

## **CHAPTER 5**

### **CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The study of proposed guidelines and indicators for sustainable tourism development: The case study of Tambon Paklok, Amphur Thalang, Changwat Phuket is subjects to develop the sustainable tourism development at local level. The results of the study can be discussed with two research objectives: 1) To create the guideline on how to develop a sustainable tourism planning and management (STPM) at Tambon Paklok, and 2) To propose the sustainable tourism indicators for tourism development at Tambon Paklok Local Administration Organization (TPLAO).

The applied methodologies were Means, percentage, Standard deviation, and Frequency. The recommendations for STPM for TPLAO and further study are also mentioned. However, regarding to the major objectives, this chapter will conclude, discuss, recommend as follows;

- 5.1 Conclusions
  - 5.1.1 The 3-year local planning and management
  - 5.1.2 The portfolio of research location
  - 5.1.3 Primary data
    - 5.1.3.1 General information of local resident households
    - 5.1.3.2 General information of officers at TPLAO
    - 5.1.3.3 Tourism circumstance at Tambon Paklok
- 5.2 Discussions
  - 5.2.1 Discussion on Objective 1
    - Local planning and management at Tambon Paklok
    - The guides for action in sustainable tourism development
    - Benefits sharing from 3LDP towards local residents
    - Benefit sharing from Tourism development towards local residents
  - 5.2.2 Discussion on Objective 2
  - 5.2.3 Proposed evaluating level of sustainable tourism development
  - 5.2.4 Proposed Guidelines for sustainable tourism planning and management 13
  - 5.2.5 Proposed indicators for tourism development at Tambon Paklok
- 5.4 Recommendations
  - 5.4.1 Limitation of study
  - 5.4.2 Suggestions for further research

## 5.1 Conclusions

The data was collected from two population groups, which were Tambon Paklok LRHs and the officers of the TPLAO. The conclusions are as follows:

### 5.1.1 The 3-year local planning and management

A 3LDP is a local economic and social development plan which is in the consonance with a development strategic plan. It is composed of a detailed plan of establishing the development project per annual budget. It is continuous and progress for all 3 years (Paklok website, 2005).

The 3 year-local development plans of Tambon Paklok (2003-2005 and 2006-2008) had been allocated the budgets on 7 different strategies, which were the development of living quality (87.37 %), development of natural resources preservation (4.82 %), development of education (2.74 %), development of local tradition and culture (2.48 %), development of economy (1.52 %), development of strong community and self-reliance (1.01), and local intelligence (0.02 %) respectively.

The TPLAO has developed the 3LDP by using the demand of community as a basic guideline for local development. The TPLAO believed that demand of local resident was a very important part for developing the community. The more the 3LDP benefits the community, the more LRHs will be satisfied.

The researcher 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).

Moreover, LRHs 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. Therefore, LRHs’ perspectives toward the 3LDP were at an “**Agree level**”. (Mean=3.59)

LRHs has suggested to TPLAO that (1) TPAO should inform LRHs on the details of development plans, work seriously, and educate LRHs on significant issues (28.4%), (2) LRHs should help to conserve and preserve nature and tourism sites (18.5%), and (3) LRHs should have more participation in local development projects (16.9%).

### **5.1.2 The portfolio of research location**

Tambon Paklok is located at the eastern part of Amphur Thalang, or the Northeast part of Changwat Phuket with the area of 23,650 rai. TPLAO is located approximately 10 kilometers away from the Heroine’s Monument of Changwat Phuket. The geographic area has both the plains and sloping areas. There are 10,845 local residents (record of June 19, 2005), 9 villages, and 3,129 LRHs in the area. Most of local residents work in agriculture as Para rubber planters, coconut planters, fruit planters, fishermen, or are general labors and traders. 80% of them are Muslims and 20% for Buddhist.

### **5.1.3 Primary data**

#### **5.1.3.1 General information of local resident households**

There were 356 respondents of LRHs at Tambon Paklok. Most of them were from Paklok village, which has the

largest number of LRHs. Most of them were **Females** (60.4%), aged **21-30 years old** (33.1%), **married** (50.6%), **high school** (34.3%), and earned **5,001-10,000 Baht** monthly (37.9%), **Muslim** (71.3%), and **student** (25.0%).

### **5.1.3.2 General information of officers at TPLAO**

The characteristic profile of the officers at TPLAO was explained as follows;

- 1) The representative of the management team of TPLAO who are in position of “A President of TPLAO”.
- 2) The representative of the local assembly council of TPLAO who are in position of “A Chairman of Local Assembly Council at TPLAO”.
- 3) The representative of the planning and policy of TPLAO, who are in position of “A Local Planning and Policy Officer”

### **5.1.3.3 Tourism circumstance at Tambon Paklok**

#### **1) Existing tourism resources**

Tambon Paklok has many natural resources such as Bangpae and Para waterfalls, Prateaw national park, and Tala beaches. It is well-known for the Bangrong and Aow Por port which serves many tourists in traveling to nearby islands.

The study of attractions of tourism destination by LRHs resulted in the attraction of Bang Pae Waterfall, attraction of Bang Rong Pier, and attraction of Tala Beach were at a “high level”. The total importance of quality of tourism facilities at Tambon Paklok was at a “moderate level”.

For the perspectives of LRHs on the most appropriate things or places for development of new tourism sites at Tambon Paklok, LRHs suggested TPLAO should have more development for Mangrove forest, beaches, and Island

(47.16%), waterfalls (13.20%) and the pier (12.26%) respectively.

## **2) Existing tourism situation**

The study of local satisfaction in Tambon Paklok tourism resulted in 30.9% of LRHs rated as “Good level” for tourism satisfaction at Tambon Paklok. For the level of tourism demand in community by LRHs resulted that 49.2% of LRHs wanted “Much More level” of tourism in Tambon Paklok.

### **3) Existing tourism planning and management**

The TPLAO did not have any specific tourism plans for Tambon Paklok. But, it has developed some projects that have become the basic elements for tourism development in order to support tourism activities and encourage investors to invest more at Tambon Paklok. There are; the development of infrastructures, development of local careers, development of natural preservation and conservation.

The TPLAO had developed tourism by supporting both careers for LRHs, and tourism activities at Tambon Paklok. 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

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. TPLAO believed that investors had an important role in development of the community. The more facilities available, the more attractive to tourists and investors it will become.

TPLAO agrees that tourism generates income and creates job opportunities for the Tambon Paklok community. They believe that it is much better if local resident can live on their own instead of relying on tourism. 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.



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.

The TPLAO mentioned that the impacts of tourism 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.

LRHs suggested that the most appropriate methods to develop tourism is 1) LRHs should assist in conserving and preserving the natural and tourism sites (31.6%), and 2) the TPLAO should provide more education on language, especially about tourism, human resources, and tourism sites (17.6%). Moreover, they also suggested that there should be more public relations (leaflets, radio, TV, billboards) for campaigning tourism of Tambon Paklok (13.2%).

#### **4) Existing participation for tourism site development**

The officer of TPLAO stated that the Tambon Paklok tourism sites should be developed seriously, with a strong coordination with LRHs in order to succeed in the long-term. For the study of local participation in tourism site development with the LAO was adapted from the guidelines from Promchod Triwaj (2005), which was categorized into the 4 processes of

tourism site development, which were tourism site planning, management, co-ordination, benefiting sharing, evaluating and following up. The summaries are as follows.

The 8 participatory activities of tourism destination planning were participated in by LRHs more than 50 %. There were; promoting job and revenue to LRHs (73.9 %), zoning the natural area specifically for tourism (72.5 %), setting up groups or clubs to look after tourism activities and local natural resources (64.9 %), participating in planning to protect from natural disaster (64.3 %), giving information and introduction about tourism areas in the community (62.9 %), assigning duty and responsibility to protect tourism sites (62.1 %), setting regulations and rules for tourists to preserve the community environment (55.6 %), and setting measures to deal with offenders to the community's orders and regulations (55.6 %).

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

Only 3 participatory activities of tourism site co-ordination were participated in by LRHs more than 50 %. There were; educating local people about 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 %).

Only 1 participatory activity of tourism destination benefit sharing was participated in by LRHs more than 50 %. There were; Managing food and beverage services (55.9 %) such as receiving proper training in food sanitation, organizing food and beverage selling groups, receiving funding to set up a food business, Providing transport for tourists (47.8 %) such as providing transportation, having a license to operate hire cars, receiving funding to set up a tourist transferring business, Accommodations service for tourists (40.4 %) such as room renting, tent renting, home stay, and receiving funding to start up an accommodation service, and Professional development to service tourists (37.4 %) such as receiving proper training for tour guides, organizing a local tourist guide club, replacing existing jobs with a tour guide career.

The 2 participatory activities of tourism site evaluating and following up were participated in by LRHs more than 50 %. There were; surveying and appraisal of damages from natural disaster (64.3 %) such as tidal waves from the

tsunami, and surveying and recording the negative impact on community environment (53.4 %) such as damage to the roads, and waste water.

### **5) Existing tourism facilities**

The researcher found that the results of the quality of tourism facilities at Tambon Paklok 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). Therefore, the average level of quality of tourism facilities was in “Good Level”. (Mean=3.56)

### **6) Existing tourism knowledge**

The tourism knowledge and tourism experience of LRHs was classified as follows;

- 70.8% of LRHs had knowledge about Tambon Paklok tourism sites.

- 55.3% of LRHs had sufficient English skills for tourism.

- 71.1% of LRHs had knowledge about sustainable tourism.

- 89.6% of LRHs received tourism information every month (34.3% of monthly frequency). The major sources of tourism information were from neighbors, the LAO, radio and television (21.9%, 17%, and 15.3% respectively).

- 91.9% of LRHs had visited tourism sites at Tambon Paklok before. Those LRHs, who travel to Tambon Paklok tourism sites mostly once a month, once a week, and every weekend (28.1%, 19.7% and 17.7% respectively).

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 that

sustainable tourism was to help keep tourism going for a long time. They mostly aimed to develop the quality of life for 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.

## **7) Existing tourism indicators and criteria**

For development of local development indicators, TPLAO stated that indicators of the 3LDP were developed from the relevant database, with reference to official documents from the government. 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.

## **8) The perspective towards tourism development guidelines**

The perspectives of LRHs on tourism development guidelines 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 average level was at **“Agree level”** (3.77).

## **5.2 Discussions**

### **5.2.1 Objective 1: To guideline on how to develop a sustainable tourism planning and management at Tambon Paklok**

#### **- Local planning and management at Tambon Paklok**

TPLAO had the 3LDP, but it did not set up any tourism plan for Tambon Paklok. The 3LDP has established into the development strategies, and development projects. The development strategies supported tourism development and activities, especially supporting all key elements for sustainable tourism developments including economic aspect, natural aspect, and socio-cultural aspect. As Clause 16(8) and 68(12) of the Sub-District Administration Organization (SAO) Act states that “SAO’s can sponsor tourism and organize tourism activities, which need to work as follows; 1) create and implement a plan (including projects and activities to promote tourism, using either the SAO budget or the budget of another office, and 2) create a local organization to manage tourism.”

From those development strategies, the TPLAO had allocated budgets for each development strategies differently, and allocated the largest budget on development of quality of life (87.37%), including construction of roads and buildings (44.56%), waterways (35.67%), water supply (11.57%), Port and Pier (4.25%) and electricity (3.91%). (TPLAO, 2005) The TPLAO focused mostly on infrastructure development in Tambon Paklok to provide convenience to LRHs, local businesses, especially to support the tourism activities. Moreover, development strategies were allocated for development of natural resources preservation (4.82%), education (2.74%), local tradition and culture (2.48%), economy



(1.52%), strong community and self reliance (1.01%), and local wisdom or intelligence (0.02%).

The TPLAO has focused to the benefit of the community and involved the participatory of community for 3LDP in local planning and management. For the process of evaluation and following up, the evaluation team, named “Following up and Evaluating committees”, has been elected by TPLAO. It includes 1 president of the TPLAO, 2 leaders of the community, 2 vice presidents of the TPLAO, 2 local assembly members in the council of the TPLAO, 2 local residents, and 2 senior specialists. Suansri (2003) supported that to enlist the participation of various community groups, LAO should give them a direct role in a committee member or shareholders that can give a sense of project ownership and build the necessary capacity to handle and manage in community. Therefore, the researcher found that they still have a small numbers of local residents that participate in the evaluating process.

TPLAO had followed the philosophy of sufficiency economy and self-reliance in living and rural development, which were elaborated by His Majesty the King Bhumibol Adulyadej of Thailand. The philosophy for a living framework was the ideas of living by oneself without disturbing others, and people should rely on themselves instead of asking for things or waiting to be helped by others. (Public relation department, 2004) Moreover, the philosophy concerning rural development was to enable people to become self-sufficient. The activities carried out in many locals and Amphur shared the goals of building self-sufficiency (The office of Royal development project board, 2002). The officers of TPLAO tried to generate the ideas of His Majesty the King to the Tambon Paklok community by developing development strategy of self-reliance. The methodologies of His Majesty the King could also be adapted to sustainable tourism development for Tambon Paklok.

### **- The guides for action in sustainable tourism development**

The development strategies of Tambon Paklok showed that the TPLAO gave importance to local people and supported the key elements of sustainable tourism as mentioned in the guideline for action in sustainable tourism development by WTO (2004) that *firstly*, sustainable tourism must make prudent use of earth's resources. TPLAO had developed natural resources preservation, which focused to LRHs to have an awareness of natural and environmental resources management, waste and garbage management, and recovering the coastal resources by launching a campaign and activities to conserve the mangrove forests at Tambon Paklok.

*Secondly*, sustainable tourism must alleviate poverty and reduce gender inequalities. The TPLAO has developed projects to develop and support careers for LRHs by providing training for career, support, funds for local career groups, as well as supporting the One Tambon One Product (OTOP) projects.

*Thirdly*, sustainable tourism must enhance the quality of life. The TPLAO has developed many projects such as infrastructure (84.2%), public health (36.72%), good health encouragement (1.69%), child-youth-old-disability people development (0.69%), no-drugs in community campaign (0.28%), and life and property security (0.27%) for LRHs in Tambon Paklok. This shows that the TPLAO still has less focus on security for people and tourist.

*Forth*, sustainable tourism must preserve biodiversity and life support system. The TPLAO funded and trained for LRHs and leader of the community in conserving the natural resources and the environment.

*Fifth*, sustainable tourism must preserve indigenous knowledge and ways of life based on respect for different traditions. The TPLAO has tried to conserve the culture and

tradition of Tambon Paklok, as well as maintain and encourage the existing culture and tradition.

*Sixth*, sustainable tourism must encourage bottom up responsibility for participation and enhance capabilities for local decision making. The TPLAO decentralized the task on Planning and management of 3LDP to all stakeholders, especially LRHs and the private business sector.

The TPLAO had developed the 3LDP in the ways of sustainability, which could lead to supporting sustainable tourism development in Tambon Paklok. Suansri (2003) stated that “Project success requires the participation of the community and the continuity of the project staff and funding agency.” But, it was found that the TPLAO still has less focus on the development of education (2.74%), local traditional and culture (2.48%), and economy (1.52%).

### **-Benefits sharing from 3LDP towards local residents**

In terms of planning and management for 3LDP, the findings show that most LRHs agreed with the projects in 3LDP because they benefits from the development projects of TPLAO, including benefiting directly to respondent, creating job opportunities in the local community, promoting youth employment, increasing added value to local goods, promoting local culture and handicrafts, utilizing local natural resources, the respondents were able to propose, participate, monitor the progress of the project, accept and reject the projects. Suansri (2003) mentioned that the heart of community work is a feel of project ownership among community members. This happens when the process of working is participatory from the start and the local people play an active role in decision making.

Moreover, there were only two areas with “indifferent level” including 1) the projects disrupt to local activities and living of community, and 2) the projects have

negative impact on Tambon Paklok. Suansri (2003) also stated that although it is difficult to ensure the direct participation of the entire community, sustainable tourism should at least allow all members of the community to benefit indirect from tourism.

Nevertheless, the “Agree Level” can be indicated as an acceptable level for sustainable tourism because it was accepted by LRHs. But, the “Indifferent Level” can be indicated as an unacceptable level because it was not clear whether LRHs accepted or rejected it. The level of perspectives at indifferent level can imply that those areas were unsustainable. Therefore, these are the areas where the TPLAO needs to improve the process of planning and management. So, there is possibility that Tambon Paklok can be developed to support sustainable tourism through the 3LDP of Tambon Paklok.

The study confirmed that the 3LDP of TPLAO was developed consistently with the sustainable tourism principles (WTO, 2004) referring to natural, economic, and socio-cultural aspects. Tambon Paklok development plans were matched with all of three aspects. However, details of the economic and socio-cultural aspects should be reviewed more by the TPLAO because LRHs received less benefit from local development plans involving LRHs’ participation, especially from women and youth. As mentioned that, the role of women and men in developing the plan must be equal. Women have a vital role in environmental management and development. Their full participation is therefore essential to achieve sustainable development (U.N., 2002).

Tambon Paklok did not have any tourism plan and no specific unit for take responsibility in the tourism development at Tambon Paklok. Therefore, it was hard for TPLAO in managing sustainable tourism development, which needed the participatory planning, environment and social impact assessment, economic costs-benefit analysis, marketing and promotion, visitor management and interpretation, carrying

capacity analysis, indicators of sustainable tourism development, and monitoring (United Nation, 2001).

### **- Benefit sharing from tourism development towards local residents**

As for LRHs' perspectives on tourism development at Tambon Paklok, LRHs agreed that they benefited from tourism. Suansri (2003) mentioned that Tourism brings income and benefits to the community and other stakeholders that must be shared between both the administrative organization and the rest of the community member. But, they also agreed that tourism generated negative impacts as well, including tourism harming the environment, raising the price of goods, and changing the behavior of LRHs negatively. Moreover, LRHs still felt unsure whether tourism disturbed the activities of community. This point must be revised by TPLAO. However, LRHs were satisfied with current tourism at Tambon Paklok (41%) as overall, and expect to have much more tourism in Tambon Paklok (49.2%). Therefore, if TPLAO and the community both determined that working together to develop STD is advantageous, TPLAO can proceed to planning (Suansri, 2003).

As for tourism knowledge at Tambon Paklok, LRHs had knowledge about their own tourism sites (70.8%), and were able to give information to tourists. But, only 55.3% of LRHs can communicate in English, especially English for tourism, which is still a small number. 89.6% of LRHs received tourism information every month mostly from neighbors (21.9%), 71.1% of LRHs know and understand the concept of sustainable tourism differently. Most of them thought sustainable tourism was to keep tourism in the long term only. Some of them thought sustainable tourism was to encourage tourists to visit Tambon Paklok all year around in order to develop tourism. Some of them did not really know what sustainable tourism means (29%). So far, they agreed with the sustainable tourism development guidelines (WTO, 2004).

For the quality of tourism facilities in Tambon Paklok, LRHs are quite satisfied with the quality of food and beverage, service of tourism site officers, safety, souvenir shop, accommodation, tourism information centers, public toilets, and garbage bins respectively. Suansri (2003) mentioned that prepare facilities and infrastructure to receive and provide services for tourists that do not negatively impact the environment. Therefore, even LRHs stated that the quality of tourism facilities were at a “good level”, the TPLAO still needs to improve these tourism facilities for the convenience of LRHs and tourists.

For major tourist sites of Tambon Paklok, LRHs thought that the tourism sites of Tambon Paklok were at a “moderate level”, especially Ban Koe Naka beach, Lam Long beach, Ban Yamu beach, Juti beach, Soponwanaram temple, and Ban Para House of Priests respectively. The TPLAO needs to improve those tourism sites to attract more tourists and generate more benefit to the local community.

### **5.2.2 Objective 2: To propose the sustainable tourism indicators for tourism development at TPLAO**

#### **-Proposed indicators for tourism development at Tambon Paklok**

The development projects of 3LDP has been monitored and evaluated in both qualitative and quantitative evaluation. TPLAO had established the qualitative target to evaluate the projects, which were at 70%-80% each year respectively. The performance of the projects had planed to reach 70% for the first year, 75% for the second year, and 80% for the third year of each development projects. The standard target of TPLAO was set at a “high level” (70%-80%) in order to improve the benefit to the community as effectively as possible. Suansri (2003) stated that the community should set its own indicators and conduct monitoring every three months to determine whether it is achieving its objectives.

Sustainable tourism indicators are information sets, which are used for measuring the changes in tourism management and resources, and measuring the desired level for sustainable tourism development (WTO, 2004). Even TPLAO does not have any tourism plan and the indicators for tourism development, it has developed the tourism in Tambon Paklok through the 3LDP. Farsari (2000) stated that one way of defining a set of indicators for sustainable tourism that perceive tourism in a more holistic approach, is to relate them to the principle of sustainable tourism.

The World Tourism Organization (WTO) recently proposed the use of selected indicators for sustainable tourism in order to useful to tourism sector managers and administrators (UNWTO, 2007). There are several sets of principles of sustainable tourism have been proposed in the literature. Sustainable tourism related to 3 areas, including environmental, socio-cultural, and economic aspects.



As existing natural resources and the findings, the researcher can adapt WTO sustainable tourism indicators and guidelines, and the evaluating level from relevant researches as mentioned in item 5.2.3, 5.2.4, and 5.2.5.

### 5.2.3 The proposed standard level of evaluating for sustainable tourism development at Tambon Paklok

From the study, the researcher concluded that the evaluating level of sustainable tourism development. The researcher has adopted the standard level of ERIC (2006) in order to evaluate in sustainable tourism development at TPLAO (See Table 5.1).

**Table 5.1** The evaluating level of standard quality in eco-tourism site

| <b>The Evaluating Level</b> |                         |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| <b>Measurement level</b>    | <b>Weight Score (%)</b> |
| Excellent                   | More than 81            |
| Very Good                   | 71-80                   |
| Good                        | 61-70                   |
| Neutral                     | 51-60                   |
| Low                         | 50 or Less than         |

**From** Details in 2.1.6.5 by ERIC, 2006

The researcher had adopted the “Linkert Scale” in column number 2 of ERIC (2006) into the proposed standard level for evaluating, which is shown in Table 5.2. From Table 5.2, the meaning in column number 2 can be translated to ERIC evaluating level in column number 3. However, the researcher has separated the 5 interval scales in the sake of utilizing in statistical evaluation, and indicated the results for sustainability as follows;

The performance in ranks of “**Absolutely Agree**”, and “**Agree**” can be counted as acceptable levels because it shows the positive and clear meaning of the performance. These ranks can be resulted as **sustainable level** because they are in the satisfied points and can lead to next direction of development.

The performance in ranks of “**Indifferent**”, “**Disagree**” and “**Absolutely Disagree**” can be counted as unacceptable levels because the neutral point shows unsure and unclear meaning of the performance. These ranks can be resulted as **unsustainable level** because they are both in unsure and unsatisfied points, which are needed to be reviewed by the evaluators.

**Table 5.2** The proposed standard level for evaluating indicators for sustainable tourism development at Tambon Paklok (**High Score = Positive Result**)

| <b>The Evaluating Level</b>         |                                       |                              |                            |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|
| <b>Score (Mean)</b>                 | <b>Measurement level</b>              | <b>Percentage (%)</b>        | <b>Result</b>              |
| 4.21-5.00<br>3.41-4.20              | Absolutely Agree<br>Agree             | More than 81<br>71-80        | <b>Sustainable Level</b>   |
| 2.61-3.40<br>1.81-2.60<br>1.00-1.80 | Indifferent<br>Disagree<br>Absolutely | 61-70<br>51-60<br>50 or Less | <b>Unsustainable Level</b> |

|  |          |      |  |
|--|----------|------|--|
|  | Disagree | then |  |
|--|----------|------|--|

**Adopted from** ERIC, 2006 in: The project of indicator study and establishment for standard quality of Eco-tourism sites

But, the performance of some indicators may result the negative meaning, although it shows high percentages of performance. Farsari and Prastacos (2000) stated that “different indicators are meaningful at different scales although some of them could be used in local as well as regional level”. Therefore, the researcher has proposed another evaluating level for sustainable tourism development, which is shown in Table 5.3.

The performance in ranks of “**Absolutely Disagree**”, “**Disagree**”, and “**Indifferent**” can be counted as unacceptable levels because it shows the negative meaning of the performance. These ranks can be resulted as “**Unsustainable Level**” because they are in the unsatisfied points, which are needed to be reviewed by the evaluators

The performance in ranks of “**Agree**” and “**Absolutely Agree**” can be counted as acceptable level because it shows positive and clear meaning of the performance. These ranks can be resulted as “**Sustainable Level**” because they are in the satisfied points, and can lead to the next direction of development.

**Table 5.3** The proposed standard level for evaluating indicators for sustainable tourism

development at Tambon Paklok (**High Score = Negative Result**)

| <b>The Evaluating Level</b>         |  |                                |                            |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|----------------------------|
| <b>Score (Mean)</b>                 | <b>Measurement level</b>                       | <b>Percentage (%)</b>          | <b>Result</b>              |
| 4.21-5.00<br>3.41-4.20<br>2.61-3.40 | Absolutely Disagree<br>Disagree<br>Indifferent | More than 81<br>71-80<br>61-70 | <b>Unsustainable Level</b> |
| 1.81-2.60<br>1.00-1.80              | Agree<br>Absolutely Agree                      | 51-60<br>50 or Less then       | <b>Sustainable Level</b>   |

**Adopted from** ERIC, 2006 in: The project of indicator study and establishment for standard quality of Eco-tourism sites

Therefore, the researcher concluded that the evaluating of the sustainable tourism level should be at “Agree Level” and “Absolutely Agree Level”. Generally, the “Indifferent Level” might be perceived by Thai people as the same as “Disagree Level”. Therefore, from level of “Indifferent” to “Absolutely Disagree”, were unacceptable level, and can be indicated as “Unsustainable Level”.

### 5.2.4 The proposed guidelines for sustainable tourism planning and management at Tambon Paklok

Based on standard level of evaluating indicators in Table 5.2 and Table 5.3, the researcher can propose the guidelines according to the findings of the TPLAO, which did not meet the accepted level of sustainable tourism development as indicated in Table 5.4. For those variables that meet the sustainable tourism development, TPLAO should maintain it in the local development plan.

Therefore, the guideline to develop sustainable tourism planning and management at Tambon Paklok can be developed from the study as follows;

**Table 5.4** The proposed guidelines for sustainable tourism development at Tambon Paklok

| <b>Dimensi ons</b> | <b>STPM at Tambon Paklok</b>  | <b>Justification for Guidelines</b>                                     |
|--------------------|---|---|
| <b>Environment</b> | Utilizing natural material for tourism activities in order to decrease unsynthentic | 50.8% of LRHs participated in that issue at less than sustainable level |
|                    | Providing or managing waste disposal bins sufficiently                              | 61.8% of LRHs participated in that issue at less than sustainable level |
|                    | Managing solid, wasted, and water treatment in community                            | 54.2% of LRHs participated in that issue at less than sustainable level |
|                    | Preparing and practicing of natural disaster prevention                             | 63.8% of LRHs participated in that issue at less than sustainable level |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Assigning duty and responsibility to protect tourism site                         | 62.1% of LRHs participated in that issue at less than sustainable level |
| Setting group or club to look after tourism activities of local natural resources | 64.9% of LRHs participated in that issue at less than sustainable level |



**Table 5.4 (Continued)**

| <b>Dimensions</b>              | <b>STPM at Tambon Paklok</b>  | <b>Justification for Guidelines</b>                                     |
|--------------------------------|---|---|
| <b>Environment (Continued)</b> | Giving information and introduction to tourism area in the community                  | 62.9% of LRHs participated in that issue at less than sustainable level |
|                                | Setting the regulation and rule to tourist to preserve community environment          | 55.6% of LRHs participated in that issue at less than sustainable level |
|                                | Setting the measurement to deal with the offender to community's order and regulation | 55.6% of LRHs participated in that issue at less than sustainable level |
|                                | Participating in planning to protect from natural disaster                            | 64.3% of LRHs participated in that issue at less than sustainable level |
|                                | Requesting for tourism development for related parties                                | 61.5% of LRHs participated in that issue at less than sustainable level |
|                                | Managing and locating tourism site by the government                                  | 39.6% of LRHs participated in that issue at less than sustainable level |
|                                | Allowing private sector to manage and establish local tourism site                    | 53.1% of LRHs participated in that issue at less than sustainable level |
|                                | Surveying and recoding the negative impact on   | 53.4% of LRHs participated in that issue                                |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| community environment  | at less than sustainable level  |
| Surveying and appraisal of damages from natural disaster                       | 64.3 % of LRHs participated in that issue at less than sustainable level      |
| Decreasing the negative impacts on Tourism, especially harming the environment | 34% of LRHs who feel unsure whether the tourism harms the environment or not. |

Table 5.4 (Continued)

| <b>Dimensi<br/>ons</b>     | <b>STPM at<br/>Tambon Paklok</b>   | <b>Justification for<br/>Guidelines</b>  |
|----------------------------|--|--|
| <b>Socio-<br/>Cultural</b> | Educating local people of the local policy thoroughly  | 61.5% of LRHs participated in that issue at less than sustainable level  |
|                            | Decreasing the negative impact from Tourism, which may disrupt local activities  | 26.7% of LRHs agreed that the tourism disrupt the local activities   |
|                            | Educating and training local people for English language   | 55.3% of LRHs can use English for tourism which is still less than the sustainable level.  |
|                            | Decreasing the negative impact from the local development projects, which may disrupt to local activities  | 34.6% of LRHs who feel unsure whether the project disrupts the local activities or not.  |
| <b>Econom<br/>ic</b>       | Promoting professional training in hospitality businesses, accommodations, transportations, and food services, to specific target group of tourists, such as eco-tourism market, Home-Stay type of accommodation, daily life activities as well as promoting local culture preservation are among the example of training program for local residents. | - 37.4% of LRHs participated in that issue at less than sustainable level<br>- 47.8% of LRHs participated in that issue at less than sustainable level |