

A Local Governance Survey 2013 in Thailand

Tsuruyo FUNATSU (Institute of Developing Economies, JETRO)

Kazuhiro KAGOYA (Kanto Gakuin University)

Fumio NAGAI (Osaka City University)

1 Profile of the Survey

This paper presents the results of a local governance survey 2013 in Thailand as part of the project entitled “Local Government Survey in Southeast Asia: Comparison among Thailand, Indonesia, and the Philippines” (principal investigator: Nagai Fumio). The project was financially supported by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS), Kakenhi Grant Number 21252003 (FY2009-2012).¹ The aim of this project was to make a comparative analysis of the extent of decentralization and its impact on the autonomy of local governments, and to evaluate the performance of local governance in these three Southeast Asian countries.

The Thai survey was composed of two parts: questions for local administrative organization (LAO) presidents and questions for LAO chief clerks. This paper first explains survey results with LAO presidents, and then presents only the tables of survey results for LAO chief clerks. As the samples of basic LAOs (urban municipalities and Tambon Administrative Organizations: TAOs) were separately selected in this survey, data that presents difference between municipalities and TAOs are compared in separate cross tabulations, while other data is shown in one cross tabulation to observe general tendencies of the survey results.

1.1 Preparation of the Survey

In Thailand, there are four types of basic local governments, or Local Administrative Organizations (LAOs). The urban LAOs are classified as (1) “*thesaban nakhon*” for core metro cities, (2) “*thesaban muang*” for central district cities, and (3) “*thesaban tambon*” for old “sanitary districts” and bigger rural *tambon* areas. Rural LAOs are classified as (4) Tambon Administrative Organization (TAO; *Ongkan Borihan Suan Tambon*, in Thai). This survey targeted these basic local governments all over Thailand as its population.

The 2013 Thai LAO survey was the second such survey conducted by this study team, following our initial LAO survey in 2006, which was conducted as a Joint Research Project with JETRO-IDE and Thammasat University’s Faculty of Political Science.² The present survey was conducted by the Kakenhi project team³ whose

members overlapped with the first survey team.

The project members started preparing the second Thai LAO survey in late 2009, by drafting the survey questionnaire, conducting pretests, and revising questions based on the pretests. In the present survey, we decided to employ a systemic random sampling method and to interview officials from rural LAOs (that is, TAOs) in person, while using the postal method for sample municipal LAO (*thesaban*) in Thai. We consulted several public opinion polling institutes, such as “Suan Dusit Poll” and Thammasat University, and entered into a contract with Nielsen Thailand which accepted our random sampling method and conducted interviews based on the sampling list described below.

We prepared a list of LAOs for random sampling in August 2012 that excluded 4 provinces in the Southern Region (Pattani, Yala, Narathiwad, and Satun) due to political instability. We also excluded the Bangkok Metropolitan Administration (BMA) for difference in its size and institutions. As a result, 500 municipalities and 1,000 TAOs in 71 provinces were selected by systematic random sampling.

The second Thai LAO survey was originally planned to be conducted in 2012, following the surveys in Indonesia and the Philippines. However, the survey had to be postponed a year, due to the severe flooding in 2011 (called “the Great Thailand Floods in 2011”) and the damage it caused across the country. In fact, it would have been difficult to reach many LAOs, however, even those in accessible areas were engaged in recovery efforts and would likely not have had time to respond to our survey.

1.2 Survey Samples

The second Thai local governance survey was conducted in 2013 from January to March, and a supplementary research to increase the effective number of samples was conducted in 2014. To raise the response rate, we included letters from the vice-rector of Thammasat University asking for the cooperation of LAOs. The survey team set a rough target rate region-by-region to assure a variety of responses.

Respondents comprised 209 city municipalities (*thesaban*) and 253 Tambon Administration Organizations (see Table 1). The response rate was 41.8% for *thesaban* from 500 samples and 25.3% for TAO from 1,000 samples.

Table 1 Number of respondents of the Thai LAO survey 2013

Classification	Number of LAOs (population)	Number of respondents
<i>Thesaban</i>	2,038	209
Tambon Administrative Organization	5,429	253

Total	7,467	462
-------	-------	-----

Source: Compiled from the survey 2013 by the authors.

The response rate and number of samples of the second survey was lower than that of the first survey, especially that of TAOs. The classification and size of the LAO respondents, and the distribution of respondents were biased to *thesaban tambon* and medium-sized TAOs, as shown in Table 2.

There might be several reasons for this low response rate. First, the increasing workload and bureaucratization of LAOs might have some effect on the low response rate. In fact, it was reported to us that some questionnaires sent by postal mail to many LAOs were lost before they could reach the LAO chief clerk and the Nielsen team had to resend the questionnaires. Second, the questions about budget items might have presented a burden to respondents in terms of the time and effort required to answer these questions. Third, Nielsen Thailand, which is famous for urban market research, was not well known among rural LAO officials, leading many LAO presidents to ask Thammasat University or the Ministry of Interior if the survey should be answered or not.

Table 2 Classification of the LAO

	Frequency	Ratio	Average number of villages/ communities (S.D.)	
1. Sub-district municipality (thesaban tambon)	195	42.2	11.7	(6.1)
2. Town municipality (hesaban muang)	13	2.8	20.1	(11.3)
3. City municipality (thesaban nakhon)	6	1.3	57.7	(27.9)
4. Small-sized TAO	6	1.3	10.2	(2.6)
5. Medium-sized TAO	207	44.8	11.7	(5.2)
6. Large-sized TAO	19	4.1	13.5	(5.7)
7. Phatthaya City	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
N.A.	16	3.5		

Source: Calculated from the survey 2013.

2 Local Governance Survey 2013 in Thailand: President Version

The questions for LAO presidents start by asking on networks and the decision-making process of the LAO. In question 1.2, we asked “From whom does LAO president get ideas about starting new projects?” by selecting three most important sources from the list, and ranking them by writing 1, 2, or 3. Similar questions were also asked in the

surveys of Indonesia and the Philippines. Notably, LAO presidents in Thailand answered that “local residents” were an important source of new ideas, accounting for 61.3% of responses. The response rate for “local residents” reached 87.7% when adding the first to third choices together. The next choice was the “president him-self” (24.2% first choice, 60.3% in total). In contrast, the response rate for “closely associated person” was very low (0.4%, 2.5%) in this Thai survey. In addition, many LAO presidents selected “local council members” for their second or third choices, and the response rate was 59.3% in total. “Community groups” was a newly added to the second survey, based on the analysis of the 2006 Thai LAO survey. In rural Thai communities, there are many kind of community groups, such as housewife groups, youth groups, elderly groups, exercise clubs, and more. In many cases, the LAO supports the foundation and management of these groups. The response rate for “community groups” was 35.9% in total. It shows that, for LAO presidents, community groups served to some extent as a source of ideas for new projects.

1.2 When your LAO considers beginning new projects, from whom does it find ideas? (Please select the three most important sources from the list below, and rank them by writing 1, 2, or 3 in the space provided) (Upper: Frequency, Lower: Ratio)

	First	Second	Third
1. President himself	112 24.2	79 17.1	88 19.0
2. Closely associated person (e.g., husband, wife, other family members, friends)	2 0.4	3 0.6	7 1.5
3. Local council members	17 3.7	124 26.8	133 28.8
4. Residents / civil society groups	283 61.3	81 17.5	41 8.9
5. Community organizations (community councils)	6 1.3	31 6.7	38 8.2
6. Community groups (e.g. , housewife groups, youth groups, elderly groups)	7 1.5	92 19.9	67 14.5
7. Intellectuals (researchers, NGOs)	1 0.2	4 0.9	9 1.9
8. PAO presidents or PAO councilors	1 0.2	2 0.4	6 1.3
9. Other local governments (<i>thesaban</i> , TAOs)	8 1.7	7 1.5	20 4.3

10. Provincial governor, district chief officer, or other officials	2 0.4	9 1.9	18 3.9
11. Others (please specify)	2 0.4	4 0.9	9 1.9
No answer	21 4.5	26 5.6	26 5.6

Note: PAO=Provincial Administrative Organization.

Next, question 1.3_1 asked about the LAO president's perception of visits by various political figures and officials to the LAO office. LAO council members tend to visit presidents very often; in fact, 47.8% of the respondents indicated that local council members visited "more than once a week." *Kamnan* and village headman and community groups also tend to visit the LAO; 22.9% of the respondents answered that *kamnan* and village headman visited more than once a week, while 16.7% answered the same for community groups. About 70% of LAOs answered that they receive regular visits (at least once a month) from public servants such as public school teachers (65.5%) and public health officials (71.2%).

The frequency of visits from local administration officials (i.e., chief/assistant district officers and officials from the Department of Local Administration) was relatively high than that from other departments. In contrast, officials at the level of provincial governor, vice governor, or deputy governor seldom visit LAOs, and the option "never" accounted for 40.0% of the responses.

1.3_1 Do any public officials visit the LAO office for consultation on LAO activities? (Please answer every question)

Visitor	Frequency of visits						No Answer
	More than once a week	Several times a month	Once a month	Once in 2-3 months	Once or twice a year	Never	
1. Teachers/professors from schools	51 11.0	146 31.6	106 22.9	104 22.5	44 9.5	3 0.6	8 1.7
2. Public health officials	51 11.0	162 35.1	116 25.1	83 18.0	37 8.0	3 0.6	10 2.2
3. Local council members of your LAO	221 47.8	173 37.4	38 8.2	16 3.5	5 1.1	2 0.4	7 1.5
4. Business persons	21 4.5	61 13.2	55 11.9	126 27.3	114 24.7	65 14.1	20 4.3

5. President of other LAOs	19 4.1	61 13.2	99 21.4	137 29.7	102 22.1	35 7.6	9 1.9
6. Clerk of other LAOs	20 4.3	46 10.0	70 15.2	134 29.0	125 27.1	57 12.3	10 2.2
7. <i>Kamnan</i> , village headman	106 22.9	200 43.3	76 16.5	38 8.2	23 5.0	11 2.4	8 1.7
8. NGO members	14 3.0	67 14.5	83 18.0	104 22.5	101 21.9	71 15.4	22 4.8
9. People's group (e.g., housewife groups, female groups, elderly groups)	77 16.7	200 43.3	98 21.2	50 10.8	27 5.8	3 0.6	7 1.5
10. Officials from Dept. of Local Administration	10 2.2	56 12.1	82 17.7	113 24.5	117 25.3	75 16.2	9 1.9
11. Chief district officer or assistant district officers	18 3.9	61 13.2	96 20.8	140 30.3	110 23.8	29 6.3	8 1.7
12. Provincial governor (vice governor)/ deputy governor	4 0.9	18 3.9	33 7.1	58 12.6	152 32.9	185 40.0	12 2.6
13. Members of parliament	5 1.1	24 5.2	48 10.4	106 22.9	142 30.7	130 28.1	7 1.5
14. Officials from Social Development and Human Security Ministry	6 1.3	32 6.9	74 16.0	127 27.5	157 34.0	60 13.0	6 1.3
15. Officials from Community Development Dept.	11 2.4	66 14.3	111 24.0	144 31.2	100 21.6	23 5.0	7 1.5

1.3_2 Do any public officials visit the LAO office for consultation on LAO activities? (Please answer every question) (Upper: Frequency, Lower: Ratio, TS: Thesaban)

Visitor		Frequency of visits					Never	No answer
		More than once a week	Several times a month	Once a month	Once in 2-3 months	Once or twice a year		
1. Teachers/ professors from schools	TS	32 15.3	76 36.4	53 25.4	34 16.3	12 5.7	2 1.0	0 0.0
	TAO	19 7.5	70 27.7	53 20.9	70 27.7	32 12.6	1 0.4	8 3.2
2. Public health officials	TS	34 16.3	86 41.1	52 24.9	22 10.5	12 5.7	2 1.0	1 0.5
	TAO	17 6.7	76 30.0	64 25.3	61 24.1	25 9.9	1 0.4	9 3.6
3. Local council members of your LAO	TS	115 55.0	70 33.5	16 7.7	6 2.9	0 0.0	0 0.0	2 1.0
	TAO	106 41.9	103 40.7	22 8.7	10 4.0	5 2.0	2 0.8	5 2.0
4. Business persons	TS	10 4.8	38 18.2	31 14.8	51 24.4	52 24.9	25 12.0	2 1.0
	TAO	11 4.3	23 9.1	24 9.5	75 29.6	62 24.5	40 15.8	18 7.1
5. President of other LAOs	TS	4 1.9	36 17.2	62 29.7	56 26.8	38 18.2	13 6.2	0 0.0
	TAO	15 5.9	25 9.9	37 14.6	81 32.0	64 25.3	22 8.7	9 3.6
6. Clerk of other LAOs	TS	4 1.9	23 11.0	41 19.6	57 27.3	56 26.8	28 13.4	0 0.0
	TAO	16 6.3	23 9.1	29 11.5	77 30.4	69 27.3	29 11.5	10 4.0
7. <i>Kamnan</i> , village headman	TS	51 24.4	88 42.1	34 16.3	13 6.2	11 5.3	10 4.8	2 1.0
	TAO	55 21.7	112 44.3	42 16.6	25 9.9	12 4.7	1 0.4	6 2.4
8. NGO members	TS	6 2.9	44 21.1	48 23.0	48 23.0	41 19.6	19 9.1	3 1.4
	TAO	8 3.2	23 9.1	35 13.8	56 22.1	60 23.7	52 20.6	19 7.5
9. People's group (e.g., housewife groups, female groups, elderly groups)	TS	46 22.0	103 49.3	41 19.6	14 6.7	4 1.9	1 0.5	0 0.0
	TAO	31 12.3	97 38.3	57 22.5	36 14.2	23 9.1	2 0.8	7 2.8

10. Officials from Department of Local Administration	TS	3 1.4	28 13.4	44 21.1	54 25.8	50 23.9	29 13.9	1 0.5
	TAO	7 2.8	28 11.1	38 15.0	59 23.3	67 26.5	46 18.2	8 3.2
11. Chief district officer or assistant district officers	TS	11 5.3	32 15.3	53 25.4	69 33.0	35 16.7	9 4.3	0 0.0
	TAO	7 2.8	29 11.5	43 17.0	71 28.1	75 29.6	20 7.9	8 3.2
12. Provincial governor (vice governor)/ deputy governor	TS	3 1.4	15 7.2	21 10.0	37 17.7	71 34.0	62 29.7	0 0.0
	TAO	1 0.4	3 1.2	12 4.7	21 8.3	81 32.0	123 48.6	12 4.7
13. Members of parliament	TS	3 1.4	15 7.2	38 18.2	64 30.6	48 23.0	41 19.6	0 0.0
	TAO	2 0.8	9 3.6	10 4.0	42 16.6	94 37.2	89 35.2	7 2.8
14. Officials from Social Development & Human Security Ministry	TS	3 1.4	20 9.6	51 24.4	64 30.6	47 22.5	24 11.5	0 0.0
	TAO	3 1.2	12 4.7	23 9.1	63 24.9	110 43.5	36 14.2	6 2.4
15. Officials from Community Development Dept.	TS	8 3.8	32 15.3	59 28.2	60 28.7	37 17.7	11 5.3	2 1.0
	TAO	3 1.2	34 13.4	52 20.6	84 33.2	63 24.9	12 4.7	5 2.0

Question 1.4 asked about the LAO president's thinking when the LAO council and residents are at odds about project sites. The combined response rate for "You mostly accept the needs of the residents" and "You always accept the needs of the residents" was 92.6%. In question 1.2, we found a high number of LAO presidents who indicated that "local residents" were an important source of ideas for new projects. Here, too, we can observe the residents-oriented attitude of Thai LAO presidents.

However, LAO presidents were not solely concerned with local residents. In question 1.5, which asked LAO presidents to define good governance, 86.8% of respondents selected "to implement projects efficiently with a small budget" versus 10.8% who selected "to implement projects that meet the needs of residents by using time and budget efficiently." This apparent contradiction in thinking implied by the responses to questions 1.4 and 1.5 may stem from the strict financial constraints faced by Thai LAOs.

1.4 If the local council opposes the local residents about project sites, how do you decide?
(please choose only one answer)

	Frequency	Ratio
1. You <u>always</u> accept the needs of <u>the local councilors.</u>	1	0.2
2. You <u>mostly</u> accept the needs of <u>the local councilors.</u>	21	4.5
3. You <u>mostly</u> accept the needs of <u>the residents.</u>	384	83.1
4. You always accept the needs of <u>the residents.</u>	44	9.5
No answer	12	2.6

1.5 How do you consider good governance to be implemented in projects at the local level?
(please choose only one answer)

	Frequency	Ratio
1. To implement projects efficiently with a small budget	401	86.8
2. To implement projects that meet the needs of residents by using time and budget efficiently	50	10.8
No answer	11	2.4

Question 1.6 asked about the number of LAO staff members sent to seminars, training, or meetings; 72.1% of the respondents answered that at least 50% of the staff members in the LAO had previously been sent to seminars or other training opportunities.

1.6 On average, how many staff members has your LAO already sent to seminars, training sessions, or meetings arranged by higher educational institutes, other local governments, the Department of Local Administration, the King Prajadhipok Institute, etc.? What percentage of meetings, training sessions, and seminars have you learned about through leaflets?

	Frequency	Ratio
1. 80-100%	126	27.3
2. 50-80%	207	44.8
3. 30-50%	90	19.5
4. Lower than 30 %	27	5.8
No answer	12	2.6

2.1 The Role of LAO in Environmental Issues

This section of the questionnaire was designed to explore LAO presidents' thinking on the management of environmental issues, and by doing so, the survey team hoped to evaluate LAO's capacity to deal with social problems. In question 2.1, we asked about the types of concerns regarding environmental problems that LAO presidents had heard from residents; 42.6% of respondents answered "Garbage from residents," while 35.9% answered "odors, wastewater, air pollution from residents."

2.1_1 Have you ever received any claims concerning environmental problems? (you may choose one or more answers)

	Frequency	Ratio
1. Odors, wastewater, air pollution <u>from residents</u>	166	35.9
2. Odors, wastewater, air pollution <u>from factories</u>	125	27.1
3. Odors, wastewater, air pollution <u>from farms</u>	148	32.0
4. Garbage <u>from residents</u>	197	42.6
5. Waste <u>from factories or organizations</u>	42	9.1
6. Waste <u>from farms</u>	23	5.0
7. Others	54	11.7

2.1_2 Have you ever received any claims concerning environmental problems? (you may choose one or more answers) (Upper: Frequency, Lower: Ratio)

	<i>Thesaban</i>	TAO
1. Odors, wastewater, air pollution <u>from residents</u>	86 41.1	80 31.6
2. Odors, wastewater, air pollution <u>from factories</u>	60 28.7	65 25.7
3. Odors, wastewater, air pollution <u>from farms</u>	49 23.4	99 39.1
4. Garbage <u>from residents</u>	101 48.3	96 37.9
5. Waste <u>from factories or organizations</u>	21 10.0	21 8.3
6. Waste <u>from farms</u>	8 3.8	15 5.9
7. Others	26 12.4	28 11.1

Question 2.2 asked LAO presidents if they could solve such problems. Regarding the two problems mentioned above, 43.5% and 30.5%, respectively, responded that “the LAO could solve the problems by itself.” Concerning odors, wastewater, air pollution from factories/farms, 24.7% and 21.6%, respectively, responded that “the LAO was unable to solve the problem by contacting the other agencies in charge.” From this, we can see that there was a difference in LAO presidents’ capacities to manage environmental issues depending on the source of problem.

2.2 Were you able to solve the following problems?

Problems	LAO could solve the problem(s) by itself	LAO could solve the problem(s) by contacting the other agencies in charge	LAO was unable to solve the problem by itself	No such problems have arisen.	No answer
1. Odors, wastewater, air pollution <u>from residents</u>	141 30.5	76 16.5	7 1.5	97 21.0	141 30.5
2. Odors, wastewater, air pollution <u>from factories</u>	36 7.8	114 24.7	14 3.0	118 25.5	180 39.0
3. Odors, wastewater, air pollution <u>from farms</u>	84 18.2	100 21.6	9 1.9	108 23.4	161 34.8
4. Garbage <u>from residents</u>	201 43.5	30 6.5	4 0.9	82 17.7	145 31.4
5. Waste <u>from factories or organizations</u>	30 6.5	60 13.0	6 1.3	145 31.4	221 47.8
6. Waste <u>from farms</u>	30 6.5	47 10.2	2 0.4	157 34.0	226 48.9

Question 2.3 inquired “to whom local presidents ask to solve environmental problems.” In the case of managing garbage from residents, 38.3% answered “*kamnan*/village headman,” while 14.3% answered “a senior member of your community.” We can also see the response rate for “*kamnan*/village headman” was relatively high for other environmental problems as well.

2.3 To solve the following environmental problem(s), which office or personnel did you contact? (You may choose one or more answers) (Upper: Frequency, Lower: Ratio)

Problems	Institution/ person						
	Provincial governor / district chief officer	Dept. of Industrial Works	Pollution Control Dept.	<i>Kamnan</i> / village headman	Senior member of your community	Members of parliament in your constituency	Intellectuals/ research institute/ university
1. Odors, wastewater, air pollution <u>from residents</u>	48 10.4	30 6.5	36 7.8	177 38.3	49 10.6	15 3.2	11 2.4
2. Odors, wastewater, air pollution <u>from factories</u>	61 13.2	92 19.9	61 13.2	83 18.0	37 8.0	15 3.2	12 2.6
3. Odors, wastewater, air pollution <u>from farms</u>	60 13.0	31 6.7	44 9.5	133 28.8	39 8.4	13 2.8	10 2.2
4. Garbage <u>from residents</u>	28 6.1	10 2.2	15 3.2	173 37.4	66 14.3	11 2.4	9 1.9
5. Waste <u>from factories or organizations</u>	32 6.9	46 10.0	37 8.0	59 12.8	20 4.3	6 1.3	9 1.9
6. Waste from farms	31 6.7	21 4.5	25 5.4	67 14.5	18 3.9	9 1.9	6 1.3
7. Other offices or persons contacted	59 12.8						

2.4 Which of the following is best placed to find solutions to environmental problems that meet residents' needs ? (Please choose only one answer)

	Frequency	Ratio
1. LAO	69	14.9
2. <i>Kamnan</i> /village headman (or community leader)	4	0.9
3. Both LAO and <i>kamnan</i> /village headman	304	65.8
4. Community leader other than <i>kamnan</i> /village headman (important members of the community)	30	6.5
5. Other (please specify)	27	5.8
6. No answer	28	6.1

In the third section, LAO presidents' opinions on elections were explored. The LAO presidents evaluated "the people's perceptions of the candidate's personality" (95.2%) as a "very important" factor in election, followed by "the candidate's policies" (76.2%), "team work among executive members" (77.3%), and "personal networks" (75.5%).

In contrast, support from national-level politicians and budgetary support from political parties were not regarded as importantly as the above local factors. From these results, we can speculate that the personal capability, recognition, and networks of candidates might be more effective tools for running in LAO election than support from national-level parties and politicians. It is also noteworthy that the system of election canvassers, which is a distinctive system in Thailand, was selected by 53.2% of the respondents as "very important."

3.1_1 In your view, how important are the following factors to winning the LAO Presidential Election? (Upper: Frequency, Lower: Ratio)

	Very important	A little important	Not important	Not sure	No answer
1. The candidate's policies	352 76.2	93 20.1	13 2.8	1 0.2	3 0.6
2. People's perceptions of the candidate's personality	440 95.2	18 3.9	2 0.4	0 0.0	2 0.4
3. Team work among executive members	357 77.3	87 18.8	10 2.2	5 1.1	3 0.6
4. System of election canvassers	246 53.2	154 33.3	38 8.2	17 3.7	7 1.5
5. Support from national-level politicians (members of parliament and senators)	132 28.6	201 43.5	102 22.1	24 5.2	3 0.6
6. Budget support from political parties	106 22.9	207 44.8	116 25.1	28 6.1	5 1.1
7. Personal network (e.g., husband, wife, relatives, friends)	349 75.5	89 19.3	16 3.5	3 0.6	5 1.1
8. Response to the needs of poor people (various interest groups)	273 59.1	130 28.1	44 9.5	12 2.6	3 0.6

3.1_2 In your view, how important are the following factors to winning the LAO presidential Election? (Please answer every question) (Upper: Frequency, Lower: Ratio) (TS: Thesaban)

		Very important	A little important	Not important	Not sure	No answer
1. Candidate's policies	TS	150 71.8	51 24.4	7 3.3	1 0.5	0 0.0
	TAO	202 79.8	42 16.6	6 2.4	0 0.0	3 1.2
2. People's perceptions of the candidate's personality	TS	199 95.2	9 4.3	1 0.5	0 0.0	0 0.0
	TAO	241 95.3	9 3.6	1 0.4	0 0.0	2 0.8
3. Team work among executive members	TS	150 71.8	51 24.4	6 2.9	2 1.0	0 0.0
	TAO	207 81.8	36 14.2	4 1.6	3 1.2	3 1.2
4. System of election canvassers	TS	103 49.3	65 31.1	32 15.3	9 4.3	0 0.0
	TAO	143 56.5	89 35.2	6 2.4	8 3.2	7 2.8
5. Support from national-level politicians (members of parliament and senators)	TS	42 20.1	93 44.5	69 33.0	5 2.4	0 0.0
	TAO	90 35.6	108 42.7	33 13.0	19 7.5	3 1.2
6. Budget support from political parties	TS	37 17.7	81 38.8	84 40.2	6 2.9	1 0.5
	TAO	69 27.3	126 49.8	32 12.6	22 8.7	4 1.6
7. Personal network (e.g., husband, wife, relatives, friends)	TS	160 76.6	39 18.7	9 4.3	0 0.0	1 0.5
	TAO	189 74.7	50 19.8	7 2.8	3 1.2	4 1.6
8. Response to the needs of poor people (various interest groups)	TS	117 56.0	59 28.2	29 13.9	4 1.9	0 0.0
	TAO	156 61.7	71 28.1	15 5.9	8 3.2	3 1.2

2.2 Allocation of Budget to LAO from the Central Government

In this section, we asked about LAOs' budgets and how LAO presidents supplemented shortfalls at the local level. In fact, nearly all respondents (94.8%) answered that the funding allocated from the central government was insufficient for delivering services. In response to question 4.2, LAO presidents expressed a strong need for financial support for "infrastructure development" (60.8%), "promotion of vocational employment" (29.7%), and "education" (27.7%).

Question 4.3 asked about who LAO presidents turn to when they need extra money

to compensate for budgetary shortfalls. Respondents indicated that they asked mostly local politicians such as “members of the provincial council” (71.5%), the “PAO president” (83.1%), and “members of parliament representing the province” (81.1%) . The figures are calculated from the presidents who reached out to these politicians, whether they could “get support for budget” nor not (“no support”). However, their contacts with national-level politicians and central government bureaucrats were limited: only 36.6% contacted an “influential politician belonging to the government party,” 32.2% “a minister of a related ministry,” 42.9% “director general of department/chief of section,” and 23.6% “budget bureau” ---- all of which were less frequent than contacts with local politicians.

In fact, success rate for obtaining additional funding was higher with “members of the provincial council” and the “PAO president.” Seeking support from the “provincial governor” was more successful, although LAO presidents had few opportunities to communicate with provincial governors.

4.1 Do you think the budget amount allocated to the LAO from the central government is sufficient?

	Frequency	Ratio
1. Sufficient	18	3.9
2. Not sufficient	438	94.8
No answer	6	1.3

4.2 If the budget amount allocated is not sufficient, which of the following need more budgetary support? (Please choose only two items)

	Frequency	Ratio
1. Promotion of vocational employment	137	29.7
2. Infrastructure development	281	60.8
3. Agriculture	72	15.6
4. Environment	73	15.8
5. Social welfare	83	18.0
6. Education	128	27.7
7. Community-related matters	4	0.9
8. Other	5	1.1

4.3_1 Over the past several years, when your LAO was in need of greater budgetary support, from whom did you seek help when you tried to obtain the extra funding (in addition to the normal procedure of forwarding a budget application form to the district office and the provincial office) ?

Sought support from	Got support for budget	No support	Did not ask support	No answer
1. Members of the provincial council (So.Jo.)	271 58.7	59 12.8	67 14.5	65 14.1
2. PAO president	325 70.3	59 12.8	44 9.5	34 7.4
3. Members of parliament (So.So.) representing the province	324 70.1	51 11.0	46 10.0	41 8.9
4. Influential politician belonging to the government party	97 21.0	72 15.6	191 41.3	102 22.1
5. Minister of a related ministry	69 14.9	80 17.3	204 44.2	109 23.6
6. Provincial governor	223 48.3	69 14.9	97 21.0	73 15.8
7. Director-general of department / chief of section	122	76	167	97

4.3_2 Over the past several years, when your LAO was in need of greater budgetary support, from whom did you seek help when you tried to obtain the extra funding (in addition to the normal procedure of forwarding a budget application form to the district office and the provincial office) ? (Upper: Frequency, Lower: Ratio)
(TS: Thesaban)

Sought support from		Got support for budget	No support	Did not ask Support	No answer
1. Members of the provincial council (So.Jo.)	TS	124 59.3	33 15.8	45 21.5	7 3.3
	TAO	147 58.1	26 10.3	22 8.7	58 22.9
2. PAO president	TS	147 70.3	27 12.9	31 14.8	4 1.9
	TAO	178 70.4	32 12.6	13 5.1	30 11.9
3. Members of parliament (So.So.) representing the province	TS	154 73.7	27 12.9	26 12.4	2 1.0
	TAO	170 67.2	24 9.5	20 7.9	39 15.4

4. Influential politician belonging to the government party	TS	55 26.3	32 15.3	113 54.1	9 4.3
	TAO	42 16.6	40 15.8	78 30.8	93 36.8
5. Minister of a related ministry	TS	39 18.7	38 18.2	123 58.9	9 4.3
	TAO	30 11.9	42 16.6	81 32.0	100 39.5
6. Provincial governor	TS	110 52.6	37 17.7	57 27.3	5 2.4
	TAO	113 44.7	32 12.6	40 15.8	68 26.9
7. Director general of department/chief of section	TS	77 36.8	40 19.1	84 40.2	8 3.8
	TAO	45 17.8	36 14.2	83 32.8	89 35.2
8. Budget bureau (Pho O)	TS	21 10.0	32 15.3	146 69.9	10 4.8
	TAO	24 9.5	32 12.6	87 34.4	110 43.5
9. Other (please specify)	TS	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	N.A.
	TAO	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 0.3	

2.3 The LAO President's Background

In this section, we asked about the characteristics and personal histories of LAO presidents. The average age was 52.4 years, while 41.1% of them were under 50 years old. In response to the question about their academic qualifications, the most frequent answer was “bachelor’s degree” (37.4%), followed by “master’s degree” (27.9%). Just as we observed from the results of our surveys in Indonesia and the Philippines, most LAO presidents and local higher bureaucrats in the three ASEAN countries have bachelor’s degrees. Of note, they often obtained their bachelor’s or master’s degree after taking their post at an LAO.

It is evident from the question 5.3 that most LAO presidents had careers in local politics before running for LAO president. The most frequent types of prior political experience were “TAO councilor” (32.0%) and “*thesaban* councilor” (14.3%).

As for LAO presidents’ occupation prior to politics (question 5.4), 39.6% of respondents had been “business owners,” while 30.5% had been involved in “agriculture.”

5.1 How old is the local president now?years old (as of 1st October, 2012)
Age 52.4 years old in the average (S.D. 7.97) (N=450)

	Average	S.D.	N
<i>Thesaban</i>	52.5	7.57	208
TAO	52.0	8.35	242

5.2_1 What is your (completed) level of education?

	Frequency	Ratio
1. Primary education	20	4.3
2. Lower secondary	20	4.3
3. Upper secondary	90	19.5
4. Diploma or equivalent	22	4.8
5. Bachelor's degree	173	37.4
6. Master's degree	129	27.9
7. Doctor's degree	4	0.9
No answer	4	0.9

5.2_2 What is your (completed) level of education? (Upper: Frequency, Lower: Ratio)

	Thesaban	TAO
1. Primary education	5 2.4	15 5.9
2. Lower secondary	7 3.3	13 5.1
3. Upper secondary	28 13.4	62 24.5
4. Diploma or equivalent	9 4.3	13 5.1
5. Bachelor's degree	74 35.4	99 39.1
6. Master's degree	82 39.2	47 18.6
7. Doctor's degree	3 1.4	1 0.4
N. A.	1 0.5	3 1.2

5.3_1 Which of the following positions have you been involved in before taking up the present post (LAO president)? (you may choose one or more answers)

	Frequency	Ratio
1. Minister	0	0.0
2. Members of parliament	4	0.9
3. Members of the provincial council	20	4.3

4. Members of the <i>thesaban</i> council	66	14.3
5. TAO councilors	148	32.0
6. <i>Kamnan</i>	50	10.8
7. Village headman	72	15.6
8. Assistant <i>kamnan</i>	8	1.7
9. Village committee members	60	13.0
10. Community organization members (e.g., agricultural group, housewife groups, physical exercise groups)	54	11.7
11. Other (please specify)	88	19.0
No experience at all	26	5.6

5.3.2 Which of the following positions have you been involved in before taking up the present post (LAO president)? (you may choose one or more answers) (Upper: Frequency, Lower: Ratio)

	<i>Thesaban</i>	TAO
1. Minister	0 0.0	0 0.0
2. Members of parliament	3 1.4	1 0.4
3. Members of the provincial council	14 6.7	6 2.4
4. Members of the <i>thesaban</i> council	66 31.6	0 0.0
5. TAO councilors	43 20.6	105 41.5
6. <i>Kamnan</i>	14 6.7	36 14.2
7. Village headman	24 11.5	48 19.0
8. Assistant <i>kamnan</i>	6 2.9	2 0.8
9. Village committee members	15 7.2	45 17.8
10. Community organization members (e.g., agricultural group, housewife groups, physical exercise groups)	15 7.2	39 15.4
11. Other (please specify)	36 17.2	52 20.6
No experience	18 8.6	8 3.2

5.4_1 Before becoming LAO president, what kind of occupation were you engaged in?
(Please choose the occupation that you undertook for the longest period)

	Frequency	Ratio
1. Business owner	183	39.6
2. Private employee	21	4.5
3. Agriculture	141	30.5
4. Teacher/ professor	38	8.2
5. Police or military officer	13	2.8
6. Other civil government official	9	1.9
7. Other (please specify)	26	5.6
8. No occupation	7	1.5
N. A.	24	5.2

5.4_2 Before becoming LAO president, what kind of occupation were you engaged in?
(Please choose the occupation that you undertook for the longest period) (Upper: Frequency, Lower: Ratio)

	<i>Theaban</i>	TAO
1. Business owner	104 49.8	79 31.2
2. Private employee	9 4.3	12 4.7
3. Agriculture	39 18.7	102 40.3
4. Teacher/ professor	14 6.7	24 9.5
5. Police or military officer	10 4.8	3 1.2
6. Other civil government official	5 2.4	4 1.6
7. Other (please specify)	13 6.2	13 5.1
8. No occupation	2 1.0	5 2.0
No answer	13 6.2	11 4.4

2.4 Flood Disaster and Problem Solving

The severe flooding in Chao Phraya River basin from August to December 2011 caused tremendous damage to wide areas in Thailand. The survey asked LAO presidents about this flooding and its effect to LAO's workings. Among LAO presidents, 74.9% answered "they had damage at some level," while 6.7% selected "all areas were damaged." For question 6.2 asking about a kind of damage, "the streets and paths in the LAO's district" (58.4%) and the "resident's assets" (49.8%) scored high among the

choices.

Questions from 6.3 to 6.5 were related with LAOs' activities after the disaster. In question 6.3, only 75 LAO presidents (16.2% of the respondents) answered they "never got help, because the LAO could solve by itself." Nonetheless, many LAOs who got damages obtained supports from higher officials such as "provincial governor" (34.2%) and "district chief officer" (32.9%) . In almost all the LAOs who got damages, frequency of meetings with governmental organizations for consultation concerning restoration remained the same as before or increased. The case was the same with frequency of meetings with people's sector, too.

6.1 Was your LAO been damaged by flooding in 2011?

	Frequency	Ratio
1. All areas were damaged	31	6.7
2. Most areas were damaged	63	13.6
3. Some areas were damaged	252	54.5
4. No areas were damaged	112	24.2
No answer	4	0.9

6.2 How seriously was your LAO affected by the flooding in 2011? (you may choose one or more answers)

	Frequency	Ratio
1. Residents had to temporarily move out of the LAO	57	12.3
2. Residents' assets	230	49.8
3. The LAO's buildings and assets were damaged	92	19.9
4. The streets and paths in the LAO's district were damaged	270	58.4
5. No specific damage compared with previous years	28	6.1
6. Other	34	7.4

6.3 From which sources did your LAO receive help after this flooding? (you may choose one or more answers)

	Frequency	Ratio
1. Central government	124	26.8
2. Provincial governor	158	34.2
3. District chief officer	152	32.9
4. Other institutions	123	26.6
5. Never got help because the LAO could solve by itself	75	16.2
6. Yet to be determined	5	1.1

6.4 In cases of damage by this flooding incident, has the number of meetings between your LAO and the province or central government increased to restore the areas damaged by the flood?

	Frequency	Ratio
1. Increased	169	36.6
2. Remained the same	172	37.2
3. Decreased	4	0.9
No answer	117	25.3

6.5 In cases of damage by this flooding incident, has the number of meetings between your LAO and the people's sector increased to restore the areas damaged by flood?

	Frequency	Ratio
1. Increased	185	40.0
2. Remained the same	157	34.0
3. Decreased	0	0.0
No answer	120	26.0

3 Local Governance Survey 2013 in Thailand: Chief Clerk Version

In this section, we inquired about demographic data of LAO, such as population, local finance and basic characteristics. We asked the LAO top bureaucrats to fill in these numbers in this survey.

We can observe the standard deviations of these numbers were extremely high in Thailand, which means that there was a disparity in Thai LAOs' demographic and financial features.

3.1 LAO Demographic Data

1.2 What is the population of this LAO? (Please use data from the Population Registration Record "Thabian Rasadorn" for 1st April, 2012)

	Average	S.D.	Frequency
1. Male population	6,228.5	20,426.6	439
2. Female population	6,143.5	19,824.4	452
3. Total number of households	4,065.8	6,779.0	375
4. Estimate of unregistered population	6,027.5	14,794.2	130

1.3 Information about occupations as sources of livelihood for residents of the LAO (from the latest “Jo Po, Tho.” survey data) (Unit: person)

	Average	S.D.	Frequency
1. Agriculture	2,913.3	3,872.0	302
2. Government official or government employee	437.5	922.2	304
3. Business owner or self-employed	468.2	1,205.8	288
4. Private employee	1,346.2	1,215.3	273
5. Temporary-hired workers	2,117.7	8,949.7	288
6. Other	858.8	1,247.2	208

1.4 How far is this LAO office from the provincial hall?

Average 47.3km, S.D.33.7km (N=451)

How far is this LAO office from the district office?

Average 11.0km, S.D. 9.6km (N=451)

1.5 All types of revenue this LAO received in three fiscal years (Upper: Average, Lower: S.D.) (Unit: 1,000 baht)

Type of revenue	2010 (N=366)	2011 (N=367)	2012 (N=361)
1. Tax collected by LAO	4,635.9	4,677.2	4,923.7
	18,260.1	17,365.7	18,418.6
2. Fees, charges, and licenses	901.7	986.7	1,651.5
	2,530.2	2,603.0	13,783.5
3. Income from properties	619.7	674.2	988.4
	1,885.3	1,837.3	2,749.7
4. Other miscellaneous income	388.1	469.5	463.4
	1,028.5	1,231.2	1,311.9
5. Shared tax allocated by the central government	23,568.7	25,068.3	37,339.7
	34,341.9	40,320.6	190,314.2
6. General subsidy	14,073.8	15,209.2	15,625.4
	14,969.0	18,289.3	19,907.2
Total	94,206.0	46,795.7	52,003.8
	1,005,433.9	75,045.5	97,851.1

Type of expenditure	2010 (N=366)	2011 (N=366)	2012 (N=361)
1. Central budget	5,033.4	4,973.6	4,201.3
	5,239.5	15,047.4	8,391.8
2. Monthly salaries and regularly paid wages	6,597.7	7,593.5	8,560.7
	9,683.6	11,698.3	11,655.6
3. Employment wages for temporary employees	4,198.3	3,988.4	4,525.0
	8,233.8	7,858.1	9,041.4
4. Rewards, rental fees, consumable goods	12,150.2	13,948.3	15,335.6
	18,539.6	21,679.6	27,316.6
5. Public works	717.3	684.3	796.2
	1,632.9	1,275.3	1,410.6

6. Subsidies	3,103.8	2,933.3	3,070.4
	3,681.5	3,449.6	3,676.8
7. Durable goods, lands, and buildings	5,762.2	7,160.7	8,505.0
	14,643.5	25,508.2	28,219.3
8. Others	1,349.5	524.9	1,311.2
	3,303.8	2,169.8	12,271.3
Total	38,480.2	39,866.3	44,904.9
	55,890.3	64,344.9	74,763.9

Fiscal year	General subsidy with conditions (1,000 baht)	General subsidy without any conditions (1,000 baht)	Special grants (1,000 baht)
2010	6,972.7	10,567.2	12,050.0
(N=170)	11,287.9	11,500.8	24,269.7
2011	5,854.3	11,407.5	11,068.0
(N=227)	12,200.5	13,342.7	20,961.6
2012	6,827.1	11,266.0	15,481.3
(N=298)	13,718.2	12,062.0	27,371.5

1.6 Does your LAO have any debt?

	Frequency	Ratio
1. Yes	54	11.7
2. No	265	57.4
No answer	143	31.0

Please fill out the amount of debt below (Upper: Average, Lower: S.D.) (Unit: 1,000 baht)

2010 (As of September 30) (N=43)	2011 (As of September 30) (N=44)	2012 (As of September 30) (N=46)
13,282.2	19,576.6	18,265.0
16,664.2	26,275.4	26,708.2

1.7 Has your LAO received any monetary assistance, apart from the regular budget, for specified objectives from other institutes? (If yes, please answer.)

No. of LAOs that have received monetary assistance: 151 (32.7%)

1.8 Does your LAO allocate any funding for education for the president, council members, and staff?

	Frequency	Ratio
1. Yes	295	63.9
2. No	54	11.7
No answer	113	24.4

Please fill out the amount of debt below, if yes (Upper: Average, Lower: S.D.)

Year		The president	Members of parliament	Staffs
2010	Amount of scholarships (N=223)	0.4 0.8	0.6 1.1	3.1 5.5
	Amount of money (baht) (N=215)	20,211.6 39,023.3	23,627.1 51,199.7	219,435.8 950,894.2
2011	Amount of scholarships (N=227)	0.4 0.7	0.6 1.1	2.8 2.5
	Amount of money (baht) (N=219)	15,952.9 32,371.7	23,917.7 49,578.0	215,994.7 940,926.1
2012	Amount of scholarships (N=222)	0.3 0.6	0.4 0.9	2.6 2.5
	Amount of money (baht) (N=210)	11,468.5 31,760.9	13,025.2 38,183.7	143,682.8 140,750.1

1.9 Has your LAO spent its budget for the following construction projects in the past several years? (Please include the budget from the central government or contributions and shared budgets from other LAOs) (Upper: Average, Lower: S.D.)

(1) Buildings

	No. of LAOs using budget	No. of facilities
1. Schools	75	4.0 2.5
2. Centers for small children	142	2.3 2.5
3. Centers for youth	18	1.1 0.2
4. Centers for elderly people	30	2.3 4.7
5. Centers for disabled persons	12	1.1 0.3
6. Other	11	1.1 0.3

(2) Public utilities

	No. of LAOs using budget	No. of sites and projects	Total budget amount (Baht)
1. Drain pipes	181	4.2 4.5	3,571,451.3 27,467,337.0
2. Waste disposal (treatment) plants	10	1.0 0.0	N.A.
3. Organic fertilizer plants	19	1.1 0.5	N.A.
4. Garbage sorting plants	8	2.8 3.5	N.A.
5. Road construction/repair	253	12.4 14.6	5,013,739.0 8,155,882.4
6. Other	53	6.8 16.9	N.A.

(3) Facilities for residents

	No. of LAOs using budget	No. of sites and projects
1. Pavilions	143	7.2 13.5
2. Various service centers	92	3.2 4.1
3. Other	28	2.8 3.7

(4) Athletic fields or recreation areas

	No. of LAOs using budget	No. of sites and projects
1. Athletic fields	149	3.3 4.9
2. Public Parks	91	1.7 1.3 2.7
3. Other	23	3.3

1.10 In the past three years, has this LAO received any prizes from the central government or provincial offices? (Not including certificates from all institutes)

	Frequency	Ratio
1. No, it has not received a prize	274	59.3
2. Yes, it has received one or more prizes (Please select the five most important prizes.)	151	32.7
No answer	37	7.9

3.2 LAO President Demographic Data

2.1 Please list the names of the presidents of this LAO in the past 6 years and the duration of their terms of office.

2.2 What is the former president's educational background?

	Frequency	Ratio
1. Primary education	34	7.4
2. Lower secondary	23	5.0
3. Upper secondary	95	20.6
4. Diploma or equivalent	21	4.5
5. Bachelor's degree	157	34.0
6. Higher than bachelor's degree	121	26.2
No answer	11	2.4

2.3 Has your former President ever held any of the following political posts? (you can choose more than one answer)

	Frequency	Ratio
1. Minister	0	0.0
2. Member of parliament	2	0.4
3. Member of PAO council	17	3.7
4. Member of municipal (<i>thesaban</i>) council	50	10.8
5. Member of TAO council	141	30.5
6. <i>Kamnan</i> (sub-district head)	63	13.6
7. Village headman	53	11.5
8. Assistant <i>kamnan</i>	4	0.9
9. Village committee member	39	8.4
10. Member of community organization (e.g., housewife groups, farmers groups, sports groups, etc.)	42	9.1
11. Other (please specify)	99	21.4
No experiences	42	9.1

2.4 Before becoming president, what was the occupation of the former LAO president?
(Please choose only one answer by selecting the occupation engaged in for the longest period)

	Frequency	Ratio
1. Business owner	174	37.7
2. Private employee	12	2.6
3. Agriculture	153	33.1
4. Teacher, professor	28	6.1
5. Police or military officer	10	2.2
6. Other Civil Government official	7	1.5
7. Other (please specify)	58	12.5
8. No occupation	12	2.6
No answer	8	1.7

2.5 Data of the most recent election

Date of election

Year of election	Frequency	Ratio
2001	1	0.2
2005	1	0.2
2007	1	0.2
2008	15	3.2
2009	149	32.3
2010	39	8.4
2011	60	13.0
2012	154	33.3
2013	16	3.5
No answer	26	5.6

Questions	Average	S.D.
1. How many candidates were there? (N=432)	3.7	7.4
2. How many eligible voters took part in the most recent election for LAO President? (N=403)	7,438.9	7,632.8
3. How many residents (voters) voted in the most recent election for LAO President? (N=406)	5,026.2	3,777.6
4. Number of votes for the winner, who received the highest number of votes (N=408)	2,715.4	2,211.9
5. Number of votes for the winner, who received the second highest number of votes (N=402)	1,619.5	1,490.3

3.3 LAO Activities and Projects

3.1 Since the latest local council member election, have any ordinances raised by the LAO council taken effect in this LAO? (e.g., “*kho bannyat PAO*” (PAO ordinance), “*thesabanyat*” (municipal ordinance) “*kho bannyat TAO*” (TAO ordinance). Do not include budget ordinances.)

	Frequency	Ratio
1. Some ordinances that have taken effect	187	40.5
2. No ordinances have taken effect so far	248	53.7
No answer	27	5.8

If any ordinances have been raised by the LAO, please list the names of the ordinances and their authors (e.g., president, clerk, member of the local council, etc. If there have been more than five ordinances, please select the five most important ordinances.)

3.2 Do people contact the LAO office for any of the following matters (Please put in order of priority, 1-2-3 respectively.)

	First Priority		Second Priority		Third Priority	
	Frequency	Ratio	Frequency	Ratio	Frequency	Ratio
1. Infrastructure repair	201	43.5	105	22.7	63	13.6
2. Environmental problems	9	1.9	35	7.6	58	12.6
3. Law and order in the community	4	0.9	13	2.8	42	9.1
4. Handling social welfare issues	117	25.3	139	30.1	72	15.6
5. Public health	9	1.9	34	7.4	78	16.9
6. Complaints (ex. personal disputes)	6	1.3	9	1.9	21	4.5
7. Resident registration	54	11.7	26	5.6	19	4.1
8. Requests for the construction of buildings	31	6.7	71	15.4	81	17.5
9. Other	19	4.1	14	3.0	9	1.9
No answer	12	2.6	16	3.5	19	4.1

3.4 Relations between LAOs and Central and Local Administrations

4.1 Do any people visit the LAO office for consultation on LAO activities? (Please answer every question) (Upper: Frequency, Lower: Ratio)

	Frequencies of visit					No answer
	Several times a month	Once a month	Once in 2-3 months	Once or twice a Year	No call for meetings	
1. Teachers/professors from schools	112 24.2	95 20.6	182 39.4	53 11.5	5 1.1	15 3.2
2. NGOs	31 6.7	45 9.7	106 22.9	161 34.8	80 17.3	39 8.4
3. Business persons	51 11.0	55 11.9	118 25.5	131 28.4	75 16.2	32 6.9
4. Public health officials	120 26.0	135 29.2	144 31.2	42 9.1	6 1.3	15 3.2
5. PAO president	7 1.5	20 4.3	64 13.9	128 27.7	208 45.0	35 7.6
6. PAO clerk	7 1.5	18 3.9	59 12.8	96 20.8	246 53.2	36 7.8
7. Presidents of other LAOs	35 7.6	63 13.6	148 32.0	146 31.6	45 9.7	25 5.4
8. Clerks of other LAOs	53 11.5	75 16.2	168 36.4	131 28.4	15 3.2	20 4.3
9. <i>Kamnan</i> , village headmen	262 56.7	92 19.9	63 13.6	18 3.9	9 1.9	18 3.9
10. Officials from Department of Local Administration	46 10.0	58 12.6	109 23.6	145 31.4	80 17.3	24 5.2
11. Chief district officers or assistant chief district officers	45 9.7	94 20.3	147 31.8	140 30.3	18 3.9	18 3.9
12. Provincial governor (vice governor) / deputy governor	5 1.1	15 3.2	55 11.9	171 37.0	192 41.6	24 5.2
13. Members of parliament	14 3.0	21 4.5	75 16.2	173 37.4	158 34.2	21 4.5
14. Officials from Social Development and Human Security Ministry	25 5.4	42 9.1	90 19.5	166 35.9	104 22.5	35 7.6

15. Officials from Community Development Dept.	47	86	158	121	31	19
	10.2	18.6	34.2	26.2	6.7	4.1

4.2_1 With regard to all LAO activities, do you think the LAO's activities should depend on the knowledge, budget, and support provided by the central governmental agencies or provincial administrations?

	Frequency	Ratio
1. Not needed	23	5.0
2. Needed	425	92.0
No answer	14	3.0

4.2_2 Fields that the LAOs are in need of support
(Upper: Frequency, Lower: Ratio)

	Knowledge	Budget
1. Infrastructure	198 42.9	367 79.4
2. City planning	323 69.9	200 43.3
3. Tax collection	241 52.2	117 25.3
4. Waste collection	201 43.5	184 39.8
5. Management	217 47.0	214 46.3
6. Waterworks	188 40.7	241 52.2
7. Public health	280 60.6	217 47.0
8. Waste water treatment	210 45.5	196 42.4
9. Welfare services	214 46.3	250 54.1
10. Preservation of arts and culture	199 43.1	188 40.7
11. Education	236 51.1	244 52.8
12. Agriculture	253 54.8	205 44.4
13. Other (please specify)	15 3.2	11 2.4

4.3_1 With regard to all LAO activities, do you think the LAO's activities should depend on the knowledge, budget, and support provided by other LAOs?

	Frequency	Ratio
1. Not needed	90	19.5
2. Needed	332	71.9
No answer	40	8.7

4.3_2 Fields that the LAOs are in need of support
(Upper: Frequency, Lower: Ratio)

	Knowledge	Budget
1. Infrastructure	133 28.8	260 56.3
2. City planning	126 27.3	92 19.9
3. Tax collection	103 22.3	57 12.3
4. Waste collection	95 20.6	97 21.0
5. Management	118 25.5	116 25.1
6. Waterworks	82 17.7	104 22.5
7. Public health	104 22.5	95 20.6
8. Waste water treatment	97 21.0	87 18.8
9. Welfare services	98 21.2	94 20.3
10. Preservation of arts and culture	95 20.6	98 21.2
11. Education	102 22.1	110 23.8
12. Agriculture	95 20.6	81 17.5
13. Other (please specify)	7 1.5	10 2.2

NOTES

- ¹ This report is analyzed under the project supported by the IDE. The 2013 survey was financed by JSPS Kakenhi Grant Number 25283009 FY2013-2016 (principal investigator: Nagai Fumio).
- ² The steering committee of the 2006 LAO survey in Thailand were Fumio Nagai, Tsuruyo Funatsu, Nakharin Mektrairat, and Supasawad Chardchawan. The 2006 survey results are briefly reported in Nagai, Fumio, Nakharin Mektrairat, and Tsuruyo Funatsu, eds., *Local Government in Thailand -- Analysis of the Local*

Administrative Organization Survey --, Joint Research Program Series, Chiba: IDE-JETRO, 2008 [in English] and in Tsuruyo Funatsu, “Preliminary Results: The Survey of Local Administrative Organizations in Thailand,” IDE Interim Report, IDE-JETRO, 2008 [in English].

- ³ The steering committee of the 2013 survey in Thailand are Fumio Nagai, Kazuhiro Kagoya, Supasawad Chardchawan, and Tsuruyo Funatsu.