 265.435 <sup>b</sup> | 0.000   | 0  | -  |
| 265.435 <sup>b</sup> | 0.000   | 0  | -  |
| 288.074 <sup>a</sup> | 22.639  | 14   | 0.066  |
| 265.435 <sup>b</sup> | 0.000   | 0  | -  |
| 265.444 <sup>a</sup> | 0.009   | 2  | 0.996  |
| 265.435 <sup>b</sup> | 0.000   | 0  | -  |
| 275.861 <sup>a</sup> | 10.426  | 14   | 0.730  |
| 292.210 <sup>a</sup> | 26.775  | 12   | 0.008  |
| 297.575 <sup>a</sup> | 32.140  | 14   | 0.004  |
| 294.734 <sup>a</sup> | 29.299  | 14   | 0.010  |
|                      |   |  |  |
| 265.435 <sup>b</sup> | .000  | 0  | -  |
| 306.092 <sup>a</sup> | 40.658  | 14   | 0.000  |
| 265.435 <sup>b</sup> | .000  | 0  | -  |
|                      | Criteria<br>-2 Log Likelihood<br>of Reduced Model<br>294.782 <sup>a</sup><br>289.758 <sup>a</sup><br>265.435 <sup>b</sup><br>265.435 <sup>b</sup><br>265.435 <sup>b</sup><br>265.435 <sup>b</sup><br>275.861 <sup>a</sup><br>292.210 <sup>a</sup><br>297.575 <sup>a</sup><br>294.734 <sup>a</sup> | Criteria         Likelihood           -2 Log Likelihood         Chi-Square           of Reduced Model         Chi-Square           294.782 <sup>a</sup> 29.347           289.758 <sup>a</sup> 24.323           265.435 <sup>b</sup> 0.000           275.861 <sup>a</sup> 10.426           292.210 <sup>a</sup> 26.775           297.575 <sup>a</sup> 32.140           294.734 <sup>a</sup> 29.299           265.435 <sup>b</sup> .000           306.092 <sup>a</sup> 40.658 | CriteriaLikelihoodRatio $-2 \log LikelihoodChi-Squaredfof Reduced ModelChi-Squaredf294.782^a29.34712289.758^a24.32314265.435^b0.0000265.435^b0.0000265.435^b0.0000265.435^b0.0000265.435^b0.0000265.435^b0.0000265.435^b0.0000275.861^a10.42614292.210^a26.77512297.575^a32.14014294.734^a29.29914265.435^b.0000306.092^a40.65814$ |

According to the table 4.1, there are six variables significantly influence choice criteria in choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok (p-value < .05).

The variables that significantly influence choice criteria in choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok include Income (0.003), Education level (0.042), Personnel (teacher & staff) (0.008), Process (problem solving) (0.004) Physical assets

(facility, atmosphere and cleanness) (0.010) and Word of mouth (0.000) expecting Trial Experience (0.066), Place (0.996) and Promotion (0.730).

Therefore, the hypothesis can explain as following.

- H1: Income is significantly influence choice criteria in choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok. (0.003<0.05)
- H2: Education level is significantly influence choice criteria in choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok. (0.042<0.05)
- H3: Occupation is not significantly influence choice criteria in choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok.
- H4: Consumer's lifestyle is not significantly influence choice criteria in choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok.
- H5: Trial Experience is not significantly influence choice criteria in choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok.
- H6: Product (teaching quality) is not significantly influence choice criteria in choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok.
- H7: Place is not significantly influence choice criteria in choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok.
- H8: Price is not significantly influence choice criteria in choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok.
- H9: Promotion is not significantly influence choice criteria in choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok.
- H10: Personnel (teacher & staff) is significantly influence choice criteria in choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok. (0.008<0.05)
- H11: Process (problem solving) is significantly influence choice criteria in choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok. (0.004<0.05)
- H12: Physical assets (facility, atmosphere and cleanness) is significantly influence choice criteria in choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok. (0.010<0.05)</li>
- H13: Reputation is not significantly influence choice criteria in choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok.

- H14: Word of mouth is significantly influence choice criteria in choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok. (0.000<0.05)
- H15: Brand Awareness is not significantly influence choice criteria in choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok.

 Table 4.2: The factors which influence customer choice in choosing mandarin training institution

| Factors       |      |                  |      |       | Sig   |               |       |          |
|---------------|------|------------------|------|-------|-------|---------------|-------|----------|
| Factors       | 0    | 1                | 2    | 3     | 4     | 5             | 6     | 7        |
| ECC           |      | $\mathbf{O}$     |      |       |       |               | 1     | 1        |
| 1.Income      | .988 | -                | .143 | .007* | .016* | .018*         | .003* | .001*    |
| 2.Education   | .434 | .988             | .150 | .817  | .962  | .662          | .280  | -        |
| Level         |      |                  |      |       |       | 0,            | . \   |          |
| 3.Occupation  | .996 | -                | .998 | .560  | .995  | .995          | .996  | -        |
| 4.Consumer's  | .996 | -                | .999 | .997  | .996  | .989          | .992  | -        |
| Lifestyle     |      |                  |      |       |       |               |       |          |
| 5. Trial      | .987 | .989             | .494 | .118  | .030* | .636          | .135  | -        |
| Experience    |      |                  |      |       |       | $\mathcal{N}$ |       |          |
| 6.Product     |      | /-/>             | .999 | 1.00  | 1.000 | .996          | .993  | -        |
| (teaching     |      | $\bigcirc \land$ | VD   | 0     |       |               |       |          |
| quality)      |      |                  |      |       |       |               |       |          |
| 7.Place       | -    | -                |      | .994  | .987  | .995          | .994  | -        |
| 8.Price       | -    | -                | _    | .990  | .989  | .990          | .993  | -        |
| 9.Promotion   | .032 | .238             | .395 | .028  | .228  | .153          | .095  | -        |
| 10.Personnel  | -    | .990             | .993 | .962  | .981  | .939          | .094  | -        |
| (teacher&staf |      |                  |      |       |       |               |       |          |
| f)            |      |                  |      |       |       |               |       |          |
|               |      |                  |      |       |       | 1             | (0    | Continue |

50

|            |      | man   | arin train | -    |      |      |      |      |
|------------|------|-------|------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Factors    |      |       |            | Sig  | 5    |      |      |      |
| 1.901012   | 0    | 1     | 2          | 3    | 4    | 5    | 6    | 7    |
| 11.Process | .990 | .997  | .991       | .105 | .052 | .473 | .835 | -    |
| (problem   |      |       |            |      |      |      |      |      |
| solving)   |      |       |            |      |      |      |      |      |
| 12.Physica | .995 | 1.000 | .999       | .993 | .988 | .411 | .516 |      |
| l Assets(  |      |       |            |      |      |      |      |      |
| facility,  |      |       |            |      |      |      |      |      |
| atmospher  |      |       |            |      |      |      |      |      |
| e and      |      |       |            |      |      |      |      |      |
| cleanness) |      |       |            |      |      |      |      |      |
| 13.Reputat | -    | .997  | .999       | .997 | .996 | .996 | -    | -    |
| ion        |      |       |            |      |      |      |      |      |
| 14. Word   | .418 | .992  | .991       | .638 | .080 | .062 | .038 | -    |
| of Mouth   |      |       |            |      |      |      | *    |      |
| 15.Brand   | -    | -     | -          | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| Awareness  |      |       |            |      |      |      |      |      |
| Pro langua | ge   |       |            |      |      |      |      |      |
| 1.Income   | .992 | -     | .966       | .581 | .501 | .740 | .507 | .170 |
| 2.Educatio | .277 | .998  | .621       | .326 | .830 | .614 | .142 | -    |
| n level    |      |       |            |      |      |      |      |      |
| 3.Occupati | .999 | -     | .999       | .994 | .998 | .996 | .997 | -    |
| on         |      |       |            |      |      |      |      |      |
| 4.Consum   | .998 | -     | .998       | .995 | .996 | .993 | .995 | -    |
| er's       |      |       |            |      |      |      |      |      |
| Lifestyle  |      |       |            |      |      |      |      |      |

 Table 4.2 (Continued)
 : The factors which influence customer choice in choosing

mandarin training institution

|               |      | mand | arın train | ing instit | ution |      |      |   |
|---------------|------|------|------------|------------|-------|------|------|---|
|               |      |      |            | S          | ig    |      |      |   |
| Factors       |      |      |            |            |       |      |      |   |
|               | 0    | 1    | 2          | 3          | 4     | 5    | 6    | 7 |
| 5. Trial      | .998 | .989 | .975       | .634       | .265  | .600 | .509 | - |
| Experience    |      |      |            |            |       |      |      |   |
|               |      |      |            |            |       |      |      |   |
| 6.P oduct     | -    | -    | .999       | -          | .999  | .997 | .995 | - |
| (teaching     |      |      |            |            |       |      |      |   |
| quality)      |      |      |            |            |       |      |      |   |
| 7.Place       | -    | -    | -          | .996       | .993  | .999 | .996 | - |
| 8.Price       |      |      |            | .991       | .994  | .996 | .996 |   |
| 0.11100       | -    | -    | -          | .991       | .994  | .990 | .990 | - |
| 9.Promotion   | .028 | .171 | .198       | .010       | .107  | .131 | .070 | - |
|               |      |      |            |            |       |      |      |   |
| 10.Personnel( | -    | .991 | .989       | .062       | .038* | .329 | .958 | - |
| teacher&staff |      |      |            |            |       |      |      |   |
| )             |      |      |            |            |       |      |      |   |
| 11.           | .980 | .998 | .984       | .526       | .594  | .052 | .988 | - |
| Process(probl |      |      |            |            |       |      |      |   |
| em solving)   |      |      |            |            |       |      |      |   |
| 12. Physical  | .992 | .998 | .993       | 1.000      | .999  | .403 | .957 | - |
| Assets(       |      |      |            |            |       |      |      |   |
| facility,     |      |      |            |            |       |      |      |   |
| atmosphere    |      |      |            |            |       |      |      |   |
| and           |      |      |            |            |       |      |      |   |
| cleanness)    |      |      |            |            |       |      |      |   |

Table 4.2 (Continued): The factors which influence customer choice in choosing

mandarin training institution

|                       | mandarin danning institution |      |       |      |       |       |       |   |
|-----------------------|------------------------------|------|-------|------|-------|-------|-------|---|
|                       |                              |      |       | Sig  |       |       |       |   |
| Factors               | 0                            | 1    | 2     | 3    | 4     | 5     | 6     | 7 |
| 13.Reputation         | .999                         | .996 | .996  | .999 | 1.000 | _     | -     | - |
| 14. Word of<br>Mouth  | .920                         | .995 | 1.000 | .983 | .984  | .003* | .001* | - |
| 15.Brand<br>Awareness | -                            | -    | -     | -    | -     | -     | -     | - |

Table 4.2 (Continued ) : The factors which influence customer choice in choosing

mandarin training institution

a. The reference category is: JCS.

b. Floating point overflow occurred while computing this statistic. Its value is therefore set to system missing.

c. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

## ECC

According to the result, customers prefer ECC over JCS due to income (p-value of  $\beta$  [Income=3,4,5,6,7] < .05), trial experience(p-value of  $\beta$  [Trial experience=4] < .05) and word of mouth (p-value of  $\beta$  [word of mouth =6] < .05).

## Pro language

According to the result, customers prefer Pro language over JCS due to Personnel (teacher & staff) (p-value of  $\beta$  [Personnel (teacher & staff) =4] < .05) and word of mouth (p-value of  $\beta$  [word of mouth =5, 6] < .05).

| Factors                                 |              |       | Sig   |       |       |
|---|--------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
|   | 1            | 2     | 3     | 4     | 5     |
| ECC                                     |              | I     |       |       | I     |
| 1. Diversity of curriculum              | 1.000        | .059  | .128  | .030* | .044* |
| 2. Flexible schedule                    | -            | .946  | .999  | .422  | -     |
| 3. The class is so funny, I can enjoy   | .886         | .998  | .926  | .038* | -     |
| 4. I can understand very well when      | -            | .919  | .996  | .900  | -     |
| teacher explain to me                   | $\mathbf{N}$ |       |       |       |       |
| 5. Teacher make a good preparation      | -            | .494  | .583  | .745  | -     |
| 6. I can make a best of my textbook and | .609         | .532  | .548  | .601  | -     |
| exercise book                           |              |       |       |       |       |
| Pro Language                            |              |       |       |       | I     |
| 1. Diversity of curriculum              | 1.000        | .995  | .995  | .996  | .995  |
| 2. Flexible schedule                    | -            | .814  | 1.000 | .801  | -     |
| 3. The class is so funny, I can enjoy   | .923         | 1.000 | .958  | .994  | -     |
| 4. I can understand very well when      | -            | .970  | .995  | .748  | -     |
| teacher explain to me                   |              |       |       |       |       |
| 5. Teacher make a good preparation      | -            | .541  | .836  | .659  | -     |
| 6. I can make a best of my textbook and | .995         | .995  | .995  | .995  | -     |
| exercise book                           |              |       |       |       |       |

## Table 4.3: The factors of 7P's marketing mix: Product

a. The reference category is: JCS.

b. Floating point overflow occurred while computing this statistic. Its value is therefore set to system missing.

c. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

## ECC

According to the result, customers prefer ECC over JCS due to diversity of curriculum (p-value of  $\beta$  [diversity of curriculum =4, 5] < .05), the class is so funny and enjoy (p-value of  $\beta$  [the class is so funny and enjoy =4] < .05).

| Factors                                |       |       | Sig   |       |      |
|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|
|  | 1     | 2     | 3     | 4     | 5    |
| ECC                                    | I     |       | 1     | I     |      |
| 1. Easy access to training institution | .997  | 1.000 | .995  | .995  | .995 |
| by BTS/MRT transportation              |       |       |       |       |      |
| 2. The training institution near my    | -     | .948  | .998  | .888  | -    |
| home or school                         | IIA   |       |       |       |      |
| 3. Varied consulting service           | .995  | .995  | .995  | .995  | -    |
| 4. Offering e-learning teaching        | .341  | .355  | .642  | .897  | -    |
| course                                 |       |       |       |       |      |
| 5. There are cluster with many other   | -     | .747  | .472  | .526  | -    |
| educational institution nearby         |       |       |       |       |      |
| Pro Language                           |       |       |       |       |      |
| 1. Easy access to training institution | 1.000 | .999  | .614  | .946  | .987 |
| by BTS/MRT transportation              |       |       |       |       |      |
| 2. The training institution near my    | -     | 1.000 | .999  | .901  | -    |
| home or school                         |       |       | LV/   |       |      |
| 3. Varied consulting service           | .000* | .000* | .000* | -     | -    |
| 4. Offering e-learning teaching        | .000* | -     | 1.000 | 1.000 | -    |
| course                                 |       |       |       |       |      |
| 5. There are cluster with many other   | -     | .750  | .511  | .932  | -    |
| educational institution nearby         |       |       |       |       |      |

# Table 4.4: The factors of 7P's marketing mix: Place

a. The reference category is: JCS.

b. Floating point overflow occurred while computing this statistic. Its value is therefore set to system missing.

c. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Pro language

According to the result, customers prefer Pro language over JCS due to varied consulting service (p-value of  $\beta$  [Personnel (teacher & staff) =1, 2, 3] < .05) and offering e-learning teaching course (p-value of  $\beta$  [word of mouth =1] < .05).

| Place          |                   | ECC | Pro language | JCS | Total |
|----------------|-------------------|-----|--------------|-----|-------|
| Easy access to | Strongly Disagree | 2   | 0            | 0   | 2     |
| training       | Disagree          | 2   | 0            | 1   | 3     |
| institution by | Neutral           | 37  | 3            | 5   | 45    |
| BTS/MRT        | Agree             | 19  | 1            | 3   | 23    |
| transportation | Strongly Agree    | 272 | 36           | 19  | 327   |

Table 4.5: The analysis crosstab form factors of 7P's marketing mix: Place

According to the table 4.5, the result can be analyzed as following.

- The majority frequency of place: easy access to training institution by BTS/MRT transportation by the respondents have level comments Strongly Agree (327) and followed Neutral level (45), Agree level (23), Disagree level (3) and Strongly Disagree level (2) respectively.
- The most respondents of ECC have level comments Strongly Agree level (272).
- The most respondents of Pro language have level comments Neutral level (3).
- The most respondents of JCS have level comments Strongly Agree level (19).

|                     |                   |     |              | institution |       |  |  |  |
|---------------------|-------------------|-----|--------------|-------------|-------|--|--|--|
| Place               |                   | ECC | Pro language | JCS         | Total |  |  |  |
| The training        | Strongly Disagree | 1   | 0            | 0           | 1     |  |  |  |
| institution near my | Disagree          | 2   | 0            | 1           | 3     |  |  |  |
| home or school      | Neutral           | 5   | 0            | 1           | 6     |  |  |  |
|                     | Agree             | 22  | 2            | 5           | 29    |  |  |  |
|                     | Strongly Agree    | 302 | 38           | 21          | 361   |  |  |  |

Table 4.6: The analysis crosstab form factors of 7P's marketing mix: Place

According to the table 4.6, the result can be analyzed as following.

- The majority frequency of place: the training institution near my home or school by the respondents have level comments Strongly Agree (361) and followed Agree level (29), Neutral level (6), Disagree level (3) and Strongly Disagree level (1) respectively.
- The most respondents of ECC have level comments Strongly Agree level (302).
- The most respondents of Pro language have level comments Strongly Agree level (38).
- The most respondents of JCS have level comments Strongly Agree level (21).

Table 4.7: The factors of 7P's marketing mix: Price

| Factors                         | Sig   |       |       |       |      |  |
|---------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|--|
|                                 | 1     | 2     | 3     | 4     | 5    |  |
| ECC                             |       |       |       | ·     |      |  |
| 1. Competitive price compared   | -     | .999  | .000* | .000* | .000 |  |
| with other training institution |       |       |       |       | *    |  |
| 2. Discount with price          | .973  | .573  | 1.000 | .527  | -    |  |
| 3. Installment plan             | -     | .779  | .926  | .705  | -    |  |
| 4. Varied payment service       | .000* | .000* | .000* | -     | -    |  |

57

| Factors                         | Sig |       |       |       |       |       |       |  |
|---------------------------------|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
|                                 | 1   | 2     |       | 3     | 4     |       | 5     |  |
| Pro Language                    |     |       |       |       |       |       |       |  |
| 1. Competitive price compared   |     |       | -     | .999  | .999  | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |
| with other training institution |     |       |       |       |       |       |       |  |
| 2. Discount with price          |     | .850  | .998  | 1.000 | .276  | -     |       |  |
| 3. Installment plan             |     | - 1   | .712  | .507  | .819  | -     |       |  |
| 4. Varied payment service       |     | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | -     |       |  |

## Table 4.7 (Continued) : The factors of 7P's marketing mix: Price

a. The reference category is: JCS.

b. Floating point overflow occurred while computing this statistic. Its value is therefore set to system missing.

c. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

## ECC

According to the result, customers prefer ECC over JCS due to competitive price compared with other training institution (p-value of  $\beta$  [competitive price compared with other training institution =3, 4, 5] < .05) and varied payment service (p-value of  $\beta$  [varied payment service =1, 2, 3] < .05).

| Factors                           | Sig  |       |      |      |      |  |
|-----------------------------------|------|-------|------|------|------|--|
|                                   | 1    | 2     | 3    | 4    | 5    |  |
| ECC                               |      |       |      |      |      |  |
| 1. Using awards to encourage      | .553 | .020* | .592 | .788 | .285 |  |
| members, such as coupon for other |      |       |      |      |      |  |
| shop                              |      |       |      |      |      |  |
| 2. Using deadline incentive to    | .896 | .851  | .799 | .821 | -    |  |
| encourage members                 |      |       |      |      |      |  |
| 3. Group purchase price           | .797 | .862  | .938 | .727 | -    |  |

Table 4.8: The factors of 7P's marketing mix: Promotion

| Factors                           | Sig  |      |      |      |      |  |
|-----------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|--|
|                                   | 1    | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5    |  |
| Pro Language                      |      |      |      |      | •    |  |
| 1. Using awards to encourage      | .809 | .920 | .905 | .684 | .936 |  |
| members, such as coupon for other |      |      |      |      |      |  |
| shop                              |      |      |      |      |      |  |
| 2. Using deadline incentive to    | .836 | .939 | .876 | .824 | -    |  |
| encourage members                 | ΙΙλ  |      |      |      |      |  |
| 3. Group purchase price           | .895 | .889 | .976 | .783 | -    |  |

Table 4.8 (Continued): The factors of 7P's marketing mix: Promotion

a. The reference category is: JCS.

b. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

c. Floating point overflow occurred while computing this statistic. Its value is therefore set to system missing.

## ECC

According to the result, customers prefer ECC over JCS due to using awards to encourage members, such as coupon for other shop (p-value of  $\beta$  [using awards to encourage members, such as coupon for other shop =2] < .05).

Table 4.9: The factors of 7P's marketing mix: Personnel

| Factors   | Sig |      |      |      |   |
|---|-----|------|------|------|---|
|   | 1   | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5 |
| ECC   |     |      |      |      |   |
| 1. Teacher's teaching experience                  | -   | -    | .998 | .709 | - |
| 2. Teacher's qualification                        | -   | .323 | .438 | .757 | - |
| 3.Teacher's language skill                        | -   | .604 | .399 | .450 | - |
| 4. Teachers have more patience and responsibility | -   | .738 | .937 | .387 | - |
| 5. Staffs pay attention when I enter<br>and leave | -   | -    | .774 | .652 | - |

| 6. Staffs' enthusiasm to respond my  | -  | -    | .390 | .371 | _ |
|--------------------------------------|----|------|------|------|---|
| questions                            |    |      |      |      |   |
| 7. Staffs' related skill and         | -  | .996 | .445 | .844 | - |
| knowledge to recommend course        |    |      |      |      |   |
| Pro Language                         |    |      |      |      |   |
| 1. Teacher's teaching experience     | -  | -    | .999 | .996 | - |
| 2. Teacher's qualification           |    | .998 | .452 | .937 | - |
| 3.Teacher's language skill           | UA | .619 | .635 | .637 | - |
| 4. Teachers have more patience and   | -  | .998 | .996 | .997 | _ |
| responsibility                       |    |      |      |      |   |
| 5. Staffs pay attention when I enter | -  | -    | .825 | .640 | - |
| and leave                            |    |      |      |      |   |
| 6. Staffs' enthusiasm to respond my  | -  | -    | .476 | .497 | - |
| questions                            |    |      | K    |      |   |
| 7. Staffs' related skill and         | -  | .995 | .467 | .907 | - |
| knowledge to recommend course        |    |      |      |      |   |

# Table 4.9 (Continued): The factors of 7P's marketing mix: Personnel

a. The reference category is: JCS.

b. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

c. Floating point overflow occurred while computing this statistic. Its value is therefore set to system missing.

According to the table 4.9, there are not variables significantly influence choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok (p-value > .05).

| Personnel         |                   | ECC | Pro language | JCS | Total |
|-------------------|-------------------|-----|--------------|-----|-------|
| Teacher's         | Strongly Disagree | 0   | 0            | 0   | 0     |
| teaching          | Disagree          | 1   | 0            | 0   | 1     |
| experience        | Neutral           | 2   | 0            | 0   | 2     |
|                   | Agree             | 10  | 0            | 3   | 13    |
|                   | Strongly Agree    | 319 | 40           | 25  | 384   |
| Teacher's         | Strongly Disagree | 1   | 0            | 0   | 1     |
| qualification     | Disagree          | 1   | 0            | 1   | 2     |
|                   | Neutral           | 14  | 1            | 2   | 17    |
|                   | Agree             | 32  | 3            | 3   | 38    |
|                   | Strongly Agree    | 284 | 36           | 22  | 342   |
| Teacher's         | Strongly Disagree | 0   | 0            | 0   | 0     |
| language skill    | Disagree          | 12  | 1            | 2   | 15    |
|                   | Neutral           | 53  | 5            | 7   | 65    |
|                   | Agree             | 55  | 8            | 5   | 68    |
|                   | Strongly Agree    | 212 | 26           | 14  | 252   |
| Teachers have     | Strongly Disagree | 1   | 0            | 1   | 2     |
| more patience and | Disagree          | 2   | 0            | 1   | 3     |
| responsibility    | Neutral           | 10  | 0            | 2   | 12    |
|                   | Agree             | 13  | 0            | 1   | 14    |
|                   | Strongly Agree    | 306 | 40           | 23  | 369   |
| Staffs pay        | Strongly Disagree | 0   | 0            | 0   | 0     |
| attention when I  | Disagree          | 0   | 0            | 0   | 0     |
| enter and leave   | Neutral           | 59  | 6            | 6   | 71    |
|                   | Agree             | 89  | 13           | 6   | 108   |
|                   | Strongly Agree    | 184 | 21           | 16  | 221   |

Table 4.10: The crosstab analysis for factors of 7P's marketing mix: Personnel
| Personnel       | Personnel         |     | institution  |     |       |  |
|-----------------|-------------------|-----|--------------|-----|-------|--|
|                 |                   | ECC | Pro language | JCS | Total |  |
| Staffs'         | Strongly Disagree | 0   | 0            | 0   | 0     |  |
| enthusiasm to   | Disagree          | 1   | 0            | 0   | 1     |  |
| respond my      | Neutral           | 37  | 4            | 5   | 46    |  |
| questions       | Agree             | 162 | 20           | 12  | 194   |  |
|                 | Strongly Agree    | 132 | 16           | 11  | 159   |  |
| Staffs' related | Strongly Disagree | 1   | 0            | 1   | 2     |  |
| skill and       | Disagree          | 11  | 2            | 0   | 13    |  |
| knowledge to    | Neutral           | 61  | 6            | 8   | 75    |  |
| recommend       | Agree             | 136 | 19           | 9   | 164   |  |
| course          | Strongly Agree    | 123 | 13           | 10  | 146   |  |

Table 4.10 (Continued): The Crosstab Analysis for Factors of 7P's Marketing Mix: Personnel

According to the table 4.10, the result can be analyzed as following.

- The majority frequency of 7P's marketing mix: Personnel is Strongly Agree level, teacher's teaching experience (384), teacher's qualification (342), teacher's language skill (252), teachers have more patience and responsibility (369), staffs pay attention when I enter and leave (221), staffs' enthusiasm to respond my questions (159) and staffs' related skill and knowledge to recommend course (146).
- The most respondents of ECC have Strongly Agree level, teacher's teaching experience (319), teacher's qualification (284), teacher's language skill (212), teachers have more patience and responsibility (306) and staffs pay attention when I enter and leave (184).
- The most respondents of Pro have Strongly Agree level, teacher's teaching experience (40), teacher's qualification (36), teacher's language skill (26), and teachers have more patience and responsibility (40) and staffs pay attention when I enter and leave (21).

- The most respondents of JCS have Strongly Agree level, teacher's teaching experience (25) teacher's qualification (22), teacher's language skill (14), teachers have more patience and responsibility (23) and staffs pay attention when I enter and leave (16).

| Factors                            | Sig  |      |       |       |      |  |
|------------------------------------|------|------|-------|-------|------|--|
|                                    | 1    | 2    | 3     | 4     | 5    |  |
| ECC                                | UΛ   | 11   |       | 1     | 1    |  |
| 1. Staffs resolve clients' problem | .998 | .895 | .016* | .000* | .000 |  |
| immediately                        |      |      |       |       | *    |  |
| 2. Staffs conduct my feedback      | -    | .998 | .212  | .429  | -    |  |
| 3. Teachers communicate clients    | -    | -    | .998  | .872  | -    |  |
| frequently in terms of teaching    |      |      |       |       |      |  |
| Pro Language                       |      |      | K     |       |      |  |
| 1. Staffs resolve clients' problem | -    | .513 | .973  | .174  | .101 |  |
| immediately                        |      |      |       |       |      |  |
| 2. Staffs conduct my feedback      | -    | .999 | .575  | .370  | -    |  |
| 3. Teachers communicate clients    | -    | 10   | 1.000 | .914  | -    |  |
| frequently in terms of teaching    | FD   |      |       |       |      |  |

a. The reference category is: JCS.

b. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

c. Floating point overflow occurred while computing this statistic. Its value is therefore set to system missing.

# ECC

According to the result, customers prefer ECC over JCS due to staffs resolve clients' problem immediately (p-value of  $\beta$  [staffs resolve clients' problem immediately =3, 4, 5] < .05).

| Factors                                |      |       | Sig           |       |   |
|--|------|-------|---------------|-------|---|
|  | 1    | 2     | 3             | 4     | 5 |
| ECC                                    |      |       |               |       |   |
| 1. Offering convenient parking place   | .052 | .998  | .002*         | .000* | - |
| 2. Offering adequate stuff for         | -    | -     | .900          | .848  | - |
| customers who are waiting, such as     |      |       |               |       |   |
| free wifi, reading materials, drinking |      |       |               |       |   |
| water ect.                             |      | 11    |               |       |   |
| 3.Offering free stationery for         | .998 | .361  | .643          | -     | - |
| customers such as pencil, paper        |      |       | 10            |       |   |
| 4. School is clean and well decorated  | .216 | .680  | .673          | -     | - |
| 5. School has enough and cleanness     | -    | .023* | .832          | .640  | - |
| toilet by itself                       |      |       |               |       |   |
| Pro Language                           |      |       | X             |       |   |
| 1. Offering convenient parking place   | .729 | 1.000 | .571          | .092  | - |
| 2. Offering adequate stuff for         | -    | -     | .595          | .975  | - |
| customers who are waiting, such as     |      | (     | $\mathcal{N}$ |       |   |
| free wifi, reading materials, drinking |      |       |               |       |   |
| water ect.                             |      |       |               |       |   |
| 3. Offering free stationery for        | .999 | .996  | .762          | -     | - |
| customers such as pencil, paper        |      |       |               |       |   |
| 4. School is clean and well decorated  | -    | .998  | .622          | .940  | - |
| 5. School has enough and cleanness     | -    | .997  | .996          | .468  | - |
| toilet by itself                       |      |       |               |       |   |

# Table 4.12: The factors of 7P's marketing mix: Physical Assets

a. The reference category is: JCS.

b. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

c. Floating point overflow occurred while computing this statistic. Its value is therefore set to system missing.

# ECC

According to the result, customers prefer ECC over JCS due to offering convenient parking place (p-value of  $\beta$  [offering convenient parking place =3, 4] < .05) and school has enough and cleanness toilet by itself (p-value of  $\beta$  [school has enough and cleanness toilet by itself =2] < .05).

| Factors                               | Sig  |       |                |       |      |
|---------------------------------------|------|-------|----------------|-------|------|
| OK                                    |      | 2     | 3              | 4     | 5    |
| ECC                                   |      | 1V    |                | 1     | 1    |
| 1. The duration of working hours      | .430 | .000* | .000*          | .016* | .000 |
| (for worker)/ learning hours (for     |      |       |                |       | *    |
| student) influence my choice          |      |       |                | \     |      |
| decision.                             |      |       |                |       |      |
| 2. I could be influence by friends,   | -    | .783  | .021*          | .231  | -    |
| family in making decision             |      |       |                |       |      |
| 3. I like reading books which related | .401 | .002* | .001*          | .285  | -    |
| to language                           |      | (     | $\mathcal{N}/$ |       |      |
| Pro Language                          |      |       |                |       |      |
| 1. The length of working hours (for   | .458 | .380  | .108           | .843  | .093 |
| worker)/ learning hours (for student) |      |       |                |       |      |
| influence my choice decision.         |      |       |                |       |      |
| 2. I could be influence by friends,   | -    | .505  | -              | .313  | -    |
| family in making decision             |      |       |                |       |      |
| 3. I like reading books which related | .999 | .865  | .282           | .717  | -    |
| to language                           |      |       |                |       |      |

a. The reference category is: JCS.

b. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

c. Floating point overflow occurred while computing this statistic. Its value is therefore set to system missing.

## ECC

According to the result, customers prefer ECC over JCS due to the length of working hours( for worker)/ learning hours (for student) influence my choice decision (p-value of  $\beta$  [the length of working hours( for worker)/ learning hours (for student) influence my choice decision =2,3,4,5] < .05), friends, family in making decision (p-value of  $\beta$  [friends, family in making decision =3] < .05) and like reading books which related to language (p-value of  $\beta$  [like reading books which related to language =2,3] < .05).

| Factors                                 | UΛ   | 115  | Sig           |       |      |
|---|------|------|---------------|-------|------|
|   | 1    | 2    | 3             | 4     | 5    |
| ECC                                     |      | <    |               | I     | 1    |
| 1. I would choose this institution      | -    | .081 | .005*         | .000* | .000 |
| according to my friend's                |      |      |               |       | *    |
| recommendations                         |      |      |               |       |      |
| 2. I would choose this institution if   | .232 | .842 | .243          | .560  | -    |
| they have good reputation               |      |      |               |       |      |
| 3. I would choose this institution if I | .950 | .950 | .943          | .691  | -    |
| enjoy trial experience class            |      | (    | $\mathcal{N}$ |       |      |
| 4. I would choose this institution if   | .984 | .949 | .168          | .618  | -    |
| they are very famous                    |      |      |               |       |      |
| Pro Language                            |      |      | 1             |       |      |
| 1. I would choose this institution      | _    | -    | .725          | .895  | .866 |
| according to my friend's                |      |      |               |       |      |
| recommendations                         |      |      |               |       |      |
| 2. I would choose this institution if   | .151 | .800 | .998          | .481  | -    |
| they have good reputation               |      |      |               |       |      |
| 3. I would choose this institution if I | .988 | .988 | .977          | .597  | -    |
| enjoy trial experience class            |      |      |               |       |      |
| 4. I would choose this institution if   | .725 | .820 | .256          | .780  | -    |
| they are very famous                    |      |      |               |       |      |

## Table 4.14: The factors of Brand

a. The reference category is: JCS.

b. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

c. Floating point overflow occurred while computing this statistic. Its value is therefore set to system missing.

## ECC

According to the result, customers prefer ECC over JCS due to friend's recommendations (p-value of  $\beta$  [friend's recommendations =3, 4, 5] < .05).

4.2 The analytical results for crosstabs testing: General Information and Demographic

Table 4.15: The Crosstab Analysis of General Information and Demographic of Gender

| Gender | ECC | Pro language | JCS | Total |
|--------|-----|--------------|-----|-------|
| male   | 141 | 19           | 10  | 170   |
| female | 191 | 21           | 18  | 230   |
| Total  | 332 | 40           | 28  | 400   |

According to the table 4.15, the result can be analyzed as following.

- The majority frequency of choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok by the respondents is female (230) and followed male (170) respectively.
- The most respondents of ECC is female (191).
- The most respondents of Pro language is female (21).
- The most respondents of JCS is female (18).

| Age           | ECC | Pro language | JCS | Total |
|---------------|-----|--------------|-----|-------|
| <12 years     | 56  | 10           | 7   | 73    |
| 12-17 years   | 60  | 6            | 6   | 72    |
| 18-24 years   | 120 | 19           | 7   | 146   |
| 25-34 years   | 67  | 5            | 6   | 78    |
| 35-45 years   | 18  | 0            | 0   | 18    |
| Over 45 years | 11  | 0            | 2   | 13    |
| Total         | 332 | 40           | 28  | 400   |

Table 4.16: The Crosstab Analysis of General Information and Demographic of Age

According to the table 4.16, the result can be analyzed as following.

- The majority frequency of choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok by the respondents have age 18-24 years (146) and followed 25-34 years (78),
   <12 years (73), 12-17 years (72), 35-45 years (18) and over 45 years (13) respectively.
- The most respondents of ECC have age 18-24 years (120).
- The most respondents of Pro language have age 18-24 years (19).
- The most respondents of JCS have age 18-24 years (7) and <12 years (7).

 Table 4.17: The Crosstab Analysis of General Information and Demographic of

 Relationship Status

| Relationship Status | ECC | Pro language | JCS | Total |
|---------------------|-----|--------------|-----|-------|
| Single              | 196 | 24           | 17  | 237   |
| In a relationship   | 24  | 2            | 3   | 29    |
| Married             | 96  | 10           | 7   | 113   |
| Divorced            | 16  | 4            | 1   | 21    |
| Others              | 0   | 0            | 0   | 0     |
| Total               | 332 | 40           | 28  | 400   |

According to the table 4.17, the result can be analyzed as following.

- The majority frequency of choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok by the respondents have Relationship Status single (237) and followed married (113), in a relationship (29) and divorced (21) respectively.
- The most respondents of ECC have Relationship Status single (196).
- The most respondents of Pro language have Relationship Status single (24).
- The most respondents of JCS have Relationship Status single (17).

 Table 4.18: The Crosstab Analysis of General Information and Demographic of

 Educational level

| Educational level | ECC | Pro language | JCS | Total |
|-------------------|-----|--------------|-----|-------|
| Primary school    | 68  | 11           | 8   | 87    |
| Secondary school  | 67  | 10           | 6   | 83    |
| Bachelor degree   | 138 | 15           | 14  | 167   |
| Master degree     | 53  | 4            | 0   | 57    |
| Doctor degree     | 6   | 0            | 0   | 6     |
| Total             | 332 | 40           | 28  | 400   |

According to the table 4.18, the result can be analyzed as following.

- The majority frequency of choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok by the respondents have Educational level bachelor degree (167) and followed primary school (87), secondary school (83), master degree (57) and doctor degree (6) respectively.
- The most respondents of ECC have Educational level bachelor degree (138).
- The most respondents of Pro language have Educational level bachelor degree (15).
- The most respondents of JCS have Educational level bachelor degree (14).

| Occupation         | ECC | Pro language | JCS | Total |
|--------------------|-----|--------------|-----|-------|
| Government working | 65  | 5            | 16  | 86    |
| Freelance          | 12  | 2            | 0   | 14    |
| Business owner     | 41  | 5            | 5   | 51    |
| Student            | 159 | 23           | 4   | 186   |
| Housewife          | 55  | 5            | 3   | 63    |
| Total              | 332 | 40           | 28  | 400   |

 Table 4.19: The Crosstab Analysis of General Information and Demographic of

 Occupation

According to the table 4.18, the result can be analyzed as following.

- The majority frequency of choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok by the respondents have Occupation student (186) and followed government working (86), housewife (63), business owner (51) and freelance (14) respectively.
- The occupation of most respondents of ECC are student (159).
- The occupation of most respondents of Pro language are student (23).
- The occupation of most respondents of JCS are government working (16).

| Monthly income            | ECC | Pro language | JCS | Total |  |  |
|---------------------------|-----|--------------|-----|-------|--|--|
| Less than 20,000 Baht     | 8   | 0            | 0   | 8     |  |  |
| 20,000-40,000 Baht        | 26  | 2            | 0   | 28    |  |  |
| 40,000-60,000 Baht        | 84  | 16           | 13  | 113   |  |  |
| 60,000-100,000 Baht       | 141 | 12           | 14  | 167   |  |  |
| More than 100,000<br>Baht | 73  | 10           | 1   | 84    |  |  |
| Total                     | 332 | 40           | 28  | 400   |  |  |

 Table 4.20: The Crosstab Analysis of General Information and Demographic of Monthly income

According to the table 4.19, the result can be analyzed as following.

- The majority frequency of choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok by the respondents have Monthly income 60,000-100,000 Baht (167) and followed 40,000-60,000 Baht (113), more than 100,000 Baht (84), 20,000-40,000 Baht (28) and less than 20,000 Baht (8) respectively.
- The most respondents of ECC have Monthly income 60,000-100,000 Baht (141).
- The most respondents of Pro language have Monthly income 40,000-60,000 Baht (16).
- The most respondents of JCS have Monthly income 60,000-100,000 Baht (14).

| Frequency of learning    | ECC | Pro language | JCS | Total |  |  |
|--------------------------|-----|--------------|-----|-------|--|--|
| Once a week              | 101 | 11           | 9   | 121   |  |  |
| Twice a week             | 127 | 17           | 10  | 154   |  |  |
| 3 times a week           | 76  | 12           | 9   | 97    |  |  |
| 4 times a week           | 20  | 0            | 0   | 20    |  |  |
| More than 4 times a week | 8   | 0            | 0   | 8     |  |  |
| Total                    | 332 | 40           | 28  | 400   |  |  |

 Table 4.21: The Crosstab Analysis of General Information and Demographic of

 Frequency of learning

According to the table 4.20, the result can be analyzed as following.

- The majority frequency of choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok by the respondents have Frequency of learning Twice a week (154) and followed Once a week (121), 3 times a week (97), 4 times a week (20) and more than 4 times a week (8) respectively.
- The most respondents of ECC have Frequency of learning twice a week (127).
- The most respondents of Pro language have Frequency of learning twice a week (17).
- The most respondents of JCS have Frequency of learning twice a week (10).

| Purpose of learning            | ECC | Pro language | JCS | Total |
|--------------------------------|-----|--------------|-----|-------|
| To get more<br>language skills | 131 | 0            | 0   | 131   |
| To pass<br>HSK/IGCSE test      | 39  | 8            | 7   | 54    |
| To do business with<br>Chinese | 19  | 5            | 2   | 26    |
| To make a Chinese<br>friend    | 3   | 3            | 4   | 10    |
| To find a satisfied job        | 140 | 24           | 15  | 179   |
| Total                          | 332 | 40           | 28  | 400   |

 Table 4.22: The Crosstab Analysis of General Information and Demographic of

 Purpose of learning

According to the table 4.21, the result can be analyzed as following.

- The majority frequency of choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok by the respondents have Purpose of learning to find a satisfied job (179) and followed to get more language skills (131), to pass HSK/IGCSE test (54), to do business with Chinese (26) and to make a Chinese friend (10) respectively.
- The most respondents of ECC have Purpose of learning to find a satisfied job (140).
- The most respondents of Pro language have Purpose of learning to find a satisfied job (24).
- The most respondents of JCS have Purpose of learning to find a satisfied job (15).

|                          | Institution         |                       |                        |  |  |  |  |
|--------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Content                  | ECC                 | Pro language          | JCS                    |  |  |  |  |
| Gender                   | Female              | Female                | Female                 |  |  |  |  |
| Age                      | 18-24 years         | 18-24 years           | 18-24 years            |  |  |  |  |
| Relationship Status      | Single              | Single                | Single                 |  |  |  |  |
| Educational level        | Bachelor degree     | Bachelor degree       | Bachelor degree        |  |  |  |  |
| Occupation               | Student             | Student               | Government<br>working  |  |  |  |  |
| Monthly income           | 40,000-60,000 Baht  | 40,000-60,000<br>Baht | 60,000-100,000<br>Baht |  |  |  |  |
| Frequency of<br>learning | Twice a week        | Twice a week          | Twice a week           |  |  |  |  |
| Purpose of               | To find a satisfied | To find a satisfied   | To find a satisfied    |  |  |  |  |
| learning                 | job                 | job                   | job                    |  |  |  |  |

 Table 4.23: The Summary of General Information and Demographic by Crosstab

 Analysis

According to the table 4.21, the result can be analyzed as following. The majority frequency of choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok by the respondents are the female who are 18-24 years old, in addition, they are single and hold bachelor degree. Most of them are the students who monthly income is about 40,000-60,000 Baht. Meanwhile, they are come to study Mandarin twice a week in order to find a satisfied job.

# CHAPTER 5 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this chapter, the researcher summarized the analytical results for hypothesis testing by using Multinomial logistic regression for internal factors (income, education level, occupation, consumer's lifestyle, trial experience) and External factors (product, place, price, promotion, personnel, process, physical assets, reputation, word of mouth and brand awareness (7 Likert Scale) which can influence choice criteria in choosing Mandarin Language institution in Bangkok.

This research will useful for owner business of mandarin training institution, marketing manager of mandarin training institution and researcher which are related to mandarin training institution. The result of this study can improve the marketing strategy of mandarin training institution for group target.

This research used the quantitative methodology which distributed questionnaire with the 400 customers who is learning at ECC, Pro language and JCS these three Mandarin training institution in Bangkok. The questionnaire was designed to gather general demographic data, 7P's marketing mix data, branding data and customer lifestyle data which related to customer's choice criteria in selecting Mandarin language institution. Each questions of questionnaire comes from previous works and literature. Even though the writer submitted this questionnaire to an independent study advisor and five experienced experts who have experience in related to this field in order to make sure content validity and pass reliability test.

In this research there are the theoretical foundations of conceptual framework that can measure the related to choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok and analyzed to hypothesis as following;

H10:  $\beta$  Income = 0

H1a: Income  $\neq 0$ 

H2o:  $\beta$  Education level = 0 H2a: Education level  $\neq 0$  H3o:  $\beta$  Occupation = 0 H3a: Occupation  $\neq 0$ 

H40:  $\beta$  Consumer's lifestyle = 0 H4a: Consumer's lifestyle  $\neq 0$ 

H50: β Trial Experience = 0 H5a: Trial Experience  $\neq 0$ 

H60: β Product (teaching quality) = 0 H6a: Product (teaching quality)  $\neq 0$ 

H7o:  $\beta$  place = 0 H7a: place  $\neq 0$ 

H80:  $\beta$  price = 0 H8a: price  $\neq 0$ 

H9o:  $\beta$  promotion = 0 H9a: promotion  $\neq$  0

H100:  $\beta$  Personnel (teacher & staff) = 0 H10a: Personnel (teacher & staff)  $\neq 0$ 

H110:  $\beta$  Process (problem solving) = 0 H11a: Process (problem solving)  $\neq 0$ 

H120:  $\beta$  Physical assets (facility, atmosphere and cleanness) = 0 H12a: Physical assets (facility, atmosphere and cleanness)  $\neq 0$  H130:  $\beta$  Reputation = 0 H13a: Reputation  $\neq 0$ 

H140:  $\beta$  Word of mouth = 0 H14a: Word of mouth  $\neq 0$ 

H150:  $\beta$  Brand Awareness = 0 H15a: Brand Awareness  $\neq 0$ 

### 5.1 Conclusion

From the research of the factors that effect on choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok, the result as following:

The variables that significantly influence choice criteria in choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok include Income (0.003), Education level (0.042), Personnel (teacher & staff) (0.008), Process (problem solving) (0.004) Physical assets (facility, atmosphere and cleanness) (0.010) and Word of mouth (0.000).

Therefore, the hypothesis can explain as following.

- H1: Income is significantly influence choice criteria in choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok. (0.003<0.05)
- H2: Education level is significantly influence choice criteria in choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok. (0.042<0.05)
- H3: Personnel (teacher & staff) is significantly influence choice criteria in choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok. (0.008<0.05)
- H4: Process (problem solving) is significantly influence choice criteria in choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok. (0.004<0.05)
- H5: Physical assets (facility, atmosphere and cleanness) is significantly influence choice criteria in choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok. (0.010<0.05)</li>
- H6: Word of mouth is significantly influence choice criteria in choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok. (0.000<0.05)</li>

The variables that significantly influence in choosing ECC more than JCS including income, trial experience and word of mouth. In addition, the variables that significantly influence in choosing Pro language more than JCS including Personnel (teacher & staff) and word of mouth.

For the factors of Marketing Mix that effect in choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok, the result as following;

- Product : there are two variables significantly influence choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok (p-value < .05), The variables that significantly influence choosing ECC over JCS including diversity of curriculum and the class is so funny, enjoy.
- 2. Place : there are two variables significantly influence choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok (p-value < .05), The variables that significantly influence choosing Pro language over JCS including varied consulting service and offering e-learning teaching course. And analyzed by Crosstab of easy access to training institution by BTS/MRT transportation and the training institution near my home or school the result that</p>

- The majority frequency of place: easy access to training institution by BTS/MRT transportation by the respondents have level comments Strongly Agree (327) and followed Neutral level (45), Agree level (23), Disagree level (3) and Strongly Disagree level (2) respectively, the most respondents of ECC have level comments Strongly Agree level (272), The most respondents of Pro language have level comments Neutral level (3) and The most respondents of JCS have level comments Strongly Agree level (19).

- The majority frequency of place: the training institution near my home or school by the respondents have level comments Strongly Agree (361) and followed Agree level (29), Neutral level (6), Disagree level (3) and Strongly Disagree level (1) respectively, The most respondents of ECC have level comments Strongly Agree level (302), the most respondents of Pro language have level comments Strongly Agree level (38), the most respondents of JCS have level comments Strongly Agree level (21).

- 3. Price : there are two variables significantly influence choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok (p-value < .05), The variables that significantly influence choosing ECC over JCS including competitive price compared with other training institution and varied payment service.</p>
- 4. Promotion : there are one variables significantly influence choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok (p-value < .05), The variables that significantly influence choosing ECC over JCS including using awards to encourage members, such as coupon for other shop.
- Personnel: there are not variables significantly influence choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok (p-value > .05). And analyzed by Crosstab of factor personnel the result that:

- The majority frequency of 7P's marketing mix: Personnel is Strongly Agree level, teacher's teaching experience (384), teacher's qualification (342), teacher's language skill (252), teachers have more patience and responsibility (369), staffs pay attention when I enter and leave (221), staffs' enthusiasm to respond my questions (159) and staffs' related skill and knowledge to recommend course (146).

- The most respondents of ECC have Strongly Agree level, teacher's teaching experience (319), teacher's qualification (284), teacher's language skill (212), teachers have more patience and responsibility (306) and staffs pay attention when I enter and leave (184).

- The most respondents of Pro have Strongly Agree level, teacher's teaching experience (40), teacher's qualification (36), teacher's language skill (26), teachers have more patience and responsibility (40) and staffs pay attention when I enter and leave (21).

- The most respondents of JCS have Strongly Agree level, teacher's teaching experience (25) teacher's qualification (22), teacher's language skill (14), teachers have more patience and responsibility (23) and staffs pay attention when I enter and leave (16).

6. Process : there are one variables significantly influence choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok (p-value < .05), The variables that significantly influence choosing ECC over JCS including staffs resolve clients' problem immediately.</p>

7. Physical Assets : there are two variables significantly influence choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok (p-value < .05), The variables that significantly influence choosing ECC over JCS including offering convenient parking place and school has enough and cleanness toilet by itself.

For the factors of Lifestyle and Brand that effect on choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok, the result as following;

- Lifestyle: there are three variables significantly influence choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok (p-value < .05), The variables that significantly influence choosing ECC over JCS including the length of working hours (for worker)/ learning hours (for student) influence my choice decision, The respondents could be influence by friends, family in making decision and The respondents like reading books which related to language.
- Brand : there are one variables significantly influence choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok (p-value < .05), The variables that significantly influence choosing ECC over JCS including the respondents would choose this institution according to their friend's recommendations.

For the analytical results for crosstabs testing: General Information and Demographic, the result as following;

1. Gender : The majority frequency of choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok by the respondents is female (230) and followed male (170) respectively, The most respondents of ECC is female (191), The most respondents of Pro language is female (21) and The most respondents of JCS is female (18). 2. Age : The majority frequency of choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok by the respondents have age 18-24 years (146) and followed 25-34 years (78), <12 years (73), 12-17 years (72), 35-45 years (18) and over 45 years (13) respectively, The most respondents of ECC have age 18-24 years (120), The most respondents of Pro language have age 18-24 years (19) and The most respondents of JCS have age 18-24 years (7) and <12 years (7).

3. Relationship Status: The majority frequency of choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok by the respondents have Relationship Status single (237) and followed married (113), in a relationship (29) and divorced (21) respectively, The most respondents of ECC have Relationship Status single (196), The most respondents of Pro language have Relationship Status single (24) and The most respondents of JCS have Relationship Status single (17).

4. Educational level : The majority frequency of choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok by the respondents have Educational level bachelor degree (167) and followed primary school (87), secondary school (83), master degree (57) and doctor degree (6) respectively, The most respondents of ECC have Educational level bachelor degree (138), The most respondents of Pro language have Educational level bachelor degree (15) and The most respondents of JCS have Educational level bachelor degree (14).

5. Occupation: The majority frequency of choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok by the respondents have Occupation student (186) and followed government working (86), housewife (63), business owner (51) and freelance (14) respectively, The most respondents of ECC have Occupation student (159), The most respondents of Pro language have Occupation student (23) and The most respondents of JCS have Occupation government working (16).

6. Monthly income : The majority frequency of choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok by the respondents have Monthly income 60,000-100,000 Baht (167) and followed 40,000-60,000 Baht (113), more than 100,000 Baht (84), 20,000-40,000 Baht (28) and less than 20,000 Baht (8) respectively, The most respondents of

ECC have Monthly income 60,000-100,000 Baht (141), The most respondents of Pro language have Monthly income 40,000-60,000 Baht (16) and The most respondents of JCS have Monthly income 60,000-100,000 Baht (14).

7. Frequency of learning : The majority frequency of choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok by the respondents have Frequency of learning Twice a week (154) and followed Once a week (121), 3 times a week (97), 4 times a week (20) and more than 4 times a week (8) respectively. The most respondents of ECC have Frequency of learning Twice a week (127), The most respondents of Pro language have Frequency of learning Twice a week (17) and The most respondents of JCS have Frequency of learning Twice a week (10).

8. Purpose of learning : The majority frequency of choosing Mandarin training institution in Bangkok by the respondents have Purpose of learning to find a satisfied job (179) and followed to get more language skills (131), to pass HSK/IGCSE test (54), to do business with Chinese (26) and to make a Chinese friend (10) respectively, The most respondents of ECC have Purpose of learning to find a satisfied job (140), The most respondents of Pro language have Purpose of learning to find a satisfied job (24) and The most respondents of JCS have Purpose of learning to find a satisfied job (15). (NDFD 196

#### 5.2 Discussion

An analysis of the data collected from the customers across these three language institutions indicated that the key factors which can influence customer's choice criteria in choosing Mandarin language institution could be conclude in six factors which are income, educational level, personnel, process, physical asset and word of mouth.

### 5.2.1 7Ps marketing mix results:

Compare with the literature review by Jinliang (2011) which the author was following, there were two factors the same as his results. Results shown that income level becomes a key factor which can influence with institution following customer's choice. Firstly, Consistent with research of Jinliang (2011) for the research of the marketing mix for English language training institution in China, he pointed out language as an important communication tool has to spend long period to learn, therefore, the customer who has high income level may pay more attention for themselves language learning or children's language learning than others. Meanwhile, According to Rehman, Khan, Triq, and Tasleem (2010) mentioned that income level becomes a key factor which can influence the institution which they selects. Secondly, another factor which can influence customer's choice criteria in this research was physical asset, this result is consistent with research by Jinliang (2011), cleanliness classroom and free wifi can increase customer's satisfaction, hence, it's important to prevent customer defections by offering convenient parking place. The data came from ECC shown that convenient parking place as a main factor can attract customer come to learn since Bangkok is very traffic as well as crowed. Thirdly, another factor which can influence customer's choice criteria in this research was personnel, this result is consistent with research by Jinliang (2011), teachers experience and teachers language skill relate to language institution, in the other side, with regards to teachers qualification, he pointed out that the most of teachers who have more than three years teaching experience and language qualification can attracted more customer come to learn. In addition, the personnel which include teacher's teaching experience, teacher's qualification and teacher's skill was identified as a key factor, according the research by Soedijati and Pratminingsih (2011). In this research, most respondents still strongly agree that personnel play very important role when they choose language institution. However, these three language institution which author selected are very famous, therefore, no matter what the language institution is, they have qualified teachers and staffs already.

On the contrary, there are two factors which can significantly influence customer's choice criteria in choosing language institution in this research is different from Jinliang (2011). Firstly, according to the research by Jinliang (2011), product is the most important factor which significantly influence customer's choice criteria, whether students understand or not is a benchmark in terms of teaching quality. However, in this research, the respondents who came from ECC language institution selected diversity of curriculum and enjoyable class as the factors which significantly influence their choice criteria. In fact, a shorter course duration such as twenty hours for each course is seen as an attractive option and provides flexibility for many customers. In addition, the most of customers who came from ECC work for government, they have to use Mandarin in their daily working. Therefore, the practical nature of courses which have work experience or employer based practicums and a placement embedded in their courses is a strong feature of the courses. In addition, most of respondents believed enjoyable language lesson can much easier concentrate on the class.

Secondly, according to the research by Jinliang (2011), the convenient transportation as the important factor which customer considered when they make a decision, because the location of most school just have public bus transportation only, he also mentioned that the distance between the school and home is essential element for customer since they need to have adequate resources to go and back. However, the data analyzed by multinomial logistic regression method shown that the location doesn't significantly influence customer's choice criteria, maybe the language institution branches which was selected was very close or these language institution branches are normally located in modern shopping mall or some busy commercial streets so that it is convenient for the customer. Meanwhile, through the crosstab analyzed, the data shown that more than 85% respondents strongly agree that the place play an important role in choosing language school, especially location and distance these two parts.

On the contrary, there are two factors which significantly influence customer's choice criteria in choosing language institution in this research, however, these two factors didn't influence customer's choice criteria in Jinliang (2011). Firstly, The respondents who came from ECC, Pro language and JCS these three language institution thought educational level can influence their choice decision, since ECC, Pro language and JCS these three language and JCS these three language mainly segment, ECC mainly focus on teaching in the institution, and Pro language mainly focus on assigning teacher to some government school for teaching, JCS mainly focus on tutoring (Ministry of Education, 2008). Therefore, the respondents who have high

educational level prefer the language institution which have the teacher who have teaching experience in big size class. Hence, Van Pelt and Allison (2007) found that the educational level becomes the key factor which influence customer's choice decision, the customer who has high educational level pay more attention for themselves education or children's education than others.

Secondly, another factor which Jinliang (2011) didn't mentioned in his research is process. In this research, the respondents who came from ECC strongly agree problem resolving is the indispensable element, the staff have to resolve clients' problem immediately when something is happening instead of explaining. As the Keith, Paul and Ruxin (2012) mentioned, hence, service also can be included in process factor since customer really care about what level service they get during this process. For this reason, school is recommended to take into consideration how their service is to be offered.

### 5.2.2 Customer's lifestyle results:

The duration of working hours also can significantly influence customer's choice criteria in choosing ECC, Pro language and JCS these three language institution in this research, the respondents who are on the night shift or work more than eight hours each day, and the respondents who have to study more than seven hours each day won't come to study on workday. In the other side, some respondents would like to choose the language institution like JCS since they can assign teacher to teach at home. In terms of the customer's lifestyle in choosing language school, Erin (2012) introduced that lifestyle can influence consumer choice since people change their mind and select the "light weight" lifestyle as their goal.

#### 5.2.3 Branding results:

Word of mouth plays am extremely role in choosing Mandarin language training institution, as Lige. W. (2012) menthion that reputation and word of mouth these two point as the most important aspects for customer in selecting language school, she mentioned that most of customer are willing to accept the new institution from their friend's recommendation instead of advertising.

On the contrary, In terms of reputation, the result of this research is different to Lige. W. (2012), as he mentioned that reputation which include provider of content and performance plays very important role in the student's choice criteria, the respondent who came from ECC, Pro language and JCS these three language institution didn't select this factor as the factor which can significantly influence their choice.

#### 5.3 Managerial Implication

From the analysis factors that influence customer's choice criteria in choosing Mandarin language institution in Bangkok, Thailand. Language institution business owner should be plan the marketing strategic as following:

5.3.1. <u>7Ps marketing mix</u>

5.3.1.1 Product: The Mandarin training institution should design diversity of curriculum to meet customer's need, and try to set up funny and enjoyable lessons.

5.3.1.2 Place: The Mandarin training institution should be located in somewhere nearby BTS/MRT transportation.

5.3.1.3. Price: The Mandarin training institution should has competitive price compared with other training institution.

5.3.1.4. Promotion: The Mandarin training institution should organize some promotion activities in some special festival like Chinese New Year.

5.3.1.5. Personnel : The Mandarin training institution should be focus on personnel this factor which include teacher's experience, teacher's qualification, teacher's language skill and so on, and ensure teacher's characteristic when they recruit.

5.3.1.6. Process: The mandarin training institution have to gather customer's feedback periodically and resolve clients' problem immediately.

5.3.1.7. Physical Assets: The mandarin training institution should be offering convenient parking place and enough and cleanliness toilet by itself.

5.3.2 Customer's lifestyle: The mandarin training institution has to open more Mandarin learning class in weekend for customer instead of workaday since most people won't come to learn after working.

5.3.3 Branding: The mandarin training institution setting up a good institution's image and increase service quality. Due to word of mouth as a main factor that has a positive effect on customers, causing them to enroll their children in school or go by themselves are more encouraging. Thus, setting up a good institution's image and increase service quality are very important, as long as customer get the satisfaction from this language institution, they will recommend their friend come to learn in here.

#### 5.4 Recommendations for Future Research

1. Since this research is based on limited analysis of selected only three language institution in Bangkok, Thailand, the conclusions should be viewed as preliminary in need of future data as new language institution continues. Based on these theories, for the new research in the further study should be specific to more language institution brand which has different segment in order to understand more information in details. 2. Based on these theories, it can argues that income, educational level, personnel, process, physical asset and word of mouth these factors can significantly influence customer's choice criteria in choosing Mandarin language institution, In terms of this standpoint, for the further research, the recommendations is following: what's the needs and motives of customer's choice? Does government policy significantly influence customer's choice criteria in choosing Mandarin language institution?

3. At the same time, further research could be conducted to examine the factors which can significantly influence customer's choice criteria in choosing Mandarin language institution in other province in Thailand like Phuket and Chiangmai, and then compare them.



#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alan, D. S., & William, T. R. (2003). Strategic online customer decision making: leveraging the transformational power of the Internet. *Online Information Review*, 27 (6), 418 – 432.
- Aliaga, M., & Gunderson, B. (2000). *Interactive Statistics*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Anas, A. (2010). Understanding Student Choice of University and Marketing Strategies in Syrian Private Higher Education. UK: University of Leeds School of Education.
- Andreassen, T. W. (2000). Antecedents to satisfaction with service recovery. *European Journal of Marketing*, *34* (1/2), 156-175.
- Arndt, J. (1967). *Word-of-mouth advertising and informal communication*. Boston : Harvard University.
- Bartlett, L., Fredrick, M., Gulbrandsen, T., & Murillo, E. (2002). The marketisation of education: public schools for private ends. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 33 (1), 1-25.
- Bell, L., & Rowley. A. (2002). The impact of educational policy on headship in primary schools in England, 1994-2001. *Educ. Admin.*, 40 (3), 195-210.
- Blackwell, R., Miniard, P., & Engel, J. (2001), *Consumer behavior* (9<sup>th</sup> ed.). Texas: Harcourt C.
- Bok, D. (2003). Universities in the Marketplace. New Jersey: Princeton University.
- Booms, B. H., & Bitner, M. J. (1981). *Marketing strategies and organization structures for service firms*. Chicago: American Marketing Association.
- Bosetti, L. (2004). Determinants of school choice: Understanding how parents choose elementary schools in Alberta. *Journal of Education Policy*, *19* (4), 387-405.
- Brassington, F. (2006). Principles of marketing (4th ed.). Harlow: FT Prentice Hall.
- Cabrera, A., & Nasa, S. (2000). Understanding the college-choice process. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 2000* (107), 5-22.

- Charles, U. (2003). *Failing Our Kids: How we are running our public schools*. Canada: McClelland & Stewart.
- Chia-Hung, C. (2006). Word-of-Mouth Information Gathering: An exploratory study of Asian international students searching for Australian higher education services.
   Unpublished master's thesis, Queensland University, Australian.
- Chung-kai, L., & Chia-Hung, H. (2008). Marketing tactics and parents' lyalty: the mediating role of school image. *J. Educ.Admin.*, *47*(4), 477-489.
- Lovelock, C., & Wright, L. (2003). Marketing Principals and Service. New Jersey: Samt.
- Coleman, M. (1994). Marketing and external relations. Harlow: Longman.
- Connor, H. (1999). *Making the Right Choice: How Students Choose Universities and Colleges*. London: CVCP.
- Cowell, D. W. (1994). 7P's Marketing mix model. Oxford: Butterworth.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, 16, 297-334.
- Davies, B., & Ekkison, L. (1991). Marketing the Secondary School. Longman: Harlow.
- Dirks, L. (1998). *Higher education in market theory*. Retrieved from http://webhost.bridgew.edu/adirks/ald/papers/mktheor.htm.
- Donalson, W. G., & Mcnicholas, C. (2004). Understanding the postgraduate education market for UK based students. *Journal of Nonprofit & Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 9 (4), 346 – 360.
- Dronkers, J., & Avram, S. (2010). Social Class Dimensions in the selection of a Private School: A Cross-National Analysis Using PISA. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 16 (2), 4 - 5.
- Eckel, P. (2007). Redefining competition constructively: the challenge of privatization, competition, and market-based state policy in the United States. *Higher Education Management and Policy*, 19 (1), 1 - 17.
- Erin, M. G. (2012). *Factors Influencing Chinese Consumer Choice of English Training Schools.* Unpublished master's thesis, Ohio State University, Ohio.

- Farquhar, P. H. (1990). Managing Brand Equity. Journal of Advertising Research, 30 (4). 7-12.
- Flateley, J. (2001). *Parents' Experiences of the Process of Choosing a Secondary School* (Research Report). Great Britain: Department for Education and Skills.

Gray, L. (1991). Marketing education. Buckingham: Open University.

- Gibbs, P., & Knapp, M. (2002). Marketing higher and further education: an educator's guide to promoting courses, departments and institutions. London: Kogan Page.
- Goldsmith, R. E. (1999). The Personalized Marketplace: Beyond the 4Ps. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning, 14* (4), 178-185.
- Hastie, R., & Dawes, R. J. (2001). *Rational Choice in an Uncertain World: The psychology of judgement and decision making*. US: Sage.

Hogarth, R. M. (2001). Educating intuition. Chicago: University of Chicago.

- Horst, P. (1968). Personality: measurement of dimensions. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ivy, J. (2008). A new higher education marketing mix: the 7Ps for MBA marketing. International Journal of Educational Management, 22 (4), 288-299
- Ivy, J., & Naude, P. (2004). Succeeding in the MBA marketplace: identifying the underlying factors. *Journal of Higher Education Policy & Management*, 26 (3), 401 - 417.
- Jackson, C., & Bisset, M. (2005) Gender and school choice: factors influencing parents when choosing single-sex or co-educational independent schools for their children. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 35 (2), 195-211.
- Janet, A. H. (1996). Marketing school and consumer choice. *International Journal of Educational Management, 10* (4), 26-32.
- Jinliang, G. (2011). The Marketing Mix for English Language Training Institution in China. Paper presented at the Central University of Finance and Economics University's 3rd International Graduate Study Conference.
- Jobber, D. & Ellis-Chadwick, F. (2013). *Principles and practice of marketing* (7<sup>th</sup> ed.). London: McGraw-Hill Higher Education.

- Keith, W., Paul, C., & Ruxin, Z. (2012). Service Quality in the Language Training Market in China. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 30 (4), 477-491.
- Kieran, C. (2009). Building Customer Based Brand Equity in Higher Education: Applying Brand Equity Theory to an International Higher Education Marketing Context. Unpublished master's thesis, Lund University, Swedish.
- Kotler, P., Bloom, P., & Hayes, T. (2002). *Marketing professional services* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.).
   London: Prentice Hall.
- Kotler, P., & Fox, K. (1995). *Strategic marketing for educational institutions* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Kotler, P. (1999). Principles of marketing. Toronto: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Lige, W. (2012). *The study of language institution's brand image in affecting consumer's purchase decision*. Chaina: Donghua University.
- Litten, L. (1982). Different strokes in the applicant pool: some refinements in a model of student college choice. *Journal of Higher Education*, *53* (4), 383-402.
- Lovelock, C., & Wirtz, J. (2004). *Services marketing: People, technology, and strategy* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Upper Saddle River: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Marland, M., & Rogers, R. (1991). Marketing the school. London: Heineman.
- McCarthy, E. J. (1960). Basic marketing. Homewood: Richard D. Irwin.
- Mehrdad, A. (2012). A New educational marketing mix: the 6Ps for private school marketing in Iran. *Research journal of applied sciences, engineering and technology*, 4 (21), 4314-4319.
- Michman, R. D., & Mazze, E. M. (2009). *The Affluent consumer: Marketing and selling the luxury lifestyle*. New York: Praeger.
- Ministry of Education. (2008). *Basic Education Core Curriculum*. Bangkok: Kurusapa Ladprao Publishing.
- Mohammed, R., & Pervaiz, K. A. (1995). Using the 7Ps as a generic marketing mix. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 13 (9), 4 – 15.
- Murray, K. B. (1991). A test of services marketing theory: Consumer information acquisition activities. *Journal of Marketing*, 55 (1), 10-25.

- Newman, F., Couturier, L., & Scurry, J. (2004). *The Future of Higher Education: Rhetoric, Reality, and the Risk of the Market.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Nguyen, N., & LeBlanc, G. (2001). Image and reputation of higher education institutions in students' retention decisions. *The International Journal of Educational Management*, 15, 6-7.
- Office of Education Council. (2004). *Sreategic Recommendations for Education Reform*. Bangkok: Century.
- Ohlson, J. (1980). Financial ratios and the probabilistic prediction of bankruptcy. *Journal* of Accounting Research, 18, 109-131.
- Olorunniwo, F., & Hsu, M. K. (2006). A typology analysis of service quality, customer satisfaction and behavioral intentions in mass services. *Managing Service Quality*, 16 (2), 106-123.
- Oplatka, I., & Jane, H.B. (2004). The research on school marketing: Current issues and future direction. *J. Educ. Admin.*, 42 (3), 375-400.
- Paulsen, M. B. (1990) College choice: understanding student enrolment behavior.Washington DC: Washington University.
- Pheng, L.S., & Tan, M. (1995). A Convergence of Western Marketing Mix Concepts and Oriental Strategic Thinking. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 13 (2), 11-36.
- Plummer, J. T. (1974). The concepts and application of lifestyle segmentation. *Journal* of Marketing, 38 (1), 33-37.
- Pugsley, L. (2004). *The University Challenge: Higher Education Markets and Social Stratification*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Rao, H. (1994). The social construction of reputation: Certification contests, legitimation, and the survival of organizations in the American automobile industry: 1985–1912. *Strategic Management Journal*, 15, 29-44.
- Rehman N. U., Khan, G., Triq, M., & Tasleem, S. (2010). Determinants of Parents' Choice in Selection of Private Schools for their Children in District Peshawar of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Province. *Academic Journal*, 44 (1), 140-151.

Rusta, A., Venus D., & Ebrahimi, A. (2005). Marketing management. New Jersey: Samt.

Sotirios, S. (2012). Palgrave Macmillan. Socail research, 4, 88.

- Scottish, E. (2006). Choosing A School A: Guide For Parents. Retrieved from www.educationscotland.gov.uk/parentzone.
- Shahrzad, J., Zeinab, A., Milad, J., Arman, P., & Hossein, H. (2013). Consumer behavior and Consumer buying decision process. *International Journal of Business and Behavioral Sciences*, 3 (5), 112-114.
- Sharrock, G. (2000). Why students are not 'just' customers. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 22* (2), 149-164.
- Shuttleworth, M. (2009). *Research Bias*. Retrieved from http://www.experiment-resources.com/research-bias.html.
- Smith, A. (1937). *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of Wealth of Nations*. Brian Baggins: Random House.
- Soedijati, E. K., & Pratminingsih, S. A. (2011). The impact of marketing mix on students' choice of university study case of private university in Bandung, Indonesia. Proceeding of the second International Conference on Business and Economic Research, Indonesia.
- Strasser, S., Ozgur, C., & Schroeder, D. L. (2002). Selecting a business college major. Mid-American Journal of Business, 17 (2). 47-56.
- Sung, M., & Yang, S.-U. (2008). Toward the model of university image: The influence of brand personality, external prestige, and reputation. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 20 (4), 357–376.
- Swan, J. E., & Oliver, R. L. (1989). Postpurchase communications by customers. *Journal* of *Retailing*, 65 (4), 516-533.
- Uma, S., & Roger, B. (2013). *Research Methods for Business: a skill- building approach*. Carbondale: British.
- Van Pelt, D., Allison, P. & Allison, D. (2007). Ontario's Private Schools: Who Chooses Them and Why? A Fraser Institute Occasional Paper. Retrieved from http://www.fraserinstitute /commerce/product\_files.

- West, D. (2001). Why Providence Parents Send Their Children to Private Schools, and What Would Bring Them Back. Taubman: Brown University.
- Wagner, K., & Fard, P. Y. (2009). Factors Influencing Malaysian Students' Intention to Study at a Higher Educational Institution. Kuala Lumpur: E-Leader.
- Yamane, T. (1973). Statistic: An introductory analysis (3rd ed.). NY: Harper and Row.
- Yang, G. (2005). Intense competition on foreign language training. Century, 21, 7-10.
- Zavgren, C. (1985). Assessing the Vulnerability to Failure of American Industrial Firms: A Logistic Analysis. *Journal of Business Finance and Accounting*, *12* (1), 19-45.
- Zeng, W. W. (2009). The current situation and development strategies of language training institutions in China. *Journal of Adult Education College of Hubei* University, 27 (1), 21-24.
- Zheng, Z. (2004), The Study of Consumer's Consumptive Psychology and Consumptive Behavior Pattern in Language Training Market. Unpublished master's thesis, Zhejiang University, China.



## **Appendix A: Content Validity**

Index of Item Objective Congruence (IOC) is the consistency between the objective and content or questions and objective which can be calculate from the formula below.

$$IOC = \frac{\Sigma R}{N}$$

Where:

IOC = Consistency between the objective and content or questions and objective.

 $\Sigma$  R= Total assessment points given from all qualified experts.

N = Number of qualified experts.

There are 3 levels of assessment point as follow:

- +1 means the question is certainly consistent with the objective of the questionnaire.

- 0 means the question is unsure to be consistent with the objective of the

questionnaire.

- -1 means the question is inconsistent with the objective of the questionnaire.

The consistency index value must have the value of 0.5 or above to be accepted. Index of Item - Objective Congruence (IOC) from three experts result are as followed;

# **The result of IOC** IOC: Item-Objective Congruency Index five experienced experts

| Question   | The experts   |   |   |   | ΣR | ∑R | Interp |              |
|--|---|---|---|---|----|----|--------|--------------|
|  | 1   | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  |    | X      | retatio<br>n |
|  | The important factors that influence consumer's choice criteria |   |   |   |    |    |        |              |
| Internal factors (1-5)   |   |   | 1 | 1 | 1  | [  |        |              |
| 1.Income   | 1   | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1  | 5  | 1      | good         |
| 2. Education level   | 1   | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1  | 5  | 1      | good         |
| 3. Occupation  | 1   | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1  | 5  | 1      | good         |
| 4. Consumer's lifestyle  | 1   | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1  | 5  | 1      | good         |
| 5. Trial Experience  | 1   | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1  | 5  | 1      | good         |
| External factors (6-14)  |   |   |   |   |    |    |        |              |
| 6.Product (teaching quality)                                   | 1   | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1  | 5  | 1      | good         |
| 7.Place  | 1   | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1  | 5  | 1      | good         |
| 8.Price  | 1   | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1  | 5  | 1      | good         |
| 9.Promotion  | 1   | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1  | 5  | 1      | good         |
| 10.Personnel(teacher&s taff)                                   | 1   | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1  | 5  | 1      | good         |
| 11. Process(problem solving)                                   | 1   | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1  | 5  | 1      | good         |
| 12. Physical assets(<br>facility, atmosphere and<br>cleanness) |   |   | 1 | 1 | 1  | 5  | 1      | good         |
| 13.Reputation  | 1   | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1  | 5  | 1      | good         |
| 14. Word of mouth  | 1   | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1  | 5  | 1      | good         |
| 15.Brand Awareness   | 1   | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1  | 5  | 1      | good         |
| General Information and Demographic                            |   |   |   |   |    |    |        |              |
| Gender   | 1   | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1  | 5  | 1      | good         |
| Age  | 1   | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1  | 5  | 1      | good         |
| Relationship Status  | 1   | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1  | 5  | 1      | good         |
| Educational level  | 1   | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1  | 5  | 1      | good         |
| Occupation   | 1   | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1  | 5  | 1      | good         |
| Monthly income  | 1      | 1    | 1     | 1     | 1     | 5      | 1   | good         |
|---|--------|------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-----|--------------|
| Question  |        | The  | exper | ts    |       | ΣR     | ∑R  | Interp       |
|   | 1      | 2    | 3     | 4     | 5     |        | X   | retatio<br>n |
| Frequency of learning   | 1      | 1    | 1     | 1     | 1     | 5      | 1   | good         |
| Purpose of learning   | 1      | 1    | 1     | 1     | 1     | 5      | 1   | good         |
| The Factors Affect to   | Choice | Deci | sion  | : Mar | ketin | ıg Mix |     |              |
| 1. product  | 1      | 1    |       | 1     |       |        |     |              |
| 1.1 Diversity of  | 1      | 1    | 1     | 1     | 1     | 5      | 1   | good         |
| curriculum  | K      |      | ١٨    |       |       |        |     | C            |
| 1.2 Flexible schedule   | 1      | 1    | 1     | 1     | 1     | 5      | 1   | good         |
| 1.3 The class is so funny, I can enjoy  | 1      | 1    | 1     | 1     | 1     | 5      | 1   | good         |
| 1.4 I can understand<br>very well when teacher<br>explain to me   | 1      | 1    | 1     | 1     | 1     | 5      | 1   | good         |
| 1.5 Teacher make a good preparation   | 1      | 1    | 1     | 1     | 1     | 5      | 1   | good         |
| 1.6 I can make a best of<br>my textbook and<br>exercise book  | 1      | 1    | 1     | 1     | 1     | 5      | 1   | good         |
| 2. Place  | 1      |      |       |       | (     |        |     | I            |
| 2.1 Easy access to training institution by  | 1      | 1    | 1     | 10    |       | 5      | 1   | good         |
| BTS/MRT<br>transportation   | VL     | ) E  |       |       |       |        |     |              |
| 2.2 The training<br>institution near my<br>home or school   | 1      | 1    | 1     | 1     | 1     | 5      | 1   | good         |
| 2.3 Varied consulting service   | 1      | 1    | 1     | 1     | 1     | 5      | 1   | good         |
| 2.4 Offering e-learning teaching course   | 1      | 1    | 1     | 1     | 1     | 5      | 1   | good         |
| <ul><li>2.5 There are cluster with many other educational institution nearby</li><li>3. Price</li></ul> | 1      | 1    | 1     | 0     | 1     | 4      | 0.8 | good         |
|   |        |      |       |       |       |        |     |              |

| 3.1 competitive price<br>compared with other<br>training institution | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | good |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|------|
| 3.2 Discount with price  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | good |
| 3.3 Installment plan   | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | good |
| 3.4 Varied payment service   | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | good |

| Question  |   | The            | exper       | ts |   | ΣR  | ΣR  | Inter         |
|---|---|----------------|-------------|----|---|-----|-----|---------------|
|   | 1 | 2              | 3           | 4  | 5 |     | x   | pretat<br>ion |
| 4. Promotion  |   |                | $ \Lambda $ |    |   |     |     |               |
| 4.1 Using awards to<br>encourage members,<br>such as coupon for<br>other shop | 1 | 1              | 1           | 1  | 1 | 5   | 1   | good          |
| 4.2 Using deadline<br>incentive to encourage<br>members                       | 1 | 0              | 1           | 1  | 1 | 4   | 0.8 | good          |
| 4.3 Group purchase price  | 1 | 1              | 1           | 1  | 1 | 5   | 1   | good          |
| 5. Personnel  |   |                |             |    | 1 | • / | l   | 1             |
| 5.1 Teacher's teaching experience   | 1 | 1              | 1           | 1  | 1 | 5   | 1   | good          |
| 5.2 Teacher's qualification   |   | ) <sup>1</sup> | D           | 1  | 1 | 5   | 1   | good          |
| 5.3 Teacher's language skill  | 1 | 1              | 1           | 1  | 1 | 5   | 1   | good          |
| 5.4 Teachers have more<br>patience and<br>responsibility                      | 1 | 1              | 1           | 1  | 1 | 5   | 1   | good          |
| 5.5 Staffs pay attention when I enter and leave                               | 1 | 1              | 1           | 1  | 1 | 5   | 1   | good          |
| 5.6 Staffs' enthusiasm<br>to respond my<br>questions                          | 1 | 1              | 1           | 1  | 1 | 5   | 1   | good          |
| 5.7 Staffs' related skill<br>and knowledge to<br>recommend course             | 1 | 1              | 1           | 1  | 1 | 5   | 1   | good          |

| 6. Process (deal with pro  | oblem) |   |   |   | - |   |   |      |
|--|--------|---|---|---|---|---|---|------|
| 6.1 staffs resolve<br>clients' problem<br>immediately  | 1      | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | good |
| 6.2 Staffs conduct my feedback   | 1      | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | good |
| 6.3 Teachers<br>communicate clients<br>frequently in terms of<br>teaching  | 1      | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | good |
| 7. Physical assets (facili   | ty)    |   |   |   | - |   | _ |      |
| 7.1 offering convenient parking place  | K      | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | good |
| 7.2 Offering adequate<br>stuff for customers who<br>are waiting, such as free<br>wifi, reading materials,<br>drinking water ect. | 1      | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | good |
| A C  | X      |   |   |   |   |   |   |      |

| Question                                   |             | The    | exper     | ts    |       | ΣR   | ΣR  | Inter         |
|--|-------------|--------|-----------|-------|-------|------|-----|---------------|
|  | 1           | 2      | 3         | 4     | 5     |      | X   | pretat<br>ion |
| 7.3 Offering free stationery for customers | 1           | 1      | 1         | 1     | 1     | 5    | 1   | good          |
| such as pencil, paper                      |             |        |           |       |       |      |     |               |
| 7.4 School is clean and                    | 1           | 1      | 1         | 1     | 1     | 5    | 1   | good          |
| well decorated                             | $\Lambda r$ |        | $\square$ |       |       |      |     |               |
| 7.5 School has enough                      |             |        | 1         | 1     | 1     | 5    | 1   | good          |
| and cleanness toilet by                    |             |        |           |       |       |      |     | 0             |
| itself                                     |             |        |           |       |       |      |     |               |
| The Factors Affect to C                    | hoice De    | cision | : Life    | style | and b | rand |     |               |
| 8. Lifestyle                               |             |        |           |       |       |      |     |               |
| 8.1 The duration of                        | 1           | 0      | 1         | 1     | 1     | 4    | 0.8 | good          |
| working hours (for                         |             | -      |           |       |       |      |     | 0             |
| worker)/ learning hours                    |             |        |           |       |       |      |     |               |
| (for student) influence                    |             |        |           |       |       |      |     |               |
| my choice decision.                        |             |        |           |       |       |      |     |               |
| 8.2 I could be influence                   | 1           | 1      | 1         | 1     | 1     | 5    | 1   | good          |
| by friends, family in making decision      | 1           | 1      | 1         | 1     | 1     | 5    | 1   | 500 <b>u</b>  |
| 8.3 I like reading books which related to  | 1           | 1      | 1         | 1     | 1     | 5    | 1   | good          |

| language  |    |   |   |   |   |   |   |      |
|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|------|
| 9. Brand  |    |   |   |   |   |   |   |      |
| 9.1 I would choose this<br>institution according to<br>my friend's<br>recommendations | 1  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | good |
| 9.2 I would choose this institution if they have good reputation                      | 1  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | good |
| 9.3 I would choose this<br>institution if I enjoy<br>trial experience class           | 1  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | good |
| 9.3 I would choose this institution if they are very famous                           | ŊК | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | good |

The consistency index value must have the value 0.5 or above to be accepted. After measurement result, the questions have misused and have adapted to make sure that each question has the constancy index value more than 0.5. Therefore,

$$IOC = \frac{63.4}{64}$$
  
= 0.99

According to IOC result of 30 questions on this questionnaire has value index of item objective congruence (IOC) equal to 0.99 without any question has IOC index less than 0.5. Thus, all questions are reasonable.

### Appendix B: The results of Reliability testing with 30 try-out questionnaires.

## **Reliability testing (All Parts)**

Scale: ALL VARIABLES

**Case Processing Summary** 

|                       | 0  |       |
|-----------------------|----|-------|
|                       | Ν  | %     |
| Cases Valid           | 30 | 100.0 |
| Excluded <sup>a</sup> | 0  | .0    |
| Total                 | 30 | 100.0 |

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

### **Reliability Statistics**

| Cronbach's |            |
|------------|------------|
| Alpha      | N of Items |
| .801       | 15         |
|            |            |

| Item Statistics             |      |                   |    |  |
|-----------------------------|------|-------------------|----|--|
|                             | Mean | Std.<br>Deviation | N  |  |
| Income                      | 4.20 | 1.901             | 30 |  |
| Education level             | 3.77 | 2.144             | 30 |  |
| Occupation                  | 4.37 | 1.903             | 30 |  |
| Consumer's lifestyle        | 4.60 | 1.850             | 30 |  |
| Trial Experience            | 4.77 | 1.775             | 30 |  |
| Product (teaching quality)  | 5.50 | 1.480             | 30 |  |
| place                       | 5.27 | 1.413             | 30 |  |
| price                       | 5.47 | 1.332             | 30 |  |
| promotion                   | 5.50 | 1.526             | 30 |  |
| personnel (teacher & Staff) | 4.47 | 1.570             | 30 |  |
| Process(problem solving)    | 3.87 | 2.177             | 30 |  |

#### tem Statistics

| Physical assets       |      |       |    |
|-----------------------|------|-------|----|
| (facility, atmosphere | 3.73 | 1.760 | 30 |
| and cleannesss)       |      |       |    |
| reputation            | 4.60 | 1.545 | 30 |
| Word of mouth         | 4.37 | 1.884 | 30 |
| Brand awareness       | 4.67 | 1.845 | 30 |

|                             |            |              |             | Cronbach's |
|-----------------------------|------------|--------------|-------------|------------|
|                             | Scale Mean | Scale        | Corrected   | Alpha if   |
|                             | if Item    | Variance if  | Item-Total  | Item       |
|                             | Deleted    | Item Deleted | Correlation | Deleted    |
| Income                      | 64.93      | 157.375      | .479        | .785       |
| Education level             | 65.37      | 151.413      | .527        | .780       |
| Occupation                  | 64.77      | 154.392      | .546        | .779       |
| Consumer's lifestyle        | 64.53      | 158.671      | .467        | .786       |
| Trial Experience            | 64.37      | 160.585      | .447        | .787       |
| Product (teaching quality)  | 63.63      | 157.895      | .639        | .776       |
| place                       | 63.87      | 165.085      | .462        | .788       |
| price                       | 63.67      | 165.678      | .478        | .787       |
| promotion                   | 63.63      | 164.240      | .442        | .788       |
| personnel (teacher & Staff) | 64.67      | 177.057      | .103        | .810       |
| Process(problem solving)    | 65.27      | 153.030      | .484        | .784       |
| Physical assets             |            |              |             |            |
| (facility, atmosphere       | 65.40      | 158.662      | .498        | .783       |
| and cleannesss)             |            |              |             |            |
| reputation                  | 64.53      | 170.878      | .262        | .800       |
| Word of mouth               | 64.77      | 169.840      | .213        | .806       |
| Brand awareness             | 64.47      | 171.499      | .185        | .807       |

| Scale | Statistics |
|-------|------------|
|       |            |

|       |          | Std.      | N of  |
|-------|----------|-----------|-------|
| Mean  | Variance | Deviation | Items |
| 69.13 | 183.844  | 13.559    | 15    |

### **Reliability testing (7Ps Marketing Mix)**

105

Scale: ALL VARIABLES

**Case Processing Summary** 

| =     |                       | 0  |       |
|-------|-----------------------|----|-------|
|       |                       | N  | %     |
|       | Valid                 | 30 | 100.0 |
| Cases | Excluded <sup>a</sup> | 0  | .0    |
|       | Total                 | 30 | 100.0 |

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

# **Reliability Statistics**

| Cronbach's | N of  |
|------------|-------|
| Alpha      | Items |
| .896       | 33    |
|            |       |

| Item Statistics |      |           |    |  |
|-----------------|------|-----------|----|--|
|                 | Mean | Std.      | Ν  |  |
|                 |      | Deviation |    |  |
| product         | 4.10 | 1.242     | 30 |  |
| product         | 3.97 | 1.033     | 30 |  |
| product         | 3.90 | 1.029     | 30 |  |
| product         | 4.23 | .858      | 30 |  |
| product         | 4.57 | .679      | 30 |  |
| product         | 4.33 | .758      | 30 |  |
| place           | 4.00 | 1.232     | 30 |  |
| place           | 3.93 | 1.048     | 30 |  |
| place           | 3.93 | 1.112     | 30 |  |
| place           | 4.17 | .913      | 30 |  |
| place           | 4.43 | .817      | 30 |  |
| price           | 4.00 | 1.232     | 30 |  |
| price           | 3.93 | 1.048     | 30 |  |
| price           | 3.93 | 1.112     | 30 |  |
| price           | 3.93 | 1.048     | 30 |  |
| promotion       | 4.20 | .925      | 30 |  |
| promotion       | 4.37 | .765      | 30 |  |

| promotion | 3.97 | 1.098 | 30 |  |
|-----------|------|-------|----|--|
| personnel | 4.43 | .774  | 30 |  |
| personnel | 4.20 | .997  | 30 |  |
| personnel | 3.73 | .740  | 30 |  |
| personnel | 3.57 | .935  | 30 |  |
| personnel | 4.17 | .699  | 30 |  |
| personnel | 4.17 | .834  | 30 |  |
| personnel | 4.13 | 1.008 | 30 |  |
| process   | 3.87 | 1.106 | 30 |  |
| process   | 3.97 | 1.033 | 30 |  |
| process   | 3.83 | .986  | 30 |  |
| physical  | 4.17 | .874  | 30 |  |
| physical  | 4.33 | .802  | 30 |  |
| physical  | 4.20 | 1.064 | 30 |  |
| physical  | 4.03 | .964  | 30 |  |
| physical  | 3.90 | .995  | 30 |  |

|           | Scale Mean | Scale        | Corrected   | Cronbach's    |
|-----------|------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|
|           | if Item    | Variance if  | Item-Total  | Alpha if Item |
|           | Deleted    | Item Deleted | Correlation | Deleted       |
| product   | 130.50     | 228.948      | .232        | .898          |
| product   | 130.63     | 231.826      | .201        | .898          |
| product   | 130.70     | 232.838      | .169        | .898          |
| product   | 130.37     | 237.620      | .032        | .899          |
| product   | 130.03     | 232.033      | .325        | .895          |
| product   | 130.27     | 231.651      | .303        | .895          |
| place     | 130.60     | 218.179      | .536        | .891          |
| place     | 130.67     | 214.368      | .774        | .887          |
| place     | 130.67     | 211.540      | .817        | .885          |
| place     | 130.43     | 226.461      | .434        | .893          |
| place     | 130.17     | 222.764      | .647        | .890          |
| price     | 130.60     | 218.179      | .536        | .891          |
| price     | 130.67     | 214.368      | .774        | .887          |
| price     | 130.67     | 211.540      | .817        | .885          |
| price     | 130.67     | 221.816      | .522        | .892          |
| promotion | 130.40     | 225.421      | .466        | .893          |
| promotion | 130.23     | 227.013      | .504        | .892          |
| promotion | 130.63     | 218.447      | .603        | .890          |

| personnel | 130.17 | 230.833 | .331 | .895 |
|-----------|--------|---------|------|------|
| personnel | 130.40 | 241.076 | 092  | .902 |
| personnel | 130.87 | 236.671 | .088 | .898 |
| personnel | 131.03 | 232.033 | .221 | .897 |
| personnel | 130.43 | 235.909 | .131 | .897 |
| personnel | 130.43 | 237.357 | .045 | .899 |
| personnel | 130.47 | 240.809 | 083  | .902 |
| process   | 130.73 | 222.271 | .477 | .892 |
| process   | 130.63 | 217.206 | .687 | .888 |
| process   | 130.77 | 221.702 | .564 | .891 |
| physical  | 130.43 | 227.702 | .407 | .894 |
| physical  | 130.27 | 224.271 | .595 | .891 |
| physical  | 130.40 | 219.421 | .592 | .890 |
| physical  | 130.57 | 218.461 | .695 | .889 |
| physical  | 130.70 | 216.217 | .752 | .887 |

| Scale | Statistics |
|-------|------------|
|-------|------------|

| Mean   | Variance | Std.      | N of  |
|--------|----------|-----------|-------|
|        |          | Deviation | Items |
| 134.60 | 239.214  | 15.467    | 33    |

# Reliability testing (product of marketing)

Scale: ALL VARIABLES

# **Case Processing Summary**

|       |                       | Ν  | %     |
|-------|-----------------------|----|-------|
| Cases | Valid                 | 30 | 100.0 |
|       | Excluded <sup>a</sup> | 0  | .0    |
|       | Total                 | 30 | 100.0 |

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

## **Reliability Statistics**

| Cronbach's<br>Alpha | N of Items |
|---------------------|------------|
| .847                | 6          |

# **Item Statistics**

| Mean | Std. Deviation                       | Ν  |   |
|------|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| 4.10 | 1.242                                | 30   |   |
| 3.97 | 1.033                                | 30   |   |
| 3.90 | 1.029                                | 30   |   |
| 4.23 | .858                                 | 30   |   |
| 4.57 | .679                                 | 30   |   |
| 4.33 | .758                                 | 30   |   |
|      | 4.10<br>3.97<br>3.90<br>4.23<br>4.57 | 4.10   1.242     3.97   1.033     3.90   1.029     4.23   .858     4.57   .679 | 4.10   1.242   30     3.97   1.033   30     3.90   1.029   30     4.23   .858   30     4.57   .679   30 |

# **Item-Total Statistics**

|         |       | Scale Variance<br>if Item Deleted | Item-Total | Cronbach's<br>Alpha if Item<br>Deleted |
|---------|-------|-----------------------------------|------------|--|
| product | 21.00 | 10.759                            | .762       | .797                                   |
| product | 21.13 | 12.533                            | .670       | .814                                   |
| product | 21.20 | 13.338                            | .547       | .839                                   |
| product | 20.87 | 14.395                            | .518       | .842                                   |
| product | 20.53 | 14.120                            | .770       | .809                                   |
| product | 20.77 | 14.323                            | .629       | .825                                   |

# **Scale Statistics**

| Mean  | Variance | Std. Deviation | N of Items |
|-------|----------|----------------|------------|
| 25.10 | 18.507   | 4.302          | 6          |

# Reliability testing (place of marketing)

Scale: ALL VARIABLES

## **Case Processing Summary**

|       |                       | Ν  | %     |
|-------|-----------------------|----|-------|
| Cases | Valid                 | 30 | 100.0 |
|       | Excluded <sup>a</sup> | 0  | .0    |
|       | Total                 | 30 | 100.0 |

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

### **Reliability Statistics**

| Cronbach's<br>Alpha | N of Items |  |
|---------------------|------------|--|
| .845                | 5          |  |

#### **Item Statistics**

|       | Mean | Std. Deviation | N  |
|-------|------|----------------|----|
| place | 4.00 | 1.232          | 30 |
| place | 3.93 | 1.048          | 30 |

| place | 3.93 | 1.112 | 30 |
|-------|------|-------|----|
| place | 4.17 | .913  | 30 |
| place | 4.43 | .817  | 30 |

|       |       | Scale Variance<br>if Item Deleted | Item-Total | Cronbach's<br>Alpha if Item<br>Deleted |
|-------|-------|-----------------------------------|------------|--|
| place | 16.47 | 9.568                             | .715       | .799                                   |
| place | 16.53 | 10.809                            | .671       | .808                                   |
| place | 16.53 | 10.464                            | .672       | .809                                   |
| place | 16.30 | 12.148                            | .558       | .837                                   |
| place | 16.03 | 11.964                            | .690       | .811                                   |

**Scale Statistics** 

| Mean  | Variance | Std. Deviation | N of Items |
|-------|----------|----------------|------------|
| 20.47 | 16.533   | 4.066          | 5          |
|       |          |                |            |

## **Reliability testing (price of marketing)**

Scale: ALL VARIABLES

# **Case Processing Summary**

|       |                       | Ν  | %     |
|-------|-----------------------|----|-------|
| Cases | Valid                 | 30 | 100.0 |
|       | Excluded <sup>a</sup> | 0  | .0    |
|       | Total                 | 30 | 100.0 |

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

# **Reliability Statistics**

| Cronbach's<br>Alpha | N of Items |
|---------------------|------------|
| .828                | 4          |

# **Item Statistics**

|       | Mean | Std. Deviation | N  |
|-------|------|----------------|----|
| price | 4.00 | 1.232          | 30 |
| price | 3.93 | 1.048          | 30 |
| price | 3.93 | 1.112          | 30 |
| price | 3.93 | 1.048          | 30 |

|       |       | Scale Variance<br>if Item Deleted | Item-Total | Cronbach's<br>Alpha if Item<br>Deleted |
|-------|-------|-----------------------------------|------------|--|
| price | 11.80 | 7.959                             | .516       | .853                                   |
| price | 11.87 | 7.154                             | .858       | .732                                   |
| price | 11.87 | 7.706                             | .667       | .777                                   |
| price | 11.87 | 8.257                             | .615       | .800                                   |

**Scale Statistics** 

| Mean  | Variance | Std. Deviation | N of Items |
|-------|----------|----------------|------------|
| 15.80 | 13.062   | 3.614          | 4          |

# Reliability testing (promotion of marketing)

Scale: ALL VARIABLES

**Case Processing Summary** 

|       |                       | Ν  | %     |
|-------|-----------------------|----|-------|
| Cases | Valid                 | 30 | 100.0 |
|       | Excluded <sup>a</sup> | 0  | .0    |
|       | Total                 | 30 | 100.0 |

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

## **Reliability Statistics**

| Cronbach's<br>Alpha | N of Items |
|---------------------|------------|
| .821                | 3          |

# **Item Statistics**

|           | Mean | Std. Deviation | Ν  |  |
|-----------|------|----------------|----|--|
| promotion | 4.20 | .925           | 30 |  |
| promotion | 4.37 | .765           | 30 |  |
| promotion | 3.97 | 1.098          | 30 |  |

#### **Item-Total Statistics**

|           |      | Scale Variance<br>if Item Deleted | Item-Total | Cronbach's<br>Alpha if Item<br>Deleted |
|-----------|------|-----------------------------------|------------|--|
| promotion | 8.33 | 3.057                             | .597       | .829                                   |
| promotion | 8.17 | 3.178                             | .763       | .703                                   |
| promotion | 8.57 | 2.254                             | .723       | .722                                   |

### **Scale Statistics**

| Mean  | Variance | Std. Deviation | N of Items |
|-------|----------|----------------|------------|
| 12.53 | 5.844    | 2.417          | 3          |

## **Reliability testing (personnel of marketing)**

Scale: ALL VARIABLES

# **Case Processing Summary**

|       |                       | Ν  | %     |
|-------|-----------------------|----|-------|
| Cases | Valid                 | 30 | 100.0 |
|       | Excluded <sup>a</sup> | 0  | .0    |
|       | Total                 | 30 | 100.0 |

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

### **Reliability Statistics**

| Cronbach's<br>Alpha | N of Items |
|---------------------|------------|
| .805                | 7          |

# **Item Statistics**

|          | Mean | Std. Deviation | Ν  |
|----------|------|----------------|----|
| personel | 4.43 | .774           | 30 |
| personel | 4.20 | .997           | 30 |
| personel | 3.73 | .740           | 30 |
| personel | 3.57 | .935           | 30 |
| personel | 4.17 | .699           | 30 |
| personel | 4.17 | .834           | 30 |
| personel | 4.13 | 1.008          | 30 |

|           |       | Scale Variance<br>if Item Deleted | Item-Total | Cronbach's<br>Alpha if Item<br>Deleted |
|-----------|-------|-----------------------------------|------------|--|
| personnel | 23.97 | 16.723                            | 082        | .869                                   |
| personnel | 24.20 | 11.614                            | .617       | .764                                   |
| personnel | 24.67 | 12.161                            | .793       | .740                                   |
| personnel | 24.83 | 11.385                            | .719       | .743                                   |
| personnel | 24.23 | 13.495                            | .548       | .780                                   |
| personnel | 24.23 | 12.392                            | .632       | .762                                   |
| personnel | 24.27 | 11.444                            | .636       | .760                                   |

**Scale Statistics** 

| Mean  | Variance | Std. Deviation | N of Items |
|-------|----------|----------------|------------|
| 28.40 | 16.800   | 4.099          | 7          |

## **Reliability testing (process of marketing)**

Scale: ALL VARIABLES

**Case Processing Summary** 

|       |                       | Ν  | %     |
|-------|-----------------------|----|-------|
| Cases | Valid                 | 30 | 100.0 |
|       | Excluded <sup>a</sup> | 0  | .0    |
|       | Total                 | 30 | 100.0 |

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

## **Reliability Statistics**

| Cronbach's<br>Alpha | N of Items |
|---------------------|------------|
| .920                | 3          |

### **Item Statistics**

| Item Sta | tistics |                |     |     |
|----------|---------|----------------|-----|-----|
|          | Mean    | Std. Deviation | ı N |     |
| process  | 3.87    | 1.106          | 30  | - 7 |
| process  | 3.97    | 1.033          | 30  |     |
| process  | 3.83    | .986           | 30  |     |

# **Item-Total Statistics**

|         |      | Scale Variance<br>if Item Deleted | Item-Total | Cronbach's<br>Alpha if Item<br>Deleted |
|---------|------|-----------------------------------|------------|--|
| process | 7.80 | 3.545                             | .881       | .850                                   |
| process | 7.70 | 4.217                             | .743       | .959                                   |
| process | 7.83 | 3.937                             | .902       | .836                                   |

### **Scale Statistics**

| Mean  | Variance | Std. Deviation | N of Items |
|-------|----------|----------------|------------|
| 11.67 | 8.437    | 2.905          | 3          |

## **Reliability testing (physical asset of marketing)**

Scale: ALL VARIABLES

**Case Processing Summary** 

|       |                       | Ν  | %     |
|-------|-----------------------|----|-------|
|       | Valid                 | 30 | 100.0 |
| Cases | Excluded <sup>a</sup> | 0  | .0    |
|       | Total                 | 30 | 100.0 |

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

# **Reliability Statistics**

| Cronbach's | N of  |
|------------|-------|
| Alpha      | Items |
| .800       | 5     |

| Item Statistics |      |           |    |  |
|-----------------|------|-----------|----|--|
|                 | Mean | Std.      | Ν  |  |
|                 |      | Deviation |    |  |
| physical        | 4.17 | .874      | 30 |  |
| physical        | 4.33 | .802      | 30 |  |
| physical        | 4.20 | 1.064     | 30 |  |
| physical        | 4.03 | .964      | 30 |  |
| physical        | 3.90 | .995      | 30 |  |

| Item-Total | <b>Statistics</b> |
|------------|-------------------|
|------------|-------------------|

|          | Scale Mean | Scale        | Corrected   | Cronbach's    |
|----------|------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|
|          | if Item    | Variance if  | Item-Total  | Alpha if Item |
|          | Deleted    | Item Deleted | Correlation | Deleted       |
| physical | 16.47      | 9.154        | .465        | .795          |
| physical | 16.30      | 8.907        | .590        | .762          |
| physical | 16.43      | 7.426        | .659        | .736          |
| physical | 16.60      | 8.248        | .578        | .763          |
| physical | 16.73      | 7.857        | .633        | .745          |

| Scale Statistics        |        |       |   |  |
|-------------------------|--------|-------|---|--|
| Mean Variance Std. N of |        |       |   |  |
| Deviation Items         |        |       |   |  |
| 20.63                   | 12.378 | 3.518 | 5 |  |

# Reliability testing (customer's lifestyle)

## Scale: ALL VARIABLES

| <b>Case Processing</b> | Summary |
|------------------------|---------|
|------------------------|---------|

|       |                       | Ν  | %     |
|-------|-----------------------|----|-------|
|       | Valid                 | 30 | 100.0 |
| Cases | Excluded <sup>a</sup> | 0  | .0    |
|       | Total                 | 30 | 100.0 |

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

# **Reliability Statistics**

| Cronbach's | N of  |
|------------|-------|
| Alpha      | Items |
| .909       | 3     |

# **Item Statistics**

|           | Mean | Std.      | Ν  |
|-----------|------|-----------|----|
|           |      | Deviation |    |
| lifestyle | 3.83 | 1.085     | 30 |
| lifestyle | 3.90 | .995      | 30 |
| lifestyle | 4.00 | 1.017     | 30 |

|           | Item-Total Statistics               |              |             |               |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|-----------|-------------------------------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|           | Scale Mean Scale Corrected Cronbach |              |             |               |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|           | if Item                             | Variance if  | Item-Total  | Alpha if Item |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|           | Deleted                             | Item Deleted | Correlation | Deleted       |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| lifestyle | 7.90                                | 3.403        | .887        | .811          |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| lifestyle | 7.83                                | 4.213        | .718        | .950          |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| lifestyle | 7.73                                | 3.720        | .861        | .834          |  |  |  |  |  |  |

| Scale | <b>Statistics</b> |
|-------|-------------------|

| Scale Statistics |          |           |       |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|------------------|----------|-----------|-------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Mean             | Variance | Std.      | N of  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                  |          | Deviation | Items |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11.73            | 8.133    | 2.852     | 3     |  |  |  |  |  |  |

# Reliability testing (brand)

Scale: ALL VARIABLES

## **Case Processing Summary**

|       |                       | N  | %     |
|-------|-----------------------|----|-------|
|       | Valid                 | 30 | 100.0 |
| Cases | Excluded <sup>a</sup> | 0  | .0    |
|       | Total                 | 30 | 100.0 |

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

## **Reliability Statistics**

| Cronbach's | N of  |  |  |
|------------|-------|--|--|
| Alpha      | Items |  |  |
| .834       | 4     |  |  |

| Item Statistics |      |           |    |  |  |  |  |
|-----------------|------|-----------|----|--|--|--|--|
|                 | Mean | Std.      | Ν  |  |  |  |  |
|                 |      | Deviation |    |  |  |  |  |
| brand           | 3.97 | 1.217     | 30 |  |  |  |  |
| brand           | 3.90 | 1.029     | 30 |  |  |  |  |
| brand           | 3.87 | 1.106     | 30 |  |  |  |  |
| brand           | 3.87 | 1.042     | 30 |  |  |  |  |

|       | Scale Mean | Scale        | Corrected   | Cronbach's    |  |  |  |  |  |
|-------|------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|--|--|--|--|--|
|       | if Item    | Variance if  | Item-Total  | Alpha if Item |  |  |  |  |  |
|       | Deleted    | Item Deleted | Correlation | Deleted       |  |  |  |  |  |
| brand | 11.63      | 7.757        | .546        | .849          |  |  |  |  |  |
| brand | 11.70      | 7.114        | .868        | .701          |  |  |  |  |  |
| brand | 11.73      | 7.720        | .650        | .796          |  |  |  |  |  |
| brand | 11.73      | 8.133        | .626        | .806          |  |  |  |  |  |

**Scale Statistics** 

| Mean  | Variance | Std.      | N of  |
|-------|----------|-----------|-------|
|       |          | Deviation | Items |
| 15.60 | 12.938   | 3.597     | 4     |

Appendix C (English):

# Study of Consumer's Choice Criteria in Choosing Mandarin Training Institution in Bangkok

#### Part I: Mandarin Training Institution Name

1. Which language training institution do you most often go to learn? (Pick one)

ECC Pro language JCS

#### Part II. Factors Which Influence Your Choice Criteria

Please indicate your response of choosing mandarin training institution by marking ( $\sqrt{}$ ) the box which corresponds to your opinion

0 = Not any effect 7 = extremely important

| The important<br>factors that<br>influence<br>consumer's<br>choice criteria<br>0-7 | 0<br>not any<br>effect | 1  | 2  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7<br>Extremely<br>important |
|--|------------------------|----|----|---|---|---|---|-----------------------------|
| Internal factors (1-5)   |                        |    |    |   |   |   |   |                             |
| 1.Income   |                        |    |    |   | 0 |   |   |                             |
| 2. Education level   |                        | VΓ | )F |   |   |   |   |                             |
| 3. Occupation  |                        |    |    |   |   |   |   |                             |
| 4. Consumer's lifestyle  |                        |    |    |   |   |   |   |                             |
| 5. Trial<br>Experience   |                        |    |    |   |   |   |   |                             |
| External factors (6-14)  |                        |    |    |   |   |   |   |                             |
| 6.Product<br>(teaching quality)  |                        |    |    |   |   |   |   |                             |
| 7.place  |                        |    |    |   |   |   |   |                             |
| 8.price  |                        |    |    |   |   |   |   |                             |
| 9.promotion  |                        |    |    |   |   |   |   |                             |

| -                    |          |       |        |       | 1 | 1             | 1 |   |
|----------------------|----------|-------|--------|-------|---|---------------|---|---|
| 10.Personnel(teac    |          |       |        |       |   |               |   |   |
| her&staff)           |          |       |        |       |   |               |   |   |
| 11.                  |          |       |        |       |   |               |   |   |
| Process(problem      |          |       |        |       |   |               |   |   |
| solving)             |          |       |        |       |   |               |   |   |
| 12. Physical         |          |       |        |       |   |               |   |   |
| assets( facility,    |          |       |        |       |   |               |   |   |
| atmosphere and       |          |       |        |       |   |               |   |   |
| cleanness)           |          |       |        |       |   |               |   |   |
| 13.Reputation        |          |       |        |       |   |               |   |   |
| 14. Word of          |          | x/    |        |       |   |               |   |   |
| mouth                |          |       |        |       |   |               |   |   |
| 15.Brand             |          |       |        |       |   |               |   |   |
| Awareness            |          |       |        |       |   | $\land \land$ |   |   |
|                      |          |       |        |       |   |               |   | • |
|                      | /        |       |        |       |   |               |   |   |
| art III General Info | ormation | and D | emogra | aphic |   |               |   |   |
| 1 Condon             |          |       |        |       |   |               |   |   |

## Part III General Information and Demographic

| 1. Gender                |                     |                    |
|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| □ male                   | female              |                    |
| 2. Age                   |                     |                    |
| $\Box$ <12 years         | 13-17 years         | 18-24 years        |
| □ 25-34 years            | 35-45 years         | over 45 years      |
| 3. Relationship Status   |                     |                    |
| □ singe                  | in a relationship   | married            |
| □ divorced               | others              |                    |
| 4. Educational level     |                     |                    |
| □ primary school         | secondary school    | bachelor degree    |
| □ master degree          | doctor degree       |                    |
| 5. Occupation            |                     |                    |
| □ government work        | freelance           | business owner     |
| student                  | housewife           |                    |
| 6. Monthly income        |                     |                    |
| $\Box$ less than 20,000  | 20,000-40,000 Baht  | 40,000-60,000 Baht |
| Baht                     |                     |                    |
| □ 60,000-100,000         | more than 100,000   |                    |
| Baht                     | Baht                |                    |
| 7. Frequency of learning |                     |                    |
| $\Box$ Once a week       | Twice a week        | 3 times a week     |
| $\Box$ 4 times a week    | more than 4 times a |                    |
|                          | week                |                    |
|                          |                     |                    |

8. Purpose of learning

-

- □ to get more language skills
- □ to make a Chinese friend
- □ to pass HSK/IGCSE test
  □ to find a satisfied job
- □ to do business with Chinese

#### Part IV. I Think These Factors Affect My Choice Decision.

1= Strongly Disagree 2= Disagree 3 =Neutral 4= Agree 5 =Strongly Agree

| Important Influential Factor  | KC                   |          |         |       |                   |
|---|----------------------|----------|---------|-------|-------------------|
| 7P's Marketing Mix :  | 1                    | 2        | 3       | 4     | 5                 |
| educational choice criteria   | Strongly<br>Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly<br>Agree |
| 1. product  |                      |          |         |       |                   |
| 1.1 diversity of curriculum   |                      |          |         |       |                   |
| 1.2 flexible schedule   |                      |          | ,       |       |                   |
| 1.3 the class is so funny, I<br>can enjoy                               |                      |          |         |       |                   |
| 1.4 I can understand very<br>well when teacher explain to<br>me         |                      |          | 64      |       |                   |
| 1.5 teacher make a good preparation                                     | <b>VDE</b>           | D        |         |       |                   |
| 1.6 I can make a best of my textbook and exercise book                  |                      |          |         |       |                   |
| 2. Place  | I                    | •        | l       | I     |                   |
| 2.1 easy access to training<br>institution by BTS/MRT<br>transportation |                      |          |         |       |                   |
| 2.2 the training institution<br>near my home or school                  |                      |          |         |       |                   |
| 2.3 varied consulting service   |                      |          |         |       |                   |

| 2.4 offering e-learning teaching course                                    |     |    |     |   |   |
|--|-----|----|-----|---|---|
| 2.5 there are cluster with<br>many other educational<br>institution nearby |     |    |     |   |   |
| 3. Price   |     |    |     |   |   |
| 3.1 competitive price  |     |    |     |   |   |
| compared with other  |     |    |     |   |   |
| training institution   |     |    |     |   |   |
| 3.2 discount with price  | KC  |    |     |   |   |
| 3.3 installment plan   |     |    |     |   |   |
| 3.4 varied payment service   |     |    | 7   |   |   |
| 4. Promotion   |     |    |     |   | • |
| 4.1 using awards to  |     |    |     |   |   |
| encourage members, such as   |     |    |     |   |   |
| coupon for other shop  |     |    |     |   |   |
| 4.2 using deadline incentive   |     |    |     |   |   |
| to encourage members   |     |    |     |   |   |
| 4.3 group purchase price   |     |    | 6   |   |   |
| 5. personnel   |     | nľ | )// | L |   |
| 5.1 teacher's teaching   | VDI |    |     |   |   |
| experience   |     |    |     |   |   |
| 5.2 teacher's qualification  |     |    |     |   |   |
| 5.3 teacher's language skill   |     |    |     |   |   |
| 5.4 teachers have more   |     |    |     |   |   |
| patience and responsibility  |     |    |     |   |   |
| 5.5 staffs pay attention   |     |    |     |   |   |
| when I enter and leave   |     |    |     |   |   |
| 5.6 staffs' enthusiasm to  |     |    |     |   |   |
| respond my questions   |     |    |     |   |   |

| 5.7 staffs' related skill and |  |  |  |
|-------------------------------|--|--|--|
| knowledge to recommend        |  |  |  |
| course                        |  |  |  |

| 6. process (deal with problem)  |     |    |    |    |  |
|---|-----|----|----|----|--|
| 6.1 staffs resolve clients' problem immediately   |     |    |    |    |  |
| 6.2 staffs conduct my feedback  | II  |    |    |    |  |
| 6.3 teachers communicate with clients frequently in terms of teaching   | U   |    |    |    |  |
| 7. physical assets ( facility)  |     |    | 5  |    |  |
| 7.1 offering convenient parking place   | _   |    | () | 2  |  |
| 7.2 offering adequate stuff for<br>customers who are waiting, such as<br>free wifi, reading materials,<br>drinking water ect. |     |    |    | TY |  |
| 7.3 offering free stationery for customers such as pencil, paper  |     |    |    |    |  |
| 7.4 school is clean and well decorated  |     | 6  | 6  |    |  |
| 7.5 school has enough and cleanness toilet by itself  | )F( | 21 | )  |    |  |

## Part V. I Think These Factors Affect My Choice Decision.

1= Strongly Disagree 2= Disagree 3 =Neutral 4= Agree 5 =Strongly Agree

| Important Influence Factor                              |                      |          |         |       |                   |
|---|----------------------|----------|---------|-------|-------------------|
| 8. Lifestyle  | 1                    | 2        | 3       | 4     | 5                 |
| Educational choice criteria                             | Strongly<br>Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly<br>Agree |
| 8.1 Duration of working<br>hours( for worker)/ learning |                      |          |         |       |                   |

| hours (for student) influence<br>my choice decision.                               |    |    |    |    |  |
|--|----|----|----|----|--|
| 8.2 I could be influence by<br>friends, family in making<br>decision               |    |    |    |    |  |
| 8.3 I like reading books<br>which related to language                              |    |    |    |    |  |
| 9. Brand   |    |    |    |    |  |
| 9.1 I would choose this<br>institution according to my<br>friend's recommendations | ΚU | NA |    |    |  |
| 9.2 I would choose this<br>institution if they have good<br>reputation             |    | P  | (P |    |  |
| 9.3 I would choose this<br>institution if I enjoy trial<br>experience class        |    |    | 15 |    |  |
| 9.4 I would choose this<br>institution if they are very<br>famous                  |    |    |    | TV |  |

# Appendix D (Thai):

# แบบสอบถาม เรื่อง การ ศึกษา เกณฑ์กำหนดทางเลือกของผู้บริโภค ในการเลือก สถาบันสอนภาษาจีน กลาง ในกรุงเทพมหานคร

# <u>ส่วนที่ หนึ่ง เชื่อสถาบัน สอนภาษาจีน</u>

1.สถาบันสอนภาษา ไหน ท่าน ไปใช้ บริการเรียนบ่อยที่สุด ? (เลือกเพียง หนึ่งข้อ)



Pro language

JCS

# <u>ส่วนที่ สอง. ปัจจัย ที่ มีอิทธิพล ต่อ หลักเกณฑ์ การเลือก</u>

กรุณาให้คะแนนระดับความสำคัญของปัจจัยในเลอกเรียน สถาบัน ภาษจีน ใน ตารางนี้ทุกรายการ โดย 🛚 (🔨

7= สำคัญมากที่สุด ถึง 0= ไม่มีผล

| กรุณาให้คะแนน            | 0       | 1  | 2  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7             |
|--------------------------|---------|----|----|---|---|---|---|---------------|
| ความสำคัญ ต่อ ปัจจัยที่  | ไม่มีผล |    |    |   |   |   |   | สำคัญมาก<br>' |
| มีส่วนในการเลือก0-7      |         |    |    | _ |   |   | - | ที่สุด        |
| ปัจจัยภายใน (1-5)        |         |    |    |   |   |   |   |               |
| 1.รายได้                 |         |    |    |   |   |   |   |               |
| 2.การศึกษา               | $\sum$  |    |    |   |   |   |   |               |
| 3.อาซีพ                  |         |    |    |   | 0 |   |   |               |
| 4. ไลฟ์ สไตล์            |         | VΓ | )F |   |   |   |   |               |
| 5. ประสบการ์ณ            |         |    |    |   |   |   |   |               |
| ทคลอง                    |         |    |    |   |   |   |   |               |
| ปัจจัยภายนอก ( <b>6-</b> |         |    |    |   |   |   |   |               |
| 14)                      |         |    |    |   |   |   |   |               |
| 6.สินค้า                 |         |    |    |   |   |   |   |               |
| (คุณภาพการสอน)           |         |    |    |   |   |   |   |               |
| 7.สถานที่                |         |    |    |   |   |   |   |               |
| 8. ราคา                  |         |    |    |   |   |   |   |               |
| 9.ส่งเสริมการขาย         |         |    |    |   |   |   |   |               |

| 10.บุคคล( อาจาร์ย      |    |   |   |    |   |                   |  |
|------------------------|----|---|---|----|---|-------------------|--|
| และเจ้าหน้าที่)        |    |   |   |    |   |                   |  |
| 11. กระบวนการ(การ      |    |   |   |    |   |                   |  |
| แก้ปัญหา)              |    |   |   |    |   |                   |  |
| 12. ทรัพย์สินทางกาย    |    |   |   |    |   |                   |  |
| ภาย( สิ่งอำนวยความ     |    |   |   |    |   |                   |  |
| สะดวก, บรรยากาศ        |    |   |   |    |   |                   |  |
| และ ความสะอาด)         |    | V |   |    |   |                   |  |
| 13.ความน่าเชื่อถือ     |    | Z | U | 1V | 1 |                   |  |
| 14.การบอกต่อ           | F) |   |   |    |   | $\langle \rangle$ |  |
| 15. แบร์นเป็นที่รู้จัก |    |   |   |    |   |                   |  |

| 4  | 1     |                 |               |
|--|-------|-----------------|---------------|
| <u>ส่วนที่สาม :ข้อมูลทั่วไป และ ข้อมูล บ</u> | เระชา | <u> </u>        |               |
| 1.1WP  |       |                 |               |
| 🗌 ชาย  |       | หญิง            |               |
| 2. อายุ                                      |       |                 |               |
| □ <12 ปี                                     |       | 13-17 ปี        | 18-24 ปี      |
| □ 25-34 ปี                                   |       | 35-45 ปี        | เกิน 45 ปี    |
| 3. สถานะ                                     |       |                 |               |
| 🗌 โสด  |       | มีความสัมพันธุ์ | แต่งงาน       |
| 🗌 หย่า                                       |       | อื่นๆ           |               |
| 4. การศึกษา                                  |       |                 |               |
| 🗌 ประถมศึกษา                                 |       | มัธยมศึกษา      | ปริญญาตรี     |
| 🗌 ปริญญาโท                                   |       | ปริญญาเอก       |               |
| 5. อาชีพ                                     |       |                 |               |
| 🗌 ราชการ                                     |       | อิสระ           | เจ้าของกิจการ |
| 🗌 นักเรียน                                   |       | แม่บ้าน         |               |
| 6. รายได้                                    |       |                 |               |

|                 | น้อยกว่า 20,00 บาท           | <b>20,000-40,000</b><br>บาท | <b>40,000-60,000</b><br>บาท |
|-----------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
|                 | <b>60,000-100,000</b><br>มาท | มากกว่า <b>100,000</b>      |                             |
| <b>7.</b> จำน   | บ เท<br>วน ครั้งของการเรียน  | บาท                         |                             |
|                 | หนึ่งครั้งต่อสัปดาห์         | สองครั้งต่อสัปดาห์          | สามครั้งต่อสัปคาห์          |
|                 | สี่ครั้งต่อสัปดาห์           | มากกว่าสี่ครั้งต่อสัปดาห์   |                             |
| <b>8.</b> วัตถุ | ประสงค์ ของการเรียน          |                             |                             |
|                 | ต้องการเพิ่มทักษะภาษา        | ต้องการผ่าน                 | ต้องการทำธรุกิจกับชาว       |
|                 |                              | HSK/IGCSE test              | ลีน                         |
|                 | ต้องการมีเพื่อนคนจีน         | ต้องการให้ได้งานที่พอใจ     |                             |

# <u>ส่วนที่สี่: ปัจจัยที่มีผลกระทบของการตัดสินใจเลือก</u>

กรุณาให้กะแนนระดับความสำคัญของปัจจัยที่มีผลต่อการตัดสินใจ ของท่าน

# โดย 5 = สำคัญมากที่สุด ถึง 1= สำคัญน้อยที่สุด

| ความสำคัญของปัจจัยที่มีผลต่อการ |                           |               |           |            |                         |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------|-----------|------------|-------------------------|
| ตัดสินใจ                        |                           |               |           |            |                         |
| ป้จจัยส่วนผสมการตลาด (7P)       | ไม่สำคัญ<br>อย่างมาก<br>1 | ไม่สำคัญ<br>2 | 1981<br>3 | สำคัญ<br>4 | สำคัญมาก<br>ที่สุด<br>5 |
| 1. ตัวสินค้า                    |                           |               |           |            |                         |
| 1.1 ความหลากหลายของหลักสูตร     |                           |               |           |            |                         |
| 1.2 ความยืดหยุ่นของตารางเรียน   |                           |               |           |            |                         |
| 1.3 การเรียนการสอนสนุกสนาน      |                           |               |           |            |                         |
| 1.4 อาจาร์ย สอนเก่งเข้าใจง่าย   |                           |               |           |            |                         |
| 1.5 อาจาร์ยมีการเตรียมการสอนดี  |                           |               |           |            |                         |

| 1.6 หนังสือ และ สมุดเรียน ดี     |     |          |   |   |   |
|----------------------------------|-----|----------|---|---|---|
| <b>2.</b> สถานที่                |     |          |   |   |   |
| 2.1 ง่ายต่อการเดินทางโดย         |     |          |   |   |   |
| BTS/MRT                          |     |          |   |   |   |
| 2.2 ไกล้บ้าน หรือไกล้โรงเรียน    |     |          |   |   |   |
| 2.3 มีให้คำปรึกษาหลากหลาย        |     |          |   |   |   |
| 2.4 มีการสอนแบบ e-learning       | KC  | N        |   |   |   |
| 2.5 อยู่ในแหล่งไกล้ๆกับสถาบัน    |     | 4        |   |   |   |
| การเรียนอื่นๆ                    |     |          |   |   |   |
| 3. ราคา                          |     |          |   |   |   |
| 3.1 ราคาถูกกว่า เจ้าอื่น         |     |          |   |   |   |
| 3.2 มีการลดราคา                  |     |          | - |   |   |
| 3.3 แบ่งชำระได้                  |     |          |   |   |   |
| 3.4 ระบบการจ่ายเงินที่หลากหลาย   |     |          |   |   |   |
| 4.ส่งเสริมการขาย                 |     |          |   |   |   |
| 4.1 จัดรางวัลเช่น คูปอง ไปใช้กับ | VDF |          |   |   |   |
| ร้านอื่นๆ                        |     |          |   |   |   |
| 4.2 จัดเพิ่มชั่วโมงพิเศษ โดย     |     |          |   |   |   |
| กำหนดเวลา โปรโมชัน               |     |          |   |   |   |
| 4.3จัดราคาพิเศษแบบกลุ่ม          |     |          |   |   |   |
| 5.บุคคล                          |     | <u> </u> | 1 | I | 1 |
| 5.1 ประสบการ์ณสอนของอาจาร์ย      |     |          |   |   |   |
| ผู้สอน                           |     |          |   |   |   |
|                                  |     |          |   |   |   |

| 5.2 คุณสมบัติของอาจาร์ยผู้สอน |   |                   |  |  |
|-------------------------------|---|-------------------|--|--|
| 5.3 ทักษะภาษาของอาจาร์ยผู้สอน |   |                   |  |  |
| 5.4 ความรับผิดชอบและอดทน      |   |                   |  |  |
| ของอาจาร์ยผู้สอน              |   |                   |  |  |
| 5.5 ความใส่ใจของพนักงาน       |   |                   |  |  |
| 5.6 ความสนใจเห็นใจของพนักงาน  |   |                   |  |  |
| ในการตอบคำถาม                 | K | $ \Lambda\rangle$ |  |  |
| 5.7 ความรู้ความสามารถในการ    |   |                   |  |  |
| แนะนำคอร์สของพนักงาน          |   |                   |  |  |
|                               |   |                   |  |  |

| 6. กระบวนการ (การแก้ไขปัญหา)            |     |   |   |  |
|---|-----|---|---|--|
| 6.1 พนักงานแก้ไขปัญหาได้ทันที           |     |   |   |  |
| 6.2 พนักงานพร้อมรับการตอบกลับ           |     | - | < |  |
| 6.3 อาจรายสื่อสารกับลูกค้าได้บ่อย       |     |   |   |  |
| 7. ทรัพย์สินทางกายภาพ ( สิ่งอำนวย       |     |   |   |  |
| ความสะดวก)                              |     |   |   |  |
| 7.1 มีสถานที่จอดรถสะดวกสบาย             | )EV |   |   |  |
| 7.2 มีสิ่งอำนวยความสะดวก ตอนรอ เช่น     |     |   |   |  |
| ไวไฟ ,อุปกร์การอ่าน,เครื่องดื่ม เป็นต้น |     |   |   |  |
| 7.3อำนวยอุบกรณ์การเรียนเช่น ปากกา       |     |   |   |  |
| ดินสอ                                   |     |   |   |  |
| 7.4 ความสะอาด และ ตกแต่งสวยงาม          |     |   |   |  |
| 7.5 ห้องน้ำเพียงพอและสะอาด              |     |   |   |  |

# <u>ส่วนที่ห้า ส่วนที่สี่: ปัจจัยที่มีผลกระทบของการตัดสินใจเลือก</u>

กรุณาให้คะแนนระดับความสำคัญของปัจจัยที่มีผลต่อการตัดสินใจ ของท่าน โดย 5 = สำคัญมากที่สุด ถึง 1= สำคัญน้อยที่สุด

| ความสำคัญของปัจจัยที่มีผลต่อการ     |                           |               |           |                 |                         |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------|-----------|-----------------|-------------------------|
| ตัดสินใจ                            |                           |               |           |                 |                         |
| 8. ไลฟ์สไตล                         | ไม่สำคัญ<br>อย่างมาก<br>1 | ไม่สำคัญ<br>2 | 1981<br>3 | สำคัญ<br>4<br>e | สำคัญมาก<br>ที่สุด<br>5 |
| 8.1 ระยะเวลาของชั่วโมงทำงาน         |                           |               | 7         |                 |                         |
| (สำหรับคนทำงาน)/ ชั่วโมงเรียน       |                           |               | U         |                 |                         |
| (สำหรับนักเรียน)ผลต่อการตัดสินใจที่ |                           |               |           |                 |                         |
| เรียน                               |                           |               |           |                 |                         |
| 8.2 เพื่อนและ ครอบครัวมีผลต่อการ    |                           |               |           |                 |                         |
| ตัดสินใจที่เรียน                    |                           |               |           |                 |                         |
| 8.3 ความชอบในการหนังสือที่          |                           |               |           |                 |                         |
| เกี่ยวข้องกับภาษา                   |                           |               | 07        |                 |                         |
| 9. ตราสินค้า                        | /DF                       | DY            |           |                 |                         |
| 9.1 เลือกสถาบันเพราะเพื่อน          |                           |               |           |                 |                         |
| แนะนำ                               |                           |               |           |                 |                         |
| 9.2 เลือกสถาบันเพราะความ            |                           |               |           |                 |                         |
| น่าเชื่อถือ                         |                           |               |           |                 |                         |
| 9.3 เลือกสถาบันเพราะการได้ทดลอง     |                           |               |           |                 |                         |
| เรียน                               |                           |               |           |                 |                         |
| 9.4 เลือกสถาบันเพราะชื่อเสียง       |                           |               |           |                 |                         |

#### BIODATA

#### Name-Surname: Dan Huang

Sex: Female

Nationality: China

Date of Birth: 21st July 1989

Contact Number: 0841911089

Email: sharonhuang721@gmail.com

Educational Background: Master Degree of MBA, Bangkok

University

Address: 1150/19-20 PK Apartment Room 705 Road Sukhumvit Soi 48 Phra khong

Bangkok

Work Experience:

Phuket British International School Mandarin Teacher 2012-2014

#### Bangkok University

# License Agreement of Dissertation/Thesis/ Report of Senior Project

Day 24 Month JUL Year 2016

| Mr./ Mrs./(Ms) DAN HUAN (               | <u> </u>     | _now livin    | gat <u>B</u> | Bang Kok        |
|---|--------------|---------------|--------------|-----------------|
| Soi48                                   | Street       |               | umvit        |                 |
| Sub-district Phra Khanong               | District     | Khlong        | Toei         |                 |
| Province Bangkok                        | Postal Code_ | <u> 0   0</u> | b            | eing a Bangkok  |
| University student, student ID 74       | 57020252     | 8             |              |                 |
| Degree level 🗆 Bache                    | elor 🗹 M     | aster         | Doct         | orate           |
| Program <u>M.B.A</u> Dep                | partment     |               | School       | Graduate School |
| hereafter referred to as "the licensor" | **           |               |              |                 |

Bangkok University 119 Rama 4 Road, Klong-Toey, Bangkok 10110 hereafter referred to as "the licensee"

Both parties have agreed on the following terms and conditions:

1. The licensor certifies that he/she is the author and possesses the exclusive rights of dissertation/thesis/report of senior project entitled

| The Study of Custor | ner's Choice | Criteria in | Chousing |
|---------------------|--------------|-------------|----------|
| Mandarin Language   |              |             |          |

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirement for  $M \cdot B \cdot A$ .

of Bangkok University (hereafter referred to as "dissertation/thesis/ report of senior project").

2. The licensor grants to the licensee an indefinite and royalty free license of his/her dissertation/thesis/report of senior project to reproduce, adapt, distribute, rent out the original or copy of the manuscript.

3. In case of any dispute in the copyright of the dissertation/thesis/report of senior project between the licensor and others, or between the licensee and others, or any other inconveniences in regard to the copyright that prevent the licensee from reproducing, adapting or distributing the manuscript, the licensor agrees to indemnify the licensee against any damage incurred.

This agreement is prepared in duplicate identical wording for two copies. Both parties, have read and fully understand its contents and agree to comply with the above terms and conditions. Each party shall retain one signed copy of the agreement.



1. 1

£ .