Causal Model of Intelligent Consumption Behavior and Effects of Yoniso Manasikara Training Program
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The purposes of this multi-method study were to examine a causal model of intelligent consumption behavior (ICB) and the effectiveness of yoniso manasikara (YM) training program (YTP) for grade 6 students in Bangkok. The samples in phase 1 were 564 students, assessed using questionnaires. Phase 2 consisted of 60 students, used in an experimental research with completely randomized one-factor pretest, posttest and follow-up design. Data were analyzed using LISREL, MANCOVA and MANOVA. The results in phase I showed that the variables that directly influence ICB and YM (referred to as the reasoned consideration and reflection process according to Buddhist teaching), were family factors and directly influenced ICB. The factors that indirectly influenced ICB through YM were family and kalyanamitra factors (good friends). In phase II, it was found that in time 2, students who trained in the YTP along with family support program (group A), and students who trained in the YTP only (group B) had higher YM scores than students untrained in the program (group C). In time 3, group A and group B had higher ICB and YM scores than group C. Meanwhile, group A had higher ICB and YM scores than group B. In addition, the statistically significant change of training type in group A, and time on YM in time 2, 3, and 4 were found. Results showed that group A had the best scores. Thus, students should be trained using both programs for developing ICB and other desired behaviors in different environments.
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Social consumerism is a product of capitalism which endlessly encourages human needs and carelessly boost consumption. It affects the self and other people leading to bad lifestyle. Many serious problems are caused by human desires or passion leading to suffering, bad health, and lack of humanity (Baudrillard, 1975; Yuwadi, 2008). According to the Buddhist principle, intelligent consumption behavior (ICB) is a reasoned consideration and reflection process called yoniso manasikara (YM). It occurs previous to the act of consumption. Discipline promotes self-sufficiency for a better quality of life. Contrary to the intelligent consumption, the individual and social conditions are destroyed by the unintelligent consumption. Most people consume something luxuriously and act negligently. In particular, children and young people become attached to materialism and are easily persuaded. However, if they have the intelligent consumption skills, they themselves can become protected from all dangers and turn them into advantages (Intasuwan, Vanintanon, Srijindara, & Satraphat, 2004; Phraphromkhunaphorn, 2013).

Capitalism leads to the unintelligent consumption country to economic prosperity, but there are the many problems of society afterwards, such as promiscuous sexual relations (Nation TV, 2014; Tantivejkul, 1998).
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Therefore, YM training for developing ICB and improving student’s quality of life is an important step for becoming a conscious, intelligent, and good healthy consumer (Phraphromkhunaphorn, 2013).

ICB development is based on the main concept of Buddha’s Dhamma teachings, including YM (psychological or internal factor), family, and kalyanamitra (KM, social or external factors). The main concept of Buddha’s Dhamma teachings can explain, predict, and develop ICB involving the solution of the consumption problems by frequent self-training to become an intelligent consumer (Phraphromkhunaphorn, 2013; Visalo, 2013).

The external factors can explain and predict the internal factor (i.e., yoniso manasikara) and many desirable behaviors. YM is the mediator between the external factors and the desirable behaviors (Phraphromkhunaphorn, 2013). Humans can be trained to develop YM and should be trained frequently. Thus, the factors of KM, family, and YM can develop student’s ICB. The objectives of this research were to examine the causal model of ICB and the effectiveness of YM training program (YTP) for Grade 6 Students in Thai schools. Adolescents are easily persuaded and their emotion change very often. Hence, they should receive attention.

**Yoniso Manasikara and Intelligent Consumption Behavior**

ICB is defined as individual’s action through reasoned consideration and reflection process based on the Buddhist concept of sufficiency consumption for their good quality of life. Things for consumption include food, medicine, clothes, technology, natural resources, and instruments. (Charoenrut, 2012; Intasuwan, Vanintanon, & Srijindarat, 2004; Phraphromkhunaphorn, 2013). YM is reasoned consideration and reflection on the Buddhism doctrine and discipline before deciding any behavior. There are four aspects or components of YM, namely, right method thinking, right path thinking, right reasoned thinking, and stimulated goodness thinking (Phraphromkhunaphorn, 2013).

YM is related to ICB. If students have developed YM, they will be more likely act with ICB. If they lack of YM, they will also lack of ICB or have less ICB (Phraphromkhunaphorn, 2013). Previous researches studied YM with ICB and resembling scope, such as those of Intasuwan, Vanintanon, and Srijindara (2004), Kasemsuk (2013) and Sansay (2013). These studies found that YM had direct effects on ICB and sufficient and efficient resource utilization behavior.

**Family Effect and Yoniso Manasikara with Intelligent Consumption Behavior**

Family is the most important primary agent to cultivate ideas, beliefs, values, attitudes, and proper behavioral patterns both directly and indirectly in consumption consisting of instruction, good example, and family support. Moreover, psychologists believe that people will have ethics and morals depending on the family’s socialization in early life (Charoenrut, 2012; Putthong, 2008; Vanintanon, 2002). Phraphromkhunaphorn (2013) concluded that family relates to the development of YM, ICB, and to the desirable behavior.

Children gain knowledge and experience through socialization. Changes in family may be related to family problem that affects children (Annette et al., 2007; Ward, 1974). The study of Chantarachot (2007) found that there were differences in the ability to think
critically, scientific problem solving, reflective thinking, and productive thinking among the students raised under an authoritarian parenting style. Similarly, Pedersen, Gronho, and Thogersen (2015), and Russell, Worsley, and Campbell (2015) found that parents influence children by their healthy or unhealthy food behaviors. Family norms affects children's fruits and vegetables eating behavior more than friend’s norm, and the family’s behavior exert more influence than their speech.

**Kalyanamitra Effect and Yoniso Manasikara with Intelligent Consumption Behavior**

Kalyanamitra effect refers to good friends who give rightful guidance and persuasion, as well as provide good example both with ideas and behaviors for better quality of life. Kalyanamitra provides guidance, support, and a good example (Chalakbang, 2005; Charoenrut, 2012; Phraphromkhunaphorn, 2000). Bern (1997) mentioned that friends have an important role in shaping ideas and behaviors when children grow up. If children need recognition from friends, they will follow their friends’ values which may conflict with family or school values.

Individual’s behaviors have been influenced by kalyanamitra and YM; at the same time, kalyanamitra affected on YM such as kalyanamitra can help weak and depressing friends to be strong and hopeful with various method effectively and so on (Phraphromkhunaphorn, 2013). Salvy, Haye, and Bowker (2012), and Susanne, Alice and John (2015) found that friend’s networks and norms are important factors to control and maintain healthy behaviors, especially healthy eating behaviors. Similarly, Charoenrut (2012) and Sansay (2013) found that kalyanamitra had direct effects on ICB and sufficient resource utilization behavior including indirect effects on ICB through YM.

**Intervention Programs and Intelligent Consumption Behavior**

These programs for developing student’s ICB apply the concept of Buddha’s Dhamma teaching together with psycho-social training knowledge aspects (Chalakbang, 2005; Phraphromkhunaphorn, 2013; Warnick, & Inch. 1994). Namely, the YTP for developing ICB was defined as YM in the handbook, and the thinking training activities to develop ICB for students could be developed by using five sub-thinking methods (i.e., problem cause investigation, problem cause component classification, systematic problem solving, advantage, disadvantage and solutions, virtue and objective stimulation), together with 6 steps and skills of thinking method. Students solved problems from situations with a training process that included 6 activities for 18 hours (during 3 days), and the three aspects of training content (e.g., factual claim, value claim, and policy claim). The family effect for support program was implemented through a handbook for parent (FESPHP), the most important family effect variable in phase 1. In phase 2, parent’s training program handbook and activities were developed and assessed for student’s ICB through instruction, good example, and family support techniques for two weeks. Previous studies relating to YM and family effect such as the study of Soonklang (2007) found that youths trained in YM through group dynamic activities had less aggressive behavior than those untrained. Similarly the study of Jong, Duijster, Bruist, Thijssen, and Ruiter (2014) found the relationship between parents’ parenting practices and caries; besides, parenting practices were the most important factor to consider in a caries preventive program.
Research Hypotheses

There were 5 hypotheses for this research.

Hypothesis 1: YM has a direct effect on ICB; family effect and kalyanamitra effect has direct effects on YM with ICB and has indirect effects on ICB through YM.

Hypothesis 2: After having finished the YTP, students trained in the YTP along with FESPHP (group A) and students only trained in the YTP (group B) had higher four aspects of YM scores than students did not train in the program (group C).

Hypothesis 3: After having finished the FESPHP for two weeks, students trained in the YTP along with FESPHP (group A) and students only trained in the YTP (group B) had higher four aspects of YM scores and three aspects of ICB scores than students did not train in the program (group C).

Hypothesis 4: After having finished the FESPHP for two weeks, students trained in the YTP along with FESPHP (group A) had higher four aspects of YM scores and three aspects of ICB scores than students only trained in the YTP (group B).

Hypothesis 5: There were statistically significant changes between training type and measurement time (time 2, time 3, time 4) on the four aspects of YM including right method thinking, right path thinking, right reasoned thinking, and stimulated goodness thinking, and training type and measurement time (Time 3, Time 4) on three aspects of ICB including food, instrument, and natural resources consumption.

Methodology

Samples

The ethical consideration for this research was approved by the institutional review board (IRB) of Srinakharinwirot University with the declaration of Helsinki regarding ethical principles for research in human (Certificate of approval no. SWUEC/E-164/2558). This research was a multi-method study and divided the process into 2 phases.

Phase I: Samples in this study were grade 6 students under the Department of Bangkok Metropolitan Administration by three-stage sampling method: 1) proportionated Stratified Random Sampling consisted of 14 metropolitan districts from a population of 35 metropolitan districts and 6 Thonburi districts from a population of 15 districts with the total amount of 20 districts, 2) Cluster Random Sampling was 20 schools in each district, and 3) Cluster Random Sampling was 20 classrooms in each school; a total of 600 questionnaires was collected and 564 were selected after checking the completion of questionnaires.

Phase II: Random samples divided to the two stages including: 1) The first stage: Cluster random sampling was five schools derived from Phase 1 which had the overall ICB average of schools groups less than percentile 25, then one school was random sampling with label method which there were 158 grade 6 students, and 2) The second stage: Simple random sampling was applied by student’s registration number equally selecting in group A 20, group
B 20, and group C 20. The permission of participating in the program was collected from the teachers, the students and their families.

**Instruments**

ICB questionnaire was adapted from Kasemsuk (2006), Intasuwan, Vanintanon, Sodmanee, Srijindara, and Satraphat (2004), and Charoenrut (2012). Some items were constructed for covering each operational definition. This questionnaire measured three aspects of ICB, namely food, instrument, and natural resources consisting of 16 items (positive and negative items in this study reverting scores) using the four point Likert scale (4 = frequent practice, 3 = some practice, 2 = almost never practice, and 1 = no practice). Cronbach’s alpha reliability of scores from 16 items was .84. An example of the item is “I only have sufficient food, no more and no less”.

YM test was adapted from Intasuwan, Vanintanon, Sodmanee, Srijindara, and Satraphat (2004), and Sansay (2013). Some items were constructed to cover each operational definition. It measured four aspects of YM, namely right method thinking, right path thinking, right reasoned thinking, and stimulated goodness thinking. The test consisted of 17 items using four answer choices test (right answer = 1 and wrong answer = 0). Kuder-Richardson’s reliability coefficient was .82. An example of the test item is “What will you have as a solution, if you can keep things that belong to the others.”

Family effect questionnaire was adapted from Yuktanonda (2006) and Charoenrut (2012). Some items were constructed to cover each operational definition. It measured three aspects of family effect, namely instruction, good example, and family support. The test consisted of 15 items using the four point Likert scale (4 = most practice, 3 = much practice, 2 = little practice, and 1 = no practice). Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient was .72. An example of item is “I buy book from my savings because parents teach me to be sufficient.”

Kalyanamitra effect questionnaire was adapted from Charoenrut (2012), Sansay (2013), and Intasuwan, Vanintanon, Sodmanee, Srijindara, and Satraphat (2004). Some items were constructed to cover each operational definition. This questionnaire measured three aspects of KE, namely instruction, good example and kalyanamitra support. It consisted of 15 items (positive and negative items reverting scores) using the four point Likert scale (4 = most practice, 3 = much practice, 2 = little practice, and 1 = no practice). Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient was .81. An example of the item is “I watch the useful website like my friend.”

During phase II, there were three groups including students trained in the YTP along FESPHP were group A, students participated only in the YTP were group B, and students untrained in program were control group C. Hence, YM had been trained for three days before group A trained the FESPHP for two weeks. Students were measured four times for YM (before treatment 1 time, after treatment 2 times, and follow up 1 time) and three times for ICB (No the first treatment).
Data Analysis

The statistics used in the data analysis were Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) with program LISREL. The two-way MANOVA with repeated measures (pairwise comparison) and MANCOVA (complex and pairwise contrast) with program SPSS. Path analysis in phase I was investigated to search the important variable leading to intervention.

Results

ICB model was consistent with the good empirical data and fit indices values consisted of SRMR = .041, RMSEA = .049, GFI = .96, NFI = .97, CFI = .98, AGFI = .94, PNFI = .72, and df = 2.32 but significant chi-square value was displayed in model due to a large sample size and a lot of parameters ($\chi^2 = 137.6$, df = 59, and $p = .00$), even if the causal model was consistent with the empirical data.

Causal variables had direct effects on ICB including family effect and YM ($\gamma = .53$, $\beta = .15; p < .05$) and had indirect effects on ICB, namely, family effect, and kalayanamitra effect (IE = .08, .08; $p < .05$). Causal variables had direct effects on YM, namely, family effect, and kalayanamitra effect. ($\gamma = .56, .51; p < .05$). YM was the mediator between internal factors and ICB. All variables could predict 72% of variance in ICB. Thus, the most important variable was the family effect which had both direct and indirect effects on ICB including the highest path coefficient. So, family effect was designed as the second program in phase II.
From Table 1, the main effect of the training type in YM in Hypothesis 2 of time 2 ($F = 51.27$, p-value < .01), in Hypothesis 3 and 4 of time 3 ($F = 228.23, 18.04$, and $p < .01$), and the main effect of training type in ICB in Hypothesis 3 and 4 of time 3 was significant varied at the level of .01($F = 159.25, 36.53$, and $p < .01$). Moreover, the interaction between the training type and time allocated in the experiment on the YM was significantly effective at the level of .01 ($F = 1.66$ and $p$-value < .01). Meanwhile, the main effect of training type in ICB in Hypothesis 5 was significant varied at the level of .01 ($F = 60.92$ and $p$-value < .01). Therefore, the results of average comparison analysis were examined using the Bonferroni procedure according to table 2 and table 3.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Sources of variance</th>
<th>Wilks’ Lambda</th>
<th>Multivariate $F$-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>Time 2: Training type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YM</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>51.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>Time 3: Training type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YM</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>228.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ICB</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>159.25**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>Time 3: Training type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YM</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>18.04**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ICB</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>36.53**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>INTERACTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training type x Time (YM)</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>1.66**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training type x Time (ICB)</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training type (ICB)</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>60.92**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (ICB)</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. YM = Yoniso Manasikara. ICB = Intelligent Consumption Behavior. **p < .01.*

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis/Time</th>
<th>Training type</th>
<th>Aspects</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>group A + group B - group C</td>
<td>YM 1</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>6.69**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>group A + group B - group C</td>
<td>YM 2</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>3.55**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>group A + group B - group C</td>
<td>YM 3</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>10.29**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>group A + group B - group C</td>
<td>YM 4</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>7.91**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>group A - group B</td>
<td>YM 1</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>5.54**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>group A - group B</td>
<td>YM 2</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>4.87**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>group A - group B</td>
<td>YM 3</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>2.52**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>group A - group B</td>
<td>YM 4</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>3.94**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>group A + group B - group C</td>
<td>ICB 1</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>8.75**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>group A + group B - group C</td>
<td>ICB 2</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>12.71**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>group A + group B - group C</td>
<td>ICB 3</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>14.83**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>group A + group B - group C</td>
<td>YM 1</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>20.39**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From Table 2, there were significant differences among the three groups. Group A and B had higher scores in four aspects of YM; in hypothesis 2 of time 2 ($t = 6.69, 3.55, 10.29, 7.91; p < .01$); in hypothesis 3 of time 3 ($t = 20.39, 16.49, 10.14, 12.62; p < .01$); and three aspects of ICB scores in hypothesis 3 of time 3 than group C ($t = 8.75, 12.71, and 14.83; p < .01$). Meanwhile, group A had higher scores in four aspects of YM ($t = 5.54, 4.87, 2.52, and 3.94; p < .01$) and in three aspects of ICB in hypothesis 4 of time 3 than group B ($t = 4.09, 5.27, 7.88; p < .01$). It can be explained that the three groups trained in different training type also had diverse YM and ICB.

From Table 3, it can be seen that there were interactions between time and group A towards YM significantly at the level .01 ($F = 7.08, p < .01$). Meanwhile, the main effect of training type on ICB was significant at the level .01 ($F = 60.92, p < .01$). This can be explained considering that the results of group A towards YM varied according to time. With respect to main effect of ICB, the differences of training type affect the differences of ICB. Therefore, the results of pairwise comparison analysis were examined using the Bonferroni procedure according to table 4.

From Table 4, in the four aspects of YM, there were significant differences among the four times; in time 2 comparing to time 3 and time 4 comparing to time 2 ($p < .01$). In the three aspects of ICB, there were significant differences among the three groups; group A and B had higher scores than control group C ($p < .01$) and group A also had higher scores than
group B ($p < .01$). It can be interpreted that the three groups trained in different Training type, they will have different YM and ICB.

Table 4

The Results of Student’s YM and ICB Average Pairwise Comparison in Each Aspect of Training type and Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of variance</th>
<th>Aspects</th>
<th>Time/Training</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time x group A</td>
<td>YM 1</td>
<td>t4</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>t3 - t2**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>t3</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>t4 - t2**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>t2</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>t4 - t3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time x group A</td>
<td>YM 2</td>
<td>t4</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>t3 - t2**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>t3</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>t4 - t2**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>t2</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>t4 - t3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YM 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>t4</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>t3 - t2**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>t3</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>t4 - t2**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>t2</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>t4 - t3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YM 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>t4</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>t3 - t2**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>t3</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>t4 - t2**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>t2</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>t4 - t3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training type</td>
<td>ICB 1</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>GA - GB**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>GA - GC**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GC</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>GB - GC**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICB 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>GA - GB**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>GA - GC**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GC</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>GB - GC**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICB 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>GA - GB**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>GA - GC**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GC</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>GB - GC**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. YM = yoniso manasikara. ICB = Intelligent Consumption Behavior. **$p < .01$.**

Discussion

The results of path analysis showed that family had direct effects on YM and ICB. YM was a strong mediator between family and ICB and between kalyanamitra effect and ICB. Moreover, ICB had a direct effect from YM but no effect from kalyanamitra.

The relationships found in this path analysis model supported the concept of the Dhamma’ teaching (Phraphromkhunaphorn, 2013) as proposed by many past researches. For example, YM had direct effects on ICB and sufficiency and efficiency resource usage behaviors (Intasuwan, Vanintanon, & Srijindara, 2004; Kasemsuk, 2006; and Sansay, 2013). Moreover, parents influenced on children’s liking in healthy or unhealthy foods (Pedersen, Gronho, & Thogersen, 2015).

Psychologists believe that people will have ethics and morals depending on family’s socialization in the early life (Charoeunrut, 2012; Putthong, 2008; Vanintanon, 2002). Friend’s networks and norms were the important factors in controlling and maintaining healthy behavior (Salvy, Haye, & Bowker, 2012). Occasionally, friends have attitudes that conflict the
family ones and affect the student’s behavior and mind such as family relationship with an
eating disorder (Kluck, Carriere, & Dallesasse, 2014; Vanintanon, 2002). If students receive
proper attention from family, they will have better YM and ICB than others. Thus, hypothesis
I was partially supported.

The programs in this research were developed based on afore mentioned concepts and
related research. Students trained in the YTP along with FESPHP were in group A; students
trained only in the YTP were in group B; and students who did not train in any programs were
in group C. But group C participated after the training had been completed. Moreover, group
C studied their subjects as usual during the training. Hence, there were significant differences
towards YM and ICB among the three groups.

Group A and B had the higher scores in all the four aspects of YM as compared to the
control group C. Both groups A and B trained in YTP, but no group C. This result was
supported by the studies of Ratanapanyo (2010) and Pongpakdee (2010) who found that
students trained in the YTP had higher scores in public mind and Buddhist emotional
intelligence in terms of good emotion, thinking, and inventive behaviors than a control group
C. Thus, hypothesis 2 was supported.

Group A and B had higher four aspects of YM scores and three aspects of ICB scores
than group C after the second program was completed. Phraphromkhunaphorn (2013)
concluded that there were individual’s behaviors related to YM and social supports such as
family effect. Pongsuwansin (1999) found that students trained in YM program had higher
problem solving scores than group C. Furthermore, Stuttard, Bryony, Clarke, Beecham, and
Morris (2016) found that the cygnet parenting supporting program for parents had relationship
between managing children problems and the autism spectrum conditions. Thus, these results
support hypothesis 3.

Group A had higher four aspects of YM scores and three aspects of ICB scores than
group B. Group A trained in both programs. Parents stimulated student learning experience in a
family program, linked it from past to present and applied to it for problem solving in daily life.
Students could follow the guidance provided by a handbook to achieve the goals
(Changkhwanyuen, 1996). Soonklang (2007) found that YM program reduced aggressive
behavior of male youths. Altafim & Linhares (2016), and Stuttard, Bryony, Clarke, Beecham,
and Morris (2016) found that family program had relationship with aggressive behavior, violent
behavior, child maltreatment, parenting practices, and childhood dental caries. Thus, hypothesis
4 was supported.

In time 2 to time 4, groups A and B had higher scores in the four aspects of YM than
group C; group A had higher scores than group B. Moreover, in time 3 and time 4, group A had
higher scores in the three aspects of ICB than group B and group C, group B had higher scores
in the three aspects of ICB than group C because there were difference in training among the
three groups, particularly group A trained in the YTP and FESPHP. Consequently, hypothesis 5
was partially supported.
Conclusion and Recommendations

Both training programs can develop students’ ICB or other desired behaviors as the results of the study showed. Hence, at the beginning, this information should be shared via various channels such as websites, brochures, and television, in stimulating the target persons. Next, the related persons should jointly apply both the programs to achieve efficiency and effectiveness of goals for other ages, contexts, and behaviors such as secondary school students, or students in juvenile detention centers. Moreover they can continuously follow the guidance provided by the handbook in various locations such as homes, workplaces, schools, and temples by themselves.
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