

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The objectives of this study were to: 1) explore characteristics effecting the success of the successful farmers group and the unsuccessful farmers group in the adoption of the philosophy of sufficiency economy as well as situational characteristics making some farmers not participate in the Huay Sai Royal Development Study Center; 2) find a model, method, and guideline for the philosophy of sufficiency economy driving of the center; and 3) propose a guideline for the philosophy of sufficiency economy driving. The informants in the study were sorted into 3 groups: 1) farmers in the successful group; 2) farmers in the unsuccessful group; and 3) farmers in the not participating group. A set of interview schedules was used for data collection. It consisted 2 parts as follows:

Part 1. Characteristics effecting the success of the successful farmers group and the unsuccessful farmers group in the adoption of the philosophy of sufficiency economy as well as situational characteristics making some farmers not participate in the project of the Huay Sai Royal Development Study Center

- 1.1 Personal characteristics
- 1.2 Economic characteristics
- 1.3 Social characteristics
- 1.4 Environmental characteristics
- 1.5 Cultural and social capital characteristics
- 1.6 Policy and plan characteristics

Part 2. Model, method, and guideline for the philosophy of sufficiency economy driving of the Huay Sai Royal Development Study Center

Part 1. Characteristics effecting the success of the successful farmers group and the unsuccessful farmers group in the adoption of the philosophy of sufficiency economy as well as situational characteristics making some farmers not participate in the project of the Huay Sai Royal Development Study Center

A set of interview schedules was used for data collection administered with the 3 groups of farmer in the area of the Huay Sai Royal Development Study Center:

1. Farmers in the successful group (39 persons)
2. Farmers in the unsuccessful group (127 persons)
3. Farmers in the not participating group (368 persons)

Results of the data analyses were shown in the tables.

4.1.1 Personal Characteristics

1. Land holding for farming and status

Farmers in the successful group: It was found that more than one-half of them (71.8%) had a farming land for more than 35 rai; 23.1 percent had a farming land for 31-35 rai and only 5.1 percent had a farming land for 25-30 rai.

Farmers in the unsuccessful group: It was found that less than one-half of them (31.5%) had a farming land for 31-35 rai; 21.3 percent had a farming land for 11-15 rai and only 3.1 percent had a farming land for more than 35 rai.

Farmers in the not participating group: It was found that less than one-half of them (44.4%) had a farming land for 11-15 rai; 21.3 percent had a farming land for 16-20 rai and only 2.5 percent had a farming land for 25-30 rai.

Table 4.1a Land holding for farming and status

Land holding for farming and status	Farmers in the successful group (n = 39)		Farmers in the unsuccessful group (n = 127)		Farmers in the not participating group (n = 368)		Total (n = 534)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1 – 5	0	0.0	0	0.0	11	3.0	11	2.1
6 – 10	0	0.0	0	0.0	26	7.1	26	4.9
11 – 15	0	0.0	27	21.3	163	44.4	190	35.6
16 – 20	0	0.0	26	20.5	78	21.3	104	19.5
21 – 25	0	0.0	16	12.6	68	18.5	84	15.7
25 – 30	2	5.1	14	11.0	9	2.5	25	4.7
31 – 35	9	23.1	40	31.5	12	3.3	61	11.4
36 – above	28	71.8	4	3.1	0	0.0	33	6.2
Total	39	100.0	127	100.0	368	100.0	534	100.0

Table 4.1b The statistical index of the farming land

Farmers in the successful group		Farmers in the unsuccessful group		Farmers in the not participating group	
Maximum	65	Maximum	42	Maximum	35
Minimum	28	Minimum	11	Minimum	1
Mean	42.82	Mean	23.98	Mean	16.81
S.D.	1.44	S.D.	8.37	S.D.	5.96

2. Educational attainment

Farmers in the successful group: It was found that more than one-half of them (71.8%) were Prathomsuksa 4-6 graduates; 15.4 person were below Prathomsuksa 4 graduates and only 2.6 percent were lower secondary school graduates or equivalent (Table 4.2)

Farmers in the unsuccessful group: It was found that more than one-half of them (51.2%) were Prathomsuksa 4-6 graduates; 33.1 percent were below Prathomsuksa 4 graduates and only 6.3 percent were upper secondary school graduates (Table 4.2)

Farmers in the not participating group: It was found that more than one-half of them (66.5%) were Prathomsuksa 4-6 13.6 percent were below Prathomsuksa 4 graduates and only 2.2 percent did not attend formal/non-formal education (Table 4.2)

Table 4.2 Educational attainment

Educational attainment	Farmers in the successful group (n = 39)		Farmers in the unsuccessful group (n = 127)		Farmers in the not participating group (n = 368)		Total (n = 534)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Below Prathomsuksa 4	6	15.4	42	33.1	50	13.6	98	18.4
Prathomsuksa 4-6	28	71.8	65	51.2	244	66.5	337	63.1
Lower secondary school or equivalent	1	2.6	12	9.4	27	7.4	40	7.5
Upper secondary	2	5.1	8	6.3	21	5.7	32	6.0
Bachelor's degree or equivalent	0	0.0	0	0.0	17	4.6	17	3.2

Table 4.2 Educational attainment (Continue)

Educational attainment	Farmers in the successful group (n = 39)		Farmers in the unsuccessful group (n = 127)		Farmers in the not participating group (n = 368)		Total (n = 534)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Graduate school	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Did not attend formal/non-formal education	2	5.1	0	0.0	8	2.2	10	1.9
Total	39	100.0	127	100.0	368	100.0	534	100.0

3. Number of family members

The successful farmers group It was found that more than one-half of them (66.7%) had 4-6 family members; 23.0 percent had 1-3 family members and 10 percent had 7-10 family members (Table 4.3)

The on-going farmers group: It was found that more than one-half of them (56.7%) had 4-6 family members; 30.7 percent had 1-3 family member and 12.6 percent had 7-10 family members (Table 4.3)

The not participating farmers group: It was found that more than one-half of them (62.9%) had 1-3 family members; 28.3 percent had 4-6 family members and only 8.7 percent had 7-10 family members (Table 4.3).

Table 4.3a Number of family members

Number of family members	Farmers in the successful group (n = 39)		Farmers in the unsuccessful group (n = 127)		Farmers in the not participating group (n = 368)		Total (n = 534)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1 – 3	9	23.0	39	30.7	231	62.9	279	52.2
4 – 6	26	66.7	72	56.7	105	28.3	204	38.1
7 – 10	4	10.3	16	12.6	32	8.7	52	9.7
More than 10	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	39	100.0	127	100.0	368	100.0	534	100.0

Table 4.3b Statistical index of number of family members

Farmers in the successful group		Farmers in the unsuccessful group		Farmers in the not participating group	
Maximum	8	Maximum	8	Maximum	9
Minimum	2	Minimum	1	Minimum	1
Mean	4	Mean	4	Mean	4
S.D.	1.44	S.D.	1.56	S.D.	1.55

4. Previous occupations before the farmers' livelihood in accordance with the philosophy of sufficiency economy

Farmers in the successful group: It was found that more than one-half of them (64.5%) grew crop plants; 25.0 percent grew rice and only 2.5 percent did fisheries (Table 4.4).

Farmers in the unsuccessful group: It was found that more than one-half of them (55.9%) grew crop plants; 24.4 percent grew rice and 7.1 percent did trading (Table 4.4)

Farmers in the not participating group: It was found that almost one-half of them (45.5%) were hired workers; 41.1 percent grew crop plants and only 1.9 percent did fisheries (Table 4.4)

Table 4.4 Previous occupations before the farmers' livelihood in accordance with the philosophy of sufficiency economy

Previous occupation	Farmers in the successful group (n = 39)		Farmers in the unsuccessful group (n = 127)		Farmers in the not participating group (n = 368)		Total (n = 534)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Government service	4	10.0	20	15.7	14	3.8	38	7.1
Hired worker	9	22.5	30	23.6	167	45.5	197	36.9
Trading	4	10.0	9	7.1	44	12.0	57	10.6
Rice growing	10	25.0	31	24.4	69	18.8	249	46.6
Crop plant growing	27	64.5	71	55.9	151	41.1	249	46.6
Fisheries	1	2.5	20	15.7	7	1.9	28	5.2
Other	5	12.5	20	15.7	60	16.3	85	15.9
Total	60		201		512		903	

*Note: More than 1 occupation was allowed.

5. Years of living in the areas around the Huay Sai Royal Development Study center

Farmers in the successful group: It was found that less than one-half of them (35.9%) had been living there for 11-20 years; 23.1 percent had been living there for 21-30 years and only 5.1 percent had been living there for 1-10 years (Table 4.5)

Farmers in the unsuccessful group: It was found that less than one-half of them (48.0%) had been living there for 21-30 years; 24.4 percent had been living there for 31-40 years and only 3.1 percent had been living there for more than 40 years (Table 4.5)

Farmers in the not participating group: It was found that less than one-half of them (40.6%) had been living there for 1-10 years; 19.6 percent had been living there for 21-30 years and 11.7 percent had been living there for more than 40 years (Table 4.5)

Table 4.5a Year of living in the areas around the Huay Sai Royal Development Study Center

Years of living	Farmers in the successful group (n = 39)		Farmers in the unsuccessful group (n = 127)		Farmers in the not participating group (n = 368)		Total (n = 534)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1 – 10	2	5.1	9	7.1	149	40.6	160	29.9
11 – 20	14	35.9	22	17.3	44	11.7	72	13.3
21 – 30	9	23.1	61	48.0	72	19.6	142	26.6
31 – 40	5	12.8	31	24.4	60	16.3	194	36.3
> 40	9	23.1	4	3.1	43	11.7	56	10.5
Total	39	100.0	127	100.0	367	100.0	534	100.0

Table 4.5b Statistical index of years of living

Farmers in the successful group		Farmers in the unsuccessful group		Farmers in the not participating group	
Maximum	45	Maximum	45	Maximum	48
Minimum	2	Minimum	1	Minimum	1
Mean	25.97	Mean	25.73	Mean	18.86
S.D.	12.50	S.D.	9.40	S.D.	5.96

6. Water sources

Water sources for farming

Farmers in the successful group: It was found that most of them (79.5%) used waster from the pond for farming; 61.5 percent were dependent on irrigation and 28.2 percent used waster form streams (Table 4.6)

Farmers in the unsuccessful group: It was found that more than one-half of them (55.1%) used waster from streams for farming; 31.5 percent used water from the pond and only 13.4 percent used well water underground water (Table 4.6)

Farmers in the not participating group: It was found than most of them (70.8%) used water from the pond for farming; 35.8 percent used water from stream and 8.7 percent used well water (Table 4.6)

Table 4.6 Water sources for farming

Water sources for farming	Farmers in the successful group (n = 39)		Farmers in the unsuccessful group (n = 127)		Farmers in the not participating group (n = 368)		Total (n = 534)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Pond	31	79.5	40	31.5	260	70.8	331	62.9
2. Stream	11	28.2	70	55.1	130	35.4	125	23.4
3. Irrigation	24	61.5	-	-	44	11.9	154	28.8
4. Well	14	17.5	17	13.4	32	8.7	63	11.7
Total	80		127		466		673	

7. Traditional think base

Based on the focus group discussion with the successful farmers group, it was found that they were confident in the philosophy of sufficiency economy. Mr. Samrong Taengplub stated that diligence, tolerance and honesty were part of his livelihood in accordance with the philosophy of sufficiency economy. Mr. Chuan Buasod added that saving and thrift were important in his livelihood. All successful farmers were aware of the philosophy of sufficiency economy and they believed that this could help them be out of debts and have a better standard of living.

Farmers in the successful group: It was found that they believed in the concept of the sufficiency economy philosophy initiated by H.M. King Bhumibol.

“... I request everybody wishes Thailand to have enough food for household consumption and be peaceful; it needs not to be a very prosperous country. If we can do it, others will follow us and this will be my valuable birthday gift forever.”

The Royal Speech of H.M. King
Bhumibol at Dusitalai Pavilion,
4th December, 1995

Besides, the successful farmers group believed in the concept of the sufficiency economy philosophy that “If only an individual practice and earn a living in accordance with the philosophy of sufficiency economy, he will surely have a better life and family since he had a good livelihood, resulting in a happy life.”

Farmers in the unsuccessful group: It was found that they were confident in the concept of the sufficiency economy philosophy. The farmers believed that it could help them do not have a poor livelihood because they had diverse food sources like vegetables, prawns, crabs, fishes, etc. for household consumption and income generating. Besides, they mostly made use of local resources to save their daily expenses. Although they had not yet been successful in their livelihood, but they still practiced the sufficiency farming.

Farmers in the not participating group: It was found that they were not confident in the concept of the sufficiency economy philosophy due to change of ages. Thus, they believed that it was difficult to be successful to do sufficiency farming. This was because of high prices of goods, farming equipment, workforce

hiring, etc. They also stated that sufficiency farming needed an appropriate area. It could be said that the not participating farmers group did not believe in the philosophy of sufficiency economy. They did not believe that the philosophy could help them be out of debts. This was because selling vegetables or fishes could generate low incomes but the investment needed a big sum of money.

8. Current thinking base (Ideas about the philosophy of sufficiency economy after the adoption of the philosophy)

Based on interviews and interview schedules as well as focus group discussion, each farmers group had different ideas based on their livelihood and socio-economic environment.

Farmers in the successful group: It was found that their family had a better standard of living because they had occupations and enough incomes. They scarcely spent money for each meal and they had enough money for children's schooling. They preferred to do mixed farming-crop growing and animal domestication in the same area which it could well contribute to each other. This was based on the relationships between plants, animals, and environment. Thus, mixed farming was more beneficial than mono farming. To be successful for mixed farming, it needed to have an appropriate planning and implementation. Each farming activity must be appropriate with the physical environment, socio-economic characteristics, workforce using, capital, land, production, and natural resources. Moreover, by products could be utilized or recycled for production. Examples were poultry or swine rearing on the fish pond, rearing fishes in the rice field, and rearing bees in the orchard.

Farmers in the unsuccessful group: It was found that the farmers had invested at a particularly level for crop growing and animal domestication. When there were an economic crisis and animal epidemic, the farmer were bankrupt because they could not cope with the problems immediately. This was because they spent a big sum of money as a circulating fund for the investment. However, they were not hopeless because the rehabilitation and practice of the philosophy of sufficiency economy was still undergone. This group of farmers was hesitating about their livelihood in accordance with the philosophy of sufficiency economy as well as assistance by the government sector. In fact, part of the farmers still lacked of good

planning, tolerance, and confidence. However, they did not refuse suggestions from other successful farmers. Importantly, it depends on social environment, e.g. some farmers had many children, debts and they did not believe that sufficiency economy could help them. However, they still hoped that the philosophy of sufficiency could help them and their family.

Farmers in the not participating group: It was found that the concept of sufficiency economy philosophy was only a policy used for promotion but it was not applicable. This was due to self-limitation on social and environmental aspects. This included their livelihood, expenditure, debts, and cultivation land-all of these did not contribute to their livelihood. For the system of sufficiency economy, it was believed that incomes earned from farming in accordance with the philosophy of sufficiency economy were not enough for earning a living. Not only this, the farmers did not have knowledge about the concept of the sufficiency economy because they were not interested in it.

Activity forms of farming in accordance with the philosophy of sufficiency economy

Farmers in the successful group: It was found that most of the farmers (87.5%) grew crop plants. This was followed by animal domestication (80.0%). Only 5 percent did all activities of farming (Table 4.7).

Farmers in the unsuccessful group: It was found that most of the farmers (91.3%) grew crop plants. This was followed by animal domestication (30.7%). Only 1.6 percent did all activities of farming (Table 4.7).

Farmers in the not participating group: It was found that more than one-half of the farmers (52.6%) grew crop plants. This was followed by rice growing (35.1%). Only 1.1 percent grew rice and domesticated animals (Table 4.7).

Table 4.7 Activity forms of farming in accordance with the concept of the sufficiency economy philosophy

Activity forms of farming	Farmers in the successful group (n = 39)		Farmers in the unsuccessful group (n = 127)		Farmers in the not participating group (n = 368)		Total (n = 534)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Crop plant growing	35	87.5	116	91.3	193	52.6	312	58.4
Rice growing	14	35.0	37	29.1	129	35.1	180	33.7
Animal domestication	32	80.0	39	30.7	62	16.9	133	24.9
Crop plant growing and animal domestication	6	15.0	18	14.2	30	8.2	54	10.1
Rice growing	6	15.0	7	5.5	9	2.5	22	4.1
Animal domestication	5	12.5	3	2.4	4	1.1	13	2.4
All above activities	2	5.0	2	1.6	7	1.9	11	2.0
Total	100		222		434		779	

***Note:** More than 1 activity was allowed

Adoption of the philosophy of sufficiency economy in daily life activities

Farmers in the successful group: It was found that less than one-half of the farmers (35.9%) had been practicing the philosophy for 21-25 years; 25.6 percent had

been practicing the philosophy for 6-10 years. Only 5.1 percent had been practicing the philosophy for 11-15 years (Table 4.8)

Farmers in the unsuccessful group: It was found that less than one-half of the farmers (43.3%) had been practicing the philosophy for 6-10 years; 25.6 percent had been practicing the philosophy for 11-15 years. Only 1.6 percent had been practicing the philosophy for more than 30 years (Table 4.8)

Farmers in the not participating group: No one practiced the philosophy of sufficiency (Table 4.8)

Table 4.8a Years of the adoption of the philosophy of sufficiency economy in daily life activities

Years of the adoption of the philosophy	Farmers in the successful group (n = 39)		Farmers in the unsuccessful group (n = 127)		Farmers in the not participating group (n = 368)		Total (n = 534)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1 – 5	8	20.5	15	11.8	0	0.0	24	4.5
6 – 10	10	25.6	55	43.3	0	0.0	65	12.2
11 – 15	2	5.1	30	23.6	0	0.0	32	6.0
16 – 20	5	12.8	9	7.1	0	0.0	14	2.6
21 – 25	14	35.9	12	9.4	0	0.0	26	4.9
26 – 30	0	0.0	4	3.1	0	0.0	4	0.7
More than 30	0	0.0	2	1.6	0	0.0	2	0.4
Total	39	100.0	127	100.0	0	0.0	166	31.1

Table 4.8b Statistical index of years of the adoption of the philosophy of sufficiency economy in daily life activities

Farmers in the successful group		Farmers in the unsuccessful group		Farmers in the not participating group	
Maximum	25	Maximum	32	Maximum	0
Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	0
Mean	13.79	Mean	11.79	Mean	0
S.D.	8.38	S.D.	6.57	S.D.	0

9. Needs for supporting characteristics form the government sector for the successful livelihood in accordance with the philosophy

Farmers in the successful group: It was found that most of the farmers (102.6%) needed for the supporting characteristics on water sources from the government sector. This was followed by tools/farm machinery (92.3%) and farming land (46.2%) Table 4.9.

Farmers in the unsuccessful group: It was found that most of the farmers (94.5%) needed for the supporting characteristics on water sources from the government sector. This was followed by plant varieties and animal breeds (78.7%). Farming land was found to have least need (62.2%). Table 4.5

Farmers in the not participating group: It was found that all of the farmers (100%) needed for the supporting characteristics on water sources from the government sector. This was followed by capital (81.7%). Plant varieties and animal breeds were found to have least need (34.3%). Table 4.9

Table 4.9 Needs for supporting characteristics from the government sector for the successful livelihood in accordance with the philosophy of sufficiency economy

Needs for supporting characteristics from the government	Farmers in the successful group (n = 39)		Farmers in the unsuccessful group (n = 127)		Farmers in the not participating group (n = 368)		Total (n = 534)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Farming land	18	46.2	79	62.2	212	57.8	309	57.8
Plant varieties/animal breeds	34	87.2	100	78.7	126	34.3	260	48.7
Water source	40	102.6	120	94.5	367	100.0	527	98.7
Tools/farm machinery	36	92.3	98	77.2	142	38.7	276	51.7
Capital	22	56.4	90	70.9	300	81.7	412	77.1
Enough (no needs)	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	150		487		1,147		1,784	

*Note: More than 1 answer was available

10. Lifestyle and daily life activities in accordance with the philosophy of sufficiency economy

Based on the interview, interview schedules, and focus group discussion, it was found that the farmers had similar lifestyle and daily life activities. However, there were some activities which were different, e.g. social aspect, resource utilization, thrift, saving, tolerance, diligence, and confidence in the philosophy of sufficiency economy. This resulted in some differences of lifestyle and livelihood.

Farmers in the successful group: It was found that the farmers were successful in vegetable growing and mixed farming in accordance with the New Theory. They made use of local raw materials and natural resources. Besides, they created new resources, e.g. growing eucalyptus along rice field dikes and growing bamboos at the edges of rice fields or near the residential area.

Eucalyptus can be sold for the farming capital and bamboos could be made as a fence or stake for climbing plants. Besides, bamboo trees are very beneficial in which the farmers preferred to grow for its roots, shoots, trunk, and leaves. If bamboos are grown on the banks of canals, it can help reduce the rapidness of the current and prevent soil erosion.

Besides, it was found that the farmers had prepared a household account for updating daily incomes and expenses. Part of their incomes was kept for emergency incidents. The money which was not spent each day was saved. Not only this, the farmers could use everything wisely and they considered the value of goods to be purchased. This conformed to the concept of the sufficiency economy philosophy on reasonableness and moderation.

Farmers in the unsuccessful group: It was found that the farmers occasionally used local resources. However, they usually purchased various materials and equipment for farming. Since the farmers did not continually do the household account, they still were not be successful in budget management, they still were not be successful in budget management, resulting in debt burden. They got a loan as the circulation fund for farming rather than got an income from mixed farming to be the circulation fund or fro daily expenses. The farmers seldom exchanged knowledge about the sufficiency economy with their farmers group. When the farmers faced a problem, they usually ignored it or sometimes solved the problem based on their understanding.

Farmers in the not participating group: It was found that they did not adopt the concept of the sufficiency economy philosophy for their daily life activities. Although the farmers used to attend the training on the philosophy of sufficiency economy or an educational tour, they still did not understand the concept of the philosophy. Besides, the farmers believed that the concept of the philosophy was not suitable for them and it was almost impossible. In addition, the farmers had their

main occupation, e.g. construction contract and hired worker. Thus, it needed various characteristics to be successful in sufficiency farming, e.g. water sources, support, and supporting agencies.

10.1 Method of daily livelihood conforming to the concept of sufficiency economy philosophy

Based on the focus group discussion, it was found that the farmers had the difference in daily livelihood. All of the 3 farmers groups made use of resources and had the difference of daily livelihood methods. Thus, they were different in successful livelihood. It could be seen that the successful farmers group was clear in their successful sufficiency farming in accordance with the philosophy of sufficiency economy.

Farmers in the unsuccessful group: It was found that the farmers' livelihood conformed to the concept of sufficiency economy philosophy. They consumed what they had or produced because they were not extravagant and they spent money wisely. The farmers grew vegetables and domesticated animals for household consumption and the surplus was sold or given to neighbors. It was also found that the farmers always sought for new knowledge. This was done by attending a training or asking suggestions from extension workers. Moreover, they were willing to be a resource person if requested.

Farmers in the unsuccessful group: It was found that the farmers perceived that the previous economic condition was different from the current one such as prices of goods. Due to a high price of goods, they could not save money. They had to spend money on daily life products for consumption. The farmers occasionally bought vegetables or fishes for cooking. Sometimes, they stopped farming due to natural calamity, epidemic aphid, plant disease, etc. these bored them and eventually stopped farming for some time.

Farmers in the not participating group: It was found that the farmers' livelihood did not conform to the concept of the sufficiency economy philosophy. They did not follow the concept of the philosophy so they were different from those who followed the concept of the philosophy. For example, the farmers had to be a hired worker and they received a low daily or weekly wage. It was found that they were construction hired workers and sewing workers most. However, they could not

end up with their incomes due to daily expenses. Some months, in other words, their incomes were less than expenses. Thus, they did not have money for saving. They had to pay debts with (high) interest.

4.1.2 Economic characteristics

Based on the interview schedules administered with the 3 farmers groups, economic characteristics having a relationship with the farmers' livelihood in accordance with the philosophy of sufficiency economy were as follows:

1. Incomes

Farmers in the successful group: It was found that less than one-half of the farmers (48.7%) had an average annual income for 150,001-200,000 baht; 25.6 percent had an average annual income for 60,001-100,000 baht. Only 10.3 percent had an average annual income for 200,001 and above (Table 4.10).

Farmers in the unsuccessful group: It was found that more than one-half of the farmers (70.1%) had an average annual income for 100,001-150,000 baht; 26.8 percent had an average annual income for 60,001-100,000 baht. Only 3.1 percent had an average annual income for 200,001 and above (Table 4.10).

Farmers in the not participating group: It was found that more than one-half of the farmers (54.5%) had an average annual income for 150,001-200,000 baht; 16.3 percent had an average annual income for 100,001-150,000 baht. Only 4.4 percent had an average annual income for 60,001-100,000 baht (Table 4.10).

Table 4.10a Family' income per year

Family's income per year (baht)	Farmers in the successful group (n = 39)		Farmers in the unsuccessful group (n = 127)		Farmers in the not participating group (n = 368)		Total (n = 534)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
60,000 and below	0	0.0	0	0.0	41	11.2	41	7.6
60,001-100,000	10	25.0	34	26.8	16	4.4	60	11.2
100,001 -150,000	7	17.5	89	70.1	60	16.3	156	29.2
150,001 – 200,000	19	47.5	4	3.1	200	54.5	223	41.8
200,001 and above	3	10.0	0	0.0	51	13.6	54	10.2
Total	39	100.0	127	100.0	368	100.0	534	100.0

Table 4.10b Statistical index of the family's income per year

Farmers in the successful group		Farmers in the unsuccessful group		Farmers in the not participating group	
Maximum	213,598.00	Maximum	190,000.00	Maximum	296,333.00
Minimum	60,589.00	Minimum	60,500.00	Minimum	50,000.00
Mean	149,246.87	Mean	122,020.96	Mean	158,839.27
S.D.	27,238.05	S.D.	27,238.05	S.D.	48,215.77

2. Expenses

Farmers in the successful group: It was found that more than one-half of the farmers (76.9%) had an average annual expense for 60,001-100,000 baht; 23.1 percent had an average annual expense for below 60,000 baht.

Farmers in the unsuccessful group: It was found that more than one-half of the farmers (71.7%) had an average annual expense for 100,001-150,000 baht; 23.6 percent had an average annual expense for 60,001-100,000 baht. Only 4.7

percent were found to have an average annual expense for 150,001-200,000 baht (Table 4.11).

Farmers in the not participating group: It was found that more than one-half of the farmers (74.4%) had an average annual expense for 100,001-150,000 baht; 14.7 percent had an average annual expense for 60,001-100,000 baht. Only 10.9 percent were found to have an average annual expense for 150,001-200,000 baht (Table 4.11).

Table 4.11a Family's expenses per year

Family's expenses per years (baht)	Farmers in the successful group (n = 39)		Farmers in the unsuccessful group (n = 127)		Farmers in the not participating group (n = 368)		Total (n = 534)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
60,000 and below	9	23.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	9	1.7
60,001-100,000	30	76.9	30	23.6	54	14.7	145	27.2
100,001 -150,000	0	0.0	91	71.7	273	74.4	334	62.5
150,001- 200,000	0	0.0	6	4.7	40	10.9	46	8.6
200,001 and above	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	39	100.0	127	100.0	367	100.0	534	100.0

Table 4.11b Statistical index of family's expenses per year

Farmers in the successful group		Farmers in the unsuccessful group		Farmers in the not participating group	
Maximum	100,000.00	Maximum	190,000.00	Maximum	200,000.00
Minimum	50,000.00	Minimum	65,900.00	Minimum	60,500.00
Mean	78,532.23	Mean	122,034.54	Mean	132,090.02
S.D.	6,570.83	S.D.	27,238.05	S.D.	27,551.67

3. Debt condition

Farmers in the successful group: It was found that most of the farmers (89.7%) had debts and only 12.5 percent had no debts. In other words, more than one-half of the farmers (66.7%) had a sum of debts for 10,001-30,000 baht; 12.8 percent had a sum of debts for less than 10,000 baht; and 7.7 percent had a sum of debts for 30,001-50,000 baht. Only 12.8 percent had no debts (Table 4.12).

Farmers in the unsuccessful group: It was found that less than one-half of the farmers (31.5%) had a sum of debts for 10,001-30,000 baht; 31.5% had a sum of debts for 50,001-70,000 baht. Only 5.5 percent had a sum of debts for 90,001-100,000 baht (table 4.12).

Farmers in the not participating group: It was found that about one-fourth of the farmers (25.3%) had a sum of debts for 30,000-50,000 bath; 24.8 percent had a sum of debts for 200,001 baht an above. Only 6.5 percent had a sum of debts for 100,001-200,000 baht (Table 4.12).

Table 4.12a Debt burden of the farmers

Debt burden (baht)	Farmers in the successful group (n = 39)		Farmers in the unsuccessful group (n = 127)		Farmers in the not participating group (n = 368)		Total (n = 534)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Have debts	34	89.7	127	100.0	367	100.0		
10,000 and below	5	12.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	0.9
10,001-30,000	26	66.7	40	31.5	0	0.0	66	12.4
30,001-50,000	3	7.7	23	18.1	93	25.3	120	22.5
50,001-70,000	0	0.0	36	28.3	39	10.6	75	14.0
70,001-90,000	0	0.0	21	16.5	30	8.2	56	10.5
90,001-100,000	0	0.0	7	5.5	90	24.5	97	18.2
100,001 – 200,000	0	0.0	0	0.0	24	6.5	24	4.5
200,001 and above	0	0.0	0	0.0	91	24.8	91	17.0
No debts	5	12.8	0	0.0	1	0.0	0	0.0
Total	39	100.0	127	100.0	368	100.0	534	100.0

Table 4.12b Statistical index of farmers' debts

The successful farmers group		The on-going farmers group		The not participating farmers group	
Maximum	50,000.00	Maximum	350,000.00	Maximum	35,000.00
Minimum	0	Minimum	34,500.00	Minimum	34,500.00
Mean	20,389.74	Mean	155,715.65	Mean	155,715.65
S.D.	12,940.47	S.D.	105,486.30	S.D.	105,486.30

3.1 Causes of having debts

Farmers in the unsuccessful group: It was found that almost one-half of the farmers (46.2%) got a loan for investment. This was followed by household expenses (30.8%). Only 15.4 percent bought a piece of land/car and others (Table 14.3).

Farmers in the unsuccessful group: It was found that more than one-half of the farmers (59.8%) got a loan for investment. This was followed by children schooling (56.7%). Only 4.7% did other activities (Table 14.3)

Farmers in the not participating group: It was found that more than one-half of the farmers (54.2%) bought a piece of land or a car. This was followed by doing other activities. It was found that 16.3 percent had debts due to children schooling (Table 14.3)

Table 4.13 Causes of debts of the farmers

Causes of debts	Farmers in the successful group (n = 39)		Farmers in the unsuccessful group (n = 127)		Farmers in the not participating group (n = 368)		Total (n = 534)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Household expenses	12	30.8	53	41.7	87	23.7	264	49.4
Children schooling	7	17.9	72	56.7	60	16.3	200	37.4
Investment	18	46.2	76	59.8	202	55.0	296	55.4
Buying land/car	6	15.4	53	41.7	199	54.2	146	27.3
Other activities	6	15.4	6	4.7	121	33.0	72	13.4
Total	49		260		669		978	

***Note:** More than 1 answer was allowed

4. Savings

Farmers in the unsuccessful group: It was found that all of the farmers (100%) had savings (Table 14.4)

Farmers in the successful group: It was found that most of the farmers (70.9%) had savings. However, 29.6% did not have savings (Table 14.4).

Farmers in the not participating group: It was found that most of the farmers (92.4%) did not have savings. Only 7.6 percent had savings (Table 4.14).

Table 4.14 Saving

Saving	Farmers in the successful group (n = 39)		Farmers in the unsuccessful group (n = 127)		Farmers in the not participating group (n = 368)		Total (n = 534)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Have	39	100.0	90	70.9	28	7.6	157	29.4
No have	0	0.0	37	29.1	340	92.4	377	70.6
Total	39	100.0	127	100.0	368	100.0	534	100.0

4.1.3 Social characteristics

Based on the interview, interview schedule, and focus-group discussion, it was found that social characteristics and knowledge/understanding about the philosophy of sufficiency economy had an effect on the successful livelihood of the farmers.

1. Group member

Farmers in the successful group: It was found that most of the farmers (87.2%) were members of the village cremation group. This was followed by members of the savings cooperative group (53.8%) and the housewives group and the farmers cooperative group (25.6%) Table 4.15.

Farmers in the unsuccessful group: It was found that most of the farmers (70.1%) were members of the village cremation group. This was followed by members of the savings cooperative group (31.5) and the housewives group (13.4%) Table 14.5

Farmers in the not participating group: It was found that most of the farmers (78.5%) were members of the village cremation group. This was followed by members of the savings cooperative group (31.5%) and housewives group (13.4%) Table 4.15

Table 4.15 Being a group member

Being a group member of ...	Farmers in the successful group (n = 39)		Farmers in the unsuccessful group (n = 127)		Farmers in the not participati ng group (n = 368)		Total (n = 534)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Saving cooperative	21	53.8	40	31.5	107	29.2	168	31.4
Housewives	10	25.6	17	13.4	56	15.3	387	72.4
Village Cremation	34	87.2	89	70.1	288	78.5	411	76.9
Farmers cooperative	10	25.6	0	0.0	47	12.8	557	10.67
Total	75		146		498		1543	

2. Sharing and Contributing to the society

Farmers in the successful group: It was found that most of the farmers shared and contributed to the society: giving (84.6%) donation (82.1%), and sold products in a cheap price (66.7%). Table 4.16

Farmers in the unsuccessful group: It was found that most of the farmers shared and contributed to the society: giving (73.2%) sold products in a cheap price (55.1%)m, and donation (29.9%). Table 4.16

Farmers in the not participating group: It was found that most of the farmers shared and contributed to the society: donation (74.1%) and giving (71.1%). Only 1.4 did not share or contribute to the society. (Table 4.16).

Table 4.16 Sharing and Contributing to the society

Sharing and contributing to the society	Farmers in the successful group (n = 39)		Farmers in the unsuccessful group (n = 127)		Farmers in the not participating group (n = 368)		Total (n = 534)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Giving	33	84.6	93	73.2	261	71.1	387	72.4
Donation	32	82.1	38	29.9	272	74.1	342	64.0
Selling product in a cheap price	26	66.7	70	55.1	115	31.3	211	39.5
Other activities	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	1.4	0	0.0
Total	91		201		653		940	

3. Participation in social activities of the village

Farmers in the successful group: It was found that most of the farmers (97.4%) participated in the village development on a special day. This was followed by participation in various festivals (87.2%). Only 5.1 percent did not participate in any activity (Table 4.17).

Farmers in the unsuccessful group: It was found that most of the people (85.0%) participated in various festivals of the village. This was followed by participation in the village development on a special day (45.7%) and parties (44.9%) Table 4.17.

Farmers in the not participating group: It was found that most of the farmers (80.7%) participated in various festivals of the village. This was followed by participation in village development on a special day (76.0%). Only 2 percent did not participate in any activity (Table 4.17).

Table 4.17 Participation in social activities of the village

Participation in social activities	Farmers in the successful group (n = 39)		Farmers in the unsuccessful group (n = 127)		Farmers in the not participating group (n = 368)		Total (n = 534)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Participation in village development on a special day	38	97.4	58	45.7	279	76.0	375	70.2
Participation in various festivals of the village	34	87.2	108	85.0	296	80.7	438	82.0
Participation in parties	30	76.9	57	44.9	203	55.3	290	54.3
No participation in any activity of the village	2	5.1	-	-	10	2.7	12	2.2
Total	104		224		788		1,115	

Knowledge and understanding about the philosophy of sufficiency economy

1. Moderation

1.1 Principles in self and family satisfaction

Farmers in the successful group: It was found that most of the farmers (97.4%) were satisfied with themselves and families. This was followed by not being extravagant (87.2%). Only 5.1 percent were satisfied with others (Table 4.18)

Farmers in the unsuccessful group: It was found that most of the farmers (84.3%) were satisfied with being not extravagant. This was followed by self-reliance (71.7%), and earning a living based on their financial status (58.3%).

Table 4.18

Farmers in the not participating group: It was found that most of the farmers (76.6%) were satisfied with self-reliance. This was followed by earning a living based on their financial status (75.7%). Only 6.5 percent were satisfied with others (Table 4.18).

Table 4.18 Principles in self and family satisfaction

Self and family satisfaction	Farmers in the successful group (n = 39)		Farmers in the unsuccessful group (n = 127)		Farmers in the not participating group (n = 368)		Total (n = 534)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Self-reliance	38	97.4	91	71.7	281	76.6	410	76.7
Earning a living based of financial status	32	82.1	74	58.3	278	75.7	384	71.9
Not exploit other	27	69.2	78	61.4	219	59.7	324	60.6
Not extravagant	34	87.2	107	84.3	226	61.6	367	68.7
Other	2	5.1	-	-	24	6.5	26	4.8
Total	133		350		1028		1511	

***Note:** More than 1 answer was allowed

1.2 Moderate agricultural production activities

Farmers in the successful group: It was found that most of the farmers (94.9%) produced agricultural products based on their potential. This was followed by appropriate production-not too much or little (61.5%) and production of produces based on needs of the market (35.9%). Table 4.19

Farmers in the unsuccessful group: It was found that more than one-half of the farmers (59.1%) produced agricultural products based on the potential. This was followed by using household workforce (44.9%). Only 14.2 percent produced agricultural products based on needs of the market. (Table 4.19).

Farmers in the not participating group: It was found that more than one-half of the farmers (57.2%) produced agricultural products based on needs of the market. This was followed by producing the agricultural products based on their potential (26.2%). Only 11.7 percent used household workforce. (Table 4.19)

Table 4.19 Moderate agricultural production activities

Agricultural production activities	Farmers in the successful group (n = 39)		Farmers in the unsuccessf ul group (n = 127)		Farmers in the not participating group (n = 368)		Total (n = 534)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Appropriate production (not too much or little)	24	61.5	55	43.3	84	22.9	163	30.5
Production based on self-potential	37	94.9	75	59.1	96	26.2	208	39.0
Using household workforce	22	56.4	57	44.9	43	11.7	122	22.8
Production based on needs of the market	14	35.9	18	14.2	210	57.2	242	45.3
Total	106		205		161.5		740	

* **Note:** More than 1 answer was allowed

1.3 Management of livelihood form

Farmers in the successful group: It was found that most of the farmers (87.2%) had savings and wear thrifty. This was followed by having enough food and the surplus was sold (82.1%). Only 5.1 percent were others. (Table 4.20)

Farmers in the unsuccessful group: It was found that less than one-half of the farmers (37.8%) had moderation and they avoided grumbles. This was followed by having enough food and the surplus was sold (36.2%). Only 6.3 percent were others. (Table 4.20)

Farmers in the not participating group: It was found that more than one-half of the farmers (56.4%) had savings and were thrifty. This was followed by moderation and they avoided grumbles (44.7%). Only 4.9 percent were others (Table 4.20)

Table 4.20 Management of livelihood form

Livelihood form	Farmers in the successful group (n = 39)		Farmers in the unsuccessful group (n = 127)		Farmers in the not participating group (n = 368)		Total (n = 534)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Reduction of import	28	71.8	27	21.3	0	0.0	155	29.0
Having enough food and the surplus was sold	32	82.1	46	36.2	0	0.0	78	14.6
Moderation and avoiding grumbles	26	66.7	48	37.8	164	44.7	74	13.9
Saving and thrift	34	87.2	36	28.3	207	56.4	70	13.1
Other	2	5.1	8	6.3	18	4.9	10	1.9
Total	133		350		1,028		1,511	

* **Note:** More than 1 answer was allowed

1.4 Perception of the knowledge about moderation from information sources

Farmers in the successful group: It was found that most of the farmers (92.3%) perceived the knowledge about moderation through the training center. This was followed by television/radio/newspaper (87.2%). Only 4.21 percent perceived it through other information sources. (Table 4.21)

Farmers in the unsuccessful group: It was found that more than one-half of the farmers (67.7%) perceived the knowledge about moderation through the training center. This was followed by other information source (50.4%) and careful decision-making (28.3%) Table 4.21

Farmers in the not participating group: It was found that most of the farmers (77.7%) perceived the knowledge about moderation through television/radio/newspaper. This was followed by the training center (41.7%). Only 12.0 percent perceived it through other information sources. (Table 4.21)

Table 4.21 Information sources on the moderation of the farmers

Information sources	Farmers in the successful group (n = 39)		Farmers in the unsuccessful group (n = 127)		Farmers in the not participating group (n = 368)		Total (n = 534)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Training center	36	92.3	86	67.7	153	41.7	273	51.1
T.V./Radio/newspaper	34	87.2	57	44.9	285	77.7	378	70.7
Neighbors	21	53.8	60	47.2	104	28.3	185	34.6
Careful decision-making	23	59.0	36	28.3	127	34.6	186	34.8
Other	2	5.1	64	50.4	44	12.0	110	20.5
Total	116		303		713		1,132	

* **Note:** More than 1 answer was allowed

2. Reasonableness

2.1 Understanding about the reasonableness in accordance with the philosophy of sufficiency economy

Farmers in the successful group: It was found that most of the farmers (89.7%) understood that planning must be done before working. This was followed by having a livelihood with principles (87.2%). Only 5.1 percent understood that it was careful decision-making. (Table 4.22)

Farmers in the unsuccessful group: It was found that less than one-half of the farmers (48.0%) understood that it was livelihood with principles. This was followed by planning before working (44.1%) and careful decision-making (Table 4.22)

Farmers in the not participating group: It was found that more than one-half of the farmers (61.9%) understood that it was planning before working. This was followed by careful decision-making (49.6%). Only 3.8 percent indicated the others item (Table 4.22)

Table 4.22 Understanding about the reasonableness in accordance with the philosophy of sufficiency economy

Understanding about the reasonableness	Farmers in the successful group (n = 39)		Farmers in the unsuccessful group (n = 127)		Farmers in the not participating group (n = 368)		Total (n = 534)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Livelihood with principles	34	87.2	61	48.0	179	48.8	274	51.3
Planning before working	35	89.7	56	44.1	227	61.9	311	58.2

Table 4.22 Understanding about the reasonableness in accordance with the philosophy of sufficiency economy (Continue)

Understanding about the reasonableness	Farmers in the successful group (n = 39)		Farmers in the unsuccessful group (n = 127)		Farmers in the not participating group (n = 368)		Total (n = 534)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Considering an effect which will arise	28	71.8	51	40.2	157	42.8	247	45.5
Careful decision-making	2	5.1	35	27.6	182	49.6	219	41.0
Other	0	0.0	43	33.9	14	3.8	57	10.6
Total	99		246		193		1108	

* **Note:** More than 1 answer was allowed

2.2 Reasonableness in the livelihood in accordance with the philosophy of sufficiency economy

Farmers in the successful group: It was found that most of the farmers (87.2%) used the reasonableness for problem solving. This was followed by thinking before acting (84.6%). Only 7.7 percent indicated the others item. (Table 4.23)

Farmers in the unsuccessful group: It was found that more than one-half to the farmers (66.9%) used the reasonableness on thinking before acting. This was followed by others (40.2%). It was found that 22.8 percent used it on appropriate guidelines. (Table 4.23)

Farmers in the not participating group: It was found that most of the farmers (74.9) used the reasonableness on thinking before acting. This was followed by using the reasonableness for problem solving (46.0%). Only 1.4 percent indicated the others item. (Table 4.23)

Table 4.23 Using the reasonableness for livelihood in accordance with the philosophy of sufficiency economy

Reasonableness in livelihood of the farmers	Farmers in the successful group (n = 39)		Farmers in the unsuccessful group (n = 127)		Farmers in the not participating group (n = 368)		Total (n = 534)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Thinking before acting	33	84.6	85	66.9	275	74.9	393	73.5
Using reasonableness for problem solving	34	87.2	50	39.4	169	46.0	253	47.3
Careful analysis in advance	27	69.2	46	36.2	120	32.7	193	36.1
Appropriate guidelines	30	76.9	29	22.8	151	41.1	210	39.2
Other	3	7.7	51	40.2	5	1.4	59	11.0
Total	127		261		720		1108	

* **Note:** More than 1 answer as allowed

2.3 Perception of the reasonableness through information sources

Farmers in the successful group: It was found that most of the farmers (76.9%) perceived the reasonableness through the training center. This was followed by television/radio/newspaper (69.2%), real life experience (64.1%), and neighbors (48.7%), respectively. (Table 4.24)

Farmers in the unsuccessful group: It was found that most of the farmers (75.6%) perceived the reasonableness through the training center. This was followed by others (45.7%), and real life experience (40.2%), respectively. (Table 4.24)

Farmers in the not participating group: It was found that more than one-half of the farmers (75.5%) perceived that reasonableness through television/radio/newspaper. This was followed by the training center (39.2%) and real life experience (37.6%), respectively. (Table 4.24)

Table 4.24 Perception of the reasonableness

Sources of reasonableness perception	Farmers in the successful group (n = 39)		Farmers in the unsuccessf ul group (n = 127)		Farmers in the not participati ng group (n = 368)		Total (n = 534)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Training Center	30	76.9	96	75.6	144	39.2	270	50.5
T.V./radio/ newspaper	27	69.2	45	35.4	278	75.7	350	65.5
Neighbors	19	48.7	28	22.0	95	25.9	142	26.5
Real life experience	25	64.1	51	40.2	138	37.6	214	40.0
Other	2	5.1	58	45.7	27	7.4	87	16.2
Total	103		278		682		1,063	

* **Note:** More than 1 answer was allowed

2.4 Reasonableness in accordance with the philosophy of sufficiency economy

An effect of a guideline sued for developing the country to be progressive results in change in all aspects of the Thai society, e.g. economy, politics, culture, environment, etc. The process of changes is complex and hard to be explained. This is because all changes are characteristics connecting one another. For a positive effect on the development, the following are found: increased economic growth rate, object progress, expansion of infrastructure, modern communication system, increased opportunity in education, etc. More than one-half of the positive effect can access to people in rural areas or those having less opportunity.

However, the process of social changes also had a negative effect. For example the expansion of government affairs in rural areas had impacts on weakness of rural areas in many aspects, e.g. dependence on markets and middlemen in capital product order; natural resource deterioration; weakness of relative relationships; and traditional group forming for existing resource management. Besides, accumulated local wisdoms used for problem solving began to be forgotten.

Importantly, there were impacts on moderate livelihood which was a basic condition for self-reliance and freedom in the determination of life destiny. This included the ability to control and management so that the villagers could receive what they wanted as well as the ability to solve various problems by themselves. All of these was basic potential which Thai people and society used to have. Indeed, the economic crisis, weakness of rural society, and other problems were good evidence of this phenomenon.

Reasonableness could help good livelihood. That was, it could help in decision-making about the level of moderation or sufficiency. This was based on careful consideration of concerned characteristics and expected outcome.

1. Having immunity

a. Understanding about immunity in the philosophy of sufficiency economy

The successful farmers group It was found that most of them (94.9%) understood the immunity in the philosophy of sufficiency economy that it is the readiness to cope with changes. This was followed by the ability to survive when there is the occurrence of economic crisis (59.0%) and having no trouble in livelihood (43.6%), respectively. (Table 4.25)

The on-going farmers group It was found that more than one-half of them (59.1%) understood the immunity in the philosophy of sufficiency economy that it is having not trouble in livelihood. This was followed by the readiness to cope with changes (55.1%) and the ability to survive when there was the occurrence of economic crisis (33.1%), respectively. (Table 4.25)

The not participating farmers group It was found that more than one-half of them (67.6%) understood the immunity in the sufficiency economy that it is the ability to survive when there is the occurrence of economic crisis. This was followed by the readiness to cope with changes (47.1%) and having social immunity (26.4%), respectively. (Table 4.25)

Table 4.25 Understanding about the immunity in the philosophy of sufficiency economy

Understanding about the immunity	The successful farmers group (n = 39)		The on-going farmers group (n = 127)		The not participating farmers group (n = 368)		Total (n = 534)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Readiness to cope with changes	37	94.9	70	55.1	173	47.1	280	52.4
Ability to survive when there is the occurrence of economic crisis	23	59.0	42	33.1	248	67.6	313	58.6
Having no trouble in livelihood	17	43.6	75	59.1	120	32.7	212	39.7
Having social immunity	3	7.7	39	30.7	97	26.4	139	26.0
Other	0	0.0	19	15.0	20	5.4	39	7.3
Total	80		245		658		983	

*Remarks

More than 1 answer was allowed.

- b. Perception of knowledge about immunity in the philosophy of sufficiency economy through data/information sources

The successful farmers group It was found that most of them (94.9%) perceived the knowledge through the training center. This was followed by television/radio/printed media (92.3%) and others (12.8%). Table 4.26

The on-going farmers group It was found that most of them (85.5%) perceived the knowledge through the training center. This was followed by television/radio/printed media (72.4%) and others (14.2%). Table 4.26

The not participating farmers group It was found that most of them (79.8%) perceived the knowledge through television/radio/printed media. This was followed by the training center (41.7%) and others (15.0%) Table 4.26

Table 4.26 Perception of knowledge about immunity in the philosophy of sufficiency economy through data/information sources

Perception sources of the knowledge about immunity	The successful farmers group (n = 39)		The on-going farmers group (n = 127)		The not participating farmers group (n = 368)		Total (n = 534)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Training center	37	94.9	109	85.8	153	41.7	299	55.9
T.V./radio/printed media	36	92.3	92	72.4	293	79.8	421	78.8
Others	5	12.8	18	14.2	55	15.0	78	14.6
Total	78		219		501		798	

*Remarks

More than 1 answer was allowed.

c. Knowledge about immunity

The successful farmers group It was found that most of them (82.1%) perceived the knowledge through thrift saving. This was followed by incomes-expenses (79.5%) and others (5.1%) Table 4.27

The on-going farmers group It was found that most of them (86.6%) perceived the knowledge through thrift and saving. This was followed by incomes-expenses (57.5%) and local resource using (31.5%) Table 4.27

The not participating farmers group It was found that most of them (63.5%) perceived the knowledge though incomes-expenses. This was followed by thrift and savings (56.9%). Only 2.7 percent through others. (Table 4.27)

Table 4.27 Characteristics effecting the knowledge about immunity

Characteristic effecting the knowledge about immunity	The successful farmers group (n = 39)		The on-going farmers group (n = 127)		The not participating farmers group (n = 368)		Total (n = 534)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Incomes-expenses	31	79.5	73	57.5	233	63.5	337	63.1
Agricultural yields	28	71.8	-	-	142	38.7	170	31.8
Thrift and savings	32	82.1	110	86.6	209	56.9	351	65.7
Local resource using	21	53.8	40	31.5	72	19.6	133	24.9
Others	2	5.1	0	0.0	10	2.7	12	2.2
Total	114		223		666		1003	

*Remarks

More than 1 answer was allowed.

d. Having good immunity has an effect on livelihood

Having a good immunity system is the third characteristic of the philosophy of sufficiency economy aside from the moderation and the reasonableness. It refers to the preparation of operational components to be ready for coping with any impacted due to external and internal changes.

Regarding the reasonableness in the business considers on the management of relationships among holistic various views, it should further consider on what activities are causes and what phenomena are effects. For example, a level of sustainability of a particular activity will be appeared after it happens for some time. Meanwhile, an activity or indicator is a cause of the sustainability, e.g. an appropriate production, moderate investment, save technology using, and non-short term profitably focusing is an activity or objective of the business running. Consideration of an indicator as an effect can make us know the incidents happened in the past or have already happened.

Thus, the consideration of relationships of the cause and effect indicators can make us forecast the opportunity and threat which will occur in the future. Besides, this will have an effect on the ability to cope with impacts or changes which will

happen. This can be done by an analysis of weak and strong points of the organization. It can be the construction of good immunity for the business.

2. Knowledge condition

4.1 Principles of the moderation, reasonableness, and good immunity causing the occurrence of knowledge

The successful farmers group It was found that most of them (76.9%) had the principle of the moderation, reasonableness, and good immunity on knowledge exchange. This was followed by local wisdoms (69.2%). Only 2.6 percent was others. (Table 4.28)

The on-going farmers group It was found that most of them (71.7%) had the principle of moderation, reasonableness, and good immunity on knowledge exchange. This was followed by local wisdoms (31.5%) and knowledge about household account preparation (16.5%)/knowledge about natural resource conservation (16.5%), respectively. (Table 4.28)

The not participating farmers group It was found that more than one-half of them (62.7%) had the principle of moderation reasonableness, and good immunity on knowledge exchange. This was followed by knowledge about local wisdom (33.0%). Only 6.8 percent was others. (Table 4.28)

Table 4.28 Principles of the moderation, reasonableness, and good immunity causing the occurrence of knowledge

Principles of the moderation, reasonableness, and good immunity causing the occurrence of knowledge	The successful farmers group (n = 39)		The on-going farmers group (n = 127)		The not participating farmers group (n = 368)		Total (n = 534)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Knowledge exchange	30	76.9	91	71.7	230	62.7	351	65.7
Knowledge about the preparation of household account	20	51.3	21	16.5	93	25.3	134	25.0
Knowledge about local wisdom	27	69.2	40	31.5	121	33.0	161	30.1
Knowledge about natural resource conservation	25	64.1	21	16.5	113	30.8	159	29.7
Others	1	2.6	0	0.0	25	6.8	26	4.8
Total	103		173		582		831	

*Remarks

More than 1 answer was allowed.

4.2 Knowledge about the philosophy of sufficiency economy

The successful farmers group It was found that most of them (82.1%) had knowledge about philosophy of sufficiency economy on the moderate livelihood. This was followed by practice, carefulness, reasonableness and not greedy (76.9%) and the occurrence of knowledge and a guideline for the application of the philosophy (61.5%), respectively. (Table 4.29)

The on-going farmers group It was found that most of them (70.9%) had knowledge about the philosophy of sufficiency economy on the moderate livelihood. This was followed by local wisdoms (59.1%) and knowledge about household account preparation (31.5%)/knowledge about natural resource conservation (31.5%), respectively. (Table 4.29)

The not participating farmers group It was found that more than one-half of them (67.3%) had knowledge about the philosophy of sufficiency economy on carefulness, reasonableness and good immunity. This was followed by moderate livelihood (58.9%). Only 5.4 percent was others. (Table 4.29)

Table 4.29 Knowledge about the philosophy of sufficiency economy

Knowledge about the philosophy of sufficiency economy	The successful farmers group (n = 39)		The on-going farmers group (n = 127)		The not participating farmers group (n = 368)		Total (n = 534)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Moderate livelihood	32	82.1	90	70.9	216	58.9	338	63.2
Practice, carefulness, not greedy, moderation	30	76.9	74	58.3	156	42.5	260	48.6
Reasonableness								
Occurrence of knowledge and a guideline for the application of the philosophy	30	76.9	75	59.1	247	67.3	352	65.9
Others	24	61.5	40	31.5	138	37.6	202	37.8
	0	0.0	0	0.0	20	5.4	37	7.0
Total	116		279		777		1,189	

*Remarks

More than 1 answer was allowed

4.3 Conditions on Knowledge having an effect on livelihood and agricultural activities

The successful farmers group It was found that more than one-half of them could apply knowledge obtained from training and other successful farmers doing sufficiency economy farming. They integrated this knowledge for planning and careful implementation.

The on-going farmers group It was found that knowledge condition had an effect on their livelihood and they could apply various knowledge to their tasks correctly and successfully.

The not participating farmers group It was found that they had no knowledge conditions for the sufficiency economy livelihood.

3. Virtue conditions

5.1 Applying virtue principle to livelihood

The successful farmers group It was found that most of them (97.4%) applied the virtue principle on generosity and followed by diligence and savings (89.7%). Only 7.7 percent was others. (Table 4.30)

The on-going farmers group It was found that most of them (86.6%) applied the virtue principle on generosity and followed by thrift and savings (73.2%). Only 13.4 percent applied the virtue principle on the precepts observing. (Table 4.30)

The not participating farmers group It was found that most of them (79.0%) applied the virtue principle on thrift and saving and followed by generosity (73.0%). Only 3.5 percent applied the virtue principle on others. (Table 4.30)

Table 4.30 Applying the virtue principles to livelihood

Applying the virtue principles to livelihood	The successful farmers group (n = 39)		The on-going farmers group (n = 127)		The not participating farmers group (n = 368)		Total (n = 534)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Generosity	38	97.4	110	86.6	268	73.0	416	79.9
Precepts observing	24	61.5	17	13.4	132	36.0	173	32.3
Thrift and savings	35	89.7	93	73.2	290	79.0	162	30.3
Customary keeping	29	74.4	0	0	133	36.2	162	30.3
Others	3	7.7	0	0	13	3.5	16	2.9
Total	129		220		823		929	

*Remarks More than 1 answer was allowed

5.2 Knowledge about virtue in accordance with the philosophy of sufficiency economy

The successful farmers group It was found that most of them (87.2%) had knowledge about the virtue on social/public assistance and followed by reasonable correctness/not taking advantage of others (82.1%). Only 2.6 percent was others. (Table 4.31)

The on-going farmers group It was found that more than one-half of them (59.1%) had knowledge about the virtue on reasonable correctness/not taking advantage of others (58.3%. Only 13.4 percent was others. (Table 4.31)

The not participating farmers group It was found that more than one-half of them (68.4%) had knowledge about the virtue on the reasonable correctness/not taking advantage of others and followed by social/public assistance. Only 5.7 percent was others (Table 4.31)

Table 4.31 Knowledge about virtue in accordance with the philosophy of sufficiency economy

Knowledge about virtue in accordance with the philosophy of sufficiency economy	The successful farmers group (n = 39)		The on-going farmers group (n = 127)		The not participating farmers group (n = 368)		Total (n = 534)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Social / public assistance	34	87.2	74	58.3	225	61.3	333	62.3
Occupational/social honesty	30	76.9	55	43.3	204	55.6	289	54.1
Reasonable correctness	32	82.1	75	59.1	251	68.4	358	67.0
Not taking advantage others	32	82.1	74	58.3	213	58.0	337	63.1
Others	1	2.6	17	13.4	21	5.7	39	7.3
Total	129		295		914		1356	

*Remarks

More than 1 answer was allowed

5.3 How virtue conditions concern with the livelihood in accordance with the philosophy of sufficiency economy

The successful farmers group It was found that virtue concerning with livelihood could be enriched. This comprised virtue awareness, honesty, tolerance, industry, and careful thinking. Examples were selling home growth vegetables in a reasonable price and giving suggestion to neighbors on sufficiency economy farming.

The on-going farmers group It was found that virtue condition concerning with their livelihood. This included virtue awareness, honesty, tolerance, diligence, and careful thinking in their livelihood.

The not participating farmers group It was found that they had no idea about the virtue conditions concerning with their livelihood. This was because they did not do sufficiency economy farming.

4. Knowledge and understanding about the application of philosophy of sufficiency economy of the farmers Components of the philosophy of sufficiency economy

The successful farmers group It was found that all of them (100%) perceived components of the philosophy of sufficiency economy. Thai was, various activities should be moderate and rely on knowledge and virtue. The virtue conditions must consist of the awareness of honesty, tolerance, diligence and careful planning in livelihood. This was followed by academic knowledge and careful planning/implementation (94.8%) Table 4.32

The on-going farmers group It was found that all of them (100%) perceived components of the philosophy of sufficiency economy. That was, they must be knowledgeable in academy and careful in the application of knowledge to planning and careful implementation. This was followed by moderate activities doing which relies on knowledge and virtue. Besides, the virtue conditions must consist of the awareness of honesty, tolerance, diligence and careful planning in their livelihood (86.6%). Table 4.32

The not participating farmers group It was found that more than one-half of them (66.8%) perceive the component of the philosophy of sufficiency economy on moderate activities relying on knowledge and virtue. This was followed by academic knowledge and careful planning/implementation (63.5%) and virtue conditions comprising honesty, tolerance, diligence, and careful planning in livelihood (36.2%). Table 4.32

Table 4.32 Components of the philosophy of sufficiency economy

Components of the philosophy of sufficiency economy	The successful farmers group (n = 39)		The on-going farmers group (n = 127)		The not participating farmers group (n = 368)		Total (n = 534)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Moderate activities must rely on Knowledge and virtue	39	100.0	110	86.6	245	66.8	394	73.8
Knowledge condition on careful planning and implementation	37	94.8	127	100.0	233	63.5	397	74.3
Virtue conditions comprising honesty tolerance, diligence, and careful planning in livelihood	39	100.0	110	86.6	133	36.2	282	52.8
Total	115		347		611		1,073	

*Remarks

More than 1 answer was allowed

5. Benefits of the philosophy of sufficiency economy

The successful farmers group It was found that all of them (100%) perceived that it was the spiritual and economic moderation. This was followed by social moderation—not taking advantage of others (97.4%) and natural resource moderation and conservation/sustainable development (92.3%) Table 4.33

The on-going farmers group It was found that all of them (100%) perceived that it was the social moderation—not taking advantage of others. Also, it was the economic and natural resource/environment moderation. This was followed by the spiritual moderation—not greedy (86.6%) and balance/sustainable development. (72.4%) Table 4.33

The not participating farmers group It was found that most of them (97.5%) understood that the benefit of the philosophy was not to take advantage of others. This was followed by the economic moderation (97.0) and balance/sustainable development (84.7%) Table 4.33

Table 4.33 Benefits of the philosophy of sufficiency economy

Benefits of the philosophy of sufficiency economy	The successful farmers group (n = 39)		The on-going farmers group (n = 127)		The not participating farmers group (n = 368)		Total (n = 534)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Spiritual moderation – not be greedy	39	100.0	110	86.6	347	94.6	496	92.8
2. Social Moderation – do not take advantage of others	38	97.4	127	100.0	358	97.5	523	97.9
3. Natural resource and environmental moderation – conservation and development	36	92.3	127	100.0	341	92.9	504	94.3
4. Technology moderation – appropriate using of technology	36	92.3	127	100.0	321	87.5	475	88.95
5. Development outcome in accordance with the principle of sufficiency economy is balance and sustainable development	36	92.3	92	72.4	311	84.7	439	82.2
Total	185		583		1,678		2,437	

*Remarks

More than 1 answer was allowed

8. Meaning and importance of the philosophy of sufficiency economy

The successful farmers group It was found that all of them perceived the meaning and importance of the philosophy of sufficiency economy. This was followed by the moderation and reasonableness.

The on-going farmers group It was found that most perceived the philosophy of sufficiency economy as follows: 1) the philosophy was initiated by H.M. King Bhumibol; 2) moderation was understood as sufficiency which was appropriate with financial status, environmental conditions and non-agricultural / agricultural livelihood; 3) reasonableness meant reasonable decision-making about a level of moderation based on concerned data/information. Also, the effect arising from an action must be considered; 4) good immunity was understood as the readiness to cope with impacts or changes which might happen in the future or are happening; 5) the development in accordance with the principle of sufficiency economy was understood as the development which is based on the middle path, carefulness, moderation, good immunity, knowledge, and virtue on decision-making (100%). Sufficiency meant moderation and reasonableness (85.0%) and sufficiency economy focused on the middle-path action and steps of development (73.2). Table 4.34

The not participating farmers group It was found that most of them (95.6%) perceived the philosophy of sufficiency economy as follows: 1) the philosophy was initiated by H.M. King Bhumibol (89.6%) and 2) moderation meant sufficiency which was appropriate with financial status, environmental conditions, and non-agricultural/agricultural livelihood. (95.6%)

4.1.4 Environmental Characteristics

From the focus group discussion, it was found that one characteristics governing the success, the failure, and the not participating of farming households in making their livelihoods following the sufficiency economy approach was related to the resources in the local environment. The whole affair can be categorized and analyzed in parts as follows:

1. The utilization of natural resources

1.1 Utilization of local natural resources

Farmers in the successful group: They were found to be capable of using and managing the available resources prudently and carefully to assure the most likely sustainability. They also adopted labor saving technologies, the ones seemingly appropriate for the needs and the production environment. However, local technological development based on local knowledge was their primary choice as this type of creativity could be advantageous for the local population to a large extent. The farmers in this group adhered to the principle of moderation, having strong spirit, with self-reliance ability, and having good sensibility in resources use. After taking out the forest resources for household or community utilization, for example, they would replant the trees for the reasons of mindfulness toward other people, compromising action, and consideration of public benefits as priority. They acted to foster the reciprocal helps, the harmonious relationships, and the strength among family and community members as manifested by their cooperative efforts in reforestation activities.

Farmers in the unsuccessful group: They appeared to utilize local resources to certain extent. When faced with the problem of resource shortage, they would spend their available money or the large sum of mobilized money for procuring the needed resources from the market without considering the saving of costs nor the investment worthiness despite the availability of substitutable local materials. However, they began to recognize the value of local resources and shared their concern in the need to use the common resources in a caring and economical manner. As a result, they occasionally participated in reforestation projects or group activities to replace the disappearing natural resources.

Farmers in the not participating group: Apparently, they utilized no local resources in their farming as they held a perspective different from that of the sufficiency economy upholders. They viewed the local resources to be inapplicable or barely applicable in their daily routines and thus they felt they had no need to use them unless necessary. They would seek any resources no present locally from other places.

Farming land conditions

Farmers in the successful group: Their farm lands are predominately in upland condition (71.8 %), to a lesser extent are in rain shadowy areas (41.0 %) and least in wetland and unclassified land category (7.7 %) Table 4.25.

Farmers in the unsuccessful group: More than half of the farmers in this group have their farm lands in the unclassified category (55.1 %); and the next most prevalent land feature is upland (16.5 %), and the least is wetland (13.4 %) Table 4.25.

Farmers in the not participating group: More than half of the farmers in this group do farming in sandy-loam soil (43.6 %), and their less prevalent soil types are sandy one (39.2 %) and other soils (3.3 %) Table 4.25.

Table 4.34 Farming land conditions

Farming land conditions	Farmers in the successful group (n = 39)		Farmers in the unsuccessful group (n = 127)		Farmers in the not participating group (n = 368)		Total (n = 534)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Upland	28	71.8	21	16.5	245	66.8	294	55.0
2. Lowland	10	25.6	19	15.0	94	25.6	44	8.2
3. Rain shadow area	16	41.0	-	-	34	.3	50	9.3
4. Wetland	3	7.7	17	13.4	44	12.0	64	11.9
5. Others	3	7.7	70	55.1	32	8.7	102	19.1
Total	60		87		449		554	

Characteristics underlying the success in farming practices in line with the sufficiency economy philosophy

Farmers in the successful group: For them, the most crucial contributive characteristics was water source (100 %), followed by land conditions ((74.4 %), and the important was other characteristics (17.9 %) Table 4.26.

Farmers in the unsuccessful group: The majority of farmers in this group considered the most important determining characteristics to be water source (92.1 %) followed by financial capital (55.9 %) and other characteristics (12.6 %) Table 4.26.

Farmers in the not participating group: More than half of the non-adopters put high consideration to financial capital ((91.0 %) followed by land conditions (59.4 %), and lowest to other characteristics (6.0 %). Table 4.26.

Table 4.35 Characteristics underlying the success in farming practices in line with the sufficiency economy philosophy

Characteristics	Farmers in the successful group (n = 39)		Farmers in the unsuccessful group (n = 127)		Farmers in the not participating group (n = 368)		Total (n = 534)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Water source	39	100.0	117	92.1	195	53.1	351	65.7
Farm land size	19	48.7	32	25.2	167	45.5	218	40.8
Land conditions	29	74.4	52	40.9	218	59.4	299	55.9
Financial capital	17	43.6	71	55.9	334	91.0	422	79.0
Knowledge	27	69.2	69	54.3	196	53.4	292	54.7
Others	7	17.9	16	12.6	22	6.0	45	8.4
Total	138		357		1132		1,627	

*Note: More than 1 answer was allowed

(other characteristics such as climate, plant diseases, and insect pests, etc.)

Environmental conservation and rehabilitation approaches in conjunction with pursuing the way of life along the sufficiency economy philosophy orientation

Farmers in the successful group: They demonstrated their attempts to conserve wisely the natural resources and environment by minimizing the resource

consumption to attain optimal benefits, sustainable use in the long-run, least possible negative impacts on the environment, and equitability in resource use among the community members. As the local natural resources and the environment at the time of this study seemed to be degrading increasingly, they reckoned that the efforts in conserving natural resources and the environment should also encompass the concept of environmental quality improvement.

Natural resources and environmental conservation and protection can be implemented by various direct and indirect measures as proposed below.

1. Direct measures for natural resources and environmental conservation applicable at the levels of individual, organization, and nation, including the following major practices:

1. Reduction to minimize resource use to the extent of meeting important needs such that the resources can be utilized for long term and in the most worthwhile manners.

2. Re-use / recycling because some materials or goods like plastic bags and paper can be reused or transformed through various processes into other useful natures like the processing of used paper into cardboard which can help minimize resource use and environmental impairment.

3 Repairing is to have the damaged or worn-out things fixed or renovated when possible to extend their working life.

4. Rehabilitation / restoration since some degraded resources and environmental conditions can be restored or prevented like in the case of taking the measures of household or industrial wastewater treatments before the release to public water bodies, or the case of rehabilitation of mangrove areas to restore their ecological balance and productivity.

5. Replacement is a means for minimizing resource use and avoiding undesirable environmental impacts, for examples, by substituting plastic bag, with cotton sack, using banana leaf instead of foam, switching from fossil fuel to solar energy, and depending on bio-fertilizer rather than chemical input.

6. Reliance on surveillance and prevention as pre-emptive actions to protect against the destruction of natural resources and the environment such as the

monitoring and control of waste dumping into water courses, and the building of fire-break strips to prevent the spread of forest fire.

2. Indirect measures for the conservation of natural resources and the environment such as:

1. Human quality development by advocating the technical instruction for knowledge of people of all ages about natural resources and environment conservation through either formal education systems or mass media to create the public's awareness of the importance and the need for such conservation and thus their sense of caring and cooperating for the conservation.

2. Social and legal measures through the formation and establishment of relevant interest group, club, community, association, society, or organization; and provision of cooperation for natural resources and environment conservation from the individual's capacity of physical, spiritual, and intellectual strengths with the recognition of how valuable and meaningful the natural resources and the environment are to our life. The interested persons or parties may join or learn from the experience of students' club for natural resources and environment conservation in various schools and universities, the Wildlife Fund Thailand, Seub Nakhasathien Foundation, and the Green World Foundation, etc.

3. Promoting local participation in conservation activities to maintain the natural conditions and prevent deterioration of natural resources and the environment for the common benefits of local population from utilizing the resources to support their livelihoods. Coordination among government agencies, local administration organizations, and the local people was considered essential for creating the mutual understanding and recognition of their respective roles and obligations in the protection and rehabilitation as well as the use of the resources in the most worthwhile manners.

4. Advocating study and research activities to find out techniques and develop technologies for the management of natural resources and the environment to assure optimal benefits, for examples, the application of information systems in the development planning endeavors, the development of energy saving farm implements to a greater extent, and researches into the efficient and sustainable approaches for environmental management, improvement, and development.

5. State policy and guideline settings for short term and long term environmental resources conservation and development as the operational framework for relevant government agencies and workers to observe, including government's support for dissemination of knowledge and information about natural resources and environment conservation either directly or indirectly.

Farmers in the unsuccessful group: More than half of farmers in this group were found to utilize local resources in their farming as well as use manure and composts for soil conservation. Some still applied chemicals for pest control and spent money for the inputs they did not have, causing them heavy investment burdens and sometime unavoidable need to get loans for investment.

For the above reasons, it is commonly found the coexistence between scarcity of sound natural resources and environment and poverty among local farm households because people still have to rely on such local resources as forest and water sources for making their living. Furthermore, the presence of environmental problems such as air pollution, domestic wastes, garbage, and polluted water in the neighborhood of residential area will definitely affect adversely the people's quality of life in the absence of mitigation and management measures, and sufficient efforts in environmental conservation.

Farmers in the not participating group: Apparently, they had very limited conservation activities since they reckoned they did not depend on local resources for making their living. They did have group activities with the fertilizer group, housewives' group but not for the purpose of farming according to the sufficiency economy principles.

The information of focus group discussion and questionnaire survey had led to a notion that one of the characteristics shaping the behavior and performance of the three different categories of farmers under study is associated with local cultures and social capital which will be elaborated further.

4.1.5 Cultural characteristics and social capital

The information of focus group discussion and questionnaire survey had led to a notion that one of the characteristics shaping the behavior and performance of

the three different categories of farmers under study is associated with local cultures and social capital which will be elaborated further.

1. Cultures and social capital in terms of local knowledge

1.1 Application of local knowledge in making livelihoods after the sufficiency economy philosophy

Local knowledge can be applied in daily life activities like home-cooking by male and female household members alike to enhance the palatability of dishes following an old saying that one's charm may come from the tip of ladle. However, this quality is found more in female than male because the former gender seems to possess more delicate sense. The exquisite traditional weaving methods and designs can be re-introduced for producing unique Thai textiles. The traditional Thai housing styles, designed differently but with the same purpose of accommodating the varying seasons and climate in each locality, are definitely in consonance with the sufficiency economy concept. The knowledge on folk medicines and herbal and medicinal plants and materials in each local community can be exploited for wider public benefits because the knowledge and information can form the basis for local people as well as outsiders to undertake study and conduct more advanced researches particularly on the determination of chemical and pharmaceutical properties of the herbal and medicinal plants for further exploitation in terms of substance extraction. The additional merits of traditional medicines and treatments lie in the connection with Buddhism belief in avoiding harms to living organisms (namely lab-test animals) and with the conservation concept to maintain the source of raw materials, not to mention the self sufficiency in health care.

Other Thai traditions and main religions are also the important references for people to rethink about application of local knowledge and wisdoms in daily life to be in line with the sufficiency economy principles.

1.2 The local knowledge in the contemporary daily life and its potential for conservation

Many traditional arts and crafts are still present in the daily life and special events in the rural communities such as fruit carving, food processing, palm sugar production, dairy cattle raising, kite making, as well as a variety of local performing arts in music, singing, and dances. As more than half of the population in

the studied village are members of Huay Sai Development and Study Center of the Royal Initiatives Project, they had the opportunity to use the local knowledge concerning arts and crafts for earning their living like joining the wickerwork group or food processing group to produce palm sugar as OTOP products.

2. The preservation and practice of local traditions

The findings from questionnaire survey revealed the adherence to local traditions was a characteristics setting the successful group apart as different from the unsuccessful and not participating groups in following the sufficiency economy philosophy.

Farmers in successful group: They preserved the local traditions and cultures by practice and participation most commonly in wedding ceremony (97.4 %) followed by ordination ritual and other religious events (89.7 %) and for those Moslems in prayers , Hujj pilgrimage, and fasting lent (12.8 %) Table 4.27.

Farmers in unsuccessful group: They appeared to be involved perfectly in ordination ritual and other religious events (100 %) followed by wedding ceremony (85.0 %) and house warming ceremony (71.7 %) Table 4.27.

Farmers in not participating group: Most of them were found to still attend religious events (93.2 %), wedding ceremony (91.0 %), and the Moslems would make their at least once in a life time pilgrimage to Mecca (6.3 %) Table 4.27.

Table 4.36 The preservation and practices of local traditions

Activity/event	Farmers in the successful group (n = 39)		Farmers in the unsuccessful group (n = 127)		Farmers in the not participating group (n = 368)		Total (n = 534)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Buddhist monk ordination	35	89.7	127	100.0	331	90.2	493	92.3
2. Wedding ceremony	38	97.4	108	85.0	334	91.0	480	89.8
3. House warming ceremony	34	87.2	91	71.7	293	79.8	418	78.2
4. Religious events	35	89.7	127	100.0	342	93.2	504	94.3
5. Islamic prayers	5	12.8	0	0.0	24	6.5	29	5.4
6. Hujj pilgrimage	5	12.8	0	0.0	23	6.3	29	5.4
7. Fasting lent	5	12.8	0	0.0	24	6.5	29	5.4
Total	157		453		1371		1982	

3. Preservation of local traditions and cultures as heritage to the future generations

From interview and focus group discussion, this study discovered different groups of farmers had different perspectives and level of concern about preserving the local traditions and cultures.

Farmers in the successful group: They developed the folk wisdoms and knowledge into a means of making profession such that the local people need not out-migrate for works elsewhere. They tried to encourage the local people to earn the living from one's own capability, and inculcate their children to appreciate the fact that their ancestors did work to make their livelihoods on their own capacity and in

their birth places and hence the present village youths should be proud of the unique local knowledge.

Farmers in the unsuccessful group: Although most of them still maintained the traditional ways of working and living thus maintaining the traditional village community characteristics, they did not care whether their children would study or have interest about the local traditions and cultures depending on the latter's will.

Farmers in the not participating group: They appeared to prepare nothing to keep the local traditions and cultures surviving in the future generations due to their obligations to work outside their villages and they had quite scant opportunity to act to cherish the local traditions and cultures.

4.1.6 Policy and plan characteristics

From focus group discussion, it was obvious that the perspective and understanding about policy and plan varied among the three groups of farmers leading to the knowledge that the policy and plan characteristics was also imperative for making the villagers understand sufficiency economy.

1. The recognition of policies and plans

Farmers in the successful group: They had the knowledge and understanding about setting policies and plans jointly with the government agencies and in fact had undertaken policy and plan determination together with the latter. Consequently, they became able to follow the policies and plans correctly and unquestionably they achieved the success in making livelihoods and carrying out activities in line with the sufficiency economy approach on the ground of their policy understanding.

Farmers in the unsuccessful group: Obviously, they lacked the understanding of policy and plan and had never taken part in policy determination and planning process with the government agencies, causing them to be unknowledgeable about the direction or plan making for leading their life in sufficiency economy ways. They perhaps knew basically that there existed a national policy on sufficiency economy but did not seek the correct understanding and hence pursued the course of actions according to their own interpretation rather than according to policies and plans and they finally ended up with inadequate success.

Farmers in the not participating group: To them, policy and plan were some things far off. They had never got involved in policy and plan formulation and were unknowledgeable about policy and plan development directions. Most of them considered policies and plans were what the government sector assigned to pertinent agencies to prepare and thus irrelevant to them. Consequently, their sufficiency economy activities if ever undertaken were not compatible with the policy and plan guidelines. Moreover, some of them had no interest in applying sufficiency economy philosophy in their daily life and they thus had no interest in the policies and plans related to sufficiency economy.

2. Participation in planning process

Farmers in the successful group: They had participated in the meetings organized by government agencies to develop policies and plans. The government agencies would generally invite farmers to the meetings to consult the latter on the matters related to how to improve the application of sufficiency economy philosophy, what are the problems and needs of the local farmers, and to allow them to propose ideas and contribute to the planning process. Any problems encountered in the policy and plan implementation would be brought back to the future meetings for policy and plan revisions so as to ensure practicality.

Farmers in the unsuccessful group: Evidently, they had been invited to attend the joint planning meetings concerning sufficiency economy with the government agencies but they either did not show up, or did so unwillingly, or participated passively because they assigned low priority to this matter. In case they had attended the meetings, they did not apply the principles afterward or did only partially and not seriously. When they found difficulties, they simply abandoned the practice of sufficiency economy since they considered the philosophy to be rather problematic in their way of life.

Farmers in the not participating group: It was found that they had never participated in the meetings with the government agencies to propose policies and plans. They regarded the policy planning to be the responsibility of the state and the government agencies rather than a process needing farmers' participation. Furthermore, they had an excuse for not having time available to attend the meetings

because they were engaged in other occupations. Some also considered there was no need for them to participate in policy and plan formulation meetings because their way of life was not in the sufficiency economy direction.

From the above analysis of information regarding the three groups of farmers, it becomes possible to discern their fundamental differences and make comparison on the characteristics underlying the extent and performance of these farmers in pursuing their livelihoods after the sufficiency economy principles. The information and study findings can be arranged and categorized to serve as performance indicators of success, failure, or rejection as presented in Table 4.28.

Table 4.37 Comparison of fundamental features of farmers in three different groups

Characteristics/indicator	Farmers in the successful group	Farmers in the unsuccessful group	Farmers in the not participating group
Characteristics affecting livelihood pattern of farming households/indicators of mechanism driving the practices of sufficiency economy principles			
1. Personal characteristics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Secondary school or diploma level education - Having 4 -6 family members living together - Previously did field crop farming - Owning farm lands - Holding lands more than 35 rai - Living in the neighboring areas of Huay Sai Center for 31 – 40 years - Making livelihoods along the sufficiency economy way for 21 – 25 years - Having the faith in the sufficiency economy philosophy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - primary school education - Having 4 6 family members - Doing field crop and paddy farming - Owning 25 – 30 rai land - Holding 31 -35 rai farm land - Living in the neighboring area of Huay Sai Center for 21 – 30 years - Perceiving sufficiency economy to be unlikely to be successful in the contemporary dynamics 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Primary school education - Having 1-3 family members - Formerly being hired labor - More than half holding 11 -15 rai land - Living in the neighborhood of Huay Sai Center for 31 -40 years - Having no faith in making sufficiency economy livelihoods either in the past or at present

Table 4.37 Comparison of fundamental features of farmers in three different groups (Continue)

Characteristics/indicator	Farmers in the successful group	Farmers in the unsuccessful group	Farmers in the not participating group
Characteristics affecting livelihood pattern of farming households/indicators of mechanism driving the practices of sufficiency economy principles			
2. Economic characteristics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Having 150,001 – 200,000 baht income per year - Having 60,001 – 100,000 baht expense per year - More than half having debt burden of 10,001 – 30,000 baht on the average 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Having 100,001 – 150,000 baht income per year - Having 100,001 – 150,000 baht expense per year - More than half having 10,001 – 300,000 baht debt burden on the average - More than half having savings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Having 60,001 - 100,000 baht income per year - Having 60,001 – 100,000 baht expense per year - More than half having 30,001 – 50,000 baht debt burden - More than half having no savings
3. Social characteristics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Forming into group for working - Placing importance on attending monthly meetings and annual general meeting - Having directions and techniques for farming practices 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Organizing into group with the sense of sharing and participating in social activities concerning natural resources utilization - Rarely attending meetings and having no interest in listening to the invited resource person - Having capability to be more than half successful after having got advice from the successful persons 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Organizing into group with the sense of sharing and participating in social activities concerning natural resources utilization - Never forming group or taking part in sufficiency economy activities

Table 4.37 Comparison of fundamental features of farmers in three different groups (Continue)

Characteristics/indicator	Farmers in the successful group	Farmers in the unsuccessful group	Farmers in the not participating group
Characteristics affecting livelihood pattern of farming households/indicators of mechanism driving the practices of sufficiency economy principles			
4. Environment characteristics	<p>Having awareness about natural resources and environment conservation as reflected by</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. keeping the community in order such as the maintenance of clean public places, proper disposal and treatment of wastes and pollutants, 2. water sources surveillance and maintenance, 3. implementing natural resources and environment conservation activities. 	<p>- Having awareness about natural resources and environment conservation.</p>	<p>- Using local resources as necessary but usually buying any needed resources from market thus forcing the farmers to shoulder heavy burden of investment capital.</p>

Table 4.37 Comparison of fundamental features of farmers in three different groups (Continue)

Characteristics /indicator	Farmers in the successful group	Farmers in the unsuccessful group	Farmers in the not participating group
Characteristics affecting livelihood pattern of farming households/indicators of mechanism driving the practices of sufficiency economy principles			
6. Policy and plan characteristics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Having to depend on the creation of faith for the adoption comprising the adoption of unification and cooperation concepts among people in the same community - Having the belief in the sufficiency economy philosophy which is practical in real life especially the moral integrity principle - Learning to understand policy and plan concepts from the Learning Center which organized training sessions conducted by resource persons who had expertise in comprehensive integrated farming systems following the royal philosophy of sufficiency and His Majesty' new theory such that they could gain the capacity to become an element in policy and plan formulation process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Becoming accepting and believing in the work process which has well defined principles in the same orientation namely the expectation to make people attain good quality of life, strength, and self-reliance - Believing that the fundamental key to success in a task is the creation of team work - Advocating the participation principle by encouraging people's participation and self-reliance in learning about policies and plans - Acquiring knowledge from time to time - Applying the acquired knowledge but this might fail to provide solutions to some problems and thus leaving the problems to stay behind 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Placing little importance on working together with the community, meanwhile involving in some social circles and evil path - Having no confidence in the sufficiency economy practices to help improve one's income - Never acquiring more knowledge nor participating in planning process while ignoring the policy matter

From the analysis, it can be concluded that farmers in different groups had different understanding of the sufficiency economy philosophy. Particularly those in the successful and unsuccessful groups appeared to have a good understanding and determine to adopt the philosophy to ensure their sustainable decent livelihoods. When facing any difficulties, they would consult among themselves for solutions. They planned their farming and conducted their daily life following what they had learned from the trainings and study visits. Farmers in both groups thus experienced a miracle change in their life from hopeless to hopeful expectations such as having no debts, having savings, feeling content with what they got, and with happiness in the family. Those remained unsuccessful were indeed in the process of waiting for their success which took longer time than the others due to such constraining characteristics as water resource which is fundamental for farming. They were able to manage other matters like controlling income and expense as well as other characteristics but the most important characteristics is still the water.

Meanwhile, the farmers in the not participating group were found to lack the confidence in the practicality of sufficiency economy philosophy in real life. They had the incorrect expectation that the public sector would provide support like giving things for free. They denied to get understanding nor to accept the reality. Especially, if they did not have the faith in the philosophy it would be difficult to convince them. It is already stated in the philosophy that practicing sufficiency economy should be a voluntary act not by force. Everything seemed to be problematic as they were used to the old system and not open to making any changes. They would come back to consider sufficiency economy practices only when they could no longer survive because they went bankrupt and could not get any further credit and hence found no way out. Then, they would view sufficiency economy as the last alternative, beginning to pay attention and determine the intention to adopt the practices. The best way to gain the interest and acceptance from the farmers in the not participating group is perhaps by demonstrating to them the secured and prosperous livelihoods of those successful farmers and gradually convincing them to learn more about sufficiency economy until they become ready to plan their suitable undertakings and expect for the success.