

CHAPTER 4

RESEARCH RESULT AND FINDING

The data will be analyzed by applying computer software such as Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), among the most widely used programs for statistical analysis in social science. It is used by market researchers, health researchers, survey companies, government, education researchers, and others. The researcher has collected the data that had gathered from the 200 respondents. The results of the study are divided into 5 parts as follow:

Part 1: Descriptive statistic on the demographic information in term of Gender, Age, Status, Income, Occupation, Family member and Education.

Part 2: Descriptive statistic on customer consumption behavior in term of Frequency and Spending.

Part 3: Analysis about the marketing mix factors (4Ps, Product, Price, Place and Promotion).

Part 4: Inferential statistic on the relationship between the independent variables and dependent variables using Chi-Square test (Hypothesis Testing).

Part 5: Summary of hypothesis testing.

Symbols used in the analysis of data

n = Number of people in the sample

% = Percent of people in the sample

= Mean

SD = Standard Deviation

* = Statistically significant level of 0.05

4.1 Part 1 Descriptive statistic on the demographic information

In this part, the demographic information of 200 respondents is analyzed in term of Gender, Age, Status, Income, Occupation, Family member and Education, from Table 1 to Table 7.

Table 1 Descriptive statistic of the respondents classified by gender

Gender		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Male	138	68.7
	Female	62	30.8
	Total	200	99.5

Table 1 shows that the majority of the respondents are male (68.7%), while the rest is female (30.8%).

Table 2 Descriptive statistic of the respondents classified by Age

Age		Frequency	Percent
Valid	27	1	.5

28	2	1.0
29	1	.5
30	7	3.5
31	32	15.9
32	29	14.4
33	23	11.4
34	17	8.5
35	79	39.3
36	6	3.0
37	2	1.0
38	1	.5
Total	200	99.5

Table 2 shows that the majority of the respondents are 35 years (39.3%), then 31 years (15.9%), 32 years (14.4%), 33 years (11.4%), 34 years (8.5%), 30 years (3.5%), 36 years (3.0%), 37 and 28 years (1.0%), and 27,29 and 38 years (0.5%).

Table 3 Descriptive statistic of the respondents classified by Marital Status

Marital Status		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Single	147	73.1
	Married	53	26.4
	Total	200	99.5

Table 3 shows that the majority of the respondents are single (73.1%), while the rest is married (26.4%).

Table 4 Descriptive statistic of the respondents classified by Income

Income	Frequency	Percent
Valid 11,000 – 20,000 Baht	1	.5
21,000 – 30,000 Baht	67	33.3
31,000 – 40,000 Baht	116	57.7
More than 40,000 Baht	16	8.0
Total	200	99.5

Table 4 shows that the majority of the respondents' incomes are between 31,000 – 40,000 Baht (57.7%), then between 21,000 – 30,000 Baht (33.3%), More than 40,000 Baht (8.0%), and between 11,000 – 20,000 Baht (0.5%).

Table 5 Descriptive statistic of the respondents classified by occupation

Occupation	Frequency	Percent
Valid Government officer	7	3.5

Private company employee	180	89.6
Self employed business	13	6.5
Total	200	99.5

Table 5 shows that the majority of the respondents are private company employee (89.6%), then self employed business (6.5%), and Government officer (3.5%).

Table 6 Descriptive statistic of the respondents classified by Member in Household

Member in Household	Frequency	Percent
Valid Two people	18	9.0
Three – four people	174	86.6
More than four people	8	4.0
Total	200	99.5

Table 6 shows that the majority of the respondents' members in household are Three – four people (86.6%), then Two people (9.0%), and More than four people (4.0%).

Table 7 Descriptive statistic of the respondents classified by Level of education

Level of education	Frequency	Percent
Valid High School	6	3.0
Bachelor Degree	145	72.1
Master Degree	43	21.4
Doctoral Degree	6	3.0
Total	200	99.5

Table 7 shows that the majority of the respondents' levels of education are Bachelor Degree (72.1%), then Master Degree (21.4%), and Doctoral Degree and High School (3.0%).

4.2 Part 2: Descriptive statistic on customer consumption behavior

In this part, the demographic information of 200 respondents is analyzed in term of frequency, spending and influential factor from Table 8 to Table 9.

Table 8 Descriptive statistic of the respondents classified by How often do you consume clean food

Often	Frequency	Percent
Valid Once a week	8	4.0
A few times per week	142	70.6
More than 5 times per	50	24.9

month		
Total	200	99.5

Table 8 shows that the majority of the respondents are A few times per week (70.6%), then More than 5 times per month (24.9%) and Once a week (4.0%).

Table 9 Descriptive statistic of the respondents classified by how much you spend on your meal

Spending	Frequency	Percent
Valid 101 – 200 Baht	54	26.9
201 – 300 Baht	140	69.7
More than 300 Baht	6	3.0
Total	200	99.5

Table 9 shows that the majority of the respondents are between 201 – 300 Baht (69.7%), then between 101 – 200 Baht (26.9%) and more than 300 Baht (3.0%).

4.3 Part 3 Analysis about the marketing mix factors

Analysis about the marketing mix factors (4Ps, Product, Price, Place and Promotion) the sample as shown in Table 10 to Table 13.

4.31 Product

Table 10 Mean and Standard Deviation of marketing mix factors that the customers at DJ Poom’s restaurant focus on each aspect of product.

Product	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	\bar{X}	SD	Degree of agreement	Ranks
I like the taste of clean food	150 (74.6%)	30 (14.9%)	20 (10.0%)			4.65	.655	Absolutely True	1
I like clean food because of healthy food	30 (14.9%)	170 (84.6%)				4.15	.358	High Degree	2
I like clean food because of various in food selection	20 (10.0%)		180 (89.6%)			3.20	.602	Moderate Degree	3
I like clean food because it is simple and quick				200 (99.5%)		2.00	.000	Minimal Degree	4
I like clean food because of attractive packaging					200 (99.5%)	1.00	.000	Not True At All	5
Average of Product						3.00	.323		-

Table 10 shows that the average mean of product is 3.00, by

First group, I like the taste of clean food (4.65);

Second group, I like clean food because of healthy food (4.15);

Third group, I like clean food because of various in food selection (3.20);

Fourth group, I like clean food because it is simple and quick (2.00);

Last group, I like clean food because of attractive packaging (1.00).

4.32 Price

Table 11 Mean and Standard Deviation of marketing mix factors that the customers at DJ Poom’s restaurant focus on each aspect of price.

Price	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	\bar{X}	SD	Degree of agreement	Ranks
I like clean food because the price is similar to local food				200 (99.5%)		2.00	.000	Minimal Degree	3
I like clean food because of reasonable price with quality		160 (79.6%)	26 (12.9%)		14 (7.0%)	3.66	.805	High Degree	1
I like clean food because of good price		26 (12.9%)	174 (86.6%)			3.13	.337	Moderate Degree	2
I like clean food because of various price range		14 (7.0%)			186 (92.5%)	1.21	.767	Not True At All	4
Average of Price						2.50	.477		-

Table 11 shows that the average mean of price is 2.50, by

First group, I like clean food because of reasonable price with quality (3.66);

Second group, I like clean food because of good price (3.13);

Third group, I like clean food because the price is similar to local food (2.00);

Last group, I like clean food because of various price range (1.21).

4.33 Place

Table 12 Mean and Standard Deviation of marketing mix factors that the customers at DJ Poom's restaurant focus on each aspect of place.

Place	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	\bar{X}	SD	Degree of agreement	Ranks
Location of restaurant		25 (12.4%)		175 (87.1%)		2.25	.663	Minimal Degree	3
Atmosphere of restaurant		175 (87.1%)	25 (12.4%)			3.88	.332	High Degree	1
Having enough car park			175 (87.1%)	25 (12.4%)		2.88	.332	Moderate degree	2
Having enough table					200 (99.5%)	1.00	.000	Not True At All	4
Average of Place						2.50	.331		-

Table 12 shows that the average mean of place is 2.50, by

First group, Atmosphere of restaurant (3.88);

Second group, Having enough car park (2.88).

Third group, Location of restaurant (2.25);

Last group, Having enough table (1.00).

4.34 Promotion

Table 13 Mean and Standard Deviation of marketing mix factors that the customers at DJ Poom’s restaurant focus on each aspect of promotion.

Promotion	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	\bar{X}	SD	Degree of agreement	Ranks
High frequency in discount promotion		178 (88.6%)	22 (10.9%)			3.89	.314	High Degree	1
Free gift promotion		22 (10.9%)		178 (88.6%)		2.22	.627	Minimal degree	3
Often see the product advertising			178 (88.6%)	22 (10.9%)		2.89	.314	Moderate degree	2
Member privilege					200 (99.5%)	1.00	.000	Not true at all	4
Average of Promotion						2.50	.313		-

Table 13 shows that the average mean of promotion is 2.50, by

First group, High frequency in discount promotion (3.89);

Second group, Often see the product advertising (2.89);

Third group, Free gift promotion(2.22);

Last group, Member privilege(1.00).

4.4 Part 4: Hypothesis testing

H1: The demographic characteristic in term of gender is not related with consumer behavior in spending clean food per meal.

Table 14:

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.165 ^a	2	.001
Likelihood Ratio	15.327	2	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	14.095	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	200		

The level of significance at .05

The result showed that the Hypothesis testing was rejected. It meant that the different genders have difference on consumer behavior in spending clean food per meal at the level of significance .05

Gender	How much do you spend on your meal			Total
	101-200 Baht	201-300 Baht	More than 300 Baht	
Male	27 (50.0%)	105 (75.0%)	6 (100.0%)	138 (69.0%)
Female	27 (50.0%)	35 (25.0%)	0 (0.0%)	62 (31.0%)
Total	54 (100.0%)	140 (100.0%)	6 (100.0%)	200 (100.0%)

H2: The Marketing Mix factor in term of product's taste is not related with consumer frequency behavior in consuming clean food.

Table 15:

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.312 ^a	4	.010
Likelihood Ratio	19.588	4	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	.945	1	.331
N of Valid Cases	200		

The level of significance = .05

The result showed that the Hypothesis testing was rejected. It meant that the Marketing Mix factor on product's taste had relationship with consumer frequency behavior in consuming clean food at the level of significance .05

I like to eat clean food because of taste	How often do you consume clean food			
	Once a week	A few times per week	More than 5 times per month	Total
Neither agree nor disagree	0 (0.0%)	20 (14.1%)	0 (0.0%)	20 (10.0%)
Agree	0 (0.0%)	18 (12.7%)	12 (24.0%)	30 (15.0%)
Strongly agree	8 (100.0%)	104 (73.2%)	38 (76.0%)	150 (75.0%)
Total	8 (100.0%)	142 (100.0%)	50 (100.0%)	200 (100.0%)

4.5 Part 5: Summary of hypothesis testing.

H1: The demographic characteristic in term of gender is not related with consumer behavior in spending clean food per meal.

The result showed that the Hypothesis testing was rejected, so the demographic characteristic in term of gender is related with consumer behavior in spending clean food per meal at DJ Poom Menu Restaurant at the level of significance .05

It meant that the different genders have difference on consumer behavior in spending clean food per meal at DJ Poom Menu Restaurant.

H2: The Marketing Mix factor in term of product's taste is not related with consumer frequency behavior in consuming clean food.

The result showed that the Hypothesis testing was rejected, so the Marketing Mix factor on product's taste is related with consumer frequency behavior in consuming clean food at DJ Poom Menu Restaurant at the level of significance .05

I meant that if the product's taste is a good taste, the consumers will frequently come to eat clean food at DJPoom Menu Restaurant.