

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The findings or the results of the study, from 356 questionnaires of LRHs at Tambon Paklok, 3 in-depth interview forms with officers in TPLAO are discussed in this chapter. The data was analyzed with both a quantitative and qualitative approach. The quantitative data was derived from questionnaires about the benefits of Tambon Paklok residents from the Tambon Paklok 3LDP, the perspectives of Tambon Paklok local resident households (LRH) toward Tambon Paklok tourism development, the current tourism knowledge and experiences of LRH, and perspectives of LRH in Tambon Paklok.

The statistics were presented in forms of tables, figures, and charts. The data was analyzed by using the descriptive statistics such as mean and %. The tools for analysis, were the software package SPSS for Window version 11.0 (Copyright 1989-2001). Qualitative data was derived from the in-depth interview forms regarding to local tourism plans, carrying capacity, tourism indicators development, and the problems of local tourism development are presented in the conclusion section.

- 4.1 Perspective of Local Resident Households
 - 4.1.1 Characteristics of the sample group
 - 4.1.2 General information on the respondents
 - 4.1.3 Benefits from Tambon Paklok 3-year local development plan
 - 4.1.4 The participation in tourism site planning and management
 - 4.1.5 Benefits from Tambon Paklok tourism
 - 4.1.6 The tourism knowledge and experience
 - 4.1.7 suggestions of Local Resident Households
- 4.2 Perspective of Officer of TPLAO
 - 4.2.1 Tambon Paklok tourism site development
 - 4.2.2 The obstacles of tourism site development at Tambon Paklok
 - 4.2.3 The development projects for tourism development
 - 4.2.4 Tourism education and training for Local Resident Households
 - 4.2.5 Tourism income in the Tambon Paklok community

- 4.2.6 The appropriate tourism benefit to Local Resident Households
- 4.2.7 Acknowledgement and encouragement of sustainable tourism
- 4.2.8 The development of local development indicators
- 4.2.9 The Local Resident Households' demand for local development
- 4.2.10 The current problems from tourism

4.1 Perspective of Local Resident Households (LRHs)

There were 356 questionnaires in Thai which were used for the quantitative analysis of this research. They were collected from the sample group of LRHs at Tambon Paklok as mentioned in Chapter 3. The results are presented as follows:

4.1.1 Characteristics of the sample group

The sample groups consisted of 356 LRHs at Tambon Paklok as shown in Table 4.1. They were 17.1 % of **Paklok village**, 16.6 % of **Bangrong village**, 15.4 % of **Para village**, 15.2 % of **Bangla village**, 12.6 % of **Pakcheed village**, 10.7 % of **Aow por village**, 5.9 % of **Yamu village**, 5.1 % of **Aow Kung village**, and 1.4 % of **Kor Naka village** respectively.

Table 4.1 Sample group of LRHs in each village

Villages of TP	Frequency	%	Valid %	Cumulative %
Pakcheed Village	45	12.6	12.6	12.6
Paklok Village	61	17.1	17.1	29.8
Bangrong	59	16.6	16.6	46.3

Village				
Para Village	55	15.4	15.4	61.8
Kor Naka Village	5	1.4	1.4	61.8
Aow Por Village	38	10.7	10.7	63.2
Yamu Village	21	5.9	5.9	73.9
Bangla Village	54	15.2	15.2	79.8
Aow Kung Village	18	5.1	5.1	94.9
Total	356	100.0	100.0	100.0

4.1.2 General information on the respondents

Table 4.2 shows gender, status, age, education level, religion, career, and Monthly income of respondents.

Females accounted for 60.4 % and 39.6 % for **Males**. Status of respondents were **Married** (50.6 %), **Single** (42.4 %), **Divorce or widow** (7 %) respectively. Ages of local people were **21-30 years old** (33.1 %), **31-40 years old** (25.6 %), **under 20 years old** (20.2 %), **41-50 years old** (13.2 %), **51-60 years old** (5.3 %) and **over 60 years old** (2.5 %).

As for the education level of respondents, it showed that **High school** was the highest level (34.3 %) followed by **Diploma** (29.2 %), **Primary school** (22.5 %), **Bachelor degree** (12.4 %), **Higher than Bachelor degree** (1.7 %). Religion showed, **Muslim** was the highest % (71.3 %), followed by **Buddhist** (27.5 %), **Christian** (0.8 %), and **others** (0.3 %).

The careers of LRHs at Tambon Paklok mostly were **General employments**(32 %), the rests were **Students** (25 %), **Husbands or housewives** (14 %), **Business owners** (13.8 %), **Private sector officers** (7.3 %), **Agricultures** (5.6 %), **Government officers** (1.1 %), **Retired** and **Others** combined together at 1.2 %.

Monthly income showed **5,001-10,000 Baht** (37.9 %), **No income** and **Lower than 5,000 Baht** combined together at 50.6 %, **10,001-20,000 Baht** (5.9 %), **More than 30,000 Baht** (3.7 %), and **20,001-30,000 Baht** (2 %) respectively.

Table 4.2 Personal data of respondent

Characteristics	Frequency	%
Gender		
Males	141	39.6
Females	215	60.4
Total	356	100.0
Status		
Single	151	42.4
Married	180	50.6
Divorce/Widow	25	7.0
Total	356	100.0
Age		
Under 20	72	20.2
21-30	118	33.1
31-40	91	25.6
41-50	47	13.2
51-60	19	5.3
Over 60	9	2.5
Total	356	100.0
Education Level		
Primary School	80	22.5
High School	122	34.3
Diploma	104	29.2
Bachelor Degree	44	12.4
Higher than Bachelor Degree	6	1.7
Total	356	100.0

Table 4.2 (Continued)

	Characteristics
	Frequency
	%
Religion	
Buddhist	98 27.5
Muslim	254 71.3
Christian	3 .8
Others	1 .3
Total	356 100.0
Career	
Agriculture	20

	5.6
Business owner	49 13.8
Retired	2 .6
Private Sector Officer	26 7.3
Housewife/Husband	50 14.0
Labor	114 32
Government Officer	4 1.1
Student	89 25.0
Others	2 .6
Total	

	356
	100.0
Monthly Income	
No income	
	90
	25.3
Lower than 5,000	
	90
	25.3
5,001-10,000	
	135
	37.9
10,001-20,000	
	21
	5.9
20,001-30,000	
	7
	2.0
More than 30,000	
	13
	3.7
Total	
	356
	100.0

4.1.3 Benefits from Tambon Paklok 3-year local development plan

The purpose of these questions is to discover LRHs' perspectives toward the projects in the 3LDP. The findings were analyzed into number and % as shown in Table 4.3, which were explained in the following details.

1) The projects benefit to Tambon Paklok community

The 138 LRHs considered that the projects benefit to Tambon Paklok community, which was at "Agree Level". It represented as 38.8% of the sample. The 126 LRHs pointed that it was at "Absolutely Agree Level", representing 35.4%. But, the 2 LRHs purposed that it was at "Absolutely Disagree Level", amounting 0.6% respectively.

2) The projects benefit directly to respondent

The 149 LRHs considered that the projects benefit directly to respondent, which was at "Neutral Level". It represented as 41.9% of the sample. The 110 LRHs pointed that it was at "Agree Level", representing 30.9%. But, the 4 LRHs purposed that it was at "Absolutely Disagree Level", amounting 1.1% respectively.

3) The projects create job opportunities to local community

The 150 LRHs considered that the projects create job opportunities to local community, which was at "Agree Level". It represented as 42.1% of the sample. The 109 LRHs pointed that it was at "Neutral Level", representing 30.6%. But, the 3 LRHs purposed that it was at "Absolutely Disagree Level", amounting 0.8% respectively.

4) The projects promote youth employment

The 133 LRHs considered that the projects promote youth employment, which was at "Agree Level" and "Neutral Level". It represented as 34.4% each level. The 57 LRHs pointed that it was at "Absolutely Agree Level", representing

16.0%. But, the 2 LRHs purposed that it was at “Absolutely Disagree Level”, amounting 0.6% respectively.

5) The projects increase value added to local goods

The 148 LRHs considered that the projects increase value added to local goods, which was at “Neutral Level”. It represented as 41.6% of the sample. The 124 LRHs pointed that it was at “Agree Level”, representing 34.8%. But, the 3 LRHs purposed that it was at “Absolutely Disagree Level”, amounting 0.8% respectively.

6) The projects disrupt to local activities and living of community

The 123 LRHs considered that the projects disrupt to local activities and living of community, which was at “Neutral Level”. It represented as 34.6% of the sample. The 106 LRHs pointed that it was at “Agree Level”, representing 29.8%. But, the 9 LRHs purposed that it was at “Absolutely Disagree Level”, amounting 2.5% respectively.

7) The projects have negative impact on Tambon Paklok

The 113 LRHs considered that the projects have negative impact on Tambon Paklok, which was at “Neutral Level”. It represented as 31.7% of the sample. The 101 LRHs pointed that it was at “Agree Level”, representing 28.4%. But, the 15 LRHs purposed that it was at “Absolutely Disagree Level”, amounting 4.2% respectively.

8) The projects promote local culture and handicrafts

The 144 LRHs considered that the projects promote local culture and handicrafts, which was at “Agree Level”. It represented as 40.4% of the sample. The 112 LRHs pointed that it was at “Neutral Level”, representing 31.5%. But, the 4 LRHs purposed that it was at “Absolutely Disagree Level”, amounting 1.1% respectively.

9) The projects utilize local natural resources

The 121 LRHs considered that the projects utilize local natural resources, which was at “Agree Level”. It represented as 34% of the sample. The 111 LRHs pointed that it was at “Neutral Level”, representing 31.2%. But, the 8 LRHs purposed that it was at “Absolutely Disagree Level”, amounting 2.2% respectively.

10) The respondent was able to propose the projects

The 136 LRHs considered that the respondent was able to propose the projects, which was at “Neutral Level”. It represented as 38.2% of the sample. The 109 LRHs pointed that it was at “Agree Level”, representing 30.6%. But, the 5 LRHs

purposed that it was at “Absolutely Disagree Level”, amounting 1.4% respectively.

11) The respondent was able to participate in planning process

The 126 LRHs considered that the respondent was able to participate in planning process, which was at “Agree Level”. It represented as 35.4% of the sample. The 114 LRHs pointed that it was at “Neutral Level”, representing 32%. But, the 4 LRHs purposed that it was at “Absolutely Disagree Level”, amounting 1.1% respectively.

12) The respondent was able to monitor the progress of the project

The 119 LRHs considered that the respondent was able to monitor the progress of the project, which was at “Neutral Level”. It represented as 33.4% of the sample. The 106 LRHs pointed that it was at “Agree Level”, representing 29.8%. But, the 12 LRHs purposed that it was at “Absolutely Disagree Level”, amounting 3.4% respectively.

13) The respondent was able to accept and reject the projects

The 106 LRHs considered that the respondent was able to accept and reject the projects, which was at “Agree Level”. It represented as 29.8% of the sample. The 105 LRHs pointed that it was at “Neutral Level”, representing 29.8%. But, the 18 LRHs purposed that it was at “Absolutely Disagree Level”, amounting 5.1% respectively.

Table 4.3 The LRHs' perspective towards 3LDPs

Item (remarks)	Accessed Level									
	Absolutely Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Absolutely Agree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	2	0.6	15	4.2	75	21.1	138	38.8	126	35.4
2	4	1.1	28	7.9	149	41.9	110	30.9	65	18.3
3	3	0.8	23	6.5	109	30.6	150	42.1	71	193.9
4	2	0.6	31	8.7	133	37.4	133	37.4	57	16.0
5	3	0.8	17	4.8	148	41.6	124	34.8	64	18.0
6	9	2.5	75	21.1	123	34.6	106	29.8	43	12.1
7	15	4.2	80	22.5	113	31.7	101	28.4	47	13.2
8	4	1.1	23	6.5	112	31.5	144	40.4	73	20.5
9	8	2.2	45	12.6	111	31.2	121	34.0	71	19.9
10	5	1.4	39	11.0	136	38.2	109	30.6	67	18.8
11	4	1.1	44	12.4	114	32.0	126	35.4	68	19.1
12	12	3.4	33	9.3	119	33.4	106	29.8	86	24.2
13	18	5.1	39	11.0	105	29.8	106	29.8	88	24.7

Remarks:

- 1) The projects benefit to Tambon Paklok community
- 2) The projects benefit directly to respondent
- 3) The projects create job opportunities to local community
- 4) The projects promote youth employment
- 5) The projects increase value added to local goods
- 6) The projects disrupt to local activities and living of community
- 7) The projects have negative impact on Tambon Paklok
- 8) The projects promote local culture and handicrafts
- 9) The projects utilize local natural resources
- 10) The respondent was able to propose the projects
- 11) The respondent was able to participate in planning process

12) The respondent was able to monitor the progress of the project

13) The respondent was able to accept and reject the projects

With regard to LRHs' perspectives toward 3LDP at Tambon Paklok shown in Table 4.3-2, the findings found that LRHs agreed with the projects on the issues including benefiting to Tambon Paklok community (4.04), benefiting directly to respondent (3.57), creating job opportunities in the local community (3.74), promoting youth employment (3.60), increasing added value to local goods (3.64), promoting local culture and handicrafts (3.73), utilizing local natural resources (3.57), the respondents were able to propose the projects (3.54), to participate in the planning process (3.59), to monitor the progress of the project (3.62), and to accept and reject the projects (3.58).

Only 2 factors, which were that the projects disrupted to local activities and living of the community (3.28), and have a negative impact on Tambon Paklok (3.24), were rated as "indifferent level". It is because the LRHs still feel unsure whether the projects caused the negative impacts to their community. These points should be reviewed by TPLAO.

The interval scales of the perspectives were divided as follows:

Mean Score	Measurement Level
Score 1.00-1.80	Absolutely disagree level
Score 1.81-2.60	Disagree level
Score 2.61-3.40	Indifferent level
Score 3.41-4.20	Agree level
Score 4.21-5.00	Absolutely agree level

In conclusion, the measurement of LRHs' perspectives toward the 3LDP was at an "Agree level". (Mean=3.59)

Table 4.4 The LRHs' perspective on 3LDPs

Factors	Frequency	Mean	S.D.	Measurement Level
1) The projects benefit to Tambon Paklok community	356	4.04	.886	Agree
2) The projects benefit directly to respondent	356	3.57	.915	Agree
3) The projects create job opportunities to local community	356	3.74	.880	Agree
4) The projects promote youth employment	356	3.60	.878	Agree
5) The projects increase value added to local goods	356	3.64	.859	Agree
6) The projects disrupt to local activities and living of community	356	3.28	1.009	Indifferent
7) The projects have negative impact on Tambon Paklok	356	3.24	1.073	Indifferent
8) The projects promote local culture and handicrafts	356	3.73	.898	Agree
9) The projects utilize local natural resources	356	3.57	1.017	Agree
10) The respondent was able to propose the projects	356	3.54	.965	Agree
11) The respondent was able to participate in planning process	356	3.59	.970	Agree
12) The respondent was able to monitor the progress of the project	356	3.62	1.053	Agree
13) The respondent was able to accept and reject the projects	356	3.58	1.124	Agree
Measurement as Total	100	3.5955	.6151	Agree

N= 356, Mean= 3.595 , S.D.= 0.615

4.1.4 The participation in tourism site planning and management

There were 4 areas of tourism site development provided in sub-questions in each area. The purpose of these questions was to indicate the action of LRHs on tourism site planning and management. Those tourism site processes consisted of areas in planning, management, co-ordination, sharing benefiting, evaluating and following up. The results are shown in Table 4.11 to Table 4.15.

a) Participation in local tourism site planning

Table 4.11 shows the findings of all 8 participatory activities of tourism destination planning, participated in by LRHs more than 50%. The ranking scores were promoting job and revenue to LRHs (73.9%), zoning the natural area specifically for tourism (72.5%), setting group or club to look after tourism activities of local natural resources (64.9%), participating in planning to protect from natural disasters (64.3%), giving information and introduction to tourism area in the community (62.9%), assigning duty and responsibility to protect a tourism site (62.1%), setting the regulations and rules for tourists to preserve community environment (55.6%), and setting the punishment to deal with offenders to community's orders and regulations (55.6%).

Table 4.5 The eight participatory activities of tourism site planning

Tourism site planning	Participation		None Participation		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1) Zoning the natural area specifically for tourism	258	72.50	98	27.50	356	100
2) Assigning duty and responsibility to protect tourism site	221	62.10	135	37.90	356	100
3) Setting group or club to look after tourism activities of local natural resources	231	64.90	125	35.10	356	100
4) Giving information and introduction to tourism area in the community	224	62.90	132	37.10	356	100
5) Setting the regulation and rule to tourist to preserve community environment	198	55.60	158	44.40	356	100
6) Setting the measurement to deal with the offender to community's order and regulation.	198	55.60	158	44.40	356	100
7) Promoting job and revenue to LRHs	263	73.90	93	26.10	356	100
8) Participating in planning to protect from natural disaster	229	64.30	127	35.70	356	100

N= 356, Mean= 1.360, S.D. = 0.344

b) Participation in local tourism site management

Table 4.12 shows the findings of 6 participatory activities of tourism site management participated in by LRHs more than 50%. The ranking scores were **campaigning the awareness of replantation of the degenerated forests (77.8%)**, **improving tourism site to conform to local natural resources (71.3%)**, **preparing and practicing of natural disaster prevention (63.8%)**, **providing or managing waste disposal bins sufficiently (61.8%)**, **utilizing natural material for tourism activities in order to decrease unsynthetic materials (58.1%)**, and **managing solid, wasted, and water treatment in community (54.2%)**.

Table 4.6 The six participatory activities of local tourism site management

Tourism site management	Participation		None Participation		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1) Improving tourism site to conform with local natural resources	254	71.30	102	28.70	356	100
2) Campaigning the awareness of replantation of the degenerated forests	277	77.80	79	22.20	356	100
3) Utilizing natural material for tourism activities in order to decrease unsynthetic materials.	207	58.10	149	41.90	356	100
4) Providing or managing waste disposal bins sufficiently	220	61.80	136	38.20	356	100
5) Managing solid, wasted, and water treatment in community	193	54.20	163	45.80	356	100
6) Preparing and practicing of natural disaster prevention	227	63.80	129	36.20	356	100

N= 356, Mean = 1.354, S.D. = 0.353

c) Participation in local tourism site co-ordination

Table 4.13 shows the % of 4 participatory activities of tourism site co-ordination participated in by LRHs mostly more than 50%. The ranking score were **educating local people about the local policy thoroughly** (61.5%), **requesting tourism development for related parties** (57%), **allowing the private sector to manage and establish local tourism sites** (53.1%), and **managing and locating tourism sites by the government** (39.6%).

Table 4.7 The four participatory activities of local tourism site co-ordination

Tourism site co-ordination	Participation		None Participation		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1) Educating local people of the local policy thoroughly	219	61.50	137	38.50	356	100
2) Requesting for tourism development for related parties	203	57.00	153	43.00	356	100
3) Managing and locating tourism site by the government	141	39.60	215	60.40	356	100
4) Allowing private sector to manage and establish local tourism site.	189	53.10	167	46.90	356	100

N= 356, Mean = 1.471, S.D. = 0.377

d) To share the benefit from tourism site management

Table 4.14 (see below) shows the % of 4 participatory activities of sharing the benefit from tourism site management participated in by LRHs less than 50%. The ranking score were **Managing food and beverage services** (55.9%) such as receiving proper training in food sanitation, organizing food and beverage selling group, receiving funding to set up food business, **Providing transfer for tourist** (47.8%) such as providing transportation for tourist, having license to operate hiring car, receiving funding to set tourist transferring business, **Accommodation services for tourist** (40.4%) such as room renting, tent renting, home stay, and receiving funding to start up accommodation service, and **Professional development to service tourist** (37.4%) such as receiving proper training for tour guide, organizing local tourist guide club, replacing existing jobs by tour guide career.

Table 4.8 The four participatory activities of sharing the benefit from tourism site management

Sharing the benefit from tourism site management	Participation		None Participation		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1) Professional development to service tourist (such as receiving proper training for tour guide, organizing local tourist guide club, replacing existing jobs by tour guide career)	133	37.40	223	62.60	356	100
2) Providing transfer for tourist (such as providing transportation for tourist, having license to operate hiring car, receiving funding to set tourist transferring business.)	170	47.80	186	52.20	356	100
3) Accommodations service for tourist (such as room renting, tent renting, home stay, and receiving fund to start up accommodation service.)	144	40.40	212	59.60	356	100
4) Managing food and beverage services (such as receiving proper training in food sanitation, organizing food and beverage selling group, receiving funding to set up food business.)	199	55.90	157	44.10	356	100

N= 356, Mean= 1.546, S.D. = 0.388

e) Participation in tourism site evaluating and following up

Table 4.15 shows the % of 2 participatory activities of tourism site evaluating and following up participated in by LRHs more than 50%. The ranking score were **surveying and appraisal of damages from natural disasters** (64.3%) such as tidal wave from tsunami, and **surveying and recording the negative impact on the community environment** (53.4%) such as damaging the roads, wasted water.

Table 4.9 The two participatory activities of tourism site evaluating and following up

Tourism site evaluating and following up	Participation		None Participation		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1) Surveying and recording the negative impact on community environment (such as damaging the roads, wasted water, and etc.)	190	53.40	166	46.60	356	100
2) Surveying and appraisal of damages from natural disaster (such as tidal wave from tsunami)	229	64.30	127	35.70	356	100

N= 356, Mean= 1.411, S.D. = 0.427

4.1.5 Benefits from Tambon Paklok tourism

The purpose of these questions is to examine LRHs' perspectives to tourism. The findings were analyzed into number and % as shown in Table 4.AB, which were explained in the following details.

1) Tourism is good for my community

The 135 LRHs considered that tourism is good for my community, which was at "Absolutely Agree Level". It represented as 37.9% of the sample. The 123 LRHs pointed that it was at "Agree Level", representing 34.6%. But, the 1 LRH purposed that it was at "Absolutely Disagree Level", amounting 0.3% respectively.

2) Respondent personally benefits from tourism industry

The 135 LRHs considered that the respondent personally benefits from tourism industry, which was at "Agree Level". It represented as 37.9% of the sample. The 108 LRHs pointed that it was at "Neutral Level", representing 30.3%. But, the 3 LRHs purposed that it was at "Absolutely Disagree Level", amounting 0.8% respectively.

3) Tourism creates jobs for local residents

The 181 LRHs considered that tourism creates jobs for local residents, which was at "Agree Level". It represented as 50.8% of the sample. The 85 LRHs pointed that it was at "Neutral Level", representing 23.9%. But, the 2 LRHs purposed that it was at "Absolutely Disagree Level", amounting 0.6% respectively.

4) Tourism employs local youth

The 140 LRHs considered that tourism employs local youth, which was at "Agree Level". It represented as 39.3% of the sample. The 112 LRHs pointed that it was at "Neutral Level", representing 31.5%. But, the 3 LRHs purposed that it was at "Absolutely Disagree Level", amounting 0.8% respectively.

5) Tourism raises price for local goods

The 135 LRHs considered that tourism raises price for local goods, which was at “Agree Level”. It represented as 37.9% of the sample. The 119 LRHs pointed that it was at “Neutral Level”, representing 33.4%. But, the 7 LRHs purposed that it was at “Absolutely Disagree Level”, amounting 2% respectively.

6) Tourism disrupts local activities

The 134 LRHs considered that tourism disrupts local activities, which was at “Neutral Level”. It represented as 37.6% of the sample. The 95 LRHs pointed that it was at “Agree Level”, representing 26.7%. But, the 15 LRHs purposed that it was at “Absolutely Disagree Level”, amounting 4.2% respectively.

7) Tourism harms the environment

The 121 LRHs considered that tourism harms the environment, which was at “Neutral Level”. It represented as 34% of the sample. The 117 LRHs pointed that it was at “Agree Level”, representing 32.9%. But, the 15 LRHs purposed that it was at “Absolutely Disagree Level”, amounting 4.2% respectively.

8) Tourism helps stimulate local culture and handicrafts

The 129 LRHs considered that tourism helps stimulate local culture and handicrafts, which was at “Agree Level”. It represented as 36.2% of the sample. The 118 LRHs pointed that it was at “Neutral Level”, representing 33.1%. But, the 5 LRHs purposed that it was at “Absolutely Disagree Level”, amounting 1.4% respectively.

9) Tourism uses natural resources needed by locals

The 126 LRHs considered that tourism uses natural resources needed by locals, which was at “Agree Level”. It represented as 35.4% of the sample. The 119 LRHs pointed that it was at “Neutral Level”, representing 33.4%. But, the 4 LRHs purposed that it was at “Absolutely Disagree Level”, amounting 1.1% respectively.

10) Tourism leads to development of entertainment venues

The 127 LRHs considered that Tourism leads to development of entertainment venues, which was at “Neutral Level”. It represented as 35.7% of the sample. The 121 LRHs pointed that it was at “Agree Level”, representing 34%. But, the

6 LRHs purposed that it was at “Absolutely Disagree Level”, amounting 1.7% respectively.

11) Tourism leads to development of public utilities

The 151 LRHs considered that tourism leads to development of public utilities, which was at “Agree Level”. It represented as 42.4% of the sample. The 106 LRHs pointed that it was at “Neutral Level”, representing 29.8%. But, the 4 LRHs purposed that it was at “Absolutely Disagree Level”, amounting 1.1% respectively.

12) Tourism impacts the changing behavior of LRHs negatively

The 120 LRHs considered that tourism impacts the changing behavior of LRHs negatively, which was at “Agree Level”. It represented as 33.7% of the sample. The 107 LRHs pointed that it was at “Neutral Level”, representing 30.1%. But, the 16 LRHs purposed that it was at “Absolutely Disagree Level”, amounting 4.5% respectively.

13) Tourism generates pride of the local community

The 128 LRHs considered that tourism generates pride of the local community, which was at “Agree Level”. It represented as 36% of the sample. The 103 LRHs pointed that it was at “Neutral Level”, representing 28.9%. But, the 4 LRHs purposed that it was at “Absolutely Disagree Level”, amounting 1.1% respectively.

14) Tourism generates a good image and attracts the investors

The 130 LRHs considered that tourism generates a good image and attracts the investors, which was at “Agree Level”. It represented as 36.5% of the sample. The 113 LRHs pointed that it was at “Neutral Level”, representing 31.7%. But, the 4 LRHs purposed that it was at “Absolutely Disagree Level”, amounting 1.1% respectively.

15) Tourism leads to alertness of the host community

The 131 LRHs considered that tourism leads to alertness of the host community, which was at “Agree Level”. It represented as 36.8% of the sample. The 102 LRHs pointed that it was at “Neutral Level”, representing 28.7%. But, the 2 LRHs purposed that it was at “Absolutely Disagree Level”, amounting 0.6% respectively.

16) Locals can easily access the areas which tourist uses

The 138 LRHs considered that locals can easily access the areas which tourist uses, which was at “Agree Level”. It represented as 38.8% of the sample. The 89 LRHs pointed

that it was at “Neutral Level”, representing 25%. But, the 15 LRHs purposed that it was at “Absolutely Disagree Level”, amounting 4.2% respectively.

Table 4.10 The LRHs' perspectives toward Tambon Paklok tourism

Item (Remarks)	Accessed Level									
	Absolutel y Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Absolutel y Agree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	1	0.3	23	6.5	74	20.8	123	34.6	135	37.9
2	3	0.8	48	13.5	108	30.3	135	37.9	62	17.4
3	2	0.6	19	5.3	85	23.9	181	50.8	69	19.4
4	3	0.8	28	7.9	112	31.5	140	39.3	73	20.5
5	7	2.0	24	6.7	119	33.4	135	37.9	71	19.9
6	15	4.2	71	19.9	134	37.6	95	26.7	41	11.5
7	15	4.2	40	11.5	121	34	117	32.9	63	17.7
8	5	1.4	32	9.0	118	33.1	129	36.2	72	20.2
9	4	1.1	34	9.6	119	33.4	126	35.4	73	20.5
10	6	1.7	37	10.4	127	35.7	121	34	65	18.3
11	4	1.1	31	8.7	106	29.8	151	42.4	64	18.0
12	16	4.5	51	14.3	107	30.1	120	33.7	62	17.4
13	4	1.1	24	6.7	103	28.9	128	36	97	27.2
14	4	1.1	17	4.8	113	31.7	130	36.5	92	25.8
15	2	0.6	18	5.1	102	28.7	131	36.8	103	28.9
16	15	4.2	29	8.1	89	25	138	38.8	85	23.9

Remarks:

- 1) Tourism is good for my community,
- 2) Respondent personally benefits from tourism industry,
- 3) Tourism creates jobs for local residents,
- 4) Tourism employs local youth,
- 5) Tourism raises price for local goods,
- 6) Tourism disrupts local activities,
- 7) Tourism harms the environment,
- 8) Tourism helps stimulate local culture and handicrafts,
- 9) Tourism uses natural resources needed by locals,
- 10) Tourism leads to development of entertainment venues,
- 11) Tourism leads to development of public utilities,
- 12) Tourism impacts the changing behavior of LRHs negatively,
- 13) Tourism generates pride of the local community,
- 14) Tourism generates a good image and attracts the investors,
- 15) Tourism leads to alertness of the host community,

16) Locals can easily access the areas which tourist uses.

With regard to LRHs' perspectives toward 3LDP at Tambon Paklok shown in Table 4.3-2, the findings found that “**Agree level**” of perspectives of LRHs on tourism were; tourism was good for the community (4.03), respondent personally benefited from tourism industry (3.58), tourism created jobs for LRHs (3.83), tourism employed local youth (3.71), tourism raised price of local goods (3.67), tourism harmed the environment (3.49), tourism helped stimulating local culture and handicrafts (3.65), tourism used natural resources needed by LRHs (3.65), tourism led to development of entertainment venues (3.57), tourism led to development of public utilities (3.67), tourism impacts the changing behavior of LRHs negatively (3.45), tourism generated pride in the local community (3.81), tourism generated a good image and attracts investors (3.81), tourism led to alertness of the host community (3.88), and LRHs can easily access to the areas a tourist uses (3.70).

For “**indifferent level**” of perspectives on tourism from LRHs was tourism disrupted local activities (3.21) because LRHs still feel unsure, which can be indicated as unstable factor and needed to be reviewed by TPLAO.

The interval scales of the perspectives were divided as follows:

Mean Score	Measurement Level
Score 1.00-1.80	Absolutely disagree level
Score 1.81-2.60	Disagree level
Score 2.61-3.40	Indifferent level
Score 3.41-4.20	Agree level
Score 4.21-5.00	Absolutely agree level

In conclusion, the measurement level of local's perspectives on tourism was at “**Agree level**”. (Mean=3.66)

Table 4.11 The LRHs' perspectives toward tourism

Factor	Frequency	Mean	Std. Deviation	Measurement Level
1) Tourism is good for my community	356	4.03	.934	Agree
2) Respondent personally benefits from tourism industry	356	3.58	.957	Agree
3) Tourism creates jobs for LRHs	356	3.83	.819	Agree
4) Tourism employs local youth	356	3.71	.909	Agree
5) Tourism raises price for local goods	356	3.67	.935	Agree
6) Tourism disrupts local activities	356	3.21	1.026	Indifferent
7) Tourism harms the environment	356	3.49	1.041	Agree
8) Tourism helps stimulate local culture and handicrafts	356	3.65	.948	Agree
9) Tourism uses natural resources needed by LRHs	356	3.65	.949	Agree
10) Tourism leads to development of entertainment venues	356	3.57	.960	Agree
11) Tourism leads to development of public utilities	356	3.67	.907	Agree
12) Tourism impacts the changing behavior of LRHs negatively	356	3.45	1.075	Agree
13) Tourism generates pride in the local community	356	3.81	.949	Agree
14) Tourism generates a good image and attracts investors	356	3.81	.914	Agree
15) Tourism leads to alertness in the host community	356	3.88	.904	Agree
16) LRHs can easily access the	356	3.70	1.052	Agree

areas which tourist uses				
Measurement as Total	356	3.669	.6198	Agree
			0	

N= 356, Mean= 3.669, S.D.= 0.619

4.1.6 The tourism knowledge and experience

The purpose of the questions in this section was to find out about the Tambon Paklok tourism knowledge and experience of LRHs. Table 4.24 showed that 91.9 % were **LRHs who visited the tourism sites at Tambon Paklok before** and 8.1 % **LRHs who never visit the tourism sites at Tambon Paklok before**. The frequency of those LRHs who visited Tambon Paklok tourism sites were **once a month** (28.1 %), **once a week** and **others** combined together (39.4 %), **every weekend** (17.7 %), and **every public holiday** (6.7 %). The 8.1 % of missing values indicated the number of the LRHs who never visits Tambon Paklok tourism sites.

Table 4.12 The frequency and percentage of tourism experience in Tambon Paklok tourism sites by LRHs

Factors	Frequency	%
Visiting experience in tourism site		
Visited Before	327	91.9
Never visit	29	8.1
Total	356	100.0
Visiting frequency to tourism site		
Once a Month	100	28.1
Once a Week	70	19.7
Other	70	19.7
Every Weekend	63	17.7
Every Public Holiday	24	6.7
Missing value	29	8.1
Total	356	100.0

The knowledge of LRHs about Tambon Paklok tourism sites (See Table 4.25) was; **LRHs had knowledge on Tambon Paklok tourism site (70.8 %)** and **LRHs who had no knowledge of Tambon Paklok tourism site (29.2 %)**. For availability of English skills, there were 55.3 % of **LRHs who had skills in English for tourism**, and 44.7 % of **LRHs who had no of skills in English for tourism**. The awareness of sustainable tourism by Tambon Paklok LRHs was 71.1 % of **Aware**, 18.3 % of **Not Sure**, and 10.7 % of **Not Aware**.

Table 4.13 The frequency and percentage of tourism knowledge by LRHs

Factors	Frequency	%
Tourism site knowledge of LRHs		
Available	252	70.8
Not Available	104	29.2
Total	356	100.0
English for tourism of LRHs		
Available	197	55.3
Not Available	159	44.7
Total	356	100.0
Awareness of sustainable tourism of LRHs		
Aware	253	71.1
Not Aware	38	10.7
Not Sure	65	18.3
Total	356	100.0

As for receiving tourism information by LRHs as shown in Table 4.26, 89.6 % of **LRHs received tourism information** and 10.4 % of **LRHs never received tourism information**. The received frequencies of tourism information were mostly **every month** for 34.3 %, **every week** for 29.5 %, **sometimes** for 14.9 %, and **everyday** for 11 %. The 10.4 % of missing values were the LRHs who never received tourism information.

Table 4.14 The receive of tourism information by LRHs

Factors	Frequenc y	%
Receiving of tourism information		
Received Before	319	89.6
Never Receive	37	10.4
Total	356	100.0
Receiving frequencies of tourism information		
Every Month	122	34.3
Every Week	105	29.5
Sometimes	53	14.9
Everyday	39	11
Missing value	37	10.4
Total	356	100.0

Moreover, LRHs, who received the tourism information, also responded that (See Table 4.27) 21.9 % received tourism information from neighbors, 17 % from LAO, 15.3 % from radio and television, 12 % from billboards/leaflets/printed matter, 9.8 % from newspapers, 9.3 % from community radio, 6.5 % from teachers/local developers/governed officers, 5 % from the Tourism Authority of Thailand, 3.1 % from internet/website, and 0.3 % from others. Moreover, 37 % was the % of LRHs who never receive tourism information.

Table 4.15 Multiple responses for sources of tourism information

Multiple Responses			
Dichotomy label			
		Pct of	Pct of
Name	Count	Responses	
Cases			
Radio and Television	120	15.3	
37.6			
Tourism Authority of Thailand	39	5.0	
12.2			
Newspapers	77	9.8	
24.1			
Billboards/Leaflets/Printed Matters	94	12.0	
29.5			
Neighbors	172	21.9	
53.9			
Community's Radio	73	9.3	
22.9			
LAO/ School	133	17.0	
41.7			
Teachers/ Local Developers/ government offices	51		
6.5	16.0		

Internet	24	3.1	7.5
Others	1	0.1	0.3

-----	-----	-----	-----
Total responses	784	100.0	245.8

37 Missing cases; 319 valid cases

Table 4.28 shows the perspectives of LRHs on the quality of tourism facilities at Tambon Paklok. The details were explained as follows

1) Quality of Accommodation

The 115 LRHs considered that quality of accommodation was at “Good Level”. It represented as 32.3% of the sample. The 110 LRHs pointed that it was at “Fair Level”, representing 30.9%. But, the 8 LRHs purposed that it was at “Worst Level”, amounting 2.2% respectively.

2) Quality of Public toilets

The 134 LRHs considered that quality of public toilets was at “Fair Level”. It represented as 37.6% of the sample. The 92 LRHs pointed that it was at “Good Level”, representing 25.8%. But, the 9 LRHs purposed that it was at “Not Found Level”, amounting 2.5% respectively.

3) Quality of Food and Beverage

The 128 LRHs considered that quality of food and beverage was at “Good Level”. It represented as 36% of the sample. The 114 LRHs pointed that it was at “Fair Level”, representing 32%. But, the 10 LRHs purposed that it was at “Not Found Level”, amounting 2.8% respectively.

4) Quality of Souvenir shops

The 123 LRHs considered that quality of souvenir shops was at “Fair Level”. It represented as 34.6% of the sample. The 98 LRHs pointed that it was at “Good Level”, representing 27.5%. But, the 12 LRHs purposed that it was at “Worst Level”, amounting 3.4% respectively.

5) Quality of Service by local officer

The 127 LRHs considered that quality of service by local officer was at “Fair Level”. It represented as 35.7% of the sample. The 114 LRHs pointed that it was at “Good Level”, representing 32%. But, the 10 LRHs purposed that it was at “Worst Level”, amounting 2.8% respectively.

6) Quality of Accessibility

The 134 LRHs considered that quality of accessibility was at “Good Level”. It represented as 37.6% of the sample. The 129 LRHs pointed that it was at “Fair Level”, representing 36.2%. But, the 7 LRHs purposed that it was at “Worst Level”, amounting 2% respectively.

7) Quality of Safety

The 126 LRHs considered that quality of safety was at “Fair Level”. It represented as 35.4% of the sample. The 101 LRHs pointed that it was at “Good Level”, representing 28.4%. But, the 8 LRHs purposed that it was at “Not Found Level”, amounting 2.2% respectively.

8) Quality of Garbage bins

The 132 LRHs considered that quality of safety was at “Fair Level”. It represented as 37.1% of the sample. The 97 LRHs pointed that it was at “Good Level”, representing 27.2%. But, the 8 LRHs purposed that it was at “Not Found Level”, amounting 2.2% respectively.

9) Quality of Tourism information Centers

The 130 LRHs considered that quality of safety was at “Fair Level”. It represented as 36.5% of the sample. The 91 LRHs pointed that it was at “Good Level”, representing 25.6%. But, the 14 LRHs purposed that it was at “Not Found Level”, amounting 3.9% respectively.

Table 4.16 The LRHs' perspective on quality of tourism facilities

Item	Accessed Level													
	Worst		Bad		Fair		Good		Excellent		Not Found		Missing Value	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	82	2.7	27	7.6	110	30.9	115	32.3	61	17.1	18	5.1	17	4.8
2	20	5.6	35	9.8	134	37.6	92	25.8	62	17.4	9	2.5	4	1.1
3	12	3.4	21	5.9	114	32.0	128	36.0	69	19.4	10	2.8	2	0.6
4	12	3.4	35	9.8	123	34.6	98	27.5	60	16.9	22	6.2	6	1.7
5	10	2.8	26	7.3	127	35.7	114	32.0	58	16.3	18	5.1	3	0.8
6	7	2	21	5.9	129	36.2	134	37.6	55	15.4	8	2.2	2	0.6
7	11	3.1	32	9.0	126	35.4	101	28.4	76	21.3	8	2.2	2	0.6
8	12	3.4	54	15.2	132	37.1	97	27.2	52	14.6	8	2.2	1	0.3
9	15	4.2	39	11	130	36.5	91	25.6	64	18.0	14	3.9	3	0.8

Remarks:

- 1) Quality of Accommodations
- 2) Quality of Public Toilets
- 3) Quality of Food and Beverage
- 4) Quality of Souvenir Shops
- 5) Quality of Service by Local Officer
- 6) Quality of Accessibility
- 7) Quality of Safety
- 8) Quality of Garbage Bins
- 9) Quality of Tourism Information Centers.

With regard to the perspectives of LRHs on the quality of tourism facilities at Tambon Paklok, the findings found that The results were at a **“Good level”** for all factors, there were quality of accommodation (3.55), public toilet (3.44), food and beverage (3.69), souvenir shops (3.58), local officer service (3.64), accessibility (3.64), safety (3.61), garbage bin (3.40), and tourism information center (3.51).

The study uses an importance level as follows:

Mean Score	Measurement Level
Score 0.00-0.83	Not Found
Score 0.84-1.66	Worse
Score 1.67-2.49	Bad
Score 2.50-3.32	Fair
Score 3.33-4.15	Good
Score 4.16-5.00	Excellent

Therefore, the measurement level of quality of tourism facilities was in **“Good Level”**. (Mean=3.56)

Table 4.17 The quality of tourism facilities at Tambon Paklok

Factor	Frequency	Mean	Std. Deviation	Measurement Level
1) Quality of Food and Beverage	356	3.69	1.078	Good
2) Quality of Service by local officer	356	3.64	1.130	Good
3) Quality of Accessibility	356	3.64	.990	Good
4) Quality of Safety	356	3.61	1.112	Good
5) Quality of Accommodation	356	3.55	1.326	Good
6) Quality of Tourism information Centers	356	3.51	1.193	Good
7) Quality of Public toilets	356	3.44	1.191	Good
8) Quality of Garbage bins	356	3.40	1.100	Good
9) Quality of Souvenir shops	356	3.58	1.248	Good
Measurement as Total	356	3.5634	.93151	Good

N= 356, Mean = 3.56, S.D.= 0.93

Table 4.29 shows that LRHs rated the interest level for Tambon Paklok tourism sites as follows, which were explained in the following details.

1) Attraction of Sophonwanaram Temples

The 178 LRHs considered that Attraction of Sophonwanaram Temples was at “Medium Level”. It represented as 50% of the sample. The 94 LRHs pointed that it was at “Low Level”, representing 26.4%. But, the 84 LRHs purposed that it was at “High Level”, amounting 23.6% respectively.

2) Attraction of Ban Para House of Priests

The 172 LRHs considered that Attraction of Ban Para House of Priests was at “Medium Level”. It represented as 48.3% of the sample. The 106 LRHs pointed that it was at “Low Level”, representing 29.8%. But, the 74 LRHs purposed that it was at “High Level”, amounting 21.9% respectively.

3) Attraction of Bang Pae Waterfall

The 253 LRHs considered that Attraction of Bang Pae Waterfall was at “High Level”. It represented as 71.1% of the sample. The 96 LRHs pointed that it was at “Medium Level”, representing 27%. But, the 7 LRHs purposed that it was at “High Level”, amounting 2% respectively.

4) Attraction of Bang Rong Pier

The 191 LRHs considered that Attraction of Bang Rong Pier was at “High Level”. It represented as 53.7% of the sample. The 144 LRHs pointed that it was at “Medium Level”, representing 40.4%. But, the 21 LRHs purposed that it was at “Low Level”, amounting 5.9% respectively.

5) Attraction of Tala Beach

The 173 LRHs considered that Attraction of Tala Beach was at “Medium Level”. It represented as 48.6% of the sample. The 161 LRHs pointed that it was at “Medium Level”, representing 45.2%. But, the 22 LRHs purposed that it was at “Low Level”, amounting 6.2% respectively.

6) Attraction of Ban Koe Na Ka Beach

The 147 LRHs considered Attraction of Ban Koe Na Ka Beach was at “High Level”. It represented as 41.3% of the sample. The 175 LRHs pointed that it was at “Medium Level”, representing 49.2%. But, the 34 LRHs purposed that it was at “Low Level”, amounting 9.6% respectively.

7) Attraction of Aow Por Beach

The 164 LRHs considered that Attraction of Aow Por Beach was at “High Level”. It represented as 46.1% of the sample. The 161 LRHs pointed that it was at “Medium Level”, representing 45.2%. But, the 31 LRHs purposed that it was at “Low Level”, amounting 8.7% respectively.

8) Attraction of Lam Long Beach

The 181 LRHs considered that Attraction of Lam Long Beach was at “Medium Level”. It represented as 50.8% of the sample. The 133 LRHs pointed that it was at “High Level”, representing 37.4%. But, the 42 LRHs purposed that it was at “Low Level”, amounting 11.8% respectively.

9) Attraction of Juti Beach

The 155 LRHs considered that Attraction of Juti Beach was at “Medium Level”. It represented as 43.5% of the sample. The 133 LRHs pointed that it was at “High Level”, representing 37.4%. But, the 68 LRHs purposed that it was at “Low Level”, amounting 19.1% respectively.

10) Attraction of Ban Yamu Beach

The 161 LRHs considered that Attraction of Ban Yamu Beach was at “Medium Level”. It represented as 45.2% of the sample. The 138 LRHs pointed that it was at “High Level”, representing 38.8%. But, the 57 LRHs purposed that it was at “Low Level”, amounting 16% respectively.

11) Attraction of Aow Kung Beach

The 168 LRHs considered that Attraction of Aow Kung Beach was at “Medium Level”. It represented as 47.2% of the sample. The 110 LRHs pointed that it was at “Low

Level”, representing 30.9%. But, the 78 LRHs purposed that it was at “High Level”, amounting 21.9% respectively.

Table 4.18 The LRHs' perspective on interesting of Tourism Attraction

Item	Accessed Level					
	Low		Medium		High	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1) Attraction of Soponwanaram Temples	94	26.4	178	50	84	23.6
2) Attraction of Ban Para House of Priests	106	29.8	172	48.3	78	21.9
3) Attraction of Bang Pae Waterfall	7	2.0	96	27.0	253	71.1
4) Attraction of Bang Rong Pier	21	5.9	144	40.4	191	53.7
5) Attraction of Tala Beach	22	6.2	161	45.2	173	48.6
6) Attraction of Ban Koe Na Ka Beach	34	9.6	175	49.2	147	41.3
7) Attraction of Aow Por Beach	31	8.7	161	45.2	164	46.1
8) Attraction of Lam Long Beach	42	11.8	181	50.8	133	37.4
9) Attraction of Juti Beach	68	19.1	155	43.5	133	37.4
10) Attraction of Ban Yamu Beach	57	16.0	161	45.2	138	38.8
11) Attraction of Aow Kung Beach	110	30.9	168	47.2	78	21.9

With regard to LRHs rated the interest level for Tambon Paklok tourism sites, the findings found that the results were **“High interest (or attractive) level” of tourism destination** such as attraction of Bang Pae waterfall (2.69), Bang Rong Pier (2.48), Tala Beach (2.42), and Aow Por beach (2.37). For **“Moderate interest (or attractive) level” of tourism destinations**, there were the Sophonwanaram temples (1.97), Ban Para house of priests (1.92), Ban Koe Na Ka beach (2.32), Lam Long beach (2.26), Juti beach (2.18), Ban Yamu beach (2.23), and Aow Kung beach (1.91).

The study uses an importance level as follows:

Mean Score	Measurement Level
Score 1.00-1.66	Low Level
Score 1.67-2.32	Medium/Moderate level
Score 2.33-3.00	High level

In conclusion, the attractive tourism sites were at **“Moderate interested or attractive level”**. (Mean=2.25)

Table 4.19 The LRHs' perspective on interesting of tourism destination

Tourism Destination	Frequency	Mean	Std. Deviation	Interest Level
1) Attraction of Bang Pae Waterfall	356	2.69	.504	High
2) Attraction of Bang Rong Pier	356	2.48	.607	High
3) Attraction of Tala Beach	356	2.42	.607	High
4) Attraction of Aow Por Beach	356	2.37	.640	High
5) Attraction of Ban Koe Na Ka Beach	356	2.32	.639	Moderate
6) Attraction of Lam Long Beach	356	2.26	.654	Moderate
7) Attraction of Ban Yamu Beach	356	2.23	.705	Moderate
8) Attraction of Juti Beach	356	2.18	.730	Moderate
9) Attraction of Sophonwanaram Temples	356	1.97	.708	Moderate
10) Attraction of Ban Para House of Priests	356	1.92	.716	Moderate
11) Attraction of Aow Kung Beach	356	1.91	.722	Moderate
Measurement as Total	356	2.2503	0.4141	Moderate

N= 356, Mean = 2.25, S.D.= 0.41

Table 4.30 aimed to find out the perspectives of LRHs on tourism development guidelines.

1) Use natural resources wisely

The 131 LRHs considered that utilizing natural resources wisely was at “Agree Level”. It represented as 36.8% of the sample. The 108 LRHs pointed that it was at “Absolutely Agree Level”, representing 30.3%. But, the 3 LRHs purposed that it was at “Absolutely Disagree Level”, amounting 0.8% respectively.

2) Respect traditional value, culture of local native

The 117 LRHs considered that respecting traditional value and culture of local native were at “Agree Level”. It represented as 32.9% of the sample. The 104 LRHs pointed that it was at “Neutral Level”, representing 29.2%. But, the 3 LRHs purposed that it was at “Absolutely Disagree Level”, amounting 0.8% respectively.

3) Generate the economic to tourism stakeholders equally and fair

The 131 LRHs considered that generating the economic to tourism stakeholders equally and fair were at “Agree Level”. It represented as 43.8% of the sample. The 103 LRHs pointed that it was at “Neutral Level”, representing 28.9%. But, the 4 LRHs purposed that it was at “Absolutely Disagree Level”, amounting 1.1% respectively.

4) Reduce the poverty problem

The 120 LRHs considered that reducing the poverty problem was at “Neutral Level”. It represented as 33.7% of the sample. The 117 LRHs pointed that it was at “Agree Level”, representing 32.9%. But, the 8 LRHs purposed that it was at “Absolutely Disagree Level”, amounting 2.2% respectively.

5) Need the participation of all tourism stakeholders

The 152 LRHs considered that utilizing natural resources wisely was at “Agree Level”. It represented as 42.7% of the sample. The 108 LRHs pointed that it was at “Neutral Level”, representing 30.3%. But, the 4 LRHs purposed that it

was at “Absolutely Disagree Level”, amounting 1.1% respectively.

6) Maintain the high level of tourist satisfaction

The 138 LRHs considered that utilizing natural resources wisely was at “Agree Level”. It represented as 38.8% of the sample. The 114 LRHs pointed that it was at “Neutral Level”, representing 32%. But, the 3 LRHs purposed that it was at “Absolutely Disagree Level”, amounting 0.8% respectively.

Table 4.20 The LRHs' perspective on sustainable tourism guidelines

Item	Accessed Level									
	Absolutely Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Absolutely Agree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1) Use natural resources wisely	3	0.8	26	7.3	88	24.7	131	36.8	108	30.3
2) Respect traditional value, culture of local native	3	0.8	34	9.6	104	29.2	117	32.9	98	27.5
3) Generate the economic to tourism stakeholders equally and fair	4	1.1	24	6.7	103	28.9	156	43.8	69	19.4
4) Reduce the poverty problem	8	2.2	24	6.7	120	33.7	117	32.9	87	24.4
5) Need the	4	1.1	20	5.6	108	30.3	152	42.7	72	20.2

participation of all tourism stakeholders										
6) Maintain the high level of tourist satisfaction	3	0.8	13	3.7	114	32.0	138	38.8	88	24.7

With regard to the perspectives of LRHs on tourism development guidelines, the findings found that the results were at “**Agree level**” for using natural resources (3.88), respecting traditional values and the culture of local native (3.77), generating the economic to tourism stakeholders equally and fair (3.74), reducing poverty (3.71), requiring the participation of all tourism stakeholders (3.75), and maintaining a high level of tourist satisfaction (3.83).

The study was arranged as follows:

Mean Score	Measurement Level
Score 1.00-1.80	Absolutely disagree level
Score 1.81-2.60	Disagree level
Score 2.61-3.40	Indifferent level
Score 3.41-4.20	Agree level
Score 4.21-5.00	Absolutely agree level

Therefore, the measurement level of local perspectives on tourism development guidelines was “**Agree level**”. (Mean=3.77)

Table 4.21 The perspectives of LRHs on tourism development guidelines

Factor	Frequ ency	Mean	Std. Deviation	Measur ement level
1) Use natural resources wisely	356	3.88	.953	Agree
2) Maintain the high level of tourist satisfaction	356	3.83	.873	Agree
3) Respect traditional value, culture of local native	356	3.77	.987	Agree
4) Need the participation of all tourism stakeholders	356	3.75	.879	Agree
5) Generate the economic to tourism stakeholders equally and fair	356	3.74	.887	Agree
6) Reduce the poverty problem	356	3.71	.984	Agree
Measurement as Total	356	3.7790	.73777	Agree

N= 356, Mean = 3.77, S.D.= 0.73

According to Table 4.31, the local satisfaction of tourism in Tambon Paklok community resulted in 41 % for “satisfied level”, 30.9 % for “good level”, 20.5 % for “excellent level”, 5.6 % for “poor level”, and 2 % for “dissatisfied level”. Therefore, the satisfaction towards overall tourism in LRHs’ perspectives was at a **Good Level**. The level of tourism demand in the community by LRHs resulted in 49.2 % of LRHs wanting “much more level” of tourism, 24.4 of LRHs wanted “more level” of tourism, 20.2 % of LRHs wanted the “same level” of tourism as now, 5.6 % of LRHs wanted “less level” of tourism, and 0.6 % of LRHs wanted “much less level” of tourism. Thus, the highest demand for tourism in community was in “**Much More Level**”.

Table 4.22 The satisfaction of tourism in community and level of tourism demand by LRHs

Factors	Frequency	%
Satisfaction toward tourism as overall		
Satisfy (Score 2.61-3.40)	146	41
Good (Score 3.41-4.20)	110	30.9
Excellent (Score 4.21-5.00)	73	20.5
Poor (Score 1.81-2.60)	20	5.6
Dissatisfied (Score 1.00-1.80)	7	2
Total (N= 356, Mean = 3.62, S.D.= 0.937)	356	100.0
Level of tourism demand in community		
Much More (Score 4.21-5.00)	175	49.2
More (Score 3.41-4.20)	87	24.4
Same (Score 2.61-3.40)	72	20.2
Less (Score 1.81-2.60)	20	5.6
Much Less (Score 1.00-1.80)	2	0.6
Total (N= 356, Mean = 4.16, S.D.= 0.973)	356	100.0

4.1.7 Suggestions of local resident households (LRHs)

The open-end question was aimed to find out about the ideas of LRHs on Tambon Paklok tourism development. The answers of respondents conclude as follow.

4.1.7.1 The perspective's of LRHs on the most appropriate methods of Tambon Paklok tourism development.

From 356 local respondents, there were 136 LRHs who gave perspectives about the most appropriate methods of Tambon Paklok tourism development. Table 4.32 shows that all LRHs should help to conserve and preserve natural and tourism sites (31.6 %), followed by the provision of education (17.6 %) and public relations (13.2 %) LRHs should participate more in local activities (9.6 %), and well-prepared tourism should be more established.

Table 4.23 The perspective's LRHs on the most appropriate methods of Tambon Paklok tourism development

Items	Frequency	%
1) LRHs should helps to conserve and preserve natural and tourism sites	43	31.6
2) Education (Language, tourism, human resources, tourism sites)	24	17.6
3) Public Relation (leaflets, radio, TV, billboards)	18	13.2
4) LRHs should participate in local activities	13	9.6
5) Well-preparation for tourism should be established	7	5.2
6) Development of the tourism concept and style should be established	6	4.4
7) TPLAO establishes the rules, regulations, and maintenance for tourism sites	5	3.7
8) Development of safety should be established	4	3
9) Providing qualified human resources to develop the community	3	2.2
10) Tourism information of Tambon Paklok should be established	3	2.2
11) The government should focus on LRHs more than investors	3	2.2
12) TPLAO should provide news about development plan	2	1.5
13) New tourism sites should be developed.	2	1.5
14) Target market of Tambon Paklok should be ecotourism tourist	1	0.7
15) There should have more water sources and placement.	1	0.7
16) Souvenir shops should be established	1	0.7

Total	136	100
--------------	------------	------------

4.1.7.2 The perspective's LRHs on the most appropriate things or places for development of new tourism sites at Tambon Paklok

From 356 local respondents, there were 106 LRHs who gave perspectives about the most appropriate things or places for development of tourism sites at Tambon Paklok. Table 4.33 shows that mangrove forests, beaches and islands should be more developed (47.16 %), the waterfall (13.20 %), the Pier (12.26 %), mountains (4.4 %), agriculture plants (2.83 %), and local traditional life combined with a mosque (3.8 %).

Table 4.24 The perspective's LRHs on the most appropriate things or places for development of tourism sites at Tambon Paklok

Items	Frequency	%
1) Mangrove forest, beaches, and Island	50	47.16
2) Waterfall	14	13.20
3) Port or Pier	13	12.26
4) Mountain	7	6.60
5) Agriculture plants	3	2.83
6) Local traditional life	2	1.90
7) Mosque	2	1.90
8) Recreation on new tourism activities for tourist	2	1.90
9) Almshouse	2	1.90
10) None of beautiful tourism sites	1	0.94
11) Youth participation in tourism activities and processes	1	0.94
12) Existing tourism sites	1	0.94
13) Sam Lam and Ha Lam at Bangrong	1	0.94
14) Handicraft career group	1	0.94

15) Public park and school	1	0.94
16) Public relations	1	0.94
17) Yamu village	2	1.90
Total	106	100

4.1.7.3 Suggestions toward 3LDP

From 356 local respondents, there were 130 LRHs who gave general suggestions for developing Tambon Paklok. Table 4.34 shows that the TPLAO should inform LRHs about the details of development plans, work seriously, and educate LRHs on significant issues (28.4 %), LRHs should help to conserve and preserve nature and tourism sites (18.5 %), LRHs should have more participation in local development projects (16.9 %), Every party should co-ordinate to support a good tourism image (5.7 %), Tourism is good for Tambon Paklok (5.4 %), The development projects impacts to the income of LRHs (4.6 %), investors make too much uses of local and public areas and The leaders of community do not work fairly (3 % each)

Table 4.25 Suggestions from LRHs

Items	Frequ ency	%
1) TPAO should inform LRHs about details of development plans, work seriously, and educate them on the significant issues.	37	28.4
2) LRHs should help to conserve and preserve the nature and tourism sites	24	18.5
3) LRHs should have more participation in local development projects.	22	16.9
4) Every party should have good co-ordination to support a good tourism image.	7	5.7
5) Tourism is good for Tambon Paklok	7	5.4
6) The development projects impacts to income of LRHs	6	4.6
7) TPLAO should help LRHs who suffered from the Tsunami disaster	2	1.6
8) The investors made too much used of local areas and public areas	4	3
9) The leaders of the community do not work fairly	4	3
10) TPAO should focus more on career support.	3	2.3
11) TPAO should examine the safety for the community	3	2.3
12) Tourism of Tambon Paklok should be more clear and realistic.	3	2.3
13) TPAO should allocate a budget to develop temples	2	1.6
14) TPAO should establish a local tourism unit or office to support tourism in community. (which operates by LRHs or community)	2	1.6
15) Tourism should not destroy the culture and tradition of community.	1	0.7
16) Tourism should not be established	1	0.7

17) Tourism businesses have negative impacts to community	1	0.7
18) Tourism should follow the sufficiency economy of His Majesty the King	1	0.7
Total	130	100

4.2 Perspective of Officer of TPLAO

The results of face-to-face interviews about proposed guidelines and indicators for sustainable tourism development: The case study of Tambon Paklok, Amphur Thalang, Changwat Phuket. According the sample size of qualitative study with TPLAO officers, the researcher had to interview the 16 management team officers, and the local council of local assembly members for 19 members. But, the researcher found that the resource persons from 1) the management team was only 2 persons, who were the president, and an policy and planning officer, 2) the council of local assembly member was only 1 person, who was the chairman of the council at TPLAO. Therefore, the samples of this group were only the president of TPLAO, the chairman of the council of local assembly member, and a policy and planning officer.

4.2.1 Tambon Paklok tourism site development

Tambon Paklok tourism site should be developed seriously, with the co-ordination of LRHs in tourism development in order to succeed long-term, because Tambon Paklok itself had the potential of being a natural tourism site with beaches, mangrove forests, natural parks, and waterfalls. TPLAO had tried to campaign for the preservation and conservation of its natural resources in order to get assistance from LRHs to maintain the natural resources, and take care of the environment. For tourism site development, TPLAO does not have a specific plan for developing it, but tried to develop the basic infrastructure for LRHs in order to attract more investors into Tambon Paklok. It is believed that investors could help to develop the community.

4.2.2 The obstacles of tourism site development at Tambon Paklok

The obstacles of tourism site development at Tambon Paklok were **firstly**, the regulations of central government especially the regulations the mangrove where because TPLAO had tried to propose permitting a walkway construction into mangrove forest in order to develop it as a tourism site for Tambon Paklok. The proposal was rejected because of strict regulations of construction. **Secondly**, the public relations of tourism site were insufficient. They thought Tambon Paklok tourism sites were at the development stage and they did not have tourism planning and management systematically.

4.2.3 The development projects for tourism development

The TPLAO had developed tourism development by supporting careers for LRHs or tourism activities and encouraging LRHs to be self-reliant as much as possible. They believe that people can live on their own instead of relying on tourism. The development strategies (such as economic and basic infrastructures) were developed in order to support tourism activities and encourage investors to invest more at Tambon Paklok.

4.2.4 Tourism education and training for LRHs

For tourism education and training for LRHs, TPLAO tried to provide a non-formal school for LRHs, provide the knowledge of One Tambon One Product for LRHs, teach English to LRHs and officers of the TPLAO, and suggested some tourism knowledge for managing the tourism business. However, the TPLAO has failed to launch English language courses for LRHs because LRHs personally have no interest or time to take the English courses provided by TPLAO.

4.2.5 Tourism income in the Tambon Paklok community

For tourism income in the Tambon Paklok community, the major economy of Tambon Paklok was from agriculture and fishery. Tourism income in Tambon Paklok is only a minor source of income because Tambon Paklok is only in the early stage of tourism development. The TPLAO has tried to develop tourism facilities for both tourists and investors. The more facilities available, the more attractive to tourists and investors it will become. TPLAO believed that investors had an important role in development of the community.

4.2.6 The appropriate tourism benefit to LRHs

For appropriate tourism benefits to LRHs, tourism generates income and creates job opportunities for the Tambon Paklok community. The best tourism benefit was that LRHs could live by their own ability or self-reliance by joining the career groups to develop tourism businesses. The TPLAO could collect income in the form of taxes from LRHs. This income would in return to develop the Tambon Paklok community.

4.2.7 Acknowledgement and encouragement of sustainable tourism at TP

As for understanding and promoting sustainable tourism at Tambon Paklok, The TPLAO understands sustainable tourism to some extent. They explained that in some islands in Malaysia and Singapore, the carrying capacity was set to limit the number of visitors to specific area. They accepted that they did not know sustainable tourism. They only knew all about sustainable tourism was to help keep tourism going for a long time. They mostly aimed to develop the quality of life for their people at Tambon Paklok. A TPLAO officer stated that they should consider more the carrying capacity, environment assessment, and maintain the good quality of LRHs' life.

4.2.8 The development of local development indicators

For development of local development indicators, they stated that indicators of the 3LDP were developed from the relevant database, with reference to official documents. There were no specific indicators for the tourism directly, but there were the indicators for the relevant projects related to tourism. They tried to follow the guidelines of government

4.2.9 The LRHs' demand for local development

For LRHs' demand for a 3LDP, the TPLAO developed the 3LDP following the local's demand (by a survey in the community). The TPLAO believed that local demand was very important to the development of community. The more the 3LDP benefits the community, the more LRHs will be satisfied.

4.2.10 The current problems from tourism

As for the current problems from tourism, the TPLAO mentioned that the problems were from both from tourists and LRHs. For example, tourists disobeyed the rules or the orders of Tambon Paklok by entering into protected areas in Tambon Paklok. Also, LRHs took advantage of tourists too much by asking too much for the boating service fare and other unfair service fees from tourists.