Community Sufficiency Economy Readiness for Sustainable Agriculture and Tourism Development

Tanainan Tanantpapat
Graduate School, Chulalongkorn University, Thailand
E-mail: tanainan@gmail.com

Anegpon Kuama
Social Research Institute, Chulalongkorn University, Thailand
E-mail: anagpon@gmail.com

Pakpachong Vadhanasindhu
Faculty of Commerce and Accountancy, Chulalongkorn University, Thailand
E-mail: pakpachong@hotmail.com

Suwit Srimai
Faculty of Liberal Arts and Management Sciences, Prince of Songkla University, Thailand
E-mail: suwitster@gmail.com

Article History
Received: 27 March 2019 **Revised:** 27 May 2019 **Published:** 30 June 2019

Abstract
The objective of the research is to study the readiness of the agricultural and tourism community towards sustainable development. The study focuses on agriculture and tourism communities in Thailand that applied Sufficiency Economy Philosophy (SEP) in their development. The research prioritized the important of factors that identify community readiness in every region of Thailand. An empirical study in both quantitative and qualitative was conducted by interviewing selected persons and experts to develop the questionnaire for data collection. The respondents of the study were 12 outstanding community leaders in agriculture and tourism and 602 villagers from 251 communities in every region of Thailand. The survey questionnaire was constructed for the study and tested for reliability, which hold good reliability with Cronbach alpha value at .968. Statistical tools used for the study are Mean, Standard deviation and One-way ANOVA. The results indicated 16 community readiness dimensions. The prioritized important level indicates 8 dimensions in high level and another 8 dimensions in moderate level. The comparison of important level by regions show different opinion towards community readiness dimensions. These findings are valuable and benefit to the communities as they are the community health check for Sufficiency Economy Readiness.
Keywords: Community Readiness, Sustainable Development, Sufficiency Economy Philosophy

Introduction
The issues of inequality development of urban and rural affect the stability of the country. The rural communities are struggling to find a solution to survive in todays' competitive and changing environment. Rural communities are engaged in agriculture and local tourism. They are suffering from the impact of inequality and unfairness agricultural policy. They do not have enough income to live; they have health problems, debt, and lack of knowledge for self-

development. Therefore, Thai government and related development agencies are addressing to these problems by promoting rural development policies and allocate huge budget to develop many rural projects such as paddy pledging, agricultural product income guarantee and related diversify economic activities. However, the research "The "Populism" Policy and Building/Diminishing Economic "Inequality" and "Unfairness": Empirical Suggestion on Pork-Barrel in Thailand's Rice Trading Business" (2012) by Kittisak Jermsittiparsert, Thanaporn Sriyakul and Chayongkan Pamornmast indicated that paddy pledging and agricultural product income guarantee can either build or diminish to Thai economy and unsolved inequality and unfairness to Thais. These implementation activities or development projects did not succeed as it should be since the community is not ready to work together with the government. Most of these aid programs can help community in short term only, not sustainably. When the development agencies move out of the area, the community cannot continue operating the projects by themselves. This is because of the lack of community readiness evaluation. Some communities are only asked for the budget of the aid project without participation or contribute to the projects, and allow outsiders operate and manage projects for them, which finally led to the projects failure (Khatun, Heywood, Ray, Bhuiya and Liaw, 2016). Therefore, the community readiness lead to the success and failure of community development. If the community is ready, the development project will proceed smoothly and lead to sustainability. Moreover, the Sufficiency Economy Philosophy (SEP) has been applied to Thai community development towards sustainability in order to solved inequality and unfairness to Thais since 1999 (Office of the National Economic and Social Development Board, 2015). The philosophy comprises of three main components, moderate, reasonableness, and self-immunity together with knowledge condition and Integrity Condition, which can be applied for a guidance of community sustainability development. These three components were also proposed to promote community readiness, which protect communities from adverse changes in todays' competitive environment (Kulvadee, 2017).
Community readiness encouragement should be a starting activities for community development (Clarke, 2017). Studying and understanding the factors that affect community readiness to tackle the existing problems and develop community readiness is crucial. Therefore, the study of dimension for assessing community readiness for sustainability is helpful and necessary for government and related agencies as it is essential to evaluate communities prior to initiating community development projects.

Methodology

Scope of the Study

The scope of the study is focused on agriculture and tourism communities in Thailand that applied Sufficiency Economy Philosophy (SEP) to their development. The research prioritized the important of factors that identify community readiness in every region of Thailand namely North, South, East, West, North East and Central region.
The secondary data related to Sufficiency Economy, the readiness of communities in Sustainable Agricultural and Tourism Development were studies to develop the semi-structure interview guide for the related government officers and community leaders.
An empirical study in both quantitative and qualitative was conducted by interviewing selected persons and experts to develop questionnaire and collect data in collaboration with participation from related government officers, expert fields, community's leaders and members to identify the readiness of the agricultural and tourism towards sustainable community development.

Population and Sampling

There are 98 communities of the Royal Initiative Discovery Institute's development project. Among them the 12 communities are outstanding in agricultural and tourism, having their

own local identities products and services, renowned and achieved sustainable development or related awards were purposively selected for in-depth interview in order to identify key factors indicated community readiness for sustainability development. The selected 12 communities locate in every region of Thailand, 2 communities were selected from each region (North, South, East, West, North East and Central). The data collected from interviews are used to develop questions for questionnaire survey. The survey was conducted from 300 agricultural and tourism communities that exhibited in agricultural fairs organized by the Department of Agriculture Extension, the Community Development Department, Tourism Authority of Thailand and the Royal Initiative Discovery Institute communities' networks that locate in every region of Thailand. There were 602 respondents from 251 communities that had answered all questions and appropriate quality to be used for statistical analysis.

Data Collection

Qualitative data collection, the research combines varied sources of data gathering techniques including literature review, in-depth interviews and observation. Literature review from secondary data was conducted to identify the community readiness for sustainability development. The 10 preliminary dimensions were identified, they are 1. Natural resources (Borisova, Bi, Larkin and Longanecker, 2016; Choudhury, Haque and Habib, 2018) 2. Stakeholders' participation (Benites-Lazaro and Mello-Théry, 2019; Teder and Kaimre, 2018) 3.Community member support (Kustriyanti, Astuti Endang and Kusumawati, 2017; Umberto, Federica and Sandra, 2017) 4. Human resources (Westgard, Naraine and Paucar Villacorta, 2018) 5. Required knowledge (Huichin and Shenglin Elijah, 2018; Kostadinov, Daniel, Stanley and Cargo, 2015) 6. Government support (Han, Liu, Xia and Gao, 2018; Liang et al., 2017), 7.Risk management (Edwin and Thomas, 2012; Nicholas, Rachel and Endres, 2013) 8. Knowing technology (Schoen et al., 2017; Vasquez, Sherwood, Larson and Story, 2017) 9. Learning culture (John, 2016; Sims, 2015) and 10. Morality & ethics (Dimitriou, 2017; Merle, 2018)

The semi structured interview question for in-depth interview with 12 community's leaders were developed from 10 community readiness dimensions.

The purposive sampling technique was used for in-depth interview in order to identify more community readiness dimensions. The 12 communities, 2 communities from each region of Thailand were selected to study their opinion about community readiness toward sustainable development (Table 1).

Table 1 Key Outstanding Communities for the In-depth Interview

No.	Regions	Provinces	Communities	Products
1	Central	Samut Sakhon	Baan Klong Wua	Sweet banana crisps, Coconut products
2	Central	Nakorn Pathom	Baan Hua Ao	Organic vegetables
3	North East	Udon Thani	Baan Thon Na Lab	Mulberry silk, herbal products
4	North East	Kalasin	Baan Nabon	Woven Prae Wa Silk
5	West	Kanchanaburi	Baan Nong Hand	Processed herbal drink
6	West	Phetchaburi	Baan Lat	Dried banana, Banana products
7	East	Rayong	Baan Talay Noi	Products from the sea, shrimp paste
8	East	Chanthaburi	Baan Nam Sai	Organic vegetables and handicraft
9	South	Surat Thani	Baan Huay Sai	Mushroom cultivation and chili paste
10	South	Phatthalung	Baan Nai Koy	Papaya, Sala
11	North	Chiang Rai	Baan Portanaram	Organic vegetables and basketry

Table 1 (Con.)

No.	Regions	Provinces	Communities	Products
12	North	Phayao	Ban Bua	Organic rice, handicraft, Carbon charcoal

The findings from interviewing community leaders were not only confirmed 10 readiness dimensions from literature review, but also added 7 more imperative community readiness that lead to sustainable community development. The 7 community readiness from interviews are Fund & working capital, Sales and marketing management, Plan & implementation, General management, Product & service development, Communication, and Sense of ownership.

The data collected from literature review, in-depth interviews and observations was analyzed by content analysis, which consequently renamed and synthesized to 16 community readiness dimensions. The 16 dimensions was validated by 7 experts who responsible for establishment and implementation of community agriculture and tourism development policy from government, universities, private and non-government organizations. The Index Objective Congruence (IOC) statistical technique is applied for validation before launching the questionnaire, which showed that all 16 dimensions are valid and reliable for assessing the community readiness.

Quantitative data collection, to prioritize the 16 community readiness dimensions into important levels, 1 for not important, 2 for less important, 3 for moderate important and 4 for high important. The pretest questionnaire survey was conducted for reliability testing, with a good Cronbach alpha value at .89.

One thousand and one hundred questionnaire were distributed to 300 communities. The 602 respondents from 251 communities were collected, which a good Cronbach alpha value at .98. The respondents are community leaders, division managers and members from community in every region of Thailand. The statistical technique was used to analysis and identify important levels by each region, which relate to opinion of people who live in different location toward community readiness dimension.

Data Analysis

The qualitative data is analyzed and synthesized by content analysis and content interpretation. The quantitative data was analyzed by SPSS statistical computerized program to analyses reliability, descriptive analysis and one-way ANOVA in order to identify the important level of each community readiness dimensions and compare with every region in Thailand.

Results

The research's result from literature review, in-depth interviews and professional experts' evaluation have shown the 16 community readiness dimensions, which lead to sustainability development.

The data obtained from 602 respondents of 251 communities has shown the demographical data of age, career, community status, and regions. Most of the respondent 34.7% is between 41-50 years old follow by 33.7% in 51-60 years old, among them 71.9% is agriculturists and 17.9% is small business owners in community, among them 59.1% is community members, 26.2% is division managers, 19.3% is community leaders. Regional wise, 32.9% of respondents is from Central, 18.4% is from North Eastern, 15.3% is from Southern, 13.6% is from Northern, 11.1% is from Western, and 8.6% is from Eastern of Thailand.

The Findings of Community Readiness Dimension Classified by Important Level

The 602 respondents have prioritized the 16 community readiness into 4 important. Statistical technique to analyze the findings using Mean, Standard deviation and define important level of each dimension are shown in table 2.

Table 2 Important Level of 16 Community Readiness Dimensions

No.	Community Readiness Dimensions	Mean	Std. Deviation	Important level
1	Community leaders	3.79	0.39	High
2	Sense of ownership	3.69	0.38	High
3	Natural resources and environment	3.68	0.40	High
4	Morality & Ethics	3.66	0.41	High
5	Planning and Implementation	3.59	0.46	High
6	Culture and Tradition	3.57	0.52	High
7	Sales and Marketing	3.55	0.50	High
8	General management	3.53	0.40	High
9	Product & service development	3.50	0.41	Moderate
10	Support from community members	3.47	0.41	Moderate
11	Communication	3.47	0.49	Moderate
12	Support from relevant agencies	3.44	0.45	Moderate
13	Risk management	3.41	0.50	Moderate
14	Fund and working capital	3.39	0.52	Moderate
15	Knowledge and knowledge management	3.39	0.36	Moderate
16	Application of technology	3.32	0.52	Moderate
Total		3.53		High

The findings in Table 2 shown the overall 16 community readiness dimensions, High important (Mean 3.51 - 4.00), Moderate important (Mean 2.51 - 3.50), Less important (Mean 1.51 - 2.50), Not important (Mean 1.00 - 1.50).

Community leaders dimension was rated at high level (Mean = 3.79), followed by Sense of ownership dimension (Mean = 3.69) and Natural resources and environment dimension (Mean = 3.68) respectively. However, the application of technology dimension was rated the lowest (Mean = 3.32)

The Findings of Community Readiness Dimension Classify by Region

One-way ANOVA was used to analyze the difference of average mean of important level classified by readiness dimension and average mean classified by regions as shown in table 3. From table 3, the ANOVA score sig. = 0.00 (sig. < 0.05) can indicate that people in different community location have different opinion towards community readiness dimensions. The findings in all six regions show that there are significant differences in villagers' opinion among community readiness dimension and community location in each region of Thailand.

The Northern region, Natural resources and environment dimension was rated the highest (Mean = 3.82), followed by Community leaders dimension (Mean = 3.80) and Sense of ownership dimension (Mean = 3.77), however, the application of technology dimension was the lowest rated (Mean = 3.02)

For the Southern, Community leaders dimension was rated the highest (Mean = 3.71) followed by Morality & ethics dimension (Mean = 3.60) and Sense of ownership dimension (Mean = 3.59). While, Application of technology dimension was rated the lowest (Mean = 3.21)

In the Eastern, Sense of ownership dimension was rated the highest (Mean = 3.81) followed by Morality & ethics dimension (Mean = 3.74) and Sale and marketing dimension (Mean = 3.64), however, fund and working capital dimension was the lowest rated (Mean = 3.22)

For the Western, Morality & ethics dimension was rated the highest (Mean = 3.88) followed by Community leaders dimension (Mean = 3.84) and Natural resources and environment dimension (Mean = 3.81), however, Fund and working capital dimension was the lowest rated (Mean = 3.05)
In the Central area, Community leaders dimension was rated the highest (Mean = 3.76) followed by Natural resources and environment (Mean = 3.64) and Sense of ownership dimension (Mean = 3.60), however, Risk management dimension was the lowest rated (Mean = 3.34)
The Northeast, Community leaders dimension was rated the highest (Mean = 3.94) followed by Planning and implementation (Mean = 3.81) and Sense of ownership dimension (Mean = 3.77), however, Application of technology dimension was the lowest rated (Mean = 3.34)

Table 3 ANOVA Crosstab Table of Mean of Readiness Dimensions Important Level and Regions

	Community readiness dimension	**Average mean classified by regions**						$\bar{x}$	**ANOVA**
		North	South	East	West	Central	North Eastern		
		n = 82	n = 92	n = 52	n = 67	n = 198	n = 111		
1	Community leaders	3.80	3.71	3.61	3.84	3.76	3.94	3.79	0.00
2	Sense of ownership	3.77	3.59	3.81	3.75	3.60	3.77	3.69	0.00
3	Natural resources and environment	3.82	3.57	3.51	3.81	3.64	3.74	3.68	0.00
4	Morality & Ethics	3.67	3.60	3.74	3.88	3.59	3.66	3.66	0.00
5	Planning and Implementation	3.59	3.47	3.55	3.67	3.50	3.81	3.59	0.00
6	Culture and Tradition	3.69	3.32	3.63	3.78	3.56	3.56	3.57	0.00
7	Sales and Marketing	3.50	3.41	3.64	3.56	3.51	3.72	3.55	0.00
8	General management	3.63	3.41	3.46	3.58	3.47	3.67	3.53	0.00
9	Product & service development	3.53	3.33	3.58	3.69	3.45	3.58	3.50	0.00
10	Support from community members	3.53	3.26	3.32	3.46	3.48	3.66	3.47	0.00
11	Communication	3.30	3.44	3.42	3.62	3.41	3.64	3.47	0.00
12	Support from relevant agencies	3.51	3.34	3.34	3.39	3.43	3.59	3.44	0.00
13	Risk management	3.50	3.25	3.62	3.30	3.34	3.56	3.41	0.00
14	Fund and working capital	3.44	3.39	3.22	3.05	3.43	3.60	3.39	0.00
15	Knowledge and knowledge management	3.31	3.43	3.34	3.21	3.39	3.55	3.39	0.00
16	Application of technology	3.02	3.21	3.64	3.17	3.44	3.34	3.32	0.00
Total average mean classified by regions		**3.54**	**3.42**	**3.53**	**3.55**	**3.50**	**3.65**	**3.53**	**0.00**

Discussion

The 16 community readiness dimensions from literature review and empirical study revealed both fundamental and distinctive readiness for agriculture and tourism community toward sustainability. They can be a diagnostic tool for community assessment particularly for agriculture and tourism communities.

The important level of the 16 community readiness dimension is prioritized by 602 respondents from 251 communities in 6 regions of Thailand. None of them are in not important level and less important level. There are 8 dimensions in high level and another 8 dimensions are in moderate level. The total average of important level is high (Mean = 3.53). This is due to most of the community leaders and members consider that these dimensions are essential and necessary for sustainable community development.

The community leader dimension is rated the highest average mean of 3.79. This is because villagers normally comply with community leaders and community leaders play the crucial role for success or failure of community development for a long time. The sense of ownership dimension is the second highest average mean of 3.69, this dimension is challenging because there are less communities considering the true needs (inside community), most of them only follow what the government wants. Villagers, in the past, were thought to follow what the government officers said and contribute less idea to community.

It is interesting that natural resources and environment (Mean = 3.68) and morality & ethics (Mean = 3.66) are the third and fourth rank, which higher than fund and working capital (Mean = 3.39) and knowledge and knowledge management (Mean = 3.39) that are in moderate level ranking in fourteenth and fifteenth. This is because villagers have learnt from the past that money could not provide natural resource and supportive environment, without natural resource and supportive environment community would unsuccessful.

Furthermore, capital availability is not as important as social readiness. The concept of Sufficiency Economy Philosophy shows that money is less important than social capital which will lead to sustainability. If community has much capital but villagers have less social capital like morality and ethics, community would finally not sustainable.

The application of technology is lowest rank in moderate level (Mean = 3.32) because of the misunderstanding of the villagers. They think that technology is only about science and engineering and difficult to understand. However, the Sufficiency Economy Philosophy urged them to explore and experience that technology can be adapted for local development as local technology for agriculture and tourism.

The findings of community readiness dimension classify by region shows that there are significant differences in villagers' opinion among community readiness dimension and community location in each region of Thailand (ANOVA score sig. = 0.00 (sig. < 0.05).

The Northern part of Thailand has high mountains and variety of national parks, this region is a major source of water for the country. The community relies on the abundance of natural resources as a major source of living. Most of the communities plant mono-agriculture, the transportation is rather difficult that result in low income. As a consequence, the community attaches great importance to the availability of natural resources and environment (Mean = 3.82) such as rain and soil fertility. However, the community leaders dimension (Mean = 3.80) and sense of ownership (Mean = 3.77) is also rated high important. The application of technology (Mean = 3.02) is rated the lowest because villagers have difficulty with technology application.

Southern part of Thailand locates in between the Gulf of Thailand and the Andaman Sea. It has abundance of natural resources. Most of the communities are rubber and oil palm plantations, which have price sensitive due to market sensitivity. The communities have to rely on community leaders (Mean = 3.71) who are knowledgeable about marketing and able to connect community to public sectors and the markets. The South community attaches great importance to morality and ethics of their doctrines of religion (Mean = 3.60) as the way of living and embed in Sufficiency Economy Philosophy for sustainable community development. However, the respondents rated importance on the use of technology (Mean = 3.21) at the lowest level because they have difficulty with technology access.

The Eastern part of the country has a fertile farmland as a source of fruits. Most of the communities have a tropical fruit, such as durian, mangoesteen, mango, and tourist destinations. Villagers have much sense of ownership in community activities as they promote fruit market for tourist. The community focuses on the sense of ownership (Mean = 3.81), following by morality and ethics (Mean = 3.74) sales and marketing and application of technology is equal important (Mean = 3.64). However, the fund and working capital (Mean = 3.22) is rated at lowest level because the villagers give important on social capital such as sense of ownership, morality and ethics than money.

The community in the Western region places emphasis high importance on morality and ethics (Mean = 3.88). In addition, virtue leaders need to have knowledge of market linkages and able to manage the usage of natural resources to maximize the benefit of the people in the community. The West community places importance on community leaders (Mean = 3.84), and natural resource and environment (Mean = 3.81) respectively. However, the communities rated the importance of the availability of fund and working capital at the lowest level (Mean = 3.05), as they believes that sustainable communities do not need to rely on external funding.

The majority of the respondents in the Central region are rice farmers, who rely on natural resources such as water and soil nutrition. The community leaders are acknowledge by the government to create agricultural groups and local tourism group by encouraging shared ownership among community members. Most of the communities in the central region focus the high important on knowledge leaders (Mean = 3.76) who promote cooperation among community government and related agencies to enhance community performance. The central community also places high importance on natural resource and environment (Mean = 3.64) and sense of ownership (Mean = 3.60) respectively. However, risk management is placed at the lowest level (Mean = 3.34), this is because they think that government project has less risk of failure.

Most of the communities in the Northeast region are poorer than communities in other regions of the country. They emphasizes the high importance on community leaders (Mean = 3.94). However, they are learning from generation to generation that a success project need systematic work so they focus on good plan and implementation (Mean = 3.81), which have objectives, clear direction, plan and action plan. The community is confident that the sense of ownership (Mean = 3.77) is a way to develop a sustainable community as the sense of ownership create attention of participation to all community activities. However, the community rates importance on application of technology at the lowest level (Mean = 3.34) because they think that technology is expensive investment, it is not a tool for development furthermore they mostly believe in social wisdom.

For local community tourism, the research “Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Tourist Decision Making Process: A Case of Foreign Tourists in Thailand” (2017) by Akhilesh Trivedi indicated the most favorite tourist destinations are natural destinations such as beaches, waterfalls, lakes, islands, hot springs, mountains, caves and floral gardens. These types of destinations are all in local communities. Therefore, it can imply that local community tourism effect to the economy of Thailand, which generate huge revenue to Thai economy. However, in today’s business environment, tour operators are driven by market pressures, which directly use local resource and environment for commercial purpose. According to the National Tourism Development Plan (2012-2016), which suggests that “Thailand is full of quality tourist attractions with global tourism competitiveness and has an ability to generate and distribute income based on fairness, balance, and sustainability.” However, in current situation, Thitinan Chankoson (2018) indicated that Thailand tourism service growth very rapidly without taking account of good sustainable management and natural resource responsibility. The irresponsibility of extravagantly consumed can directly

affect to the natural resources and environment in local communities, which will be rapidly and resulting in environmental deterioration, poor community resource, continuing ecological destruction, and more conflicts regarding the exploitation of natural resources. Moreover, the tourism that only focuses on demand side and ignore supply side has effect on tourism attractions in terms of local environment and traditional lifestyles. Hence, the quality and sustainable promotion are needed to develop the demand side and supply side in order to create a good balance, which is an effective approach to enhancing the quality and sustainability of tourism in Thailand.

Conclusion

The 16 community readiness dimensions finding from literature review and empirical study are Natural resources and environment, Community leaders, Knowledge and knowledge management, Support from community members, Support from relevant agencies, Fund and working capital, Planning and Implementation, General Management, Risk management, Product & service development, Sales and Marketing, Communication, Application of technology, Culture and Tradition, Morality & Ethics and Sense of ownership.

The important level of readiness dimensions are prioritized by 602 respondents in 251 communities. The empirical data indicates that none of them are rated in not important level and less important level. There are only eight dimensions in high level namely Community leaders, Sense of ownership, Natural resources and environment, Morality & Ethics, Planning and Implementation, Culture and Tradition, Sales and Marketing and General management and another eight dimensions in moderate level namely Product & service development, Support from community members, Communication, Support from relevant agencies, Risk management, Fund and working capital, Knowledge and knowledge management and Application of technology.

The important level of readiness dimensions by regions is analysis by One-way ANOVA, statistical technique. The result indicates the ANOVA score sig. = 0.00, which mean villagers live in different regions have different opinion towards important level of community readiness dimensions.

Recommendation

The results show that the 16 community readiness dimensions are at high and moderate important level. Community leader dimension is paramount to community development for sustainability. Community leaders are the starting point for community development. Community development should be systematically operated by community leaders and members with supportive from government and relevant agencies both inside and outside of the community. Building a good relationship between those people will create networks that accelerate the benefits of participating in activities for engagement creation and coexistence (Kalyanamitra, 2018). The community strategic management approach such as human resource management, accounting & financial management, knowledge management, networking management, innovation & technology management, stakeholder participation management, and marketing mix management are essential management skills to sustainable community development (Seisawatwanit, 2013). The ability of selecting an appropriate technology to be used as development tools that compatible with local wisdom is important as well as strategic management mentioned above. Financial plan, staff plan, and implementation plan with a time schedule is also needed for project development within community. Moreover tracking actions and evaluating step by step is essential to prevent potential failures and avoid undesired risks. However, if there are plans without the genuine participation, sense of ownership, trust of leaders and technological capability of community

members, community development will not achieve its goal of sustainability (Khatun et al., 2016). The application of managerial accounting data has also direct influence on financial ratios of communities. In addition, financial ratios in terms of liquidity, assets management, debt management, and profitability have direct influence for agriculture sustainable community development. Managerial accounting data can helps community create knowledge as an important resource to enable competitive advantages and leads to community sustainability. The analysis of accounting data is crucial because community leaders can use to evaluate community operational performance as it reveals strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, past operational obstacles within an accounting period, and profitability when comparing with sales volume and capital. Moreover, it indicates financial risk of debt and equity financing of the each community business activities. In addition, knowledge-based view (KBV) which considers organizational knowledge is an important resource for community development. It should be used to develop community readiness performance and help community establishes competitive advantages and leads to expected outcomes. The knowledge presentation is also needed to encourage communication among community leaders and members to acknowledge strengths, weaknesses, opportunity and threat in order to co-regulate administrative and operational policy for sustainable community development (Ditkaew, 2018).

In order to strengthen the community toward sustainability, community leaders should promote the willingness of participation among community member by considering determinants of social norms, trust, environmental concern and community identity (Kalkbrenner and Roosen, 2016). The participation activity should be started before the development project, and should be implemented in parallel throughout the community development period by the mutual decision-making process, in order to find common problems, needs and wants and understanding among community members and stakeholders to set up goals, solutions and operational procedures and responsibilities of leaders and community members. Good knowledge, perseverance and patience, mindfulness and intelligence, and harmony of local wisdom combined with academic principles, careful planning and practice enhances appropriate processes for the development of social capital for sustainable development through moderation and the building of immunity to sustainable development in accordance with the philosophy of sufficiency economy. Community sustainable development should focus on strengthening the people's capital of different areas, economic capital, natural resources and environment which are combined and inter-related for the benefits of development leading to strong community development and emphasizing on community support and the power of the community in developing countries (Kalyanamitra, 2018).

In addition, learning, teaching and sharing of knowledge among community members should be embedded in participation building process (González-Patiño, 2018), six keys principle of systematic engagement in six areas; systems thinking, collaborative inquiry, support for ongoing learning, emergent design, multiple strands of inquiry and action and trans-disciplinarily should be considered for community development (McNall, Barnes-Najor, Brown, Doberneck and Fitzgerald, 2015), a network of cooperation and coalitions (Anderson-Carpenter, Watson-Thompson, Jones and Chaney, 2017) from outside agencies should be developed for further community development so that community development process will becomes a normal practice of work within community and lead to community sustainability.

For local community tourism, it can be seen that the local community tourism sector has an effect on the economy, society, and environment. As discussed that it is needed to balance the quality and quantity of tourism in demand and supply sides, the long-term tourism framework of the National Economic and Social Development Plan Volume 12 (2017-2021) should

bring to practice in order to enhance the community readiness. The framework initiates 7 greens concept of sustainable tourism management; green heart, green logistics, green attraction, green community, green activity, green service, and green plus, which Thai tourism agencies should realized and actively cooperated in the restoration of natural tourist attractions. The ecological tourism campaigns such as beach cleaning, afforestation as well as organizing various training programs to build environmental awareness among community, tourists and entrepreneurs, which encourages all parties involved in tourism business activities to understand and deal with tourism product and service management in a sustainable and environmentally-friendly way. It is the key to preserving the environment and reducing negative behaviors causing adverse effects on natural resources and the local community environment (Chankoson, 2018).

From the abovementioned, in order to develop community sustainability, communities and related agencies should consider the 16 communities readiness dimensions and supportive recommendations prior to conducting community development projects especially for administrators who establishing a government policy must be more careful in issuing populism policy because besides the poverty aspect, the inequality and unfairness aspects should be also considered as it is becoming more and more severe in todays. Besides the policy makers, community members need to realize the necessity of proofs whether the government policies are true support with good faith and beneficial to community as a whole (Jermsittiparsert, Sriyakul and Pamornmast, 2012). According to Sufficiency Economy Philosophy (SEP), community development towards sustainability is to encourage potential promote of those 16 community readiness to the communities in every part of Thailand, so that they can conduct self-assessment and can be self-reliant to lead the sustainability in the future.

The future research is recommended to develop the criteria for each readiness dimension and strategies implementation for enhancing community sustainability.

References

Anderson-Carpenter, K., Watson-Thompson, J., Jones, M., and Chaney, L. 2017. "Improving community readiness for change through coalition capacity building: Evidence from a multisite intervention." **Journal of Community Psychology** 45 (4): 486-499.

Benites-Lazaro, L. and Mello-Théry, N. 2019. "Empowering communities? Local stakeholders' participation in the Clean Development Mechanism in Latin America." **World Development** 114: 254-266.

Borisova, T., Bi, X., Larkin, S. and Longanecker, J. 2016. "Assessing Nature-Based Recreation to Support Economic Development and Environmental Sustainability Extension Programs." **Journal of Extension** 54 (5): 1-13.

Chankoson, T. 2018. "Multilevel Confirmatory Factor Analysis of Green Tourism Management in Thailand for ASEAN Economic Community." **Asian Administration & Management Review** 1 (2): 88-99.

Choudhury, M.-U.-I., Haque, C., and Habib, S. 2018. "Participatory exclusion of women in natural resource management: silent voices from wetland communities in Bangladesh." **Community Development Journal** 53 (1): 42-60.

Clarke, S. 2017. "Community Organization and Development: From Its History Towards a Model for the Future." **Community Development Journal** 53 (4): 792-794.

Dimitriou, C. 2017. "The quest for a practical approach to morality and the tourism industry." **Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management** 31: 45-51.

Ditkaew, K. 2018. "Application of Managerial Accounting Information to Land Reform Management for Sustainable Agriculture." **PSAKU International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research** 7 (2): 174-188.

Edwin, M. and Thomas, S. 2012. "Agricultural-risk management through community-based wildlife conservation in Zimbabwe." **Journal of Agribusiness in Developing and Emerging Economies** 2 (1): 41-56.

González-Patiño, J. 2018. "Learn, Teach and Share, Participation in Expanded Educational Communities: Madrid Pikler Seminar as a Practice of Continuing Education between Childhood Professionals." **Digital Education Review** (33): 203-216.

Han, X., Liu, X., Xia, T., and Gao, L. 2018. "Home-country government support, interstate relations and the subsidiary performance of emerging market multinational enterprises." **Journal of Business Research** 93: 160-172.

Huichin, H. and Shenglin Elijah, C. 2018. "Localized Innovation of Knowledge Community - Creation of Local Knowledge and Learning Landscape." **Environment-Behaviour Proceedings Journal** 3 (7): 87-94.

Jermsittiparsert, K., Sriyakul, T., and Pamornmast, C. 2012. "The "Populism" Policy and Building/Diminishing Economic "Inequality" and "Unfairness": Empirical Suggestion on Pork-Barrel in Thailand's Rice Trading Business." **Public Policy and Administration Research** 2 (7): 21-31.

John, N. 2016. "Cultural Dimensions in Global Human Resource Management: Implication for Nigeria." **Independent Journal of Management & Production** 7 (3): 807-832.

Kalkbrenner, B. and Roosen, J. 2016. "Original research article: Citizens' willingness to participate in local renewable energy projects: The role of community and trust in Germany." **Energy Research & Social Science** 13: 60-70.

Kalyanamitra, P. 2018. "The Development of Social Capital in Pathum Thani Province towards Sustainable Development Based on Sufficiency Economy Philosophy." **PSAKU International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research** 7 (1): 314-320.

Khatun, F., Heywood, A., Ray, P., Bhuiya, A., and Liaw, S.-T. 2016. "Community readiness for adopting mHealth in rural Bangladesh: A qualitative exploration." **International Journal of Medical Informatics** 93: 49-56.

Kostadinov, I., Daniel, M., Stanley, L., and Cargo, M. 2015. "Assessing community readiness online: a concurrent validation study." **BMC Public Health** 15 (1): 1-6.

Kulvadee, K. 2017. "Philosophy of sufficiency economy for community-based adaptation to climate change: Lessons learned from Thai case studies." **Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences** 38 (1): 56-61.

Kustriyanti, S., Astuti Endang, S. and Kusumawati, A. 2017. "Analysis on Continuous Participation Behavior of Virtual Community Member Based on the Usability and Sociability Perspective." **Russian Journal of Agricultural & Socio-Economic Sciences** 67 (7): 153-159.

Liang, Y., Jiang, C., Ma, L., Liu, L., Chen, W., and Liu, L. 2017. "Government support, social capital and adaptation to urban flooding by residents in the Pearl River Delta area, China." **Habitat International** 59: 21-31.

McNall, M., Barnes-Najor, J., Brown, R., Doberneck, D., and Fitzgerald, H. 2015. "Systemic Engagement: Universities as Partners in Systemic Approaches to Community Change." **Journal of Higher Education Outreach & Engagement** 19 (1): 1-25.

Merle, F. 2018. "The Community of Morality Plays." **Comparative Drama** 9 (4): 332-349.

Nicholas, R., Rachel, A., and Endres, A. 2013. "Community Supported Agriculture: An Exploration of Legal Issues and Risk-Management Strategies." **Natural Resources & Environment** 28 (2): 26-29.

Office of the National Economic and Social Development Board. 2015. **Sufficiency economy: implications and applications**. Bangkok: Office of the National Economic and Social Development Board.

Schoen, J., Mallett, J., Grossman-Kahn, R., Brentani, A., Kaselitz, E., and Heisler, M. 2017. "Perspectives and experiences of community health workers in Brazilian primary care centers using m-health tools in home visits with community members." **Human Resources for Health** 15: 1-10.

Seisawatwanit, P. 2013. "An Approach to Efficient Management Models for Agritourism Businesses in Eastern Region of Thailand." **PSAKU International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research** 2 (1): 114-129.

Sims, K. 2015. "Culture, community-oriented learning and the post-2015 development agenda: a view from Laos." **Third World Quarterly** 36 (10): 1922-1943.

Teder, M. and Kaimre, P. 2018. "The participation of stakeholders in the policy processes and their satisfaction with results: A case of Estonian forestry policy." **Forest Policy and Economics** 89: 54-62.

Trivedi, A. 2017. "Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Tourist Decision Making Process: A Case of Foreign Tourists in Thailand." **PSAKU International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research** 6 (2): 111-119.

Umberto, M., Federica, B., and Sandra, N. 2017. "Community Participation, Natural Resource Management and the Creation of Innovative Tourism Products: Evidence from Italian Networks of Reserves in the Alps." **Sustainability** 9 (12): 1-16.

Vasquez, A., Sherwood, N., Larson, N., and Story, M. 2017. "Research: Community-Supported Agriculture as a Dietary and Health Improvement Strategy: A Narrative Review." **Journal of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics** 117 (1): 83-94.

Westgard, C., Naraine, R., and Paucar Villacorta, D. 2018. "Performance Evaluation of Community Health Workers: Case Study in the Amazon of Peru." **Journal of Community Health** 43 (5): 908-919.