

Development and Wellbeing: A Case Study of the Phitsanulok 2020 Indochina Intersection New Economic Zone

Farung Mee-Udon^{a*} and Nopparat Rattanaprathum^a

^a*Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Faculty of Social Sciences*

Naresuan University, Phitsanulok 65000, Thailand

^{*}*Corresponding Author. Email: farungm@nu.ac.th*

Received: August 5, 2020

Revised: October 8, 2020

Accepted: December 1, 2020

Abstract

This study aims to assess the wellbeing level of people after the implementation of the current strategic plan for area development known as the Phitsanulok 2020 Indochina Intersection New Economic Zone Strategy. Conducted in 2019, the study used the convergent parallel mixed-method study design. Qualitative data were gathered from 12 key informants. Quantitative data of the sampling group were collected from 400 households living in nine districts. Results show that the Phitsanulok 2020 plan began officially in 2015 but has been a focus of attention since 1994. The plan is going well because Phitsanulok has always been a politically and economically important city in the North, and the Indochina intersection has been developed continuously. The plan has contributed to a new approach to development determined not by the government's initiation but through multi-sectoral coordination. The plan was proposed by the private sector and supported by the government with an advisory committee consisting of representatives from the public and private sectors. While the plan was to implement 12 initial projects in the first five years, most of the projects have not moved beyond the implementation phase since they are 'megaprojects' and require substantial investment and long completion time. Although initiated by the local community, decision-making, and budget approval for the plan are guided by government rules and regulations. Moreover, the country's recent political instability and the changes of Phitsanulok governors have hindered continued support. Quantitative data shows that people's wellbeing in terms of objective, subjective, and social relations is at a high level. Nevertheless, approximately 70 percent of the sample reported not being aware of the projects and about 25 percent thought that the projects still do not meet their expectations. These are important considerations for policy development in the future.

Keywords: Phitsanulok 2020 plan, wellbeing, Indochina intersection

Introduction

The Indochina intersection, Phitsanulok, has been an area of great importance since it was declared a strategic area for trade, investment, and tourism of the northern region since 1997 (Thiwaphan, 2018, 39-40). It is located on the East-West Economic Corridor (EWEC) and the North-South Economic Corridor (NSEC), and is a transportation hub connecting countries like China with ASEAN countries such as Myanmar, Laos, and Vietnam.

The purpose of the Indochina intersection development in 1997 was to expand trade and tourism. Since then, the intersection has become widely recognized, resulting in developments particularly in transportation which connect all nearby routes via a junction at the Asian Landbridge in Phitsanulok. The development of the Indochina intersection first took shape in 1994-1996 through the collaboration of various parties under the name of the Educational Club for Indochina Intersection Development. In 1997, the Thai Cabinet identified the Indochina intersection as a main strategic area for the development of the North (Northern Development Center, 1998: 1; Thiwaphan et al., 2014: 52). The development of the Phitsanulok Indochina intersection has been continuing since then. In 2015, the “Phitsanulok 2020 Development Strategy - Indochina Intersection New Economic Zone” (hereafter referred to as the Phitsanulok 2020 plan) was formulated to further develop Phitsanulok. The objective was to increase the dimensions of development, not only in trade and tourism, but also as a city well-known for advanced social development, culture, and quality of life and environment. The duration of the project was set for five years (2015-2020).

The Phitsanulok 2020 plan was an evidence-based scheme based on the urban development concept of Smart Growth. It was proposed by civil society groups whose members included residents of Phitsanulok, who recognized that the development process involved more dimensions than just trade and tourism but also encompassed social development, quality of life, and the environment (Joint Committee

of Phitsanulok Private Sector and Network Organizations, 2015: 1; Phitsanulok Provincial Office, 2017: 1-4). Although the Phitsanulok 2020 plan was proposed by the private sector (including, notably, the Phitsanulok Chamber of Commerce), it has garnered support from the government as well as from local communities.

Before the development of the Indochina intersection, Phitsanulok had always been supported by the state. Since the 5th National Economic and Social Development Plan (1982-1986) to the 7th Plan (1992-1996), the province has been identified as one of the regional industrial centers of the northern region. During the development of the Indochina intersection, Thailand changed its developmental approach, shifting the focus more towards human development and wellbeing rather than just economic development. The wellbeing concept has been implemented since the 8th Plan (1997-2001). In the 9th Plan (2002-2006), indicators of wellbeing were established, and, in the 10th plan (2007-2012) the concept of societal wellbeing was proposed as a vision statement (National Economic and Social Development Board-NESDB, 2013). This research used the term ‘wellbeing’ in accordance with the definition coined by NESDB (2003), which could be translated as ‘live well, be happy.’ The concept consists of the following seven aspects: health, education, employment, income and income distribution, family life, the environment, and good governance.

The importance of the concept of wellbeing in human development has been researched extensively, but often there is little explanation of the conditions under which people could utilize their potential because the concept is still too abstract (Gough and McGregor, 2007). Nobel Laureate Amartya Sen (1993) views human development as central to the development process and suggests that the economy should serve merely as a tool or a path to the success of development. Layard (2005) supports Sen’s argument empirically, demonstrating that increased income does not always increase people’s satisfaction/happiness in developed countries. Since 2001, researchers have tried to make Sen’s concept more practical. The most notable effort is a group

of academics known as the Research Group on Wellbeing in Developing Countries-WeD (2007), led by Allister McGregor. Having conducted a study on wellbeing in four developing countries (Thailand, Bangladesh, Ethiopia, and Peru), WeD concludes that wellbeing is a social construction and its interpretation and meaning varies across people and contexts (Phromphakphing, 2006). The definition of wellbeing here refers to conditions that allow humans to achieve what they value or desire without compromising the wellbeing of others (Gough and McGregor, 2007; Phromphakphing, 2006).

Among Thai scholars, the definition of wellbeing can be both concrete and abstract. Phra Bhramagunabhorn (2005) explains wellbeing as related to two levels of happiness. The first level is the householder, referring to people who want to acquire various things in life. The other level is a higher level of happiness, which can only be acquired when people are free from craving or the desire for more (Phra Bhramagunabhorn, 2005). Wasee (2005) views wellbeing in economic, social, and psychological dimensions and explains that it can be affected by internal (i.e., within the individual) and external (i.e., environmental) factors simultaneously. Phromphakphing (2006) describes wellbeing as a development discourse that is created in response to critiques that material possessions alone do not lead to human wellbeing. The discourse does not deny material progress and suggests that human wellbeing is multidimensional, encompassing objective wellbeing (OWB), which refers to an individual's ability to meet various levels of needs, as well as (non-material) subjective wellbeing (SWB), which refers to subjective evaluations of life satisfaction and happiness. In addition to OWB and SWB, the wellbeing perspective of WeD moves beyond the individual dimension to the social and relational dimension of wellbeing (WeD, 2007). Finally, Mee-Udon (2010) explains wellbeing from the perspective that is consistent with WeD (2007) and the Research Group on Wellbeing and Sustainable Development-WeSD (2017). She argues that wellbeing encapsulates three elements: the objective circumstances of an individual, his/her subjective evaluation of such circumstances, and social relationships that influence wellbeing.

According to NESDB (2003), good governance is one of seven aspects fundamental to the creation of public wellbeing (NESDB, 2003). Scholars have consistently shown that good public policies provide better opportunities for improving people's lives (Phra Bhramagunabhorn, 2005). The formation of the Phitsanulok 2020 plan occurred during the time that Thailand was adjusting its development guidelines to address people's wellbeing. As development (among other factors) inevitably affects people in one way or another, its impact on wellbeing of the community must be taken into consideration.

Most existing studies on the Indochina intersection focus mainly on the material aspects of development. Some studies investigate Phitsanulok's preparation for the development of the intersection (Wongmanee and Rattanawong, 2005; Wuthirak, Kanoksing, and Suksomboonlert, 2002; Inthawong, 2015; Kaewthongkum et al., 2007) and the plan's feasibility (Phairot, 2015; Wongmanee and Rattanawong, 2006), while others explore the proposition of the Indochina intersection as the region's logistics hub (Fakket, 2018). There remains little research on the impact of the Phitsanulok 2020 policy on the wellbeing of Phitsanulok people. This research applies the Wellbeing Focused Evaluation-WFE (Mee-Udon, 2010) developed from the work of WeD (2007) and WeSD (2017) as a research framework.

Research Methods

The study used a convergence parallel mixed methods study design, which is one with at least two parallel and relatively independent strands (Teddle and Tashakkori (2009). It focuses on collecting, analyzing, and mixing both quantitative and qualitative data in a single study or series of studies combining the strengths of quantitative and qualitative methods to develop a better understanding of the research question. In this study, both qualitative and quantitative analyses were conducted within the period of one year. Primary data for the qualitative analysis were based on in-depth interviews with 12 key informants, one from each of the 12 projects under the Phitsanulok 2020 plan. Primary data for the quantitative analysis were collected from a sample of

400 households in nine districts of Phitsanulok, using a multi-stage sampling method. Household heads or their partners (if the household head was absent), aged 20 years and over, were interviewed. Following the fact that the total number of households in Phitsanulok was 296,807 (National Statistical Office, 2017), the sample size was calculated using the Taro Yamane ready-made table for a population of more than 100,000 (Israel, 1992).

Table 1 Number of samples from household heads in 9 districts

District	Residents	Sample
Mueang Phitsanulok	114,730	155
Nakhon Thai	27,762	37
Chat Trakan	12,872	17
Bang Rakam	28,913	39
Bang Krathum	14,514	20
Phrom Phiram	28,227	38
Wat Bot District	12,911	17
Wang Thong District	38,157	51
Noen Maprang	18,721	25
Total	296,807	400

Source: National Statistical Office (2017)

Qualitative and quantitative data were collected from different groups of people using a variety of tools. For the qualitative component, semi-structured in-depth interviews were conducted, based on an interview guideline that was developed from existing studies and relevant theories. Policymakers and practitioners were recruited to provide details of the Phitsanulok 2020 plan, and people from the general population were asked to provide an insight as to their actual experiences with the plan in terms of wellbeing. The level of wellbeing of households was quantified using descriptive statistics. Wellbeing scores were divided into four levels: low (mean score = 0.1-1.50), moderate (mean score = 1.51-3.50), high (mean score = 3.51-5.50), and very high (mean score = 5.51-6). Content validation of both qualitative

and quantitative instruments was cross-checked by an expert. It should be mentioned that this research received a human research ethics clearance from Naresuan University on July 11, 2019 (project number 0250/62).

Research Results

Phitsanulok 2020 Plan

The Phitsanulok 2020 plan is an extension of the Indochina intersection development plan that has been ongoing for decades. Its formation in 2015 received government support with an advisory committee mandated to implement the Phitsanulok 2020 plan. The committee is comprised of representatives of the public and private sectors, academics, and a steering committee. The 55 committee members have worked together on 12 initial projects from 2015 until today. The progress of each project is summarized in Table 2.

Table 2 Summary of project progress according to Phitsanulok 2020 Plan

Strategic Plan for Area Development of Phitsanulok Province		
Strategy	Project	Overall results
Strategy 1: Urban and rural area development	1.1 The Phitsanulok Economic Development Center Project is a regional economy and commerce center	In process of designing the transportation system by the town planning department according to the principal city plan.
	1.2 MICE Industry Project to support the MICE Center of the Lower-Northern Region for MICE Hub and Phitsanulok Convention and Exhibition Center	The construction of the convention center was completed but has not been utilized because emphasis has been on the process of first promoting Phitsanulok as a MICE city.
	1.3 The development of Bueng Ratchanok into a regional park	In process of dredging and developing the area.
	**1.4 Phitsanulok: Healthy City Aging Destination Project	There is progress in building universal design architecture, which is accessible to all, regardless of age, disability, etc. in some major tourist spots and hotels.

Table 2 Summary of project progress according to Phitsanulok 2020 Plan (cont.)

Strategic Plan for Area Development of Phitsanulok Province		
Strategy	Project	Overall results
	**1.5 Phitsanulok: Creative City Project to connect the landscape, way of life, culture, history, and the creative hub	Progress due to completion of the construction of the Phitsanulok City Information and Exhibition Center; the service was opened in 2019.
Strategy 2: Transport and logistics infrastructure development	2.1 Phitsanulok Multimodel Transportation Center Project at the Phitsanulok High-Speed Railway Station (Bangkok-Phitsanulok-Chiang Mai)	Research has begun but there is still no progress in the construction of the route.
	**2.2 Phitsanulok Mass Transit System Development Project	Feasibility study and policy research have been completed. There is a plan for the construction of the route in 2023.
	2.3 Lower-Northern Regional Logistics Center Project at Ban Bueng Phra, Mueang District	In process of surveying land ownership by Department of Land Transport.
	2.4 A project to develop Phitsanulok airport to be an international airport	Is well equipped in terms of regulations and structure but cannot open international flights.
Strategy 3: Economic development for increased agricultural value trade and investment	3.1 The Phitsanulok Food and Herb Product Innovation Project	In the process of preparing two areas for this project: (1) Ban Bueng Phra, Mueang District and (2) Phrom Phiram District.
	3.2 Phitsanulok Research and Development for Product Innovation Center Project	In process of preparing two areas for this project: one close to Naresuan University and another near Phitsanulok University.
	**3.3 The Phitsanulok City of Renewable Energy and Integrated Waste Management Project (Phitsanulok: The City of Recycling)	Progress due to the good foundation of Wong Phanit Company and the center of integrated waste management and energy park-solar cell at Naresuan University.

Remark: ** Projects that have made substantial progress

Table 2 indicates that four projects under the Phitsanulok 2020 plan have progressed well. They are 1.4 Healthy City Aging Destination Project, 1.5 Creative City, 2.2 Mass Transit System Development Project, and 3.3 the City of Recycling. The Healthy City Aging Destination Project focuses on the aging society in Thailand as part of an international trend and thus, Phitsanulok would be an attraction for senior tourists. The Exhibition Center under the Creative City project would be a destination for tourists as well as Phitsanulok people who are interested in a healthy way of life, as well as in culture and history. The Mass Transit System Development Project proposes using electric buses in urban areas of Phitsanulok, and mass transportation may replace personal passenger cars and solve the traffic problems faced in Phitsanulok. The City of Recycling aims to reduce waste and establish sustainable energy management for Phitsanulok. According to NESDB (2003), health, environmental, and good governance are important aspects of creating wellbeing for the public; thus the occurrence of these four projects could improve the wellbeing of Phitsanulok people. Although the majority of the projects are still in the process of being implemented, they have the potential to be completed.

1. Conditions that enable the four projects to perform well

Regarding the results in Table 2, there are important issues that need to be taken into consideration. Based on the in-depth interviews, several conditions have been identified as success factors for the four projects. First, according to the majority of informants, Phitsanulok is “an area that is forced to develop.” The location of Phitsanulok has high development potential and the Thai government has prioritized Phitsanulok as one of the main cities in the North. According to Wongthet (2002: 6), Phitsanulok has been of great historical, political, and economic importance to Thailand from the Sukhothai period (1781-1981) until the present. There is evidence that, even before the railway was built in 1907, Phitsanulok had been a junction for foreign trade. Burmese merchants walked from Mawlamyine, Mae Sot to enter Sukhothai to sell different products in Phitsanulok. Lao merchants from Luang Prabang would travel by foot, using ox carts to carry goods

through Loei province, entering Nakhon Thai district to reach Phitsanulok (Aneksuk and Panyawutakul, 2015: 3). Moreover, Phitsanulok is the location of the famous Phra Buddha Chinnarat, known as one of the most beautiful Buddha images in Thailand. The priceless statue is so revered that every king since the Sukhothai period would come to visit and worship (Aneksuk and Panyawutakul, 2015: 2).

Second, there is a continuous integration of civil society groups. The emergence of the Phitsanulok 2020 plan was an attempt to push for the development of Phitsanulok to keep up with the development of ASEAN. Much development planning (2014-2018) before the Phitsanulok 2020 plan (2015-2020) occurred under the vision of "Phitsanulok: City of Indochina Intersection Economy and Society Service." The creation of the Phitsanulok 2020 plan after 2015 made it possible to integrate many projects into a coherent provincial development plan. Additionally, driven by the establishment of a steering committee chaired by the governor, there are 12 sub-committees/working groups, each consisting of members from both old and new generations, mostly Phitsanulok people, who work together for their hometown. The plan represents an example of the horizontal development paradigm that is different from the state-led development.

Finally, the emergence of the Phitsanulok 2020 plan is evidence-based. The plan's development was based on research and knowledge related to urban development under the concept of Smart Growth. Naabutjom (2018: 47) argues that the growth of Phitsanulok in the past lacked proper urban planning and therefore the city had been unable to successfully support the development of important projects that would benefit the economy in the Indochina intersection. Bunyaprawit (2015) shows that, with the Smart Growth concept as a governing framework, Phitsanulok 2020 is a progressive development blueprint of integrated city planning to drive the economy and economic development that can enhance the quality of life of the people.

2. Key obstacles to the project

Despite the plan's seeming success, obstacles remain. First, most of the projects are still in the process of being implemented, and

therefore, it is not clear whether they will have the intended effects on the wellbeing of the people. The delay is due to the fact that most projects are large scale requiring sizable funding and a long-term operation, while the duration of the plan itself covers only five years. According to the KI-9 (the 9th key informant, interviewed on September 19, 2019), the plan may also be seen as overly ambitious, hoping to accomplish too much in too little time, while the projects have faced problems including budget inadequacy, legal matters, government regulations, and limited stakeholder involvement.

Second, the political situation in Thailand over the past decade has been at best unstable and several civil servants have served as the provincial governor in the five-year duration of the 2020 plan. Since the governor presides over the plan's steering committee, the fact that the position has been constantly filled by new people has resulted in the lack of full and continuous support from the government sector.

Finally, the Phitsanulok 2020 development plan does not give sufficient importance to human development and public participation. In fact, during the interviews, many key informants felt that the plan placed a great emphasis on infrastructure at the expense of human development and it could have included the local communities more extensively. One key informant stated:

Phitsanulok 2020 is focused on the smart city concept, making it easy to forget about smart people. The plan has a lot of 'coming soon' projects that probably will not be completed on time. If the plan is written as a dream, it can only be accepted as something hoped for. To accomplish the dream, it is essential to empower people first (KI-4, 2019).

This section has presented a description of the Phitsanulok 2020 development plan from the policymakers' and practitioners' point of view. The next section shows the profile of respondents and how the plan affects people's wellbeing in terms of their actual experiences, from their point of view in term terms of objective, subjective, and social wellbeing.

Household Characteristics

In this study, 400 households were interviewed for quantitative analysis. The sample was composed of more female (67.0 percent) than male respondents (33 percent). About 40 percent of the sample were between 50 and 59 years old with an average age of 52.8. About 70 percent of the sample were married, half (54.3 percent) had completed primary education and about 27 percent were small traders and professionals, followed by farming and general employment (20.3 percent and 16.3 percent), respectively. Approximately 80 percent had a monthly income of 10,000 baht or under, with an average income of 7,938.86 baht per month. The majority (66.5 percent) of the sample lived in a non-municipal area. About 44.5 percent had 2-3 household members, with an average number of household members of 3.61. More than 50 percent of the sample lived with children and grandchildren, 20 percent lived with spouses, and 9 percent lived alone.

Wellbeing in Phitsanulok Province

According to WeD (2007) and WeSD (2017), the wellbeing concept includes objective wellbeing, subjective wellbeing, and social relations. In this study, objective wellbeing was operationalized by looking at five dimensions of wellbeing, including economic (e.g. have money to spend, no debt), career and career path (e.g. having a job, children having education), health (good health, having food to consume everyday), home environment (having running water, electricity, shelter), and transportation (owning a vehicle). Altogether 10 questions were formulated, and the respondents were asked to select five wellbeing aspects that best describe the wellbeing of their households. Then, each respondent was asked to rank the level of the five selected aspects with a score of from 1-6.

Based on the survey of 400 households in the sample, the top five aspects which best described the wellbeing of the households in the survey were that the households 1) have food to eat every day (53.5 percent), have jobs that generate income (23.5 percent), have good health (21.5 percent), have no debt (19.0 percent), and have a vehicle (18.0).

As for the level of wellbeing, it was found that these five wellbeing aspects were at a high level, with the mean score at 5.34, 4.82, 5.00, 4.80, and 4.82, respectively (Table 3).

Table 3 Top five objective wellbeing aspects and level of wellbeing

Objective wellbeing	Percentage (n=400)	Wellbeing level		
		Mean	S.D.	Meaning
1. Have food to eat every day	53.5	5.34	0.82	high level
2. Have a job which generates income	23.5	4.82	1.11	high level
4. Have good health	21.5	5.00	1.08	high level
3. Have no debt	19.0	4.80	1.21	high level
5. Have a vehicle	18.0	4.82	0.99	high level

Subjective wellbeing included the following three dimensions: 1) happiness in the mind because of self-reliance, 2) feeling secure in life and at home, and 3) freedom of living through various choices in life. The top five aspects of subjective wellbeing are: people's satisfaction with what they have (49.5 percent), access to healthcare (28.2 percent), contentment with the safety and security of their life and property (17.3 percent), feeling secure in life (17.0 percent), and feeling happy and cheerful (13.8 percent). The sample assesses the actual wellbeing at a high level with an average score in the range of 4.60-4.96 points (Table 4).

Table 4 Top five subjective wellbeing aspects and level of wellbeing

Subjective wellbeing	Percentage (n=400)	Wellbeing level		
		Mean	S.D.	Meaning
1. Being content with what they have	49.5	4.96	0.92	high level
2. Access to healthcare	28.2	4.75	0.97	high level
3. Being content with safety and security	17.3	4.60	0.93	high level
4. Feeling secure in life	17.0	4.76	0.95	high level
5. Always feeling cheerful	13.8	4.95	0.90	high level

Wellbeing related to social relations included four dimensions, namely 1) having a good family, 2) having a cheerful demeanor, 3) being surrounded by children, 4) living in a harmonious society, being generous, and helping each other. Based on these four dimensions, ten questions were developed and the respondents were asked to select five aspects that are most relevant to them. The top five results are: good relationships with their families (75.0 percent), good relationships with their neighbors within their community and with the communities nearby (37.0 percent), opportunities to help those in need (26.5 percent), feeling kindness towards others (23.3 percent), and spending time with their families during important holidays (15.5 percent). The sample group assessed the true wellbeing at a high level. The average score is in the range of 4.57-5.09 points (Table 5).

Table 5 Top five wellbeing aspects related to social relations and level of wellbeing

Social relations of wellbeing	Percentage (n=400)	Wellbeing level		
		Mean	S.D.	Mean
1. Have good relationships with their families	75.0	5.09	0.90	high level
2. Have good relationships with neighbors in the community and nearby communities	37.0	4.57	0.89	high level
3. Have opportunities to help those in need	26.5	4.61	1.03	high level
4. Have kindness to others	23.3	4.58	1.0	high level
5. Spend time with their families during important holidays	15.5	5.08	1.0	high level

Perception and Expectations of the Project According to the Phitsanulok 2020 Plan

The quantitative data indicate that people's awareness of the Phitsanulok 2020 plan was limited. Approximately two-thirds of the sample (69.8 percent) had never heard of the plan, although people in urban areas were more aware of it than people outside the municipality.

Only approximately 25 percent of the sample were able to express opinions and expectations about the plan when asked open-ended questions about their expectations of it. The results were sorted from the highest to the lowest percentage of expectations. Phitsanulok people expected that the Phitsanulok 2020 project would be able to create a total of 19 wellbeing aspects, which have been classified into three wellbeing dimensions, namely objective, subjective, and social relations wellbeing, as follows.

1) Objective wellbeing included six items, namely: 1) good cities, 2) a good economy, 3) good agriculture, 4) living well, 5) expectations of a good life for the new generation, and 6) affordable goods. From the analysis of all six expectations and actual wellbeing, it was found that most of them have actually not been realized. There is only one aspect that 50 percent of the respondents perceived to be true at a medium level, namely expectation that the new generation will have good life (Table 6).

Table 6 Expected objective wellbeing, percentage of expectants, and perceptions of the realization of the wellbeing as a result of the Phitsanulok 2020 Plan

Expected objective wellbeing	Percentage of expectants (n=400)	Level of wellbeing being realized				
		Very low	Low	Medium	High	Very high
1. Good city	50.00	6.50	53.50	37.00	3.00	-
2. Good economy	42.25	18.93	37.28	43.19	0.59	-
3. Good agriculture	10.00	22.50	57.50	20.00	-	-
4. Living well	3.75	26.67	46.67	26.66	-	-
5. New generation has a good life.	3.00	8.33	33.33	50.00	8.33	-
6. Goods are not expensive.	1.75	42.86	42.86	14.29	-	-

2) Subjective wellbeing included eight aspects, namely: 1) safe road travel, 2) more service and health benefits from the state, 3) more

jobs for the elderly, 4) safety in life and property, 5) promote more handicrafts for villagers, 6) a place to buy agricultural products, 7) recreational facilities for the elderly, and 8) stability in life. It was found that most people still believe that the expected subjective wellbeing has not been realized very well. The one aspect with the highest percentage (38.46 percent) was service and health benefits from the state.

Table 7 Expected subjective wellbeing, percentage of expectants, and perceptions of the realization of wellbeing as a result of the Phitsanulok 2020 Plan

Expected subjective wellbeing	Percentage of expectants (n=400)	Level of wellbeing being realized				
		Very low	Low	Medium	High	Very high
1. Traveling on the roads is safe.	3.75	13.33	60.00	26.67	-	-
2. Comprehensive health services and welfare from the state	3.25	-	61.54	38.46	-	-
3. More work for the elderly to do	2.0	75.0	25.0	-	-	-
4. Safety in life and property	1.25	-	80.0	20.0	-	-
5. Promoting handicrafts for villagers	0.25	100.0	-	-	-	-
6. A place to buy agricultural products.	0.25	-	100.0	-	-	-
7. Recreation facilities for the elderly	0.25	-	100.0	-	-	-
8. Stability in life	0.25	-	100.0	-	-	-

3) The expected social relations of wellbeing included the following five items: 1) an increase in the number of tourists, 2) a tourist center, 3) equality in prosperity, 4) more distribution of income to the countryside, and 5) more foreign investment. As in the other two aspects above, most people agreed that these are not in evidence. An increase in tourists is the one thing that 63.64 percent of the respondents perceived to be true at a moderate level.

Table 8 Expected social relations wellbeing, percentage of expectants, and perceptions towards the realization of the wellbeing as a result of the Phitsanulok 2020 Plan

Expected social relations wellbeing	Percentage of expectants (n=400)	Level of wellbeing being realized				
		Very low	Low	Medium	High	Very high
1. Increasing the number of tourists	2.75	-	36.36	63.64	-	-
2. Being a tourist center	2.25	11.11	77.78	11.11	-	-
3. Equality in prosperity	0.75	66.67	33.33	-	-	-
4. Increase in income distribution to rural areas	0.75	33.33	66.67	-	-	-
5. More foreign investment	0.25	-	100.00	-	-	-

Conclusion

The study concludes that in general, objective wellbeing, subjective wellbeing, and wellbeing related to social relations were at a high level in Phitsanulok. This high level of wellbeing could be the result of the Phitsanulok 2020 plan, which has been developing for over two decades. Development of the Indochina Intersection area has always been important for area development, receiving good capital backing with enthusiastic interest working groups contributing to the continued success of the Indochina and Phitsanulok 2020 plans. However, the data showed that most people in the sample (70 percent) were not aware of the plan even at this stage and about one-quarter felt that the projects under the plan did not meet their expectations. In light of the results, this study suggests that the community and the state should provide a mechanism to increase awareness of the Phitsanulok 2020 plan and to promote public participation. In the next phase, the community should be informed at the planning stage so that the needs of the people in each area can be incorporated, and the people's wellbeing, which is the ultimate goal of development, can be improved.

Acknowledgments

The researchers would like to thank Naresuan University for financial support, as well as key informants, leaders, and ordinary people in all nine districts as well as the research assistant team from the university's social development program and the Indochina Intersection Development Institute.

References

Aneksuk, B. and Panyawutakul, W. (2015). *Phit lok mua raek thieo phatthanakan kanthongthieo nai changwat Phitsanulok*. (In Thai) [Phit Lok when first traveling. Tourism development in Phitsanulok province]. Chiang Mai: Max Printing.

Fakket, P. (2018). *Kanphatthana senthang kan chuam yong kanthongthieo Luang Phra Bang – In Do Chin - Mo Lamyai*. (In Thai) [The development of Luang Prabang - Indochina – Moei Longan Tourism Linkage Route]. *Journal of Management, Chiang Rai Rajabhat University*, 14(1), 171-200.

Gough, I. and McGregor, A. (2007). *Wellbeing in developing countries: From theory to research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Inthawong, K. (2015). *Kantriam khwam phrom to kan poet seri dan raeng ngan nai prachakhom setthakit Asian khong raeng ngan Thai nai khet phunthi si yaek Indochin*. (In Thai) [Preparation for labor liberalization in the ASEAN Economic Community of Thai workers in Indochina intersection]. Uttaradit: Uttaradit Rajabhat University.

Joint Committee of Phitsanulok Private Sector and Network Organizations. (2015). *Prakat changwat Phitsanulok ruang taengtang khana kammakan khapkhluan yutthasat phitsanulok songphanyisip khet setthakit mai si yaek Indochin*. (In Thai) [Press statement about the strategic driving of Phitsanulok 2020]. Phitsanulok: n.p.

Kaewthongkum, D., Bupakdee, R., and Malindonkhiewprai, W. (2007). *Kanphatthana si yaek Indochin: Mattrakan chat rabop raengngan tangdao nai changwat Phitsanulok*. (In Thai) [Development of Indochina Intersection: Measures for organizing a foreign labor system in Phitsanulok province]. Phitsanulok: n.p.

Layard, R. (2005). *Happiness: Lessons from a new science*. London: Penguin Books.

Mee-Udon, F. (2010). Evaluating the universal health insurance coverage (UC) scheme in rural Thailand using a wellbeing focused evaluation (WFE) approach. In *Proceedings of the Asian Conference on Art and Humanities 18th-21st June 2010*. (pp. 2081-2097). Osaka, Japan.

Naabutjom, P. (2018). *Phatthana phua prachachon pensuk yang mankhong mangkhang yangyun bantheuk senthang phop rong phu wa ratchakan changwat Phitsanulok*. (In Thai) [Towards a development of a stable, prosperous and sustainable society with happy people: A record of an interview with the deputy governor of Phitsanulok province]. *SBL Phitsanulok records Thailand*, 9(84), 47.

National Economic and Social Development Board-NESDB. (2003). *Khwam yu di mi suk khong khon Thai: 5 pi lang wikrit setthakit*. (In Thai) [The wellbeing of Thai people: 5 years after the economic crisis]. (2nd ed.). Nonthaburi: Petrung.

Northern Development Center. (1998). *Sarup phap ruam kanphatthana klum changwat si yaek Indochin*. (In Thai) [Summary of development overview of Indochina intersection province group]. Phitsanulok: Northern Development Center.

Phairot, W. (2015). *Kansuksa kan chamlong kan plianplaeng kanchai prayot thidin korani suksa: si yaek indochin amphoe muang changwat Phitsanulok*. (In Thai) [A study of land use change model case study: Indochina intersection, Mueang District, Phitsanulok Province]. In *Proceedings of The 8th Geography and Geographic Information Science Student Conference of Thailand*. (pp. 1-16). Phitsanulok.

Phra Bhramagunabhorn. (2005). *Sukkha phawa ong ruam naeo phut*. (In Thai) [Holistic health, Buddhist style]. Bangkok: Thanatach Printing.

Phromphakphing, B. (2006). *Khwam yu di mi suk: naeokhit lae praden kanesuksa wichai*. (In Thai) [Wellbeing: Concepts and research issues]. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 29(2), 23-50.

Research Group on Wellbeing and Sustainable Development (WeSD). (2017). A comparative analysis of need to the wellbeing of rural household in Northeast of Thailand between 2005 and 2016. In *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on the Humanities and Social Sciences (IC-HUSO 2017) 2-3 November 2017*. (pp. 2581-2582). Khon Kaen: Khon Kaen University.

Sen, A. (1993). Capability and well-Being. In M. Nussbaum and A. Sen (Eds.). *The quality of life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Teddlie, C. and Tashakkori, A. (2009). *Foundations of mixed methods research: Integrating qualitative and quantitative approaches in the social and behavioral sciences*. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE publications.

Thiwaphan, S. (2018). *Yutthasat kuchat ku phaendin*. (In Thai) [National salvage strategy]. Phitsanulok: Rongphim trakun Thai.

Thiwaphan, S., Pruksawan, S., and Panpanich, B. (2014). **Naeokhit thang yutthasat kan phatthana prathet choeng ruk kan prap plian yutthasat kan phatthana si yaek In Do Chin (GMS) pai su sun logistics lae so uppathan Asian.** (In Thai) [Strategies for proactive country development. Modification of the Indochina Intersection Development Strategy (GMS) to the ASEAN Center for Logistics and Supply Chain]. Pathum Thani: Joey Design.

Wasee, P. (2005). **Mak sipsong su prathet Thai yu yen pensuk.** (In Thai) [Maka 12 to go to Thailand, stay calm]. Bangkok: Office of System Reform National Health and National Health Promotion and Support Fund. N.P.: n.p.

Wongmanee, W. and Rattanawong, W. (2005). **Kansuksa kan khonsong tonuang lai rupbaep samrap changwat Phitsanulok.** (In Thai) [Study of multimodal transportation for Phitsanulok province]. In **Proceedings of the 5th Annual Symposium on Logistics and Supply Chain Management.** (pp. 154-171). Phitsanulok.

Wongmanee, W. and Rattanawong, W. (2006). **Kansueksa khwam mosom khong sathanthi tangsun krachai sinkha si yaek Indochin changwat Phitsanulok.** (In Thai) [Study of location suitability: Distribution center Indochina intersection Phitsanulok province]. In **Proceedings of the 6th Annual Symposium on Logistics and Supply Chain Management.** (pp. 125-136). Phitsanulok.

Wongthet, S. (2002). **Sinlapa watthanatham chabap phiset: lumnam Nan prawattisat borannakhadi khong Phitsanulok muang oktaek.** (In Thai) [Introduction to art and culture, special issue. Nan Basin archaeological history of Phitsanulok; The city of having a waterway pass through the middle]. Bangkok: Matichon Publishing House.

Wuthirak, K., Kanoksing, E., and Suksomboonlert, W. (2002). **Senthang kan khonsong lae Kan chatkep phonphalit thangkan kaset boriwen si yaek Indochin changwat Phitsanulok nai pi 2565.** (In Thai) [Transport and storage of agricultural products at Indochina intersection. Phitsanulok province in the year 2065]. Phitsanulok: Naresuan University.

Websites

Bunyaprawit, T. (2015). **Phitsanulok songphanyisip khet setthakit longthun mai si yaek Indochin.** (In Thai) [Phitsanulok2020 New Investment Zone in Indochina Intersection]. Retrieved August 18, 2019, from <https://www.bloggang.com/viewdiary.php?id=rattanakosin&month=082015&date=12&group=9&gblog=8>

Israel, G.D. (1992). **Determining Sample Size 1.** Retrieved July 15, 2016 from http://www.academia.edu/21353552/Determining_Sample_Size_1

National Statistical Office. (2017). **Chamnuan prachakon lae ban chamnaek penrai amphoe lae rai tambon changwat Phitsanulok na duan thanwakhom 2554.** (In Thai) [Population and houses classified by district and sub-district, Phitsanulok province ss of December 2010]. Retrieved March 8, 2019, from <http://service.nso.go.th/nsopublish/districtList/S010107/th/43.htm>

Phitsanulok Provincial Office. (2017). **Wisaihat lae yutthasat kanphatthana changwat Phitsanulok.** (In Thai) [Phitsanulok Provincial Vision and Strategy]. Retrieved August 30, 2019, From www.phitsanulok.go.th/yutthasat/vision_strategy55new.doc

WeD. (2007). **Wellbeing in Developing Countries-WeD.** Retrieved July 15, 2019, from <http://www.welldev.org.uk/>

Interviews

KI-1. (2019, July 26). **Interview.** Committee on Strategic Development for Phitsanulok 2020.

KI-2. (2019, August 3). **Interview.** Committee on Strategic Development for Phitsanulok 2020.

KI-3. (2019, August 9). **Interview.** Committee on Strategic Development for Phitsanulok 2020.

KI-4. (2019, August 27). **Interview.** Committee on Strategic Development for Phitsanulok 2020.

KI-5. (2019, September 4). **Interview.** Committee on Strategic Development for Phitsanulok 2020.

KI-6. (2019, September 10). **Interview.** Committee on Strategic Development for Phitsanulok 2020.

KI-7. (2019, September 10). **Interview.** Committee on Strategic Development for Phitsanulok 2020.

KI-8. (2019, September 19). **Interview.** Committee on Strategic Development for Phitsanulok 2020.

KI-9. (2019, September 19). **Interview.** Committee on Strategic Development for Phitsanulok 2020.

KI-10. (2019, September 19). **Interview.** Committee on Strategic Development for Phitsanulok 2020.

KI-11. (2019, September 20). **Interview.** Committee on Strategic Development for Phitsanulok 2020.

KI-12. (2019, September 20). **Interview.** Committee on Strategic Development for Phitsanulok 2020.