

Original Research Article

Bangkok Street Food Vendors (SME) Business Continuity During Covid-19 Pandemic

ABSTRACT

Aims: This study aimed at capturing the perceptions of Bangkok street food vendors related to business continuity of SME during the covid-19 pandemic.

Study design: The study design followed the 7 P of the service marketing model: product, price, place, promotion, process, physical evidence and people related to street food.

Place and Duration of Study: The study took place in Bangkok, Thailand from Summer 2021 until Fall of 2021.

Methodology: We included 200 participants (66 men, 124 women; age range 18-80 years) who were SME street food vendors, 40% of them were under 40 years old with 59% having no university education and 35% with a bachelor degree. Two thirds of the vendors (86%) earned less than 500 USD a month.

Results: In terms of product the vendors stuck to the favorites trying to maintain quality and quantity while keeping prices pretty much the same. The most effective promotion was the 50/50 government food substitutes. Place changed from sit-down restaurants to take-away and home delivery via food delivery apps. Process changes were required due to social distancing requirements. The number one physical evidence was wearing of face masks and sanitization. People changed in terms of customer mix with less foreigners and tourists as well as less migrant workers and more government agents taking a closer look at street food hawkers.

Conclusion: Street food hawkers adjusted all 7P of the marketing mix to assure business continuity during the covid-19 pandemic. These predictors, however, need further work to validate reliability in Thailand, ASEAN and worldwide.

Keywords: business continuity, covid-19, entrepreneurship, foodservices, food delivery app (FDA), hospitality industry, SME, street food vendors.

1. INTRODUCTION

The corona virus that spread from in Wuhan China in December 2019, was declared a worldwide pandemic by the World Health Organization (WHO) on March 11, 2020 by then there were more than 118,000 cases in 114 countries, and 4,291 people have lost their lives. In comparison at that time in Thailand 59 infections, 34 cured, 24 patients remain in hospitals and only one fatality (<https://www.tatnews.org/2020/03/infographic-coronavirus-disease-2019-covid-19-situation-in-thailand-as-of-11-march-2020-11-00-hrs>). We compare this to June 27, 2021 total cases 244,447, recovered 26,873, deaths 1,912 and worldwide total cases 181 million, deaths 3.92 million. In comparison some 60 million people died in WWII about 20 million military personnel and 40 million civilians in Russia alone 27 million people lost their lives. Covid-19 infections in Thailand, since the start of the third wave of the pandemic in Thailand on April 1st, 2021, have reached 203,784 cases, with 4,108 additional infections on June 24, 2021 (Thai PBS; <https://www.thaipbsworld.com/tag/covid-19>) Only 0.31 persons per 100 population received one dose of vaccine, as of June 24, 2021 8.98 million doses were administered mostly of Chinese variants of the covid-19 vaccine such as 1.8 million doses of AstraZeneca produced by Siam Bio and 10.5 million Sinovac received from China (<https://ourworldindata.org/coronavirus/country/thailand>). While other countries allow asymptomatic COVID-19 patients to quarantine at home these patients without symptoms and treatment had to stay in hospitals for two weeks and after that another two weeks at home, to generate revenue for hospitals, until the hospitals were filled to capacity in June 2021 and asymptomatic patients then were asked to take care of themselves while they are waiting for hospital beds during the current crisis. This shows how the situation has escalated and with it the situation for street food vendors. One also has to mention that the country virtually has been closed for foreign tourists for over a year since March 2020, and a series of lock-downs have happened since then and various social distancing measures that effected food service establishments such as limiting operating hours, closing early by 9 PM, in some hot zones total lock downs, then since June 28 only take-out food has been allowed, and guests could not dine in. This also applied to street food stalls which no longer could serve their customers sitting down on the sidewalk. We explored the business continuity approaches of street food vendors as small medium size enterprises (SME) on various dimensions following the 7Ps of service marketing including:

- o Product
- o Price
- o Promotion
- o Place
- o Process
- o Physical Evidence
- o People



Comment [B1]: What is your reference for this claim? please, include it.

Comment [B2]: It is better to write: Small and medium-sized enterprises

Fig. 1. Street Food in Bangkok during Covid-19

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The body of literature that deals with street food can be subdivided into the following broad categories which include food safety, tourism and hospitality, innovation management and entrepreneurship, SME and general business aspects, socio-economic as well as political aspects and government regulations and covid-19 regulations and sustainability in the new normal. We also looked at the existing literature on Thai street food and street food in Bangkok in particular.

Abdussalam, M. and Käferstein Fritz back in 1993 researched the safety of street food which took on a different meaning during the covid-19 pandemic. Azanza, M.P.V., Gatchalian, C.F. and Ortega, M.P. (2000) looked at food safety knowledge and practices of street food vendors in the Philippines. Liu, Z., Zhang, G. and Zhang, X. (2014) studied risk mitigation practices for urban street foods in China. Street food consumption in terms of the food safety and health was also the focus of the study of Sezgin, A.C. and Sanlier, N. (2016). Poojara, Rashmi H. (2020) street foods safety concerns in light of the covid-19 crisis taking a food supply chain farm to fork approach. Hossain, M. (2021), explored the effect of the Covid-19 on sharing economy activities. Tan, Eunice (2020) looked at the digitalization of hawker (street) food and food delivery during the covid-19 crisis. Mazumder, M. Amin, A. Paul, R.K. and Riyad, R.H. (2020) conducted a study on the livelihood of the mongers and cognition of street food safety under Covid-19 pandemic situation in Dhaka city. Zeb, Shumaila Shahwar Hussain Syed and Javed, Asma (2021). COVID-19 and a way forward for restaurants and street food vendors.

Many modern street food vendors find their roots in tourism as tourism and street food go hand in hand. Tourism developed street food and street food became an attraction for tourists. Cetin, G. and Bilgihan, A. (2016) saw street food as components of the cultural tourist experience and so did Gupta, V., Sajnani, M. and Gupta, R.K. (2019) when they looked at street food and the contemporary preference of tourists and the role of street food as a destination attraction.

Street food hawkers are entrepreneurs. Alfiero, Simona Lo Giudice, A. Bonadonna, Alessandro (2017) explored street food and innovation from an entrepreneurial perspective. While Arcese, G., Flammini, S., Lucchetti, M.C. and Martucci, O. (2015) looked at the evidence and experience of open sustainability innovation practices in the food sector. Steyn, N.P. and Labadarios, D. (2011) compared street foods and fast-food industries. Hawkers are business people who both cook and sell. The longest lines are a good indication of quality. Hearty meals, comfort food from their home countries, carrying baskets on poles balanced on their shoulders or pushing carts equipped with stoves, the hawkers peddled hot meals around town, stopping at various immigrant settlements.

The social aspect of street food includes not only the cultural but also economic impact over time. Adjrah, Y., Soncy, K., Anani, K., Blewussi, K., Karou, D.S., Ameyapoh, Y., de Souza, C. and Gbeassor, M. (2013) tried to determine the socio-economic profile of street food vendors along with the study of Alves da Silva, S., Cardoso, R.D.C.V., Góes, J.T.W., Santos, J.N., Ramos, F.P., Bispo de Jesus, R., Sabá do Vale, R. and Teles da Silva, P.S. (2014). Basinski, S. (2014), who focused on immigrant street food vendors in New York City. Tigari, Harish and Shalini, S. (2020) further dwelled on the socio-economic conditions of urban street food vendors. De Cassia Vieira Cardoso, R., Dos Santos, S.M.C. and Silva, E.O. (2014) saw street food as an intervention with strategies and proposals for the development

of the world. Yahiro, K., Toi, S. and Nagashima, Y. (2013) studied the impact of street food stalls on the local economy and conditions for their sustainable management.

McGee, T.G. (1973) *Hawkers in Hong Kong: A study of planning and policy in a Third World city* is a landmark paper on how governments deal with street food vendors who are not always welcome as informal forms of employment and business. Kusakabe, K. (2006) researched the policy issues in street vending and offered an overview of studies in Thailand, Cambodia and Mongolia. Williams, C.C. and Horodnic, I.A. (2017) discussed regulating the sharing economy to prevent the growth of this informal sector in the hospitality industry which is often seen as a thorn in the eyes of the governments of emerging countries as it is not only a reminder of its roots but debrites the government of tax revenue.

Boland, Ramond (2019) concentrated his research on street food in Bangkok which has been very helpful for our study at hand. Cifci I, Atsiz, O Gupta, V. (2021) also explored the street food experience of Bangkok in more recent days. While Jeaheng, Y. and Han, H. (2020) looked at Thai street food in the once fast-growing global food tourism industry before covid-19 and the preferences and behaviors of food tourists. Lertputtarak, S. (2012) explored the relationship between destination image, food image, and revisiting as in the case of the beach resort town of Pattaya, Thailand, which now has been dead for almost two years. Lunchprasith, T. and Macleod, D. (2018) discussed food tourism and the use of authenticity in Thailand. Nualkhair, Chawadee (2015) in his book discussed Thailand's best street food offers on less than two hundred pages the complete guide to street side dining in Bangkok, Chiang Mai, Phuket and other areas of Thailand. One has to question how complete it is? Chavarria, Luis Torres and Phakdee-Auksorn, Panuwat (2017) attempted to understanding international tourists' attitudes towards street food in Phuket, Southern Thailand. The leading author on Thai street food may be David Thompson, (2010) with his book *Thai street food*. In which he explains how the satay man, usually Malay, would bring his skewers and peanut sauce to Chinese communities, just as the Chinese noodle man would appear in Indian-dominant neighborhoods. In Bangkok this resulted into eighteen Micheline star street food vendors offering everything from extra crispy pork to fish soup, fried oyster omelets, fish balls, pig innards, roasted noodles, many using the same recipe for over 50 years. These family-run old-school street stall restaurants serve local customers from teenagers to adults along with tourists before covid-19. This literature review provided us with the theoretical underpinnings for our study of street food vendors in Bangkok and how they cope with the covid-19 situation and business continuity as entrepreneurial SME.



Fig. 2. Street Food Vendor selling packaged food during Covid-19

3. METHODOLOGY

We conducted a study of street food vendors in Bangkok, Thailand that tried to capture their approach to business continuity during the covid-19 pandemic. Following the 7 Ps of the service marketing model research focus of Matteucci, X. and Gnoth, J. (2017). The research instrument developed by the primary investigator (PI) is a quantitative measurement. A paper-based survey instrument was developed by the PI and pretested following ontologies, epistemologies, and methodologies as described by Decrop, A. in 2004. The owners and operators of street food stalls were interviewed by the researcher and the results were captured with a pretested questionnaire as recommended by the research guidelines of Gursay, D. (2018).

Comment [B3]: Explain the questionnaire's validity and reliability in further detail. What method was used to validate the questionnaire? Did you do a pilot study before doing the main study?

3.1 Population

This study focused on the local phenomena of street food vendors in the capital city of Bangkok Thailand. However, as street food vending throughout Thailand is pretty much the same in terms of layout, organization and operations it is hoped that generalizations can be made from this study. Street food vendors in other Asian countries and the world have many commonalities in terms of entrepreneurial nature of these SME, operations, customers, and covid-19 coping mechanisms while the food items and tastes are localized.

3.2 Sample

The study was conducted in various parts of Bangkok, the capital of Thailand. We surveyed food vendors and their customers both on weekdays and weekends throughout the day from breakfast to lunch and dinner. The money and time spent varied with the meal type and with covid-19 the social gathering effect was greatly restricted if not even eliminated by food delivery. The majority of the participating vendors were female (67.00%) and 40% of them were under 40 years old with 59% having no university education or in 35% of the cases with an undergraduate university education. Only 5.5 percent had master degrees these were usually owner/operators one of the owners even had a doctorate degree. Two thirds of the vendors (86%) earned less than 500 USD a month while the minimum wage for a college graduate Thailand is 500 USD a month. Only nine percent made more than 1000 USD a month, one also has to state that these like everything are self-reported numbers, which may be on the low side, for various reasons. Also, these numbers are before tax and for most of them are the same after tax as they may only pay very little if any sales and income tax and only in the case the business is registered. While the vendors may make \$200 or even less a month, they may actually pay relatively high rents starting as thirty dollars and more a month to the owners of the land they sell on or for the sidewalks in front of the houses they set up their restaurants in the evening. In most cases the rent also includes electricity and water provided by the landlord for the vendors. About two thirds of the participants were less than three years in the business. For some street food vending is a way to make a living while being between jobs during the covid-19 crisis, some may even have worked for five-star hotels before, but with the country being closed for foreign tourists and lockdown many hotels closed their doors for ever due to the pandemic. This may also explain while only eight percent have been in business over eight years. The sample included 200 Thai participants from Bangkok. The sample was a random convenience sample and the sample demographics represent the demographics of the street food vendor population in Bangkok.

Comment [B4]: please, Mention the sample size determination formula. Can 200 persons adequately represent all Bangkok food vendors?

Comment [B5]: please, include statistical analysis part

Table 1. Demographics – Street Food Vendors

| Participants Street Food Vendors | Respondents Count | Respondents Percentage (%) |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| Gender | | |
| Male | 66 | 33.00 |
| Female | 134 | 67.00 |
| TOTAL | 200 | 100% |
| Age | | |
| < 21 years | 10 | 16.00 |
| 21 - 30 years | 18 | 27.0 |
| 31 - 40 years | 12 | 27.5 |
| 41 - 50 years | 18 | 23.25 |
| 51 - 60 years | 14 | 9.00 |
| 61 – 70 years | 12 | 6.00 |
| > 70 years | 16 | 8.00 |
| TOTAL | 200 | 100% |
| Education Level | | |
| No University Degree | 119 | 59 |
| Bachelor Degree | 70 | 35 |
| Master Degree | 11 | 5.5 |
| Doctor Degree | 1 | 0.5 |
| TOTAL | 200 | 100% |

Table 2. Demographics Continued – Street Food Vendors

| Participants Street Food Vendors | Respondents Count | Respondents Percentage (%) |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| Income (Monthly) | | |
| < 200 USD | 70 | 35.0 |
| 201 - 300 USD | 67 | 33.5 |
| 301 - 400 USD | 27 | 13.5 |
| 401 - 500 USD | 8 | 4 |
| 501 – 1,000 USD | 12 | 6 |
| > 1,000 USD | 18 | 9 |
| TOTAL | 200 | 100% |
| Years in Business | | |
| < 1 year | 49 | 24.5 |
| 1 - 3 years | 89 | 44.5 |
| 4 - 5 years | 35 | 17.5 |
| 5 - 10 years | 12 | 6.0 |
| > 10 years | 15 | 7.50 |
| TOTAL | 200 | 100% |

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The research findings can be grouped into the following broad categories following the conceptual research framework outlined by the author following the 7Ps of marketing, as per the research hypotheses and the research instrument developed by the PI. The data was summarized in the following tables and their findings were briefly explained in the research context. The results include both mean and standard deviation (SD) as well as correlation coefficients for the relationship of SME Bangkok street food vendors and business continuity during the Covid-19 pandemic:

- 4.1 Product
- 4.2 Price
- 4.3 Promotion
- 4.4 Place
- 4.5 Process
- 4.6 Physical Evidence
- 4.7 People

4.1 Product

The respondents strongly agreed that they stick to the existing menu with a mean of 4.34 and an SD of 0.97. They also agreed that offering a dish of the day known as plat du jour (mean 3.79 and SD 0.92) was a good idea as it allowed to simply the menu. They found that selling an altering weekly special helped to keep the menu interesting and eliminate boredom among customers (mean 3.41 and SD 0.94) and was agreed. They also agreed changing the portioning sizes downward helped with inflation during the crisis (mean 3.63 and SD 0.95). Some of the vendors changed to healthier food, but it was mostly disagreed upon by the majority of vendors (mean 2.88 and SD 0.84). Offering a limited menu was also agreed upon as it required less staff (mean 3.55 and SD 0.88). Focusing on the bestselling item was a strongly agreed upon (mean 4.54 and SD 0.98). The stalls still wanted to serve their signature dishes which was agreed with mean 3.71 and SD 0.81. The strategies that were most successful were less labor-intensive (mean 4.27 and SD 0.93) and less costly dishes (mean 4.45 and SD 0.95). On average the food vendors agreed that the best approach in terms of product is to change as little as possible and stick to the favorite menu (mean 3.94 and SD 0.92).

4.2 Price

It was strongly agreed that the best pricing strategy was to keep price unchanged (mean 4.35 and SD 0.89). Some more charity minded vendors offered discounts to help their customers through the crisis with a mean of 3.79 and SD 0.78 it was agreed upon. Price increases were found necessary by some vendors but it was not strongly agreed upon with a mean of 3.34 and SD 0.90. The majority disagreed with extra packaging charges for take-away food (mean 2.88 and SD 0.84). The hawkers agreed with the idea of delivery charges collected by the food app providers with a mean of 3.65 and a SD of 0.77. But overall, the participants still agreed with keeping the prices pretty much the same with an overall average of mean 3.58 and SD 0.84.

4.3 Promotion

The buy-one-get-one free promotion were popular mostly at the end of day to get rid of leftover dishes with a mean 3.20 and SD 0.61. Promotional pricing was also agreed on (mean 3.21 and SD 0.72). But word of mouth as always was the most powerful means of promotion (mean 4.35 and SD 0.89). Additional signage was installed by some vendors (mean 3.10 and SD 0.77). Advertisement in various form was also added during covid-19 (mean of 3.33 and SD 0.88). Give-away items were popular with Thais (mean 3.53 and SD 0.84). But the government 50/50 copay program was the most effective (mean 4.69 and SD 0.99). Overall promotions helped to some extent with a mean of 3.63 and a SD of 0.81 as agreed.

4.4 Place

During the covid-19 crisis there has been many changes in place of the marketing mix. Most notable was food delivery. The most popular food delivery app is GrabFood which was strongly agreed upon with a mean 4.45 and SD 0.95. Foodpanda came in at second place and was also strongly agreed upon with mean 4.15 and SD 0.92. In third place was LINE MAN with a mean of 4.03 and SD 0.83 and also strongly agreed upon. Also, Robinhood was strongly agreed upon as a relatively new player with a mean 4.02 and SD 0.81. Less popular was for restaurants to deliver the meal themselves which was only agreed upon with a mean 3.77 and SD 0.71. Take-away was the most popular alternative during covid-19 and was strongly agreed with a mean of 4.77 and SD 0.96. Drive-through was a disagreed option which only a few shops offered with a mean of 2.82 and SD 0.83. Catering of larger parties was also a disagreed option with a mean of 2.65 and SD 0.75. Down-sizing was a strongly agreed upon option which was forced upon the vendors by the covid-19 crisis with a mean of 4.53 and a SD of 0.83. Relocation was another option which may have been necessary as the old location was no longer available during the crisis especially in areas of total lockdown and was only agreed upon with a mean of 3.53 and SD 0.84. Overall change of place has been agreed upon by the vendors, the change of venue may have meant food delivery or take away as well as down-sizing and relocation of the venue (Mean 3.87 and SD 0.84).

4.5 Process

There were a number of process changes to comply with covid-19 regulations. Facemasks and face shields were the most visible process changes and strongly agreed upon with a mean 4.03 and SD of 0.82 by the respondents. They also agreed with wearing plastic gloves while serving food mean 3.66 and SD 0.78. Disinfecting staff and customers was only agreed upon as disinfecting alcohol added a lot of cost for vendors with a mean of 3.25 and SD 0.88. Taking temperature of customers and staff was another agreed upon added process with mean 3.02 of and SD 0.77. Guest registration either handwritten by providing name and phone number or covid-19 tracking apps was agreed upon with mean of 3.77 and SD 0.71. Guest reservation only applied when sit-down dining was an option and even restaurants which never before used a reservation system started to do so no by law with mean 3.45 and SD 0.96. No seating allowed was the most severe and most strongly agreed upon by the respondents with a mean of 4.73 and SD 0.83. Social distancing in terms of cue lines and distances between tables was not agreed upon by the hawkers with a mean 2.65 and SD 0.75. Scan-to-pay and electronic payments interestingly enough were strongly agreed upon by the vendors as they use mobile phones to receive the payment and 50/50 government contribution which was strongly agreed upon with mean 3.87 and SD 0.82. The most obvious and often most painful process change was the reduction of operating hours

during the various lockdowns was strongly agreed upon with a mean of 4.88 and SD 0.88. Overall, the respondents agreed that there were process changes even so they don't welcome them with an average mean of 2.10 and standard deviation of 0.67.

4.6. Physical Evidence

We already discussed some of the physical evidences under visible process changes mandated by government regulations. Overall, they can be classified as hygiene and social distancing measures which have hit food service establishments hard. Covid-19 protective equipment such as temperature measurement, registration, sanitizing equipment, and most visible PVC framed Plexiglas or plastic screens received a mean of 4.51 and a SD of 0.65 and was strongly agreed upon by the vendors as an unwelcomed burden. Selling packaged food was another requirement which was agreed upon with a mean of 3.77 and SD 0.75 it often was not such a big impact as especially neighborhood vendors even before sold take-home food. Rearranging the service area had different requirements depending on the nature of the operation and the phase of the covid-19 pandemic. It may have meant a two-meter distance between tables or reducing the number of seating by 50%, one customer per table, dividers on tables or totally switching to food delivery. The hawkers were forced to agree with these requirements with a Mean of 3.22 and SD of 0.88. Sealed utensils were not that popular as it meant extra costs and disposable plastic utensils had to be provided, some of the low-end food stalls simply sold the food without silverware this was disagreed upon with a mean of 2.81 and SD 1.04. Vaccinating the staff was only agreed upon by the hawkers as the government required vaccination while the vaccination facilities had limited capacities with a mean of 3.12 and SD of 0.78). Overall, the hawkers agreed with the physical evidences with an average mean of 3.43 and standard deviation of 0.85.

4.7 People

The most important factor in a service business are people. There was often a reduction in staff in order to cut cost and also because of staff shortage this was strongly agreed with a mean of 4.32 and SD of 0.89. They also strongly agreed on cutting staff salary mostly in form of reduced working hours and no overtime due to mandatory curfew (Mean 4.11 and SD 0.93). The less expensive often illegal migrant workers from neighboring countries like Cambodia, Laos and Myanmar were lacking due to the closure of the borders which was agreed upon with a mean of 3.94 and SD 0.73. This led to increase the number of Thai nationals working in the stalls who are either family members or often ex hotel employees who lost their jobs due to the pandemic this was strongly agreed upon with a mean of 4.51 and an SD of 0.65. The big change in the customer mix was that there were fewer international tourists, if any tourists only Thai nationals and expats who work in Thailand, more affluent tourists were missing this was strongly agreed upon with a mean of 4.77 and an SD of 0.75. The focus on local customers was also strongly agreed upon with a mean of 4.22 and SD of 0.88. The new customer mix with different discretionary income was strongly agreed upon with a mean of 4.66 and a SD of 0.66. Everyone agreed that there were fewer customers with a mean of 4.92 and a SD of 0.78. But there were also new vendors entering the market with the change in dynamics during the crisis which was agreed upon with a mean of 3.55 and a SD of 0.56. The heavier involvement of the various government agents was also strongly agreed upon and less welcomed with a mean of 4.77 and a SD of 0.75. With an average mean of 4.38 and a SD 0.76 the people variable was strongly agreed upon by the respondents.

Table 3. Product

| Variable | Mean | S.D. | Results |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|
| Product | | | |
| 1. Existing menu | 4.34 | 0.97 | Strongly Agreed |
| 2. Dish of the day - plat du jour | 3.79 | 0.92 | Agreed |
| 3. Weekly special | 3.41 | 0.94 | Agreed |
| 4. Portioning | 3.63 | 0.95 | Agreed |
| 5. Healthier food | 2.88 | 0.84 | Disagreed |
| 6. Limited menu | 3.55 | 0.88 | Agreed |
| 7. Focus on best seller | 4.54 | 0.98 | Strongly Agreed |
| 8. Signature dish | 3.71 | 0.81 | Agreed |
| 9. Less labor-intensive dishes | 4.27 | 0.93 | Strongly Agreed |
| 10. Less costly dishes | 4.45 | 0.95 | Strongly Agreed |
| Average | 3.94 | 0.92 | Agreed |

Table 4. Price

| Variable | Mean | S.D. | Results |
|----------------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|
| Price | | | |
| 1. Price unchanged | 4.35 | 0.89 | Strongly Agreed |
| 2. Price discount | 3.70 | 0.80 | Agreed |
| 3. Price increase | 3.33 | 0.90 | Agreed |
| 4. Packaging charges | 2.88 | 0.84 | Disagreed |
| 5. Delivery fee | 3.65 | 0.77 | Agreed |
| Average | 3.58 | 0.84 | Agreed |

Table 5. Promotion

| Variable | Mean | S.D. | Results |
|---------------------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|
| Promotion | | | |
| 1. Buy one get one free | 3.20 | 0.61 | Agreed |
| 2. Promotional pricing | 3.21 | 0.72 | Agreed |
| 3. Word of mouth | 4.35 | 0.89 | Strongly Agreed |
| 4. Signage | 3.10 | 0.77 | Agreed |
| 5. Advertisement | 3.33 | 0.88 | Agreed |
| 6. Give-away item | 3.53 | 0.84 | Agreed |
| 7. Government copay 50/50 | 4.69 | 0.99 | Strongly Agreed |
| Average | 3.63 | 0.81 | Agreed |

Table 6. Place

| Variable | Mean | S.D. | Results |
|--------------|------|------|---------|
| Place | | | |

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|
| 1. GrabFood delivery | 4.45 | 0.95 | Strongly Agreed |
| 2. foodpanda delivery | 4.11 | 0.93 | Strongly Agreed |
| 3. LINE MAN delivery | 4.03 | 0.83 | Strongly Agreed |
| 4. Robinhood delivery | 4.02 | 0.81 | Strongly Agreed |
| 5. Shops deliver themselves | 3.77 | 0.71 | Agreed |
| 6. Take-away | 4.77 | 0.96 | Strongly Agreed |
| 7. Drive-through | 2.82 | 0.83 | Disagreed |
| 8. Catering | 2.65 | 0.75 | Disagreed |
| 9. Down-size | 4.53 | 0.83 | Strongly Agreed |
| 10. Store Relocation | 3.53 | 0.84 | Agreed |
| Average | 3.87 | 0.84 | Agreed |

Table 7. Process

| Variable | Mean | S.D. | Results |
|---|-------------|-------------|-----------------|
| Process | | | |
| 1. Face masks/Shields | 4.03 | 0.82 | Strongly Agreed |
| 2. Gloves | 3.66 | 0.78 | Agreed |
| 3. Disinfecting | 3.25 | 0.83 | Agreed |
| 4. Temperature taking | 3.02 | 0.77 | Agreed |
| 5. Guest registration/covid-19 tracking app | 3.77 | 0.71 | Agreed |
| 6. Guest reservation | 3.45 | 0.96 | Agreed |
| 7. No seating | 4.73 | 0.83 | Strongly Agreed |
| 8. Social distancing | 2.65 | 0.75 | Disagreed |
| 9. Scan-to-pay, electronic payment | 3.87 | 0.82 | Agreed |
| 10. Operating hours | 4.88 | 0.88 | Strongly Agreed |
| Average | 3.73 | 0.82 | Agreed |

Table 8. Physical Evidence

| Variable | Mean | S.D. | Results |
|--|-------------|-------------|-----------------|
| Physical Evidence | | | |
| 1. Covid-19 protective equipment/screens | 4.51 | 0.65 | Strongly Agreed |
| 2. Packaged food | 3.77 | 0.75 | Agreed |
| 3. Rearrange the service area | 3.22 | 0.88 | Agreed |
| 4. Sealed utensils | 2.81 | 1.04 | Disagreed |
| 5. Vaccinated staff | 3.12 | 0.78 | Agreed |
| Average | 3.49 | 0.82 | Agreed |

Table 9. Physical Evidence

| Variable | Mean | S.D. | Results |
|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------------|
| People | | | |
| 1. Staff reduction | 4.32 | 0.89 | Strongly Agreed |
| 2. Staff salary cut | 4.11 | 0.93 | Strongly Agreed |
| 3. Reduce migrant workers | 3.94 | 0.73 | Agreed |
| 4. Increase Thai staff | 4.51 | 0.65 | Strongly Agreed |
| 5. Less tourists in customer mix | 4.77 | 0.75 | Strongly Agreed |

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------|-------------|------------------------|
| 6. Focus on local customers | 4.22 | 0.88 | Strongly Agreed |
| 7. New customer mix | 4.66 | 0.66 | Strongly Agreed |
| 8. Fewer customers | 4.92 | 0.78 | Strongly Agreed |
| 9. New Vendors | 3.55 | 0.56 | Agreed |
| 10. Government Agencies | 4.77 | 0.75 | Strongly Agreed |
| Average | 4.38 | 0.76 | Strongly Agreed |

Correlation Coefficient Analysis

The researcher also performed a correlation coefficient analysis which looked at the business continuity approached among SME street food vendors under the covid-19 pandemic in Bangkok, Thailand which included the following dimensions:

- 4.8 Product
- 4.9 Price
- 4.10 Promotion
- 4.11 Place
- 4.12 Process
- 4.13 Physical Evidence
- 4.14 People

Whereby the correlation coefficient represents the following:

- +0.30. A weak uphill (positive) linear relationship
- +0.50. A moderate uphill (positive) linear relationship
- +0.70. A strong uphill (positive) linear relationship
- + 1.00 A perfect uphill (positive) linear relationship

4.8 Product

Sticking to the existing menu with the least possible changes received a very high correlation coefficient of 0.833. Offering a plat du jour or dish of the day received a coefficient of 0.774. The weekly special was less embraced by the gar kitchen operators with a coefficient of 0.503. While changing the size of the portions with 0.775 was a popular way to deal with the crisis and keep quality and price of the product the same. Healthier dishes were less popular as not everyone was able to adapt with a correlation coefficient of 0.364. A reduced or limited menu on the other hand was a welcomed solution that can be implemented with less staff and less resources and received a coefficient of 0.587. Also focusing on the proven best seller was a very practical solution with a coefficient of 0.834. A similar approach is the signature dish which often is also the best seller with a coefficient of 0.737. Less labor-intensive dishes were the answer for many restaurants as they were shorthanded during the crisis with a coefficient of 0.808. Also, less expensive dishes were the answer during the economic collateral damage caused by the covid-19 crisis with a correlation coefficient of 0.901. Overall, the vendors agreed that there had to be changes to be made to the product with the minimum impact on quality and price limiting to the existing best sellers.

4.9 Price

Price was felt by most vendors to be left alone relatively unchanged despite inflation and increased costs while the customers had less money to spent. It was strongly agreed to leave price unchanged with a correlation coefficient of 0.849. Price discounts were less

popular and only agreed upon with a correlation coefficient of 0.766. Price increases were even less agreed upon with a coefficient of 0.656. Packaging charges were even disagreed upon with a coefficient of 0.345 as most vendors already sold their food in simple freezer style plastic bags. Charging delivery fees were agreed upon with a correlation coefficient of 0.750, as the fees were normally collected by the food delivery app and this became standard practice during the covid-19 crisis.

4.10 Promotion

Buy one get one free was an agreed upon promotion, which sometimes took on the form of buy two get one free with a correlation coefficient with 0.721. Promotional pricing was about as popular and agreed upon among the hawkers with a correlation coefficient of 0.724. But the best promotion and the most cost-effective promotion method was word of mouth a very high correlation coefficient of 0.892. Additional signage was a less agreed upon way of promotion which some vendors felt was not that effective in attracting additional business with a lower correlation coefficient of 0.567. Advertisement also did not receive a very high correlation coefficient with 0.657. Give-away items such as face masks and disinfection alcohol were even less popular with a correlation coefficient of 0.543. The most popular promotion was the 50/50 copay provided by the Thai government to those people who would qualify, this meant that they can spent up to 150 baht a day on food with a 50% government match. The customers paid with an app and the vendor received the money in his bank account. The government 50/50 match received a very high correlation coefficient of 0.899 and was strongly agreed upon by the street food vendors.

4.11 Place

The main change in place was from sit-down restaurant to delivery. The correlation coefficient for GrabFood delivery was the highest with 0.805 and strongly agreed upon. The second highest was for foodpanda with a correlation coefficient of 0.753. LINE MAN received a correlation coefficient of 0.722. Robinhood the newest delivery service on the block still received a correlation coefficient of 0.6881 and was still agreed upon. Only agreed upon among the shops was the concept of the shop delivering the food to the customers directly themselves which had a lower correlation coefficient with 0.565. Take-away was strongly agreed upon and for many stalls this was the only option even before for the crisis so it received a correlation coefficient of 0.891. Drive-throughs is a great US concept but only worked well for a few high-so establishments in our survey and received a low correlation coefficient of 0.256 and was mostly disagreed upon among the hawkers. Also, catering was a more theoretical option and worked for a few vendors who delivered boxed food to companies for lunch service. Parties and special events even weddings and funerals were cancelled due to covid-19 it received a correlation coefficient of 0.345. Down-sizing operations was another form of changing place and was not welcomed but strongly agreed upon with a correlation coefficient of 0.743. Store relocation was the ultimate change in place and agreed upon but not very often executed by the entrepreneurs the correlation coefficient was 0.668.

4.12 Process

The most visible changes were related to covid-19 regulations. Facemask and face shields received the highest correlation coefficients with 0.886. Wearing plastic gloves was for some less of a change and received a correlation coefficient of 0.645. Disinfecting

customers and staff with alcohol has received a correlation coefficient of 0.782. Taking temperature received a correlation coefficient of 0.757. Guest registration with pencil and paper forms or covid tracking apps received a correlation coefficient of 0.711. Somewhat lower was the correlation coefficient of 0.689 for advanced guest reservation. The highest correlation coefficient 0.901 was for losing seating opportunities for customers. Social distancing in cue lines and seating were allowed received a correlation coefficient of 0.757. Electronic payment methods and scan to pay for the 50/50 program received a high correlation coefficient of value of 0.811. The change and reduction in operating hours due to lockdowns and curfews received the highest correlation coefficient with 0.888 and summed up the process changes during covid-19 which greatly handicapped the way of doing business.

4.13 Physical Evidence

The physical evidence as pointed out under process focused largely on covid-19 protective measures including protective equipment for protecting employees and customers, taking temperature, disinfecting and screening which received a correlation coefficient of 0.878. Boxed and Packaged food was another change with a correlation coefficient of 0.757. Rearranging the layout of the service area received a correlation coefficient of 0.688. Providing sealed utensils was disagreed upon with a correlation coefficient of 0.456. Having vaccinated staff received a correlation coefficient of 0.721 as early in the crisis this was not an option and still now not all staff is vaccinated, some if lucky received the first dose.

4.14 People

People is the most important variable in the service marketing mix. It included all the stake holders which went beyond employees and customers. Staff reduction willingly or unwillingly was strongly agreed and received a correlation coefficient of 0.899. Staff salary cut was also forced upon the vendors with a correlation coefficient of 0.867. Reducing the number of migrant workers was also agreed by those who employed migrant workers and were more than a family business with a correlation coefficient of 0.737. On the other side migrant workers had to be replaced with more expensive Thai nationals and received a correlation coefficient of 0.778. Everyone agreed that there were less tourists in the mix especially foreign visitors with a correlation coefficient of value of 0.888. The focus switched to less affluent local customers with a coefficient of 0.798. The new customer mix greatly impacted the operations and revenue of the business with a correlation coefficient of 0.803. Overall, there were fewer customers in number with a coefficient of 0.915. Because of the change in product mix also new vendors came in the game with a correlation coefficient of 0.665. The various government agencies and their staff played a bigger role especially in the enforcement function which was seen as additional burden by the street food vendors and was strongly agreed upon with a correlation coefficient of 0.805.

Table 10. Product

| Variable | Mean | Correlation Coefficient | Results |
|-----------------------------------|------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Product | | | |
| 1. Existing menu | 4.34 | 0.833 | Strongly Agreed |
| 2. Dish of the day - plat du jour | 3.79 | 0.764 | Agreed |

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|------|-------|-----------------|
| 3. Weekly special | 3.41 | 0.503 | Agreed |
| 4. Portioning | 3.63 | 0.755 | Agreed |
| 5. Healthier food | 2.88 | 0.364 | Disagreed |
| 6. Limited menu | 3.55 | 0.587 | Agreed |
| 7. Focus on best seller | 4.54 | 0.834 | Strongly Agreed |
| 8. Signature dish | 3.71 | 0.737 | Agreed |
| 9. Less labor-intensive dishes | 4.27 | 0.808 | Strongly Agreed |
| 10. Less expensive dishes | 4.45 | 0.901 | Strongly Agreed |

Table 11. Price

| Variable | Mean | Correlation Coefficient | Results |
|----------------------|------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Price | | | |
| 1. Price unchanged | 4.35 | 0.849 | Strongly Agreed |
| 2. Price discount | 3.70 | 0.766 | Agreed |
| 3. Price increase | 3.33 | 0.656 | Agreed |
| 4. Packaging charges | 2.88 | 0.345 | Disagreed |
| 5. Delivery fee | 3.65 | 0.750 | Agreed |

Table 12. Promotion

| Variable | Mean | Correlation Coefficient | Results |
|---------------------------|------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Promotion | | | |
| 1. Buy one get one free | 3.20 | 0.721 | Agreed |
| 2. Promotional pricing | 3.21 | 0.724 | Agreed |
| 3. Word of mouth | 4.35 | 0.892 | Strongly Agreed |
| 4. Signage | 3.10 | 0.567 | Agreed |
| 5. Advertisement | 3.33 | 0.657 | Agreed |
| 6. Give-away item | 3.53 | 0.543 | Agreed |
| 7. Government copay 50/50 | 4.69 | 0.899 | Strongly Agreed |

Table 13. Place

| Variable | Mean | Correlation Coefficient | Results |
|-----------------------------|------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Place | | | |
| 1. GrabFood delivery | 4.45 | 0.805 | Strongly Agreed |
| 2. foodpanda delivery | 4.11 | 0.753 | Strongly Agreed |
| 3. LINE MAN delivery | 4.03 | 0.722 | Strongly Agreed |
| 4. Robinhood delivery | 4.02 | 0.681 | Strongly Agreed |
| 5. Shops deliver themselves | 3.77 | 0.565 | Agreed |
| 6. Take-away | 4.77 | 0.891 | Strongly Agreed |
| 7. Drive-through | 2.82 | 0.256 | Disagreed |
| 8. Catering | 2.65 | 0.345 | Disagreed |
| 9. Down-size | 4.53 | 0.743 | Strongly Agreed |
| 10. Store Relocation | 3.53 | 0.668 | Agreed |

Table 14. Process

| Variable | Mean | Correlation Coefficient | Results |
|---|------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Process | | | |
| 1. Face masks/Shields | 4.03 | 0.886 | Strongly Agreed |
| 2. Gloves | 3.66 | 0.645 | Agreed |
| 3. Disinfecting | 3.25 | 0.782 | Agreed |
| 4. Temperature taking | 3.02 | 0.757 | Agreed |
| 5. Guest registration/covid-19 tracking app | 3.77 | 0.711 | Agreed |
| 6. Guest reservation | 3.45 | 0.686 | Agreed |
| 7. No seating | 4.73 | 0.901 | Strongly Agreed |
| 8. Social distancing | 2.65 | 0.757 | Disagreed |
| 9. Scan-to-pay, electronic payment | 3.87 | 0.811 | Agreed |
| 10. Operating hours | 4.88 | 0.888 | Strongly Agreed |

Table 15. Physical Evidence

| Variable | Mean | Correlation Coefficient | Results |
|--|------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Physical Evidence | | | |
| 1. Covid-19 protective equipment/screens | 4.51 | 0.878 | Strongly Agreed |
| 2. Packaged food | 3.77 | 0.757 | Agreed |
| 3. Rearrange the service area | 3.22 | 0.688 | Agreed |
| 4. Sealed utensils | 2.81 | 0.456 | Disagreed |
| 5. Vaccinated staff | 3.12 | 0.721 | Agreed |

Table 16. People

| Variable | Mean | Correlation Coefficient | Results |
|----------------------------------|------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| People | | | |
| 1. Staff reduction | 4.32 | 0.899 | Strongly Agreed |
| 2. Staff salary cut | 4.11 | 0.867 | Strongly Agreed |
| 3. Reduce migrant workers | 3.94 | 0.737 | Agreed |
| 4. Increase Thai staff | 4.51 | 0.778 | Strongly Agreed |
| 5. Less tourists in customer mix | 4.77 | 0.888 | Strongly Agreed |
| 6. Focus on local customers | 4.22 | 0.798 | Strongly Agreed |
| 7. New customer mix | 4.66 | 0.803 | Strongly Agreed |
| 8. Fewer customers | 4.92 | 0.915 | Strongly Agreed |
| 9. New Vendors | 3.55 | 0.665 | Agreed |
| 10. Government Agencies | 4.77 | 0.805 | Strongly Agreed |

4. CONCLUSION

The collateral damage of the covid-19 crisis hit gastronomy businesses hard worldwide. The impact was felt even more on the low end of the industry with little access capacity. Our research focused on the business continuity of Thai street food vendors under the early waves of the covid-19 pandemic. This was a study of street food hawkers in the Thailand capital Bangkok with two hundred participating SME. The study followed the frame work of the 7Ps of service marketing and included the following:



Product saw only minor changes in response to the covid-19 pandemic. Most of the changes were to simplify the product offering as fewer staff was available and resources had to be preserved. The food hawkers stuck to their signature dish and best sellers. The menu was simplified by eliminating more complicated and less profitable dishes. The dish of the day - plat du jour and weekly special was another way along the same line. The quality of the product was impacted as well, for instance instead of using ground pork only it was stretched with ground chicken. Often the customers initially did not recognize the change in quality as it was covered up with seasoning which deceived the palate. Portioning was too slowly reduced by some gar kitchens while reducing the dishes too much would have caused complaints from the customers. Some vendors also switched to healthier food on demand from the customers to fight the covid-19 pandemic with a healthier lifestyle.

Prices did not change much as the covid-19 crisis made the customers more price sensitive than even before. Only some high-end street food vendors were able to increase the price for the more affluent clientele which understood that operating expense increased and had to be passed on to the customers. The lower end of the market did not tolerate price increases, and the vendors were afraid to lose their customers. The competition were supermarkets that offered ready to eat and frozen food, in hygiene packaging but higher prices than available on the street. Street food vendors found it difficult to pass on corona induced packaging charges. It was easier to ask customers to pay a delivery fee that was charged and collected by the food delivery app (FDA) operators.

Promotions took on various forms, depending on the target market. Promotions were in form of more advertisement in print and online, which only worked for the upper end of the market. Signage which was as simple as installing a covid-19 sign at the stall attracted more attention of the walk-in in customers. There was also some type of promotional pricing occasionally. While stores like IKEA offered 10% discount for shopping in the store street food hawkers were not able to stimulate more business with such discount schemes. Word of mouth as always was the strongest promotion method. This coupled with buy-one-get-one free at the end of the day attracted more customers. Give-away items were not as effective

in stimulating sales with the exception of give-away food for charity as public relations event which easily attracted a crowd. The most popular promotion was the 50/50 government match where qualified customers would get up to 150 baht roughly five US dollars in daily government support a kind of electronic food stamps which were redeemed by the vendors with a smart phone.

Place saw the biggest changes during covid-19. Place of business was heavily affected by covid-19 regulations. This included reduction in size of operation, also moving the restaurant. And even different modes of place through delivery service, catering and carry-out. Delivery services with GrabFood being the most popular followed by foodpanda and LINE MAN with Robinhood being the newest which comes out of SCB bank. Beep, Skootar, LALAMOVE, Get!, Gojek, and Skootar were other competing food delivery apps (FDA) which competed for market share. Shops delivering themselves was not that popular. Some street food vendors used their own motorcycles or local motorcycle taxi drivers to deliver the food mostly to their regular customers who were afraid to go out during the covid-19 pandemic to get the food by themselves. The vendors delivered especially large orders of boxed food to the customer on a regular basis and more or less unknowingly turned their restaurant into a catering service not so much for parties which were not allowed during covid-19 periods but for lunch services at the workplace. Again, this is something which worked for the larger street food vendors, small vendors have cash flow problems when it comes to purchase large quantities. Take-away was even popular before the crisis and often the standard operating mode for street food vendors. Drive-through was an option for the upper end which targeted the same customers as fast-food restaurants. Down-sizing was the threatened theme in terms of place changes. In the worst-case gar kitchens had to be relocated due to total lockdowns and other restrictions.

Process changes were also obvious, such as taking customer names in a list or scanning the covid-19 app. Customers make reservations. Cash payments are trying to be avoided by scan-to-pay and electronic payments the 50/50 government copayment which only required a smart phone with internet access. Customers get silverware wrapped in plastic, and may even be in a plastic container. More frequent and more thorough cleaning. Some have a walk-through disinfecting spray and special floor mats. Food is no longer served on plates but packed in lunch boxes. Also measuring the temperature of customers as they came in. The first and last solution was to modify the food stalls or should we call them curbside restaurants. This was not so much voluntary but in response to government regulations to limit the spread of covid-19. These were in the first-place measures which hit everyone such as the mandatory wearing of masks early on in March of 2020, as well as sanitizing the hands and keeping social distance. Then there were the measures for food services in particular, like taking the temperature of guest, providing hand sanitizers, wearing of plastic gloves while serving and limiting the availability of buffets. Then the stores had to receive shielding in form of Plexiglas screens that were framed with PVC to support them. All these were added costs, as well as packaging material for take-home food, when restaurants were totally closed and only allowed the customers to eat the food at home. Also, during times when the restaurant could be open the social distancing required two meters between guests which often was more like one meter. Then the requirement changed that there also needs to be a screen on the table to separate the maximal two diners. After that the regulations changed to only have one person sit on the table by himself, this meant that occupancy decrease by 75% a big loss to business. But for some street food hawkers the worst was yet to come when some hot spot areas were totally closed and the stalls had to relocate or temporarily shut down. As these really small SME businesses did not have the capital some had to go to the seed corn and sell everything they had and this way they were totally forced out of business. Covid-19 and its new strains is here to stay with us even with mass vaccination which just now starts in Thailand. As even the director general of the World Health organization WHO pointed out we need to learn how

to live with the virus there is no end in sight and we may never go back to the colorful vibrant curbside dining with street food vendors in Thailand, after all the tourists did not come back either, and we do not know when and if? Another unseen process change was that maintenance was deferred.

Physical evidence of the covid-19 crisis was easy to see with the covid-19 warning signs and regulations highlighted by government posters. Issuing disinfection spray to customers and employees was a visible sign as well that often also smelled good in the high-end restaurants which had their own signature smell. There were also barriers for the crowd to generate cue lines and maintain social distancing of at least one meter distance between customers. Covid-19 protective equipment not only included the temperature measuring and providing of disinfection, and registration via covid-19 app and barcode scanning or sign-in before entering but also Plexiglas screens surrounding the food as a sneeze break. Packaged food in Styrofoam boxes or simple plastic bags was another change in the physical evidence induced by covid-19 along with issuing packaged sealed utensils. Rearrange the service area often was necessary to create social distancing, the most frequent change was serving out of the restaurant window or door and banning entrance to the actual stall. Vaccinated staff was another physical evidence later in the game especially in the fall of 2021. But staff not only had vaccination passes but there were also posters indicating that all the staff was fully vaccinated in upscale hawker places.

People are the heart and soul of any service business and the vulnerable part of the marketing mix especially during the covid-19 crisis. Staff reduction Staff salary cut Reduce migrant workers Increase Thai staff Less tourists in customer mix Focus on local customers New customer mix Fewer customers New Vendors Government Agencies. People changed to in terms of fewer staff and staff wearing face shields and gloves as well as face masks and face shields. The staff also was more conscious of the hygiene requirements and also was often the victim of layoffs in larger food stalls. Vendors also cooperated as stakeholders as well as customers and owners. There is a new customer target for those vendors which dependent on tourists in the past. Also, the service expectations of the customers became different. Thailand's third richest man with a net worth of \$12.7 billion according to the 2021 Forbes list 2021, is Mr. Charoen Sirivadhanabhakdi he not only controls Thai Beverage, Thailand's largest brewery, and Big C supermarkets but he is also the self-made son of a Bangkok street vendor. As we can see these SME enterprises are run by entrepreneurs of all types who were able to continue their businesses during the crisis.




Figure 3. Street Food Vendor Service Marketing Framework adapts to Covid-19

| STREET FOOD VENDOR BUSINESS CONTINUITY | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|---------|-------|-----------|-------|-------------------|---------|--------|
| | | 7 | P's | Marketing | in | Covid-19 | Crisis | |
| | | Product | Price | Promotion | Place | Physical Evidence | Process | People |
| Variable | Category | | | | | | | |
| Customer | | | | | | | | |
| | Low | | | | | | | |
| | High | | | | | | | |
| | Local | | | | | | | |
| | Foreign | | | | | | | |
| Meal | | | | | | | | |
| | Breakfast | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|-----------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Lunch | | | | | | | |
| | Dinner | | | | | | | |
| | Late Night | | | | | | | |
| Format | | | | | | | | |
| | Takeaway | | | | | | | |
| | Delivery | | | | | | | |
| | Seating | | | | | | | |
| Cost | | | | | | | | |
| | 0.15-0.30 | | | | | | | |
| | 0.60-1.20 | | | | | | | |
| | 1.50-2.50 | | | | | | | |
| | 3.00-4.50 | | | | | | | |
| Employee | | | | | | | | |
| | 1-2 | | | | | | | |
| | 3-4 | | | | | | | |
| | 5-10 | | | | | | | |
| Years in Business | | | | | | | | |
| | < 1 year | | | | | | | |
| | 1 - 3 years | | | | | | | |
| | 4 - 5 years | | | | | | | |
| | 5 - 10 year | | | | | | | |
| | > 10 years | | | | | | | |
| Impact | (Legend) | | | | | | | |
| | very high | | | | | | | |
| | high | | | | | | | |
| | low | | | | | | | |
| | very low | | | | | | | |

Figure 4. Street Food Vendor BUSINESS CONTINUITY

Limitations

This study is a snapshot in time, and time is the major variable in the covid-19 crisis. The covid-19 situation in Thailand as world-wide has been very fluid to say the least and continues to occurred in various stages, also referred to waves, while the first wave meant the loss of foreign tourists due to the closure of the country, the second wave imposed social distances, government regulations and curfews on the Thai people. While the third wave resulted in a total shut-down of businesses especially in the hospitality industry. By now Thailand has experienced over 2 million covid-19 infections and over 21,000 covid-19 related deaths in 2021 and the year has not yet ended. The Covid-19 Delta variant and SARS-CoV-2 plus variants will stay with us for a long time even after mass immunizations

which will have to be repeated semiannually as find out now. The swift spread of the variants across Europe has upended wishful thinking of a quick return to normal from the pandemic.

Recommendations

It is highly recommended to follow up this study with a larger sample in terms of number of participating street food hawkers. And also, over time, as time plays an important factor in the covid-19 crisis marked by the various waves and level of wide spread immunization not to take into account the various types of vaccines and first second and third doses, currently the level of fully immunized population is still relatively low. And the country is just in the process of opening up to tourists and releasing some restrictions. The ban on alcohol is still in place which greatly influences the hospitality industry as well as other restrictions. It also would be interesting to apply this research instrument to other areas in Thailand outside of the capital city Bangkok. It also would be of great interest to study other ASEAN countries and other parts of the world with the same or an improved instrument that may also take other aspects of street food vending into consideration while the world is still suffering from the pandemic's fallout, as street food hawkers represent suffering SME battered by a broken economy.

COMPETING INTERESTS DISCLAIMER:

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist. The products used for this research are commonly and predominantly use products in our area of research and country. There is absolutely no conflict of interest between the authors and producers of the products because we do not intend to use these products as an avenue for any litigation but for the advancement of knowledge. Also, the research was not funded by the producing company rather it was funded by personal efforts of the authors.

REFERENCES

1. Abdussalam, M. and Käferstein Fritz (1993). Safety of Street Foods. February 1993, World Health Forum 14(2):191-4. Source PubMed
2. Acerbi, Patricia (2017). Street Occupations: Urban Vending in Rio de Janeiro, 1850-1925. University of Texas Press. ISBN-13: 9781477313565
3. Alfiero, Simona Lo Giudice, A. Bonadonna, Alessandro (2017). Street food and innovation: the food truck phenomenon. November 2017. British Food Journal 119(11):00-00 .DOI: 10.1108/BFJ-03-2017-0179
4. Adjarah, Y., Soncy, K., Anani, K., Blewussi, K., Karou, D.S., Ameyapoh, Y., de Souza, C. and Gbeassor, M. (2013). "Socio-economic profile of street food vendors and microbiological quality of ready-to-eat salads in Lomé", International Food Research Journal, Vol. 20 No. 1, pp. 65-70.
5. Alves da Silva, S., Cardoso, R.D.C.V., Góes, J.T.W., Santos, J.N., Ramos, F.P., Bispo de Jesus, R., Sabá do Vale, R. and Teles da Silva, P.S. (2014), "Street food on the coast of Salvador, Bahia, Brazil: a study from the socioeconomic and food safety perspectives", Food Control, Vol. 40No. 1, pp. 78-84.

6. Alvesson, M. (2003). "Methodology for close up studies—struggling with closeness and closure", *Higher Education*, Vol. 46 No. 2, pp. 167-193
7. Arcese, G., Flammini, S., Lucchetti, M.C. and Martucci, O. (2015). "Evidence and experience of open sustainability innovation practices in the food sector", *Sustainability*, Vol. 7 No. 7, pp. 8067-8090.
8. Azanza, M.P.V., Gatchalian, C.F. and Ortega, M.P. (2000). "Food safety knowledge and practices of street food vendors in a Philippines university campus", *International Journal of Food Sciences and Nutrition*, Vol. 51 No. 4, pp. 235-246.
9. Basinski, S. (2014). "Hot dogs, Hipsters, and Xenophobia: immigrant street food vendors in New York", *Social Research: An International Quarterly*, Vol. 81 No. 2, pp. 397-408
10. Boland, Ramond (2019). Bangkok street food. In book: *Tourism and Hospitality in Conflict-Ridden Destinations*. DOI: 10.4324/9780429463235-15
11. Bhowmik, S. K. (2005). 'Street Vendors in Asia: A Review', *Economic and Political Weekly*, May 28–June 4: 2256–2264
12. Calaresu, Melissa and van de Heuvel, Danielle (2016). *Food Hawkers – Selling in the Streets from Antiquity to the Present*. Routledge Publishers ISBN 9781138329706
13. Cavuta, G., Di Matteo, D., (2015). *Experiential Tourism: The Strategic Role of the Factory Outlet Centre for the Development and Attractiveness of the Destination*. *Journal of Geography and Earth Sciences* 3. American Research Institute for Policy Development, Madison, 63-86.
14. (PDF) *Enogastronomic Tourism: Can it Mitigate the Intangibility of the Destination? Streetfood as a New Business Model for the Management of Tourist Regions*. Available from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/305396279_Enogastronomic_Tourism_Can_it_Mitigate_the_Intangibility_of_the_Destination_Streetfood_as_a_New_Business_Model_for_the_Management_of_Tourist_Regions [accessed Jun 19 2021].
15. Cetin, G. and Bilgihan, A. (2016). "Components of cultural tourists' experiences in destinations", *Current Issues in Tourism*, Vol. 19 No. 2, pp. 137-154.
16. Charmaz, K. (2006), *Constructing Grounded Theory, a Practical Guide through Qualitative Analysis*, Sage, London
17. Chavarría, Luis Torres and Phakdee-Auksorn, Panuwat (2017). Understanding international tourists' attitudes towards street food in Phuket, Thailand. January 2017 *Tourism Management Perspectives* 21:66-73 DOI: 10.1016/j.tmp.2016.11.005
18. Cifci I, Atsiz, O Gupta, V. (2021). The street food experiences of the local-guided tour in the meal-sharing economy: the case of Bangkok. *British Food Journal* © Emerald Publishing Limited 0007-070X DOI 10.1108/BFJ-01-2021-0069

19. Cross, John (editor) and Morales, Alfonso (editor) (2013). *Street Entrepreneurs: People, Place, & Politics in Local and Global Perspective*. Routledge, Paperback, ISBN: 041574847X. ISBN-13: 9780415748476
20. De Cassia Vieira Cardoso, R., Dos Santos, S.M.C. and Silva, E.O. (2014), "Street food and intervention: strategies and proposals for the developing world", in De Cassia Vieira Cardoso, R., Companion, M. and Marras, S.R. (Eds), *Street Food: Culture, Economy, Health and Governance*, Routledge, London, pp. 255-268. Routledge, ISBN-13: 9781138706491
21. De Cassia Vieira Cardoso, R., Companion, M. and Marras, S.R. (Eds), *Street Food: Culture, Economy, Health and Governance*, Routledge, London, pp. 255-268. Routledge, ISBN-13: 9781138706491
22. Decrop, A. (2004). Trustworthiness in qualitative tourism research. In J. Phillimore & L. Goodson (Eds.), *Qualitative research in tourism: Ontologies, epistemologies, and methodologies* (pp. 165–196). London: Routledge.
23. Di Matteo, Dante and Cavuta, Giacomo (2016). Enogastronomic Tourism: Can it Mitigate the Intangibility of the Destination? Streetfood as a New Business Model for the Management of Tourist Regions. December 2016 *Procedia Economics and Finance* 39:347-356 DOI: 10.1016/S2212-5671(16)30335-5 License CC BY-NC-ND 4.0
24. Erokhin, Vasily and Gao, Tianming (2020). Impacts of COVID-19 on Trade and Economic Aspects of Food Security: Evidence from 45 Developing Countries. August 2020. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 17(16):5775 DOI: 10.3390/ijerph17165775. License CC BY
25. Evers, Clifton (Editor) and Seale, Kristen (Editor). (2018). *Informal Urban Street Markets: International Perspectives*. Routledge ISBN-13: 9781138546394
26. Grivetti, Louis Evan (2002). Street Foods. February 2002. *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition* 75(2):337-338 DOI: 10.1093/ajcn/75.2.337
27. Gupta, V., Sajjani, M. and Gupta, R.K. (2019). "Street foods: contemporary preference of tourists and its role as a destination attraction in India", *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, Vol. 14 No. 1, pp. 136-154.
28. Gursoy, D. (2018). "Future of hospitality marketing and management research", *Tourism Management Perspectives*, Vol. 25, pp. 185-188.
29. Henderson, J.C. (2019). "Street food and tourism: a Southeast Asian perspective", in Park, E., Kim, S. and Yeoman, I. (Eds), *Food Tourism in Asia*, Springer, Singapore, pp. 45-57.
30. Henderson, J.C., Yun, O.S., Poon, P. and Biwei, X. (2012). "Hawker centers as tourist attractions: the case of Singapore", *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol. 31 No. 3, pp. 849-855.
31. Hossain, M. (2021). "The effect of the Covid-19 on sharing economy activities", *Journal of Cleaner Production*, Vol. 280, p. 124782

32. Jeaheng, Y. and Han, H. (2020). "Thai street food in the fast growing global food tourism industry: preference and behaviors of food tourists", *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, Vol. 45, pp. 641-655. DOI: 10.1016/j.jhtm.2020.11.001
33. Kodvanj I, Homolak J, Virag D, Trkulja V. (2020). World Health Organization (WHO) COVID-19 Database: Who needs it? Department of Pharmacology, University of Zagreb School of Medicine. July 2020 DOI: 10.20944/preprints202007.0051.v2
34. Kong, Lily (2007). *Singapore Hawker Centres: People, Places, Food*. Singapore: Publisher National Environment Agency. ISBN 9789812481498
35. Kusakabe, K. (2006). *Policy Issues in Street Vending: An Overview of Studies in Thailand, Cambodia and Mongolia, Informal Economy Poverty and Employment*, Geneva.
36. Lee, Derrick Chen, Tingzhen and Chan, Wilco (2021). Perceptions of Gen Z Tourists on Street Food in Hong Kong. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-70695-1_10 In book: *Generation Z Marketing and Management in Tourism and Hospitality*
37. Lertputtarak, S. (2012). "The relationship between destination image, food image, and revisiting Pattaya, Thailand", *International Journal of Business and Management*, Vol.7 No.5, pp.111-122
38. Liu, Z., Zhang, G. and Zhang, X. (2014). "Urban street foods in Shijiazhuang city, China: current status, safety practices and risk mitigating strategies", *Food Control*, Vol. 41 No. 1, pp. 212-218. Long-Solís, J. (2007), "A survey of street foods in Mexico city", *Food and Foodways*, Vol. 15 Nos 3-4, pp. 213-236
39. Lunchaprasith, T. and Macleod, D. (2018). "Food tourism and the use of authenticity in Thailand", *Tourism, Culture and Communication*, Vol. 18 No. 2, pp. 101-116.
40. Lusch, Robert and Nambisan, Satish (2015). *Service Innovation: A Service-Dominant Logic Perspective*. March 2015 *MIS Quarterly* 39(1):155-175 DOI: 10.25300/MISQ/2015/39.1.07
41. Mazumder, M Amin, A. Paul, RK and Riyad, RH (2020). A study on livelihood of the mongers and cognition of street food safety under Covid-19 pandemic situation in Dhaka city. December 2020. *Journal of Advanced Civil Engineering Practice and Research* 11 (December 2020):25-29
42. Matteucci, X. and Gnoth, J. (2017). "Elaborating on grounded theory in tourism research", *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 65, pp. 49-59.
43. McGee, T.G. (1973). *Hawkers in Hong Kong: A study of planning and policy in a Third World City*. Hong Kong: Centre of Asian Studies.
44. Milgram, B. Lynne (2019). (Re) fashioning Philippine street foods and vending. August 2019 *Economic Anthropology* 7(2) DOI: 10.1002/sea2.12161
45. Makalesi, Arastirma Mutlu, Havva Gözgeç and Aydemir, Burhan (2019). *WOMEN STREET FOOD VENDORS IN GASTRONOMY: A CASE STUDY*. October 2019 Gözgeç, H. ve Aydemir, B. (2019). "Gastronomide Kadın Sokak Gıda Satıcıları: Bir Örnek Olay Çalışması", *Manas Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 8 (4): 3854-3870.

46. (PDF) WOMEN STREET FOOD VENDORS IN GASTRONOMY: A CASE STUDY. Available from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/337196785_WOMEN_STREET_FOOD_VENDORS_IN_GASTRONOMY_A_CASE_STUDY [accessed Jun 30 2021].
47. Muangmee, C.; Kot, S.; Meekaewkunchorn, N.; Kassakorn, N.; Khalid, B. (2021). Factors Determining the Behavioral Intention of Using Food Delivery Apps during COVID-19 Pandemics. *Journal of Theoretical and Applied Electronic Commerce Research* 2021, 16, Page 1297–131 DOI: 10.3390/jtaer16050073
48. Nguyen, Luke (2017). *Street Food Asia: Saigon, Bangkok, Kuala Lumpur, Jakarta*. Hardie Grant Books Publisher, South Yarra, Australia. ISBN13 9781743792193
49. Nualkhair, Chawadee (2015). *Thailand's Best Street Food: The Complete Guide to StreetSide Dining in Bangkok, Chiang Mai, Phuket and Other Areas*. Tuttle Publications ISBN 9780804844666
50. Olsen, Sjúður F. (2001). Street Foods. March 2001 *BMJ Clinical Research* 322(7287) Source PubMed Central
51. Philips, Alan (2020). *Starting & Running a Food Truck Business: Everything You Need to Succeed with Your Kitchen on Wheels*, Alpha Books ISBN-13: 9781465490117
52. Pilato, Manuela; Platania, Marco; and Seraphin, Hugues (2021). Connecting Locals and Visitors: The Case of Street Food. DOI: 10.1108/978-1-80043-900-920211018 In book: *Tourism in the Mediterranean Sea*
53. Poojara, Rashmi H. (2020). Street Foods: Safety Concerns. In book: *Safety and Quality in Food supply Chain: A farm to Fork approach* Publisher: New India Publishing Agency, New Delhi
54. Privitera, D. and Nesci, F.S. (2015). "Globalization vs. Local. The role of street food in the urban food system", *Procedia Economics and Finance*, Vol. 22, pp. 716-722
55. Richards, G., (2015). Food experience as integrated destination marketing strategy, *World Food Tourism Summit in Estoril, Portugal*.
56. Rosales, Rocio (2020). *Fruteros: Street Vending, Illegality, and Ethnic Community in Los Angeles*. University of California Press ISBN-13: 9780520319851
57. Saha, D. (2011). Collective bargaining for street vendors in Mumbai: Toward promotion of social dialogue. *Journal of Workplace Rights*, 15(3-4).
58. Setboonsarng, C. Thai Siam Commercial Bank Launches Food Delivery App Amid Competition Reuters 2020
59. Sezgin, A.C. and Sanlier, N. (2016). "Street food consumption in terms of the food safety and health", *Journal of Human Science*, Vol. 13 No. 3, pp. 4072-4083
60. Simopoulos AP, Bhat RV (Eds): (2000). *Street Foods*. World Rev Nutr Diet. Basel, Karger, 2000, vol 86, pp 100-122. DOI: 10.1159/00005

61. Steyn, N.P. and Labadarios, D. (2011). "Street foods and fast foods: how much do South Africans of different ethnic groups consume?" *Ethnicity and Disease*, Vol. 21 No. 4, pp. 462-466.
62. Tan, Eunice (2020). iDabao during Covid-19: Online-to-offline (O2O) food delivery service and the digitalization of hawker (street) food during a crisis. November 2020. Conference: The 4th International Seminar on Tourism (ISOT)
63. Thakur, C.P., Mehra, R., Narula, C., Mahapatra, S. and Kalita, T.J. (2013). "Food safety and hygiene practices among street food vendors in Delhi, India", *International Journal of Current Research*, Vol. 5 No. 11, pp. 3531-3534.
64. Thompson, David (2010). *Thai Street Food*. Publisher Ten Speed Press, Berkley, CA ISBN10 158008284X ISBN13 9781580082846
65. Tigari, Harish and Shalini, S. (2020). Socio Economic Condition of Urban Street Food Vendors. June 2020. *Shanlax International Journal of Economics* 8(3) DOI: 10.34293/economics.v8i3.3193 License CC BY-SA 4.0
66. Volkova, S., Ayton, E., Porterfield, K., Corley, C.D. (2017). Forecasting influenza-like illness dynamics for military populations using neural networks and social media. *PloS one* 12(12), 0188941
67. Williams, C.C. and Horodnic, I.A. (2017). "Regulating the sharing economy to prevent the growth of the informal sector in the hospitality industry", *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 29 No. 9, pp. 2261-2278
68. Winarno, F.G. and Allain, A. (1991), "Street foods in developing countries: lessons from Asia", *Food, Nutrition and Agriculture*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 11-18
69. Yahiro, K., Toi, S. and Nagashima, Y. (2013). "The impact of street food stalls on the local economy and conditions for their sustainable management", *Memoirs of the Faculty of Engineering, Kyushu University*, Vol. 73 No. 1, pp. 1-11.
70. Yang, M.; Mamun, A.A.; Mohiuddin, M.; Nawi, N.C.; Zainol, N.R. Cashless transactions: A study on intention and adoption of e-Wallets. *Sustainability* 2021, 13, 831.
71. Yeo, V.C.S.; Goh, S.-K.; Rezaei, S. Consumer experiences, attitude and behavioral intention toward online food delivery (OFD) services. *Journal of Retail. Consumer Services* 2017, 35, 150–162.
72. Yu, Anne Shen, Angela Ryan, Michael Boulanger, Lucy (2021). Bulletin of the World Health Organization March 2021 99(3):171-171A DOI: 10.2471/BLT.21.285550
73. Zeb, Shumaila Shahwar Hussain Syed and Javed, Asma (2021). COVID-19 and a way forward for restaurants and street food vendors. January 2021 *Cogent Business & Management* 8(1):1923359. DOI: 10.1080/23311975.2021.1923359 License CC BY 4.0
74. Zhao, Y.; Bacao, F. What factors determining customer continuingly using food delivery apps during 2019 novel coronavirus pandemic period? *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 2020, 91, 102683.

75. Zinecker, M.; Doubravský, K.; Balcerzak, A.P.; Pietrzak, M.B.; Dohnal, M. The Covid-19 Disease and Policy Response to Mitigate the Economic Impact in the EU: An Exploratory Study Based on Qualitative Trend Analysis. Technol. Econ. Dev. Econ. 2021

UNDER PEER REVIEW