

## **The Extent and Impact of People’s Participation in Local Development Planning: The Suratthani Municipality Thailand Experience**

Teerawat Prompen  
**Thailand**

Joselito D. De la Rosa  
**University of Northern Philippines**

### **ABSTRACT**

*This study assessed the extent and impact of people’s participation in local development planning of Suratthani Municipality, Thailand. It employed a descriptive-correlational method which involved 399 respondents from six areas of Suratthani, Thailand. A questionnaire-checklist was used to gather data. Ethical protocols were observed. Frequency count and percentage, mean and multiple linear regression analysis were used to treat the data. The study reveals that majority of the respondents are male, middle-aged, high school graduates, receiving a modest monthly income, almost all are Buddhist and all are non – members of any organization. Further, it shows high level of incentive factors which encouraged people to participate in the development planning, high level of people participation in Local Development Planning and high level of impact on people’s participation in Local Development Planning. The level of people’s participation in local development planning is not influenced by the incentive factors and profile of the respondents. The impact is significantly influenced by the level of people’s participation in local development planning. Respondents are encouraged to pursue college level to improve their skills and knowledge with the hope to contribute more in the local development planning. The high level of incentive factors which encouraged people to participate in the local development planning may be maintained. The high level of people’s participation in the local development planning may be sustained. A similar study may be undertaken to include other variables not included in the study.*

**Keywords:** *empowered leaders, incentives for participation, programs and projects, organizations*

### **INTRODUCTION**

Suratthani, formerly Chaiya Province is the largest of the southern provinces (Changwat). It was named by Rama VI. Suratthani means “city of good people”. The province has one city (thesaban nakhon), three towns (thesaban mueang), and 24 sub-district municipalities (thesaban tambon). There are also 109 tambon administrative authorities (TAO), responsible for the non-municipal areas.

The current ability of Thai municipalities to facilitate local development planning is relatively poor (Ing, 2010). The weakness of the municipality in its authority and ability translates to state dominance of local decisions in local public affairs. When central government retains key powers in localities, local development planning becomes less relevant as important local issues are decided externally. Thailand has a considerable history of centralized state control (commencing in the late 1890s) within which central administrations have often attempted to undermine local governments. Consequently, local administrations are typically weak and have no major role in local development, which in turn contributes to failures of local participatory planning (Chaowarat, 2010). It is considered as one of the major problems. The need to determine development planning and management has become a recurring issue in the plans and policies of developing nations and international agencies in recent years. With the changing concentration on development strategies toward promoting more socially equitable economic growth and meeting the basic needs of the poorest groups in developing countries, wide spread participation in decision-making as a means of facilitating that participation becomes urgent.

Similar to other developing nations, Thailand has experimented with several approaches to rural development in an attempt to accelerate the pace of development in the rural areas. In brief, Thailand's rural development planning and program formulation during the past four national development plans (October 1961 – September 1981) tended to rest with the central planning agency, various ministries, and departments in Bangkok. Though at the beginning and the end of the Fourth National – Economic and Social Development Plan (October 1976-September 1981) the Thai Governments began to realize the increasing importance of decentralization in rural development, in practice there was no consensus among them as to how much and to whom they should decentralize.

One of the problems of Thailand that surfaced is the nature of planning which is characterized as top-down. Despite efforts toward decentralized planning, to some degree, in the formulation of the National Rural Development Program (NRDP), the new rural development policy still retains the features of a centralized policy framework as well as budget allocation. This can be seen from the fact that all provinces were requested to formulate their rural projects within the standard policy frameworks of the four main ministries and submit them to the central administration for final approval. This means that various projects continue to be inconsistent with assorted real needs at the village level.

The second problem is the lack of people's participation in the planning process. Under the new rural development policy, people's participation is strengthened significantly so as to play an active role in the development process as a whole and in specific project planning. However, it was found out that village

people and their local representative body do not perform the expected role in reality, especially at certain planning stages, i.e., project identification, selection and evaluation.

Pongponrat (2011) in his study showed the innovative approach of adapting the community participation concept to diverse local conditions. The process of community participation was evaluated to understand the method and practice of the community. It was also mentioned that people should participate starting from the planning to its completion.

The third problem is time constraint. With a view to time scheduling by the central administration for the purpose of plan formulation in provincial development planning, it is obvious that several steps in the planning exercise are to be undertaken within a relatively short period. When considering the 1983 calendar for provincial development planning fixed by the NRDC, which schedule several steps of central government coordination, involving eight months of operation, the subnational bodies at Tambon district and provincial levels are required to finish their plans within four months. As far as length of time is concerned, the period set for the formulation of Tambon district and provincial development plans is too short.

Development means “improvement in country’s economic and social conditions”. More specially, it refers to improvements in way of managing an area’s natural and human resources in order to create wealth and improve people’s lives. It is a multidimensional process which involves major changes in institutions and structures with the aim of eliminating absolute poverty. It is the process of improving the quality of all human lives (Todaro, 1981). Dennis Goulet went a step further and indicated life sustenance, self – esteem and freedom of choice as the three core values of development for Individuals and societies. It envisions a state of life regarded as spiritually and materially better. Moreover, development encompasses not only the reorganization and reorientation of the entire economic and social systems but also includes radical changes as well in social, administrative structures, beliefs, attitudes and even customs and traditions. According to Balten as cited by Sukhonthashaya (2005), development connotes change for the better.

People living in good welfare include physically healthy, standards of access to public services and amenities, employment opportunities to enable them to have income and right to participate in decisions that affect their lives. The objectives of development are equity and the improvement of the quality of life.

Self – esteem is the extent to which people have pride in themselves and their capabilities. Individuals with high esteem think they are generally capable and worthy people who can deal with most situations. Individuals with low self – esteem

question their self – worth, doubt their capabilities, and are apprehensive about their ability to succeed in different endeavors. Self – esteem influences people’s choice of activities and jobs. Individuals with high self – esteem are more likely than with low self – esteem to choose challenging careers and jobs.

People have opportunities to participate in the political process. Rights of the community, voters and citizens are guaranteed. Political development can help increase bargaining power of NGOs and the people vis – a – vis the government. Civil society, as a whole, can push for more environmental acceptance of people’s opinions and become policies.

Participation is a very broad concept that means different things to different people. The term is often used by people with different ideological positions, who give very different meanings. Participation is an ideologically contested concept which produces a range of competing meanings and applications. The result is a variety of views on how participation is defined, whom it is expected to involve, what it is expected to achieve, and how it is to be brought about (Lane 1995).

According to Poudyal L. (1999), the vagueness and lack of conceptualization of the concepts of participation and empowerment cause confusion over expectations and over the evaluation of outcomes of the participatory development process. One commonality to all definitions is the role of community in decision-making. As such, participation is often referred to as community participation. Many definitions of participation hint at the participation continuum and the various levels of community involvement. Some definitions focus on other aspects such as the involvement of all stakeholders, at all stages of development; on outcomes; on empowerment; and on the important role of disadvantaged groups particularly women and the poor (Oakley, 1989).

The concept of popular participation was broadly conceived: popular participation does not only require the creation of opportunities for political involvement but the adoption of measures that would enable ordinary people to share fully in the development process.

In general, participation is understood as a process and not as static phenomenon. However, it is still controversial whether participation is a means or an end of development, although it is maintained that this divergence can be reconciled (Bhaduri and Rahman 1982). Sometimes participation can be an end in itself, or it can be a means of to another goal of development (Buijs and Galjart 1982, pp. 2-3). Participation of people in decision-making and local development planning is in the various phases of governmental management such as planning, implementation and evaluation of programs and projects that fulfil some stated policies. People are considered as the semi bottom-up model in decision-making. It

is important to use the lessons on the inability of the previous decision-making structure to ensure response to local need and effective coordination in the use of resources for rural development in each province and political pressures on the government for increased local participation in the development planning. To formulate the provincial development plan, the Provincial Development Committee usually identified local needs and problems from the resolutions made by the Tambon Council, the Sanitary Districts, the Municipalities, including opinions obtained from members of the Provincial Council district officers, and chiefs of the sub districts.

With decentralization in place, there is a need to conduct a formal study. Hence, this investigation determined the extent and impact of people's participation in local development planning in Suratthani. Specifically , it determined the following: socio- demographic profile of respondents in terms of sex, age, religion ,educational attainment, memberships in organizations, and monthly income; level of incentive factors that encouraged people to participate in development planning;level of people participation in local development planning; impact of people's participation in local development planning and the influence of the level of participation of the people in local development planning on incentive implementation and profile of respondents.

The findings of the study would serve as baseline data which can be used by authorities in the formulation of policies that would further enhance people's participation in development planning especially in Suratthani, Thailand. Data generated would help enrich the literature of public administration.

In the study of Samah and Aref (2009) the people's participation in community development activities is viewed as a method by which people are involved in planning, initiating, deciding, implementing and managing the activities. It is also a process of developing their social aspect in their own environment, seek out ways and means to meet their needs and expectations and surmount their difficulties and problems. In the pursuit of this collective action, the self-help and mutual-help spirit that underlies the Asian traditional community spirit of working, helped in achieving shared interests through group-based-activities. Thus, by understanding this collective action in which people participate, it is possible to comprehend the dynamic aspect of the group process within which planning and participation took place.

## **METHODOLOGY**

The descriptive-correlational method was employed in the study which involved 399 respondents selected through stratified random sampling from six areas of Suratthani. Through the use of Slovin's formula, the sample size was

determined. Thereafter, proportional allocation was employed to determine the sample size per area/stratum. The descriptive method was employed through the use of questionnaire and the presentation of the summary of descriptive measures while the correlational method was done to determine the significant influence of input on output variables and consequently the significant influence of output to impact variables.

Ethical protocols and consideration in the conduct of the research were observed. There was no conflict of interest between the researchers and the respondents. Respondents' identity were not divulged in the research report as codes were used to identify the respondents in the questionnaire. Respondents were informed and requested to provide data in the questionnaires without undue pressure and coercion. In terms of vulnerability, most of the respondents are adults who are in a stable and mature position to participate. Answered questionnaires were kept in a locked steel cabinet. After one year, they were shredded and disposed.

Data were tabulated and interpreted through the aid of statistical tools such as frequency count and percentage, mean and multiple linear regression analysis.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### **Socio-demographic profile of residents**

Majority of the respondents are male while a great percentage are female. In terms of age, majority of the respondents are middle aged while the least are between 20 – 30 years old. On religion, almost all of the respondents are Buddhist while the least are Islam. Understandably, Thailand is predominantly a Buddhist country. On educational attainment, majority of the respondents are high school graduates while a great percentage are elementary graduates. All of the respondents are not members in any organization. As to income, majority of the respondents are receiving a modest monthly income while the least have low monthly income.

### **On incentives for participation**

Table 1 reveals that along the level of incentive factors, the respondents obtained an overall mean rating of 4.16 with a descriptive rating of "High". This may imply that the incentive factors for people participation are somewhat effective and beneficial for both the respondents and the local development planning. This finding is confirmed by Adhikari, Kingi and Ganesh (2014) that access to benefits and enforcement of legal property rights are identified as the key influential incentives that determine the effective participation of people in resource governance.

**On Social Activities.** It can be seen from the table that respondents attained an overall mean rating of 4.22 with a descriptive rating of “Strongly Agree”. Taken singly, item 3 *“People are interested in taking part in decisions especially on matters that affect them”* got the highest mean rating of 4.36 described as “Strongly Agree”. Marume, Ndudzo and Chikasha (2016) concluded in their study that people’s participation is a very essential element in decision and policy making in order to attain the set goals. Item 2 *“People are interested in the organizational aspect of the participatory process such as organizing group meetings and leading discussions”* obtained the lowest mean rating of 4.12 described as “Agree”. This may indicate that people are more interested to participate in the local government planning with matters that involve them.

**On Projects.** The respondents rated themselves with an overall mean rating of 4.23 described as “Strongly Agree”. Item 1 *“The project is interesting because it is a new project”* got the highest mean rating of 4.52 with a descriptive rating of “Strongly Agree” which appears that it is the best motivator. On the other hand, item 2 *“The project idea came from the people themselves”* obtained the lowest mean rating of 3.74 described as “Agree”. This implies that people tend to participate in the local development planning if they feel that the projects are interesting. In addition, Wodajo (2014 et al.) mentioned that projects must be advertised publicly so that people generally are not left in the dark as is often the complaint so they could give inputs for the improvement of the projects.

**On Organizational Direction.** The respondents obtained an overall mean rating of 4.09 with a descriptive rating of “Agree”. Separately, item 1 *“Allocation of resources is in accordance with government plans and needs of the people”* obtained the highest mean rating of 4.25 described as “Strongly Agree” while item 2 *“Government encourages the people to participate”* got the lowest mean rating of 3.90 described as “Agree”. This may mean that the government has to exert more efforts in encouraging people to participate in development planning.

**On Empowered Local Leaders.** The respondents obtained an overall mean rating of 4.12 which is described as “Agree”. Item 1 *“Local leaders work best with the people in the community”* obtained the highest mean rating of 4.34 described as “Strongly Agree” This is confirmed by the study of Mollel (2010), he stated that the link between participation and development can be seen as a part of the broad concept of ‘democratic decentralisation’, which puts much emphasis on the links between people and local governments as a strategy for development. On the other hand, item 3 *“Local leaders have high regard for organizational efficiency, personal growth of subordinates and allocation of responsibilities”* has the lowest mean rating of 3.83 described as “Agree”. The data tend to imply that leaders have an ordinary influence on the extent of people participation in the local planning development process.

**Table 1**  
**Item mean ratings on the levels of the incentive factors which encouraged people to participate in development planning**

INCENTIVES OF PARTICIPATION	Mean	DR
<b>A. Social Activities</b>		
1. People have the interest to join group gatherings	4.14	A
2. People are interested in the organizational aspect of the participatory process such as organizing group meetings and leading discussions	4.12	A
3. People are interested in taking part in decisions especially on matters that affect them	4.36	SA
4. Participation creates a feeling of cooperation among the community people.	4.26	SA
Overall	4.22	SA
<b>B. Projects</b>		
1. The project is interesting because it is a new project	4.52	SA
2. The project idea came from the people themselves	3.74	A
3. The project benefits the community people	4.50	SA
4. The project solves some community problems	4.16	A
Overall	4.23	SA
<b>C. Organizational Direction</b>		
1. Allocation of resources is in accordance with government plans and needs of the people.	4.25	SA
2. Government encourages the people to participate	3.90	A
3. Promotion greater cooperation with NGO to reduce government project	4.12	A
Overall	4.09	A
<b>D. Empowered Local Leaders</b>		
1. Local leaders work best with the people in the community	4.34	SA
2. Local leaders make the decision and gives the orders	4.03	A
3. Local leaders have high regard for organizational efficiency, personal growth of subordinates and allocation of responsibilities.	3.83	A
4. Local leaders have confidence in the subordinates	4.27	SA
Overall	4.12	A
Grand Mean	4.16	H

Norm:

Statistical Range	Item	Descriptive Rating
4.21-5.00	Strongly Agree (SA)	Very High (VH)
3.41-4.20	Agree (A)	High (H)
2.61-3.40	Undecided (U)	Average (A)
1.81-2.60	Disagree (D)	Low (L)
1.0-180	Strongly Disagree (SD)	Very Low (VL)

### On local development planning

Table 2 shows that along level of participation in local development planning, the respondents got an overall mean rating of 3.97 with a descriptive



**Table 2**  
**Item mean ratings on the level of people participation**  
**in local development planning**

Items	Mean	DR
<b>A. Formulation of Goals and Objectives</b>		
1. The goals and objectives of the plan were made known to the people	4.14	A
2. The community people were asked to give suggestion on what goals/objectives should be pursued.	3.84	A
3. The suggestions of the people were included in the formulation of development goals and objectives	3.65	A
Overall	3.87	A
<b>B. Preparation of Plan</b>		
1. The people were involved in the identification of priority programs and projects.	4.04	A
2. The people are asked to identify development problems, needs and concerns.	4.18	A
3. The people were asked to extend technical support.	3.91	A
4. The people were involved in the identification of budget and fiscal requirements.	4.45	SA
5. There is public consultation with respect to the plan.	3.71	A
Overall	4.06	A
<b>C. Approval of Plan</b>		
1. There is public hearing with respect to planned activities.	4.09	A
2. The people are involved in the publication and dissemination of the project approval.	3.83	A
3. The approval of the project is mostly done at the higher level	4.14	A
4. The government follows a systematic approval procedure	4.04	A
5. Project approval is done in a laborious manner.	3.94	A
Overall	4.01	A
<b>D. Implementation of Plan</b>		
1. The people are allowed to coordinate with line agencies for the implementation of projects	3.67	A
2. The people are involved in the actual implementation of projects in the community	3.69	A
3. The people provide manual labor for the implementation of community projects	4.51	SA
4. The people are involved in solving problems that emerged during the implementation of projects.	3.85	A
Overall	3.93	A
Grand Mean	3.97	A

Norm:

Statistical Range	Descriptive Rating	Overall
4.21-5.00	Strongly Agree (SA)	Very High (VH)
3.41-4.20	Agree (A)	High (H)
2.61-3.40	Undecided (U)	Average (A)
1.81-2.60	Disagree (D)	Low (L)
1.0-180	Strongly Disagree (SD)	Very Low (VL)

rating of “Agree”. This may indicate that the participation of people to the local development planning is relatively high. Wodajo, Yoadom and Asfaw (2014) mentioned that people’s participation in planning is essential for community

development. It is the cornerstone of local development, a universally-accepted concept in empowering people.

**On Formulation of Goals and Objectives.** The respondents have an overall mean rating of 3.87 described as “Agree”. Separately, item 1 *“The goals and objectives of the plan were made known to the people”* obtained the highest mean rating of 4.14 described as “Agree” while item 3 *“The suggestions of the people were included in the formulation of development goals and objectives”* obtained the lowest mean rating of 3.84 described as “Agree”. This may show that people help realize the goals and objectives of local development planning if the plans are known to them prior to its implementation.

**On Preparation of Plan.** The respondents obtained an overall mean rating of 4.06 with a descriptive rating of “Agree”. On the other hand, taking singly, item 4 *“The people were involved in the identification of budget and fiscal requirements”* has the highest mean rating of 4.45 which is described as “Strongly Agree” while item 5 *“There is public consultation with respect to the plan”* got the lowest mean rating of 3.71 described as “Agree”. This may mean that when it comes to financial matters, people are interested to participate. Wodajo et al. (2014) added that a project should consist of an optimum set of investment-oriented actions based on strategic planning. It should include combination of human and material resources.

**On Approval of Plan.** The respondents obtained an overall mean rating of 4.01 labelled as “Agree”. Individually, item 3 *“The approval of the project is mostly done at the higher level”* obtained the highest mean rating of 4.14 described as “Agree” while item 2 *“The people are involved in the publication and dissemination of the project approval”* obtained the lowest mean rating of 3.83 described as “Agree”. This could mean that most of the projects being approved are not well disseminated to the people.

**On Implementation of Plan.** The respondents have an overall mean rating of 3.93 described as “Agree”. Singly, item 3 *“The people provide manual labor for the implementation of community projects”* obtained the highest mean rating of 4.51 described as “Strongly Agree” while item 1, *“The people are allowed to coordinate with line agencies for the implementation of projects”* obtained the lowest mean rating of 3.67 described as “Agree”. This could mean that people strongly participate in the implementation of projects by rendering manual labor.

### **On impacts of people participation**

Table 3 reveals that along impact of people participation in local development planning, the respondents obtained an overall mean rating of 3.91 with a descriptive rating of “High”. This may imply that the respondents believe that there is a high level of impact of people participation which means that people’s

**Table 3**

**Item mean ratings on the impact of people’s participation in local development planning**

Items	Mean	DR
<b>A. Attitudes of People</b>		
1. The government should take sole responsibility for planning and implementing all development projects	4.13	A
2. Members of the community do not like to work together	4.07	A
3. Members of the community should be involved because they know more about local problems than the experts	3.72	A
4. It is the duty of all members of the community to participate in development programs	3.75	A
5. The community people should identify their own needs as basis of the government in providing services	4.16	A
6. The community development programs succeed without the help of the outside experts	4.04	A
Overall	3.98	A
<b>B. Quality of Life</b>		
<b>People’s participation:</b>	3.73	A
1. Promotes development of local economies		
2. Promotes public utilities, facility systems and information infrastructure in the locality	3.69	A
3. Results to more responsive projects	3.74	A
4. Improves the standards of living of the people in the community.	4.27	SA
5. Unites the people	4.53	SA
6. Contributes to community modernization and progress	3.79	A
Overall	3.96	A
<b>C. Benefits of Participation</b>		
1. Group Participation reduces individual workload	4.22	SA
2. People participation is helpful to the government for the successful implementation of programs	3.74	A
3. People participation helps the government save time and money	3.82	A
4. People participation improves efficiency and accessibility of projects	3.71	A
5. People participation improves awareness of the people on the existence of government projects/programs	3.40	A
Overall	3.78	A
<b>D. Disadvantages of Participation</b>		
1. Involvement of the people may delay the implementation of government projects	3.62	A
2. Programs/projects may not be in accordance with the goals of the national government	3.60	A
3. Projects might not meet standards because of the lack of technical knowledge of the people	4.47	SA
4. More problems might arise during project implementation because of too many people involved	3.64	A
5. It might cause conflict among the people because each group will insist on the kind of project that they want.	4.35	SA
Overall	3.93	A
Grand Mean	3.91	H

Norm:

Statistical Range	Descriptive Rating	
	Item	Overall
4.21-5.00	Strongly Agree (SA)	Very High (VH)
3.41-4.20	Agree (A)	High (H)
2.61-3.40	Undecided (U)	Average (A)
1.81-2.60	Disagree (D)	Low (L)
1.0-1.80	Strongly Disagree (SD)	Very Low (VL)

involvement in governmental activities significantly affects their lives. Adhikari et al. (2014) stated that people’s active participation in any project is instrumental in achieving successful and sustainable management.

On Attitude of People. The respondents got an overall mean rating of 3.98 with a descriptive rating of “Agree”. Taken singly, item 5 “The community people

should identify their own needs as basis of the government in providing services” obtained the highest mean rating of 4.16 described as “Agree” while item 3 “Members of the community should be involved because they know more about local problems than the experts” obtained the lowest mean rating of 3.72 described as “Agree”.

### On local people’s participation

On Quality of Life. The respondents obtained an overall mean rating of 3.96 with a descriptive rating of “Agree”. Singly, item 5 “Unites the people” obtained the highest mean rating of 4.53 described as “Strongly Agree” while item 2 “Promotes public utilities, facility systems and information infrastructure in the locality” obtained the lowest mean rating of 3.69 described as “Agree”. This implies that the people participation has a high impact on bringing a good quality of life for it unites people and the community as a whole.

On Benefits of Participation. The respondents obtained an overall mean rating of 3.78 with a descriptive rating of “Agree”. When taken individually, item 1 “Group Participation reduces individual workload” acquired the highest mean rating of 4.22 described as “Strongly Agree” while item 5 “People participation improves awareness of the people on the existence of government projects/programs” has the lowest mean rating of 3.40 described as “Undecided”. This implies that if people commit themselves to participate, the more it is lighter and easier to work. Wodajo et al. (2014) mentioned that best result is achieved when all people participate and help actively in all stages of development process of a project cycle.

**Table 4**  
**Regression analysis of the level of participation of the people in local development planning on the incentive implementation and the profile of the respondents**

	Beta	t-value	t-prob
<b>Profile of the Respondents</b>			
Sex	-.054	-1.143	.254
Age	.035	.693	.488
Religion	.125	2.916	.004
Educational attainment	.064	1.350	.178
Income	.189	3.788	.000
<b>Incentive of Participation</b>			
Social Activities	-.001	-.026	.979
Projects	-.046	-.998	.319
Organizational Directions	.257	4.935	.000
Empowered Local Leaders	.265	5.187	.000

MultR = .558    F-ratio = 22.014\*\*  
 RSq = .311    F-prob = .000

On Disadvantage of Participation. The respondents gave an overall mean rating of 3.93 labelled as “Agree”. Individually, item 3 “Projects might not meet standards because of the lack of technical knowledge of the people” obtained the highest mean rating of 4.47 described as “Strongly Agree” while item 2 “Programs/projects may not be in accordance with the goals of the national government” obtained the lowest mean rating of 3.60 described as “Agree”. This may indicate that unity is not a guarantee for a project to become successful. The people need to be of high level of education to acquire technical knowledge in order for his / her participation become beneficial and acknowledged.

Multiple linear regression analysis was utilized to test the null hypothesis, which states that the level of participation of people in local development planning is not influenced by the profile of the respondents and their level of incentive factors at .05 level of significance. The result of the analysis exhibited a significant regression as backed up by an F-value of 22.014 with a probability level of 0.0000. This means that at least one of the independent variables (profile) influenced the dependent variable (level of participation). With reference to the regression table summary, religion (t=2.916), income (t=3.788), organizational directions (t=4.935), and empowered local leaders (t=5.187) which indicates that these are good predictors of participation.

Further, the independent variables when combined and correlated with the dependent variable showed a moderate relationship as presented by the Mult R value of .558. The coefficient of determination (RSq) is .311 which means that the independent variables contributed only 31.1% of the variation on the level of people participation while the remaining 68.9% of the variance could be explained by other variables not considered in the study.

This implies that demographic profiles and incentives for participations are not good predictors of the level of participation of people in local development planning.

**Table 5**  
**Regression analysis of the impact of the people participation on the local development planning**

Variables	Beta	t-value	t-prob
Formulation of Goals and Objectives	.035	.441	.659
Preparation of Plan	-.087	-1.235	.218
Approval of Plan	.358	5.078**	.000
Implementation of Plan	.008	.064	.949

MultR = .354    F-ratio = 14.112\*\*  
 RSq = .125    F-prob = .000

The result of the regression exhibited an F-ratio of 14.112 with a probability level of .000, which indicates a highly statistically significant regression. This means that at least one of the activities of local development planning has a significant influence on the impact of people participation. This is along “approval of plan” which showed an t-value of 5.078 with a probability level of 0.000. This is an indication that approval of the plan is a good predictor of the impact of people participation.

Moreover, when the independent variables are taken together and correlated with the impact, a moderate relationship is obtained (MultR = .354). The coefficient of determination (RSq = .125) indicates that only 12.5% is accounted for the variation of the activities in local development planning on the impact variable while 87.5% is accounted for the variables not included in the study.

### **CONCLUSIONS**

Majority of the respondents are male, middle-aged, high school graduates, receiving a monthly income between 5,001 – 10,000 baht. Almost all respondents are Buddhist and all are non – members of any organization. As to the level of incentive factors, people are encouraged to participate in development planning because the effects are beneficial to them. On the level of people participation in local development planning, people take active part in the realization of the goals and objectives of local development planning. On the level of impact of people’s participation in local development planning, respondents have the perception that participation produces positive results. The level of participation of the people in local development planning is not significantly influenced by the incentive for participation and profile of the respondents which may imply that said variables are not good predictors for people’s participation in development planning. The impact is significantly influenced by the level of people’s participation on local development planning. This connotes that people’s participation in development planning is a good predictor on the impact of participation.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The pursuance of higher studies and participation to trainings and seminars may be of great help in enhancing the skills and knowledge of respondents in local development planning. The maintenance of the high level of incentive factors which stimulate people’s participation in development planning is encouraged. A similar study to include other variables not included in the study is highly recommended.

## LITERATURE CITED

- Adhikari, S., Kingi, T. & Ganesh S. (2014). Incentives for community participation in the governance and management of common property resources: The case of community forest management. Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/262691367\\_Incentives\\_for\\_community\\_participation\\_in\\_the\\_governance\\_and\\_management\\_of\\_common\\_property\\_resources\\_The\\_case\\_of\\_community\\_forest\\_management\\_in\\_Nepal](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/262691367_Incentives_for_community_participation_in_the_governance_and_management_of_common_property_resources_The_case_of_community_forest_management_in_Nepal)
- Bhaduri, A. & Rahman, A. (1982). Studies in rural participation New Delhi: Oxford.
- Buijs, D. & Galjart, B. (1982). Introduction in participation of the poor in development Benno aijart and Dieke Buijs (ed), Leien: Institute of Cultural and Social Studies, University of Leiden.
- Chaowarat, P. (2010). Participatory planning in municipal development in Thailand. Dissertation, Technical University of Berlin. Retrieved from <https://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:f53D0JF0N78J:https://d-nb.info/1003605915/34+&cd=1&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=ph>
- Lane, J. (1995). Non-governmental organizations and participatory development: the concept in theory versus the concept in practice. In 'power and participatory development'. Intermediate Technology Publications: London.
- Marume, Ndudzo & Chikasha (2016). People's participation in the administrative process. Retrieved from [https://www.ijbmi.org/papers/Vol\(5\)9/version-3/J05936568.pdf](https://www.ijbmi.org/papers/Vol(5)9/version-3/J05936568.pdf)
- Mollel, H. A. (2010). Participation for local development: The reality of decentralization in Tanzania. *African Studies Collection*, vol. 29. Retrieved from <https://openaccess.leidenuniv.nl/bitstream/handle/1887/16269/ASC-075287668-2792-01.pdf?sequence=2>
- Oakley, P. (1989). Community involvement in health development: an examination of some critical issues. World Health Organization (WHO), Geneva, 1989.

- Pongponrat, K. (2011). Participatory management process in local tourism development: A case study on fisherman village on Samui Island, Thailand. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, Vol. 16, No. 1. Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/254240483\\_Participatory\\_Management\\_Process\\_in\\_Local\\_Tourism\\_Development\\_A\\_Case\\_Study\\_on\\_Fisherman\\_Village\\_on\\_Samui\\_Island\\_Thailand](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/254240483_Participatory_Management_Process_in_Local_Tourism_Development_A_Case_Study_on_Fisherman_Village_on_Samui_Island_Thailand)
- Poudyal, L. P. (1999). People's involvement in planned district development through decentralization in Nepal Bangkok. *Asian Institute of Technology (AIT) Doctoral Dissertation*, HS-90-2.
- Samah, A. A. & Aref, F. (2009). People's Participation in Community Development: A Case Study in a Planned Village Settlement in Malaysia. *World Rural Observations*, Vol. 1, No. 2. Retrieved from [http://www.sciencepub.net/rural/0102/wro09\\_0102\\_07\\_45\\_54.pdf](http://www.sciencepub.net/rural/0102/wro09_0102_07_45_54.pdf)
- Sukhonthashaya, T. (2005). Development orientation and performance of the SAO Mayors in Nakaonnayok, Province, Thailand. Doctoral Dissertation. UNP, Vigan City.
- Todaro, M. P. (1981). *Economic development in the third world*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. USA: Longman Group Limited.
- United Nations (1988). Report of the study on the organizational issues in community participation in national family planning programs: A comparative analysis office countries in the ESCAP region.
- Wodajo D., Yiadom, K. & Asfaw M. (2014). Improving people's participation In Local Development Project: A case of urban local government in Oromia. Retrieved from <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/234681625.pdf>

### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

The authors extend their profound thanks to the University of Northern Philippines administration; the Suratthani municipality especially to the respondents of the various Tambons namely; Talad, Makhamtei, Bangbaimai, Bangchana, Bangkok and Klongchanak and to professors who gave their comments and suggestions for the refinement of this research work. Gratitude is likewise due to the University Research and Development Office for its publication. Above all, they give thanks to the Almighty for his infinite goodness without whom, this piece of work would not have been possible.