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## ABSTRACT

In 2019 alone, the number of Chinese students studying abroad broke a record high of 703,5000, a growth of $6.25 \%$ ( 41,400 students) compared with 2018. Furthermore, a surging number of Chinese students have chosen Thailand as a study abroad destination at higher education level. Therefore, it is very important to investigate the influencing coefficients behind the fact.

This thesis concentrates on cultural intentions and adopts Hofstede's cultural dimensions theory to be its framework. It utilizes five cultural dimensions including power distance, individualism, masculinity, uncertainty avoidance and longterm orientation. The research is based on the data collected by survey and it employs SPSS software to conduct quantitative research in order to find out the correlation between the framework and cultural intentions.

Through regression and correlation analysis, it's found that independent variable "individualism" is in negative interrelation with the dependent variable "intention to study". Precisely speaking, "collectivism" acts as a significant influential factor for Chinese students to study at Thai universities in the aspect of cultural intentions.
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## CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the data disclosed by Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China, from 1978 to 2019, along with the globalization and internationalization strongly supported by booming economy of China, the accumulated number of Chinese students studying abroad reaches 6.56 million. Obviously, mobility of Chinese students across national borders has become common worldwide. However, the underlying reasons that motivate these students to pursue overseas study and influential factors are not sufficiently studied. (Wu, Q. 2014)

Previously, studies mainly focus on some quantitative index, such as school ranking, tuition fee and living expenditure. Nevertheless, soft power like culture, which weights heavily in the process of decision-making, is usually overlooked. Therefore, it is important to figure out the cultural factors that attract Chinese students to study at Thai universities. This research adopts Hofstede's cultural dimensions theory to detect correlation between cultural factors and intentions for Chinese students to pursue higher education in Thailand. Cultural dimensions consist of power distance, individualism-collectivism, masculinity-femininity, uncertainty avoidance and long-term orientation, which will be explained and discussed expressly in the following chapters.

Chapter 4 introduces research methodology and presents general description of survey samples. Chapter 5 depicts findings and inferences resulted from SPSS analysis of each variable. Chapter 6 focuses on foreseeable and potential limitations in the research and provides some supporting arguments. Chapter 7 summarizes the theoretical framework and correlation among variables. It also points out some key influential factors and social value of the research. In Chapter 8, it gives some feasible recommendations to important stakeholders.

All in all, the research findings have important implications for Thai universities to develop more effective recruitment strategies and study orientation
particularly for targeted Chinese students. Meanwhile, it also serves as a guidance for Chinese families to take cultural factors into account when planning to study at Thai universities.

## CHAPTER II THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Before going into the detailed research findings, it is first important to clarify used terminologies about this subject that will be mentioned in the next chapters of this paper. It is understandable that some readers are already familiar with a certain portion of these terms due to their popularity in published literature. However, the concepts of them can differ in existing articles and perplex readers. The concepts of terms in this research are closely linked with cultural dimensions and "intention to study".

### 2.1 Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions

The choices of dimensions have been widely discussed to find out the most appropriate approach to conceptualize and operate culture. However, Hofstede's framework, across social science, psychology and marketing research, is the most widely employed cultural framework worldwide. In Hofstede's empirical study, there were 116,000 surveys collected from more than 60,000 respondents in 70 countries. (Hofstede, 1984, 1991, 2001) He designed 5 cultural dimensions. In the meantime, he assigned metrics on each to all nations, and interrelated the cultural dimensions with economic, demographic, and political aspects of a society. Notably, his framework is the most systematic and dominant in terms of the number of national culture samples. Furthermore, the framework is significantly applicable in developing hypotheses for comparative cross-cultural studies. (Soares, A. M., Farhangmehr, M., \& Shoham, A. 2007)

### 2.2 Intention to Study Abroad

Intention to study abroad is borrowed from the concept of "intention to purchase" in marketing research. Referring to the Theory of Rational Choice and the Theory of Planned Behavior, the intention to study abroad is shaped by students' assessment of anticipated positive outcomes from studying abroad, resources and restrictions about its realization and normative aspects. (Petzold, K., \& Moog, P. 2018) Research outcomes reveal motivation in five dimensions covering personal dynamic, reverse motivation, parental influence, globalization persuasion, and outlying factors. Each dimension is analyzed and found to be unevenly assessed for Chinese students to make decisions regarding overseas study. (Griner, J., \& Sobol, A. 2014)

## CHAPTER III

## LITERATURE REVIEW

In the following chapter, the explanation of several factors that potentially influence Chinese students' intention to study at Thai Universities are divided into five independent variables and one dependent variable in this research paper. Those factors are listed as follows:

- Power Distance (independent variable)
- Individualism (independent variable)
- Masculinity (independent variable)
- Uncertainty Avoidance (independent variable)
- Long Term Orientation (independent variable)
- Intention to Study at Thai Universities (dependent variable)


### 3.1 Power Distance

This dimension reflects the consequences of power inequality and authority relations in society. It influences hierarchy and dependence relationships in the family and organizational contexts. (Hostede, G., \& Hofstede, G. 1991)

### 3.2 Individualism

Individualism-collectivism describes the relationships individuals have in each culture. In individualistic societies, individuals look after themselves and their immediate family only whereas in collectivistic cultures, individuals belong to groups that look after them in exchange for loyalty. (Hostede, G., \& Hofstede, G. 1991)

### 3.3 Masculinity

Dominant values in masculine countries are achievement and success and in feminine countries are caring for others and quality of life. (Hostede, G., \& Hofstede, G. 1991)

### 3.4 Uncertainty Avoidance

Uncertainty avoidance refers to "The extent to which people feel threatened by uncertainty and ambiguity and try to avoid these situations" (Hofstede, 1991: 113). This dimension deals with the need for well-defined rules for prescribed behavior. (Soares, A. M., Farhangmehr, M., \& Shoham, A. 2007)

### 3.5 Long Term Orientation

Long-term orientation "stands for the fostering of virtues oriented towards future rewards, in particular perseverance and thrift". (Hofstede, 2001: 359) A late addition to the initial four, this dimension represents a range of Confucian-like values and was termed Confucian Dynamism. Hofstede (1991) later proposed the long-term versus short-term designation as more appropriate for this dimension. Findings highlight differences in parent-student ratings of importance and the consequent demand for marketers to pay greater attention to cultural values in the aspect of recruiting students from Confucian societies. (Bodycott, P. 2009)

### 3.6 Intention to Study at Thai Universities



Figure 3.1 Comparative Cultural Dimensions between China and Thailand

Due to the large scale and unprecedented recognition of China and its culture across the globe, studies covering a myriad of issues among Chinese students studying abroad have been initiated within many host countries and regions. (Henze, J., \& Zhu, J. 2012) Being one of the strongest economies in ASEAN countries, Thailand is an appealing study abroad destination for Chinese students. From cultural perspectives (Figure 3.1), there are some similarities in power distance and individualism between China and Thailand. Differences also exist in the dimensions of masculinity, uncertainty avoidance, long-term orientation and indulgence.

In the aspect of intercultural communication and education, outcome is often unfulfilled through the approaches it addresses the utterances of research targets, especially under the circumstances that they are 'Others'. Oftentimes, it seems to be the case in research on acculturation of 'the Chinese student' abroad. (Dervin, F. 2011)

## CHAPTER IV

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research aims to analyze the cultural intentions for Chinese students to further their study at Thai universities. The framework has five cultural dimensions and it's vital to find out the underlying correlation between the framework and intentions. Qualitative research can hardly be conducted in a large scale and it's easily subjective with personal bias. Therefore, the research approach of this paper applies a questionnaire survey conducted online by means of Google form and wjx.com with the purpose to collect the required data on this subject. To further interpret the collected information, quantitative methods were adopted to complete the analysis. Compared to qualitative research, statistics and analysis, made by quantitative research, are more objective.


ANOVA ${ }^{a}$

| Model |  | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Regression | 4.307 | 5 | . 861 | 1.471 | $.365{ }^{\text {b }}$ |
|  | Residual | 2.343 | 4 | . 586 |  |  |
|  | Total | 6.650 | 9 |  |  |  |

a. Dependent Variable: IntentiontoStudyPT
b. Predictors: (Constant), LongTermOrientationPT, PowerDistancePT, IndividualismPT, UncertaintyAvoidancePT, MasculinityPT

Coefficients ${ }^{\text {a }}$

| Model |  | Unstandardized Coefficients |  | Standardized Coefficients Beta | t | Sig. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | B | Std. Error |  |  |  |
| 1 | (Constant) | 1.377 | 3.117 |  | . 442 | . 682 |
|  | PowerDistancePT | -. 559 | . 461 | -. 392 | -1.212 | . 292 |
|  | IndividualismPT | . 081 | . 400 | . 068 | . 202 | . 850 |
|  | MasculinityPT | -. 846 | . 734 | -. 467 | -1.154 | . 313 |
|  | UncertaintyAvoidancePT | -. 158 | . 600 | -. 100 | -. 263 | . 806 |
|  | LongTermOrientationPT | 1.827 | . 752 | 1.069 | 2.429 | . 072 |

Figure 4.1 Pilot Test Tables

Prior to distributing the final surveys, a pilot test was done to justify the interrelation between the framework and "intention to study". Hence, the pilot test survey was simplified and it only displayed specific questions. The minimum requirement for the sample scale of a pilot test is 10 respondents. Accordingly, surveys were sent to 10 Chinese students I was acquainted with. The 10 respondents were made up of 2 undergraduate students and 8 postgraduate students from different Thai universities. In terms of genders, it was uneven, 3 female and 7 male. After completion of raw data collection, some basic data was revised, the details of which are stated in variables analysis. Next, the SPSS software was used to translate cultural dimensions into independent variables and "intention to study" into dependent variables through computing the mean value in numeric expression. Then, linear regression was run to excavate the correlation among them. The Sig. in ANOVA table (Figure 4.1) is 0.365, which is above 0.05 . Apart from that, all the Sig. values in coefficients table are above 0.05 . Judging from these outputs, no correlation was determined so far.

a. Dependent Variable: IntentiontoStudyPT

## Figure 4.2 Pilot Test Table

However, in Figure 4.2, a positive correlation was found between LT4 "Persistent efforts are the surest way to results." and "intention to study". Since interrelation is evident, it's necessary to proceed with this research in a larger scale.

The target goal of sample scale is at least 100 and the minimum requirement is 80 . After weeks' endeavor, only the minimum requirement was achieved. To further interpret the collected information, quantitative methods were adopted to complete the analysis. The questions in the survey were designed to pair
with influencing variables. The screening question narrows down the respondents and helps target respondents accurately. The survey questions in its full length are presented in the Appendix A of this paper.

### 4.1 Samples

In total, there are 92 respondents filling out the survey, whereby only 85 responses are used as valid samples due to defined limitations of this empirical evaluation in advance. The valid samples must meet all of the following criteria. First, respondents must be a Chinese. Second, respondents must be studying or have studied in Thailand. This research puts emphasis on the cultural intentions for Chinese student to study at Thai universities. Third, respondents must pursue their higher education, including bachelor, master and Ph.D. Respondents, who failed to meet any one of the criteria, could not go on with answering the survey.

Making comparisons among quantitative data acts as an approach to draw more precise conclusions and check if the results are as consistent as possible within methods. In the end, the research is accomplished when the outcomes yield concrete advice on the cultural intentions while testing the defined independent variables in relation to the dependent factor cultural intentions for Chinese students to study at Thai University on a significance level of $95 \%$. By using the SPSS regression tool in this empirical study, this enables to deliver the desired results of this research objective. Each participant was asked to choose one option out of a total of 5 possible options which range from "strongly disagree" (rated as " 1 ") to "strongly agree" (rated as " 5 ") for the evaluation of findings. Therefore, the mean among every valid participant can be derived thanks to the analysis through SPSS. Consequently, conclusions about the average preference of the sample size in regard to the tested significance level can be drawn.

## CHAPTER V

## QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH

Before the main factors are going to be presented, a glance at the demographic distribution of this quantitative approach can give an overview of the respondents. For this purpose, demographic questions were created that ask for information about the age, gender, education status and marital status of each individual.

|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid | 18-22 | 44 | 51.8 | 51.8 | 51.8 |
|  | 23-35 | 38 | 44.7 | 44.7 | 96.5 |
|  | 36-45 | 3 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 85 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Figure 5.1 Age Frequency Table

Starting with the age, the survey diversifies 5 options regarding the age groups, which are "below 18 years", "18-22 years", "23-35 years", "36-45 years" and "above 45 years". The respondents (Figure 5.1) only cover 3 age groups including "18-22 years", "23-35 years", and "36-45 years". Regarding age distribution, there are 44 students ( $51.8 \%$ ) with the age from 18 to 22,38 students ( $44.7 \%$ ) between the age 23 and 35 years and 3 students ( $3.5 \%$ ) of an age from 36 to 45 . At this point, the other two age groups, "below 18 years" and "above 45 years", were deleted.

EducationLevel

|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative <br> Percent |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid | UG | 51 | 60.0 | 60.0 | 60.0 |
|  | PG | 30 | 35.3 | 35.3 | 95.3 |
|  | PHD | 4 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 85 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Figure 5.2 Educational Level Frequency Table

Among the 85 valid respondents (Figure 5.2), 51 undergraduate students lay a solid foundation and take up $60 \%$ of the total audience. 30 postgraduate students are second to that and cover $35.3 \%$ of the respondents body. At the top of the pyramid, 4 PHD students consist of $4.7 \%$. Overall, the distribution of education level matches holistically with the age groups.

## UniversityLocation

|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid | Bangkok | 52 | 61.2 | 61.2 | 61.2 |
|  | Chiang Mai | 9 | 10.6 | 10.6 | 71.8 |
|  | Other places | 24 | 28.2 | 28.2 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 85 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Figure 5.3 University Location Frequency Table

In terms of university location (Figure 5.3), 52 students selected "Bangkok". That is to say, the mass majority of students, $61.2 \%$, preferred big city like the state capital. 9 students (10.6\%) chose "Chiang Mai" and 24 students (28.2\%) went to "other places".

## StudyStatus

|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid | Studying | 71 | 83.5 | 83.5 | 83.5 |
|  | Suspension of schooling | 2 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 85.9 |
|  | Graduated | 12 | 14.1 | 14.1 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 85 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

## Figure 5.4 Study Status Frequency Table

As the data (Figure 5.4) demonstrates, 71 respondents (83.5\%) are currently studying, 12 respondents ( $14.1 \%$ ) have graduated and only 2 respondents ( $2.4 \%$ ) suspend their schooling. It might be inferred that the vast majority of respondents proceed smoothly with their study plan without being impacted by the pandemic or other factors.

FullTimeStudent

|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative <br> Percent |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid | Yes | 73 | 85.9 | 85.9 | 85.9 |
|  | No | 12 | 14.1 | 14.1 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 85 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Figure 5.5 Full Time Student Frequency Table

In Figure 5.5, it is clearly seen that 73 students ( $85.9 \%$ ) are full-time and 12 students ( $14.1 \%$ ) are part-time. Most Chinese students prefer to concentrate on their study without work distraction. It may be interpreted that only a few Chinese students have work background.


Figure 5.6 Gender Frequency Table

Regarding gender (Figure 5.6), there are 43 male respondents ( $50.6 \%$ ) and 42 female respondents ( $49.4 \%$ ). Broadly speaking, genders of respondents are equally distributed.

MaritalStatus

|  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative <br> Percent |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid | 79 | 92.9 | 92.9 | 92.9 |  |
| Single with no child | 3 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 96.5 |  |
| Single with a <br> child/children | 1 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 97.6 |  |
| Married with no child | 2 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 100.0 |  |
| Married with a <br> child/children | 85 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |

Figure 5.7 Marital Status Frequency Table

With regard to marital status (Figure 5.7), 79 respondents (92.9\%) are "single with no child" and the other 6 respondents (7.1\%) consist of "single with a child/children", "married with no child" and "married with a child/children". It manifests a trend that students with a diverse marital history are emerging and it helps enrich the student body.

### 5.1 Variables Analysis

Part of raw data have been revised in order to align with the positive correlation of each variable. The ratings to the questions, that are reverse to the order, were adjusted from 5 to 1,4 to 2,2 to 4 and 1 to 5 . However, the rating 3 remained unchanged because it's neutral. In total, there are 7 questions involved. Under power distance, there are 2 questions, "Students should be encouraged to express their disagreements." and "In Thai society, power is shared throughout the society.". Under individualism, there are 2 questions, "Regarding group project in Thai universities, the majority encourage group loyalty even if individual goals suffer." and "In Thai universities, the teaching system is designed to maximize collective interests.". Under masculinity, there are 2 questions, "At study, I am motivated by a relaxing and friendly atmosphere." and "In Thai universities, students are generally concerned about others.". Under long-term orientation, there is 1 question, "In Thai society, people place more emphasis on solving current problems.".

### 5.1.1 Power Distance (independent variable)

| Coefficients ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Model |  | Unstandardized Coefficients |  | Standardized Coefficients Beta | t | Sig. |
|  |  | B | Std. Error |  |  |  |
| 1 | (Constant) | 4.054 | . 339 |  | 11.967 | . 000 |
|  | PowerDistance 1 | . 085 | . 082 | . 131 | 1.045 | . 299 |
|  | PowerDistance2 | . 040 | . 091 | . 054 | . 445 | . 658 |
|  | PowerDistance3 | -. 174 | . 087 | -. 214 | -2.011 | . 048 |
|  | PowerDistance4 | -. 165 | . 077 | -. 242 | -2.154 | . 034 |

a. Dependent Variable: IntentionToStudy

Figure 5.8 Power Distance Factors and Dependent Variable Coefficients Table
PowerDistance3

|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative <br> Percent |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid | Strongly Disagree | 22 | 25.9 | 25.9 | 25.9 |
|  | Disagree | 49 | 57.6 | 57.6 | 83.5 |
|  | Neutral | 8 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 92.9 |
|  | Agree | 4 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 97.6 |
|  | Strongly Agree | 2 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 85 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

PowerDistance4

|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid | Strongly Disagree | 10 | 11.8 | 11.8 | 11.8 |
|  | Disagree | 28 | 32.9 | 32.9 | 44.7 |
|  | Neutral | 33 | 38.8 | 38.8 | 83.5 |
|  | Agree | 8 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 92.9 |
|  | Strongly Agree | 6 | 7.1 | 7.1 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 85 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Figure 5.9 Power Distance 3\&4 Frequency Table

In SPSS, linear regression was run to detect the correlation between power distance factors and "intention to study". In Figure 5.8, it's found that only Sig. value of power distance 3 (0.048) and power distance 4 (0.034) are below 0.05. Power distance 3 stands for the question "Students should be encouraged to express their disagreements." and power distance 4 stands for "In Thai society, power is shared throughout the society.". Nevertheless, in Figure 5.9, the ratings of both power distance 3 and power distance 4 were reversely revised. Additionally, unstandardized Beta and standardized Beta of both power distance 3 and power distance 4 are negative. It can be inferred that Chinese students are expecting a freer and more equal atmosphere rather than high power distance at Thai universities. Their expectation may result from higher levels of inequality in the home country.

### 5.1.2 Individualism (independent variable)

| Coefficients ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Unstandardized Coefficients |  |  |  | Standardized Coefficients Beta |  |  |
| Model |  | B | Std. Error |  | t | Sig. |
| 1 | (Constant) | 3.843 | . 459 |  | 8.369 | . 000 |
|  | Individualism1 | -. 230 | . 088 | -. 299 | -2.624 | . 010 |
|  | Individualism2 | -. 105 | . 096 | -. 131 | -1.093 | . 278 |
|  | Individualism3 | . 166 | . 082 | . 215 | 2.030 | . 046 |

Figure 5.10 Individualism Factors and Dependent Variable Coefficients Table

The coefficients table (Figure 5.10) demonstrates that Sig. of individualism 1 (0.01) and individualism 3 (0.046) are below 0.05. However, individualism 1 is in negative correlation with dependent variable "Intention to Study" while individualism 3 is in positive correlation with "Intention to Study". Accordingly, it's hard to draw any meaningful conclusion regarding this set of data.

### 5.1.3 Masculinity (independent variable)

| Model |  | Coefficients ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  | t | Sig. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Unstandardized Coefficients |  | Standardized Coefficients <br> Beta |  |  |
|  |  | B | Std. Error |  |  |  |
| 1 | (Constant) | 2.816 | . 649 |  | 4.341 | . 000 |
|  | Masculinity1 | -. 069 | . 096 | -. 086 | -. 712 | . 478 |
|  | Masculinity2 | -. 211 | . 099 | -. 257 | -2.137 | . 036 |
|  | Masculinity3 | . 132 | . 080 | . 170 | 1.637 | . 106 |
|  | Masculinity4 | . 236 | . 110 | . 266 | 2.144 | . 035 |
|  | Masculinity5 | . 027 | . 077 | . 035 | . 351 | . 726 |
|  | Masculinity6 | . 006 | . 069 | . 008 | . 083 | . 934 |
|  | pendent Vari | tentionT |  |  |  |  |

Figure 5.11 Masculinity Factors and Dependent Variable Coefficients Table

By linear regression (Figure 5.11), it's observed that Sig. of masculinity 2 (0.036) and masculinity $4(0.035)$ are below 0.05 . But masculinity 2 is in negative correlation with dependent variable by contrast to positive correlation of masculinity 4 with "Intention to Study". Therefore, no further analysis can be proceeded with.

### 5.1.4 Uncertainty Avoidance (independent variable)

| UncertaintyAvoidance1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 |
|  | Disagree | 6 | 7.1 | 7.1 | 9.4 |
|  | Neutral | 30 | 35.3 | 35.3 | 44.7 |
|  | Agree | 37 | 43.5 | 43.5 | 88.2 |
|  | Strongly Agree | 10 | 11.8 | 11.8 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 85 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

UncertaintyAvoidance2


UncertaintyAvoidance3

|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative <br> Percent |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid | Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Disagree | 2 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 4.7 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Neutral | 22 | 25.9 | 25.9 | 30.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Agree | 41 | 48.2 | 48.2 | 78.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Strongly Agree | 18 | 21.2 | 21.2 | 100.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  | 85 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Figure 5.12 Uncertainty Avoidance Frequency Table

Overall, in Figure 5.12, the frequencies of 3 uncertainty avoidance factors show that more than a half respondents agree or strongly agree with those statements regarding this cultural dimension. 47/85 Chinese students are in support of uncertainty avoidance 1 . $59 / 85$ Chinese students go for uncertainty avoidance 2 and uncertainty avoidance 3 . To some extent, it proves that Thailand has a higher level of uncertainty avoidance than China, which is aligned with the metrics of Hofstede's cultural dimensions between the two countries.

| Coefficients ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Model |  | Unstandardized Coefficients |  | Standardized Coefficients Beta | t | Sig. |
|  |  | B | Std. Error |  |  |  |
| 1 | (Constant) | 2.195 | . 408 |  | 5.373 | . 000 |
|  | UncertaintyAvoidance 1 | . 192 | . 094 | . 238 | 2.036 | . 045 |
|  | UncertaintyAvoidance2 | . 132 | . 133 | . 142 | . 993 | . 324 |
|  | UncertaintyAvoidance3 | . 065 | . 110 | . 080 | . 591 | . 556 |

a. Dependent Variable: IntentionToStudy

Figure 5.13 Uncertainty Avoidance Factors and Dependent Variable Coefficients Table

In order to figure out the interrelationship between each uncertainty avoidance factor and "intention to study", multiple linear regression was adopted and the coefficients table (Figure 5.13) indicates that only Sig. of uncertainty avoidance 1 $(0.45)$ is less than 0.05 . Uncertainty avoidance 1 is "In Thai universities, orderliness is stressed.", which positively links with "intention to study".

### 5.1.5 Long Term Orientation (independent variable)

Coefficients ${ }^{\text {a }}$

| Model |  | Coefficients ${ }^{\text {a }}$ <br> Unstandardized Coefficients |  | Standardized Coefficients Beta | $t$ | Sig. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | B | Std. Error |  |  |  |
| 1 | (Constant) | 3.393 | . 488 |  | 6.954 | . 000 |
|  | LongTermOrientation1 | . 306 | . 088 | . 377 | 3.499 | . 001 |
|  | LongTermOrientation2 | . 039 | . 078 | . 055 | . 496 | . 622 |
|  | LongTermOrientation3 | -. 402 | . 081 | -. 482 | -4.974 | . 000 |
|  | LongTermOrientation4 | -. 042 | . 096 | -. 047 | -. 436 | . 664 |

a. Dependent Variable: IntentionToStudy

Figure 5.14 Long Term Orientation Factors and Dependent Variable Coefficients Table

Through running linear regression (Figure 5.14), it's detected that Sig. of long-term orientation 1 ( 0.001 ) and long-term orientation 3 (0) do not exceed 0.05 . Nevertheless, long-term orientation 3 is in negative correlation with dependent variable compared with positive correlation of long-term orientation 1 with "Intention to Study". Based on the data, it's hard to draw further conclusion.

### 5.1.6 Intention to Study at Thai Universities (dependent variable)



| IntentiontoStudy3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative <br> Percent |  |  |
| Valid | Strongly Disagree | 5 | 5.9 | 5.9 |  |


| IntentiontoStudy2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | Strongly Disagree | 6 | 7.1 | 7.1 | 7.1 |
|  | Disagree | 3 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 10.6 |
|  | Neutral | 29 | 34.1 | 34.1 | 44.7 |
|  | Agree | 32 | 37.6 | 37.6 | 82.4 |
|  | Strongly Agree | 15 | 17.6 | 17.6 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 85 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |


| IntentiontoStudy4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Figure 5.15 Intention to Study Frequency Table

From the 4 frequency tables (Figure 5.15) of intention to study, it is observed that more than a half of respondents chose "agree" or "strongly agree". As for intention to study 3 and intention to study 4 , they stand for "I want to study at a Thai university if it was recommended by my friends." and "I will study at a Thai university because of recommendations and reviews from my family." respectively. 44 Chinese students agree or strongly agree with the statements, which refer to strong influence from their friends and family. Apart from "agree" and "strongly agree", a large chunk of respondents chose "neutral" and only a small portion of respondents went for "strongly disagree" or "disagree".

a. Dependent Variable: IntentionToStudy
b. Predictors: (Constant), LongTermOrientation, Individualism, PowerDistance, Masculinity, UncertaintyAvoidance

## Coefficients ${ }^{\text {a }}$

| Model |  | Unstandardized Coefficients |  | Standardized Coefficients Beta | t | Sig. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | B | Std. Error |  |  |  |
| 1 | (Constant) | 2.567 | . 986 |  | 2.603 | . 011 |
|  | PowerDistance | -. 086 | . 133 | -. 069 | -. 648 | . 519 |
|  | Individualism | -. 350 | . 152 | -. 243 | -2.297 | . 024 |
|  | Masculinity | . 246 | . 232 | . 116 | 1.062 | . 291 |
|  | UncertaintyAvoidance | . 205 | . 124 | . 196 | 1.647 | . 104 |
|  | LongTermOrientation | . 215 | . 174 | . 155 | 1.235 | . 220 |

a. Dependent Variable: IntentionToStudy

Figure 5.16 Independent Variables and Dependent Variable Linear Regression Tables

All the factors are transformed into target variables respectively by computing the mean value in numeric expression. The multiple regression generated several tables (Figure 5.16). In accordance with the ANOVA table, the regression model is acceptable because Sig. (0.001) is less than 0.05 . Judging from model summary, the value of R Square is $21.9 \%$, which is lower than expected $50 \%$.

As indicated from the coefficients table, only Sig. of Individualism is below 0.05 but both its unstandardized Beta and standardized Beta are negative. It can be inferred that individualism is reversely correlated with "intention to study", which means that collectivism is dominantly influential to the dependent variable "intention to study".

In terms of other independent variables, Sig. values are above 0.05 , which cannot closely associate with the dependent variable "intention to study".

## CHAPTER VI RESEARCH LIMITATION

Due to the small sample size of the survey and time limit, the research findings may not be comprehensive. Apart from that, there are many provinces in China, the cultural backgrounds of people from different regions can vary significantly because of economical and historical factors. A study has found that prominent differences exist psychologically within China, which are continuously influencing people in the modern world. (Talhelm, T. et al. 2014)

Additionally, respondents are from an assortment of schools in Thailand and each school is distinguished in teaching styles, teaching quality, student management and study atmosphere, which may impact students' cultural perception. Furthermore, culture is heavily immersive and some Chinese students can hardly experience through online education in the pandemic.

Presently, there are 6 cultural dimensions, namely, power distance, individualism, masculinity, uncertainty avoidance, long-term orientation and indulgence. In the middle of designing questions, it's found that there are some overlapping questions between indulgence and other dimensions. Therefore, indulgence was deleted from the survey questions, which may result in an incomplete coverage. Besides, survey questions were developed from various researches, the combination of which may not concentrate on each variable. Last but not the least, this research solely adopts quantitative research methodology and it does not conduct qualitative research methodology, the findings of which can be partial.

## CHAPTER VII CONCLUSION

This research is supposed to introduce the intentions for Chinese students to study at Thai universities from a cultural perspective. The initial research objective is to figure out whether Hofstede's cultural framework factors have significant effects on Chinese students' intentions to study at Thai universities and then give feedback to Thai universities and stakeholders to better manage Chinese students. Judging from the research findings, the only independent variable with a significance value under 0.05 is individualism, excluding power distance, masculinity, uncertainty avoidance and long-term orientation. Besides, due to the negative correlation between individualism and dependent variable, collectivism plays a dominant role in "intention to study".

The quantitative research reveals that age groups pair generally with levels of education, along with an equal distribution of gender. However, the above-listed limitations have to be taken into account. The survey was filled out by only 85 valid respondents from various schools in different parts of Thailand. Additionally, the mass majority of the surveyed participants were full-time students who may lack of work experience and cultural cognition. Furthermore, it is important to mention that the omitted variable bias cannot be ignored. Since respondents hold different perceptions and experience toward cultures at Thai universities, and other factors may also impact "intention to study" in a positive or a negative manner.

Based on the results of the survey, the following conclusion can be made. Within an assortment of cultural factors, collectivism gained more popularity among Chinese students concerning intention to study at Thai universities. Since both Thai and Chinese cultures are in favor of collectivism, Chinese students prefer to immerse themselves in a similar cultural atmosphere when selecting the host country to study abroad. This may be an incentive to be investigated further as this study didn't analyze it in details.

## CHAPTER VIII RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of this research, it suggests that Thai universities, especially for those departments relevant to international students management, can take some concrete measures to improve their performance in the following phases: school marketing campaign, student recruitment, student orientation, student activity and alumni networking. Chinese students are susceptible to opinions from their surrounding friends and parents. Hence, in marketing campaigns and student recruitment activities, differential strategies should be deployed towards student cohorts and their parents. On the social media platforms for students, key opinion leaders of similar age group can serve as strong stimulants to attract and inspire students. As for parents group, search engine optimization with detailed school profiles enable them to better and deeper understand the target universities and guide parents to recommend their children to consider those schools.

Through studying targeted participants and data analysis by means of multiple approaches, it has been found that culture shock is contextually based; students are able to tackle culture shock and obtain cross-cultural capability with the help of student associations and social support; and cross-cultural adaptability can be fortified by communication with people of the same cultural backgrounds. (Lin, C. 2006) Chinese students value collectivism greatly and would like to get connected. After admission to Thai universities and prior to the start of an academic year, student orientation should provide opportunities for students to establish relationship with cohorts to enhance their sense of belonging as a whole. During students' study period, Thai universities can create more teamwork in teaching and daily life. For instance, students are able to work as a group toward academic goal and participate in student unions and associations. Moreover, alumni networking is also vital to students to feel like being a part of a community.
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## APPENDICES

## Appendix A: Survey (Cultural Intentions for Chinese Students to Study at Thai Universities)

## Introduction

Dear participants,
Thank you for accepting this invitation. I appreciate your participation in this online survey. It will only last for about 10 minutes.

I am from Mahidol University. I am conducting an independent research on Cultural Intentions for Chinese Students to Study at Thai Universities. This survey is for research purposes. Results will only be reported on an aggregated level, and any information you provide will be entirely anonymous and confidential. All of your input is extremely valuable to the research.

## Screening Questions

Are you a Chinese who is or was studying at a Thai university?
Yes.
No.

## General Questions

Which level do/did you study at a Thai university?
Bachelor/Undergraduate
Master/Postgraduate
Doctor/PHD

Where is your Thai university?
Bangkok
Chiang Mai
Other places

What is your current study status at a Thai university?
Studying
Suspension of schooling
Exchanging at another university
Graduated

Are/were you studying full-time?
Yes.
No.

## Specific Questions

| Power Distance | Strongly <br> Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly <br> Agree |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| In Thai universities, students are <br> expected to obey their teacher <br> without question. |  |  |  |  |  |
| I would like to study with a teacher <br> who expects students to carry out <br> the decisions loyally and without <br> raising questions. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Students should be encouraged to <br> express their disagreements. |  |  |  |  |  |
| In Thai society, power is shared <br> throughout the society. |  |  |  |  |  |


| Individualism | Strongly <br> Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly <br> Agree |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Regarding group project in Thai <br> universities, the majority <br> encourage group loyalty even if <br> individual goals suffer. |  |  |  |  |  |
| In Thai universities, the teaching <br> system is designed to maximize <br> collective interests. |  |  |  |  |  |
| I have considerable freedom to <br> adapt to my own approach to the <br> study. |  |  |  |  |  |


| Masculinity | Strongly <br> Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly <br> Agree |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| At study, I am motivated by a <br> relaxing and friendly atmosphere. |  |  |  |  |  |
| In Thai universities, students are <br> generally concerned about others. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Conflict is positive and productive <br> in our group project. |  |  |  |  |  |
| In Thai universities, students are <br> encouraged to strive for <br> continuously improved <br> performance. |  |  |  |  |  |
| I do whatever I have to in order to <br> study toward success. |  |  |  |  |  |
| I don't allow others to have control <br> over my life. |  |  |  |  |  |


| Uncertainty Avoidance | Strongly <br> Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly <br> Agree |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| In Thai universities, orderliness is <br> stressed. |  |  |  |  |  |
| It is important to closely follow <br> instructions and procedures. |  |  |  |  |  |
| It is important to have instructions <br> spelled out in details so that I <br> always know what I'm expected to <br> do. |  |  |  |  |  |


| Long Term Orientation | Strongly <br> Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly <br> Agree |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| I study hard for success in the <br> future. |  |  |  |  |  |
| I do not mind giving up today's fun <br> for success in the future. |  |  |  |  |  |
| In Thai society, people place more <br> emphasis on solving current <br> problems. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Persistent efforts are the surest way <br> to results. |  |  |  |  |  |


| Intention to Study at Thai <br> Universities | Strongly <br> Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly <br> Agree |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| I believe I possess ability to study <br> at a Thai university. |  |  |  |  |  |
| I prefer to study at a Thai <br> university over universities in <br> other countries. |  |  |  |  |  |
| I want to study at a Thai university <br> if it was recommended by my <br> friends. |  |  |  |  |  |
| I will study at a Thai university <br> because of recommendations and <br> reviews from my family. |  |  |  |  |  |

## Demographic Questions

What is your gender?
Male
Female

What is your age?
Under 18
18-22
23-35
36-45
Above 45

What is your current marital status?
Single with no child
Single with a child/children
Married with no child
Married with a child/children

## Gratitude

Thank you for completing this survey. I truly value the information you have provided. Your responses will contribute to the analysis of exploring research for Mahidol University. I am extremely grateful to you for being generous with your valuable time and your honest information.

## Appendix B: Figures



Figure 3.1 Comparative Cultural Dimensions between China and Thailand
Model Summary

| Model | $R$ | R Square | Adjusted R <br> Square | Std. Error of <br> the Estimate |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | $.805^{\text {a }}$ | .648 | .207 | .76532 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), LongTermOrientationPT, PowerDistancePT, IndividualismPT, UncertaintyAvoidancePT, MasculinityPT

| Model |  | ANOVA $^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  | Sig. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F |  |
| 1 | Regression | 4.307 | 5 | . 861 | 1.471 | $.365{ }^{\text {b }}$ |
|  | Residual | 2.343 | 4 | . 586 |  |  |
|  | Total | 6.650 | 9 |  |  |  |

a. Dependent Variable: IntentiontoStudyPT
b. Predictors: (Constant), LongTermOrientationPT, PowerDistancePT, IndividualismPT, UncertaintyAvoidancePT, MasculinityPT

Coefficients ${ }^{\text {a }}$

| Model |  | Unstandardized Coefficients |  | Standardized Coefficients Beta | t | Sig. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | B | Std. Error |  |  |  |
| 1 | (Constant) | 1.377 | 3.117 |  | . 442 | . 682 |
|  | PowerDistancePT | -. 559 | . 461 | -. 392 | -1.212 | . 292 |
|  | IndividualismPT | . 081 | . 400 | . 068 | . 202 | . 850 |
|  | MasculinityPT | -. 846 | . 734 | -. 467 | -1.154 | . 313 |
|  | UncertaintyAvoidancePT | -. 158 | . 600 | -. 100 | -. 263 | . 806 |
|  | LongTermOrientationPT | 1.827 | . 752 | 1.069 | 2.429 | . 072 |

a. Dependent Variable: IntentiontoStudyPT

Figure 4.1 Pilot Test Tables

| Coefficients ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Unstandardized Coefficients |  |  |  | Standardized Coefficients Beta |  |  |
| Model |  | B | Std. Error |  | t | Sig. |
| 1 | (Constant) | -2.892 | 2.129 |  | -1.358 | . 232 |
|  | LT1 | . 269 | . 325 | . 287 | . 826 | . 446 |
|  | LT2 | -. 039 | . 224 | -. 051 | -. 173 | . 869 |
|  | LT3 | . 723 | . 292 | . 904 | 2.480 | . 056 |
|  | LT4 | . 920 | . 276 | 1.128 | 3.333 | . 021 |

a. Dependent Variable: IntentiontoStudyPT

## Figure 4.2 Pilot Test Table

| Age |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | \(\left.\begin{array}{c}Cumulative <br>

Percent\end{array}\right]\)

Figure 5.1 Age Frequency Table

EducationLevel

|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | | Cumulative |
| :---: |
| Percent |$|$| Valid | UG | 51 | 60.0 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 60.0 |  |  |
|  | PG | 30 | 35.3 |
|  | 95.3 |  |  |
|  | PHD | 4 | 4.7 |

Figure 5.2 Educational Level Frequency Table

## UniversityLocation

|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative <br> Percent |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid | Bangkok | 52 | 61.2 | 61.2 | 61.2 |
|  | Chiang Mai | 9 | 10.6 | 10.6 | 71.8 |
|  | Other places | 24 | 28.2 | 28.2 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 85 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Figure 5.3 University Location Frequency Table

## StudyStatus

|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid | Studying | 71 | 83.5 | 83.5 | 83.5 |
|  | Suspension of schooling | 2 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 85.9 |
|  | Graduated | 12 | 14.1 | 14.1 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 85 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Figure 5.4 Study Status Frequency Table

FullTimeStudent

|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid | Yes | 73 | 85.9 | 85.9 | 85.9 |
|  | No | 12 | 14.1 | 14.1 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 85 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Figure 5.5 Full Time Student Frequency Table

| Gender |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative <br> Percent |
| Valid | Male | 43 | 50.6 | 50.6 | 50.6 |
|  | Female | 42 | 49.4 | 49.4 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 85 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Figure 5.6 Gender Frequency Table

MaritalStatus

|  |  |  |  | Cumulative <br> Percent |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid | Single with no child | 79 | 92.9 | 92.9 | 92.9 |
| Single with a <br> child/children | 3 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 96.5 |  |
| Married with no child | 1 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 97.6 |  |
| Married with a <br> child/children | 2 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 100.0 |  |
| Total | 85 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |  |

Figure 5.7 Marital Status Frequency Table

| Model |  | Coefficients ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  | t | Sig. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Unstandardized Coefficients |  | Standardized Coefficients Beta |  |  |
|  |  | B | Std. Error |  |  |  |
| 1 | (Constant) | 4.054 | . 339 |  | 11.967 | . 000 |
|  | PowerDistance 1 | . 085 | . 082 | . 131 | 1.045 | . 299 |
|  | PowerDistance2 | . 040 | . 091 | . 054 | . 445 | . 658 |
|  | PowerDistance 3 | -. 174 | . 087 | -. 214 | -2.011 | . 048 |
|  | PowerDistance 4 | -. 165 | . 077 | -. 242 | -2.154 | . 034 |

a. Dependent Variable: IntentionToStudy

Figure 5.8 Power Distance Factors and Dependent Variable Coefficients Table

## PowerDistance3

|  |  |  |  | Cumulative <br> Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid | Strongly Disagree | 22 | 25.9 | 25.9 | 25.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Disagree | 49 | 57.6 | 57.6 | 83.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Neutral | 8 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 92.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Agree | 4 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 97.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Strongly Agree | 2 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 100.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{8 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |  |

PowerDistance4

|  |  |  |  |  | Cumulative <br> Prequency |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid | Percent | Valid Percent | Ptrongly Disagree Disagree | 10 | 11.8 |
|  | 11.8 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Neutral | 28 | 32.9 | 32.9 | 44.7 |
|  | Agree | 33 | 38.8 | 38.8 | 83.5 |
|  | Strongly Agree | 8 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 92.9 |
|  | Total | 6 | 7.1 | 7.1 | 100.0 |

Figure 5.9 Power Distance 3\&4 Frequency Table

| Coefficients ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Model |  | Unstandardized Coefficients |  | Standardized Coefficients Beta | t | Sig. |
|  |  | B | Std. Error |  |  |  |
| 1 | (Constant) | 3.843 | . 459 |  | 8.369 | . 000 |
|  | Individualism1 | -. 230 | . 088 | -. 299 | -2.624 | . 010 |
|  | Individualism2 | -. 105 | . 096 | -. 131 | -1.093 | . 278 |
|  | Individualism3 | . 166 | . 082 | . 215 | 2.030 | . 046 |

a. Dependent Variable: IntentionToStudy

Figure 5.10 Individualism Factors and Dependent Variable Coefficients Table

| Model |  | Unstandardized Coefficients |  | Standardized Coefficients Beta | t | Sig. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | B | Std. Error |  |  |  |
| 1 | (Constant) | 2.816 | . 649 |  | 4.341 | . 000 |
|  | Masculinity1 | -. 069 | . 096 | -. 086 | -. 712 | . 478 |
|  | Masculinity2 | -. 211 | . 099 | -. 257 | -2.137 | . 036 |
|  | Masculinity3 | . 132 | . 080 | . 170 | 1.637 | . 106 |
|  | Masculinity4 | . 236 | . 110 | . 266 | 2.144 | . 035 |
|  | Masculinity5 | . 027 | . 077 | . 035 | . 351 | . 726 |
|  | Masculinity6 | . 006 | . 069 | . 008 | . 083 | . 934 |

a. Dependent Variable: IntentionToStudy

Figure 5.11 Masculinity Factors and Dependent Variable Coefficients Table

| UncertaintyAvoidance1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Frequency |  |  |  |  |  | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative <br> Percent |
| Valid | Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Disagree | 6 | 7.1 | 7.1 | 9.4 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Neutral | 30 | 35.3 | 35.3 | 44.7 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Agree | 37 | 43.5 | 43.5 | 88.2 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Strongly Agree | 10 | 11.8 | 11.8 | 100.0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total | 85 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |  |  |  |  |

UncertaintyAvoidance2

|  |  |  |  |  | Cumulative <br> Percent |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid | Strongly Disagree | 2 | Percent | Valid Percent | 2.4 |
|  | 2.4 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Neutral | 24 | 28.2 | 28.2 | 30.6 |
|  | Agree | 48 | 56.5 | 56.5 | 87.1 |
|  | Strongly Agree | 11 | 12.9 | 12.9 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 85 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

UncertaintyAvoidance3

|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid | Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 |
|  | Disagree | 2 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 4.7 |
|  | Neutral | 22 | 25.9 | 25.9 | 30.6 |
|  | Agree | 41 | 48.2 | 48.2 | 78.8 |
|  | Strongly Agree | 18 | 21.2 | 21.2 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 85 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Figure 5.12 Uncertainty Avoidance Frequency Table

| Mod | Coefficients ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  | t | Sig. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Unstandardized Coefficients |  | Standardized Coefficients Beta |  |  |
|  |  | B | Std. Error |  |  |  |
| 1 | (Constant) | 2.195 | . 408 |  | 5.373 | . 000 |
|  | UncertaintyAvoidance 1 | . 192 | . 094 | . 238 | 2.036 | . 045 |
|  | UncertaintyAvoidance2 | . 132 | . 133 | . 142 | . 993 | . 324 |
|  | UncertaintyAvoidance3 | . 065 | . 110 | . 080 | . 591 | . 556 |

a. Dependent Variable: IntentionToStudy

Figure 5.13 Uncertainty Avoidance Factors and Dependent Variable Coefficients
Table

| Coefficients ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Model |  | Unstandardized Coefficients |  | Standardized Coefficients Beta | t | Sig. |
|  |  | B | Std. Error |  |  |  |
| 1 | (Constant) | 3.393 | . 488 |  | 6.954 | . 000 |
|  | LongTermOrientation1 | . 306 | . 088 | . 377 | 3.499 | . 001 |
|  | LongTermOrientation2 | . 039 | . 078 | . 055 | . 496 | . 622 |
|  | LongTermOrientation3 | -. 402 | . 081 | -. 482 | -4.974 | . 000 |
|  | LongTermOrientation4 | -. 042 | . 096 | -. 047 | -. 436 | . 664 |

a. Dependent Variable: IntentionToStudy

Figure 5.14 Long Term Orientation Factors and Dependent Variable Coefficients
Table


|  |  | IntentiontoStudy3 |  |  | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent |  |
| Valid | Strongly Disagree | 5 | 5.9 | 5.9 | 5.9 |
|  | Disagree | 5 | 5.9 | 5.9 | 11.8 |
|  | Neutral | 31 | 36.5 | 36.5 | 48.2 |
|  | Agree | 31 | 36.5 | 36.5 | 84.7 |
|  | Strongly Agree | 13 | 15.3 | 15.3 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 85 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |
| IntentiontoStudy 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | Strongly Disagree | 5 | 5.9 | 5.9 | 5.9 |
|  | Disagree | 6 | 7.1 | 7.1 | 12.9 |
|  | Neutral | 30 | 35.3 | 35.3 | 48.2 |
|  | Agree | 35 | 41.2 | 41.2 | 89.4 |
|  | Strongly Agree | 9 | 10.6 | 10.6 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 85 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Figure 5.15 Intention to Study Frequency Table

## Model Summary

| Model | $R$ | R Square | Adjusted R <br> Square | Std. Error of <br> the Estimate |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | $.468^{\mathrm{a}}$ | .219 | .170 | .64584 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), LongTermOrientation, Individualism, PowerDistance, Masculinity, UncertaintyAvoidance

| ANOVA $^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Model |  | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| 1 | Regression | 9.251 | 5 | 1.850 | 4.436 | $.001{ }^{\text {b }}$ |
|  | Residual | 32.952 | 79 | .417 |  |  |
|  | Total | 42.203 | 84 |  |  |  |

a. Dependent Variable: IntentionToStudy
b. Predictors: (Constant), LongTermOrientation, Individualism, PowerDistance, Masculinity, UncertaintyAvoidance

| Model |  | Coefficients ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  | Sig. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Unstandardiz <br> B | Coefficients Std. Error | Standardized Coefficients Beta | t |  |
| 1 | (Constant) | 2.567 | . 986 |  | 2.603 | . 011 |
|  | PowerDistance | -. 086 | . 133 | -. 069 | -. 648 | . 519 |
|  | Individualism | -. 350 | . 152 | -. 243 | -2.297 | . 024 |
|  | Masculinity | . 246 | . 232 | . 116 | 1.062 | . 291 |
|  | UncertaintyAvoidance | . 205 | . 124 | . 196 | 1.647 | . 104 |
|  | LongTermOrientation | . 215 | . 174 | . 155 | 1.235 | . 220 |

a. Dependent Variable: IntentionToStudy

Figure 5.16 Independent Variables and Dependent Variable Linear Regression
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