

Alternative Perspectives on Urban Governance: The Views of Local People in the Border Special Economic Zone, Thailand

¹Asoke Ponbumrung, ²Buapun Promphakping

¹*Department of Development Science, Faculty of Humanities and Social Science, Khon Kaen University, 40002, Thailand, asokpon@yahoo.com*

²*Faculty of Humanities and Social, Science, Khon Kaen University, 40002. Thailand, buapun@kku.ac.th*

Abstract

Special Economic Zone has been promoted on economic growth but it is a driver of border city growth. Power, resources and knowledge imbalance between different stakeholders are a problem in administration. This paper investigates effective urban governance from the perspective of the local stakeholders. A phenomenological method was chosen for this research. Data collection tools included in-depth interviews and focus group discussions. Data were analyzed using content analysis. Their perspectives of urban governance in the context of rapid urban growth are reducing the control of the central government, and collaboration among multi-stakeholders.

Keywords: Urban Governance, Border Special Economic Zone, Urban Growth, Thailand.

INTRODUCTION

UN-Habitat (2016) stated urban growth is one of the highest challenges to development in the 21st century. The growth of cities increasingly plays a critical role in a country's sustainable development because the city can create jobs, offering the city population better living standards and help to reduce both urban and rural poverty. From 1990-2000, the world's urban population increased between 57 million to 77 million per year. From 2010-2015, and 2 out of 3 of the world's population will live in urban areas by 2050. The Asian Development Bank (2016) predicts that by 2025, 60 per cent of the population of Thailand will live in cities and this will rise to over 72 per cent by 2050. As cross-border trading has been promoted in the Southeast Asian region over the past few decades, coupled with the promotion of SEZ along the borders, urbanization of border cities in particular has increased.

Urbanization has had both a positive and negative impact on the population of the city (Dociu & Dunarintu, 2012, p.49-50). However, there is abundant evidence that the development focus emphasizing economic growth has had detrimental effects on specific groups of the population (Phromphakphing, 2013, p.24-31). The negative effects of rapid urban growth are as follows: 1) decreasing quality of life, including public health problems, due to inadequacy of good basic infrastructure, deteriorating environmental hygiene, increasing waste and population density, and flash flooding, and 2) insufficient public services for private or business sectors. The two main causes of the problems are a systematic problem of power and resources imbalances between stakeholders in the city. The public agencies do not have the capacity to cope with the city's problems. Other non-state actors that have capacity, knowledge, and resources are not engaged in finding solutions.

With an aim to boosting economic growth, the Thai government has announced and developed border areas in 10 provinces. This has the potential to form special economic zones under the framework of the Greater Mekong Sub-Region Economic Cooperation (GMS-EC), promoted and funded by Asian Development Bank. This may be a driving force for ASEAN economic growth in building potential and opportunities for development in the border areas. The SEZs have been set up to stimulate foreign direct investment (FDI) to spread development into different areas. They are also tool to improve the quality of life of the people in a wider area through creation of jobs and income and reduce the economic disparity between the city and the countryside. The administrative models of the Government act as instruments to attract investors in the SEZ, for the development of infrastructure facilities. A goal is the relaxation of regulations that hinder trade and improve investment. The SEZ can simplify laws regulating returns or benefits of investment, management of foreign workers, and land acquisition (Office of the National Economic and Social Development, 2015). With these favorable factors, the border areas that have been announced as SEZs have become a maelstrom of change.

Thailand's Government has selected Mae Sot District of Tak Province, bordering Myanmar as one among the 10 cities to be a SEZs. The city is located on the west border of the East-West Economic Corridor (EWEC) route or Route No.9 (R9) following the GMS-EC. With the potential of Mae Sot which is the border of Thailand and Myanmar plus the Burmese market which has very high potential, big market size, and more purchasing power. As the location of Myanmar is the main entrance in distributing the goods to the large markets including India, China, Bangladesh.

Mae Sot City has been stimulated by the impetus of SEZ and the growth of Mae Sot has been remarkable since 2001 following the policy to increase border trade. The per capita income of the city between the years 2003-2014 was increased an average of 11.9 percent. This is a high rate among the border municipalities. Thitawadee & Yoshihisa (2018)

have stated that Mae Sot urban zone is expanding mostly into rural and agricultural areas, including encroachment on a protected forest area, mainly as a result of the construction of the transport infrastructure for the development of the SEZ. The expansion of Mae Sot can be characterized as 'urban sprawl', and the urban growth pattern has not conformed to any land use planning.

Urban growth is an issue for urban governance. Indeed, the existing governance system is already under pressure. If the same framework and system of governance continues, it will be increasingly difficult to deal with the ensuing urban rapid growth. The SEZ is adding more and more drivers propelling city growth, and therefore urban governance will become an increasingly pressing issue in the future. This paper examines the alternative urban governance system from the perspective of the city's stakeholders under the context of the rapid growth of the city driving force of SEZ. The recognition of effective urban governance from the stakeholders' viewpoint is critical as local stakeholders interact play with the state in their roles of governance. The focus will be on the issues of their priorities in governance, power, resources, knowledge, and details of those issues that have the potential to guide governance indicators in the future.

This paper itself is organized into six main sections. Section 1 has set out already the state of urbanization, the significance of the SEZ, and the justification for understanding the city's stakeholders' perspectives in alternative urban governance. Section second now presents a literature review of the urban governance concept. Section third describes the research methodology. Section fourth describes the results of the research. Section fifth provides discussion. Finally, the paper ends with conclusion and recommendation.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Halfani et al. (1994) pointed out that during the 1980s research and practice in urban areas was dominated by urban management perspectives. The management perspective was largely

crafted in response to the rapid urban growth of the developing world during the 1970s. This posed critical problems for central and local governments (Farrell, 2017) as a consequence of the inadequacy of urban services. The World Bank (1991) stated that urban management comprised: 1) urban institutions and intergovernmental fiscal relations; 2) local resource mobilization; 3) maintenance of urban infrastructure; 4) enabling regulatory framework and 5) financial services for urban development.

Since the 1980s the concepts of urban management have been changing, and the concept of urban governance has been increasingly present in the literature. Often, urban management and urban governance are used interchangeably. Leftwich (1993) argues that the surge of interest in urban governance was due to the structural adjustment programs imposed by IMF, the rise of the neoliberal ideology, the collapse of communism in the late 1980s, and the rise of pro-democracy movements. In the broadest sense, governance refers to the management of power relations in a given society in order to achieve desired development outcomes. Governance regimes may include: 1) the form of political regimes; 2) the management of the country's economic and social resources; 3) the capacity of government to deliver public services; and 4) the engagement of local actors to provide forces or inputs of governance. In practice, the World Bank governance formula is narrowed to efficiency improvement of government management, the formula generally known as 'good governance'.

In this paper the definition of urban governance is broadened and derived from a broad social sciences perspective in development. In the context of urban areas, Avis (2016) highlights key characteristics of urban governance as follows: 1) the interface of national and local government guiding urban growth in a sustainable and inclusive direction; 2) the capacity of a municipality in managing urban growth; 3) the role of the private sector and 4) institutions and political systems underpinning symmetric power relations in urban space. Urban governance, as the outcome of an urban

system could lead to an improvement of the quality of life of a population, eradicating poverty and increasing wealth – economic development – of the city. Silva and et al. (2012) see urban governance from a systems perspective; the urban systems are governed by sub-systems including infrastructure, institutions, and agencies. Pierre (1999) stated that institutions and agencies are key factors determining the outcomes of urban governance. The different institutional models of urban governance describe different systems of values, norms, beliefs, and practices, and then produce different urban policy choices and outcomes.

Following this line of thought, we define urban governance as the system governing relationships between actors within a given urban context, which determine or contribute to the quality of outcomes of urban management. This definition gives priority to actors involved in the governance system of the urban area. It is therefore imperative to understand the perspectives of stakeholders regarding how the urban system operates and how it should be governed. What issues are important to the stakeholders and how they prioritize urban governance issues? We will continue to present our research addressing these questions in the following section.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A phenomenological method was chosen for this qualitative research which seeks to gain some understanding of the meaning, impact and value of urban governance, and also of the perspective of local stakeholders toward urban governance of the border SEZ. Data collection was conducted from sixteen key informants identified by purposive and snowball sampling techniques, and interviewed by using in-depth interview techniques (Corbetta, 2003). These key informants were leaders of organizations involved in the city and the border's SEZ development including public agencies, local government organizations, the private sector, and civil society organizations.

In addition, a focus group interview was used to obtain specific information from residents of the city. The participants were from three communities located in the SEZ development area consisting of a central business district (CBD) community, a peri-urban area, and a rural area. There were three focus groups organized, with a total of 28 individual attendees/respondents.

Data triangulation was conducted based on two format techniques based on the Creswell Guidelines (Creswell, 2013) of two format techniques include: 1) triangulate different data sources; and 2) member-checking triangulation. The data, both from interviews and focus group discussion was analyzed using content analysis techniques.

RESEARCH RESULTS

The perspective on the value and Impacts of the Mae Sot's SEZ.

In the case of the Mae Sot SEZ, the Thai Government has attempted to promote the benefit of this economic instrument to the local people. From the information received from the central government sources, most of the residents understood that this meant an open trade policy under which everyone in the area could receive benefits from the SEZ, including local residents. However, under this development policy, the central government agencies never allowed local stakeholders to participate in any public hearing platform. They never had an opportunity to state their needs on the SEZ development. As a result, even the private sector, which is the key group advocating/supporting the SEZ in Mae Sot area, expressed the opinion that local people cannot gain benefit from the SEZ. They felt that the state's policy contributed only to the benefit of Thai investors from outside Mae Sot. These investors were based in Bangkok, or were foreign investors. Moreover, the representatives of civil society organizations said that the design of the SEZ by the central government is not in line with the socio-economic context and potentials of the area. This group voiced the opinion that they do not

want to have the SEZ in the city anymore. As a result, the government agencies think the local people do not support the SEZ. In the view of the residents this is because the government cannot clearly explain the intended benefit of the SEZ for the local people. There is no law, master plan nor agency directly responsible to administer the SEZ. Moreover, the SEZ is a special development strategy designed from the central government but the area is governed by the provincial government system. At a present time, the system cannot effectively administer this kind of special area development.

The development of the SEZ has affected the city in many ways. The local stakeholders have recognized that the SEZ has driven the rapid urban growth of the city. The growth stems mainly from the central government which has dedicated a huge budget for infrastructure construction to support the SEZ. This includes the expansion of roads an airport, a Thailand-Myanmar friendship bridge, a water supply and electric system improvement. The infrastructure has made the way of life of the local people more convenient and they have been able to deal with the urban growth pressures of Mae Sot city for at least the last 20 years.

On the other hand, the development has not only had positive benefits to the city; the SEZ has failed to protect the environment. The provision of land for investment by the government was conducted without consultation/participation of local people. The construction of projects under the SEZ resulted in the exclusion of people from land use, the access to land to earn a living was denied. Specifically, in 2017, when the government declared Mae Sot to be a SEZ, it used Special Law, Section 44, to expropriate the farming land from the villagers, which they declared was 'common property'. Some of the villagers had possessed their land more than 50 years and some even from 1927. Unfortunately, the land mostly did not have permanent title deeds. The villagers claimed financial compensation, and the first case got compensation in 2019. However, up the present, not all have been compensated. Most are not happy with the money, stating that if they could choose, they

would keep their land, which was their heritage. In addition, land speculation has turned farming lands into a commodity; many residents sold their land to speculators, from BKK with close relationships to policy makers.

Moreover, the city growth resulted in further loss of agriculture and forest lands. The local stakeholders expressed the view that the whole range of stakeholders, and the participation of local people must be high priorities for the urban governance, and that local people should be included in the benefits of the SEZ development.

Urban governance from local stakeholders' perspective

Local stakeholders expressed the views that in order to govern the city's growth arising from the SEZ, Mae Sot must have a special urban governance pattern. The city can no longer be administered under the existing structure of centralized governance. The local people view the roles and responsibilities of city actors and institutions as follows:

The central government policy

Local stakeholders recognize the role of the central government as a policy-making and planning agency. That role would be consistent with the capacity of the city, if the central government created mechanisms, laws or policies local stakeholders could cooperate with various agencies at each level or each sector. This would lead to effective city governance. Local stakeholders, however, stated that the city administration of Thailand is determined by the central government. Powers of the city governance are constrained by laws. They urge the state to decentralize power to local government by giving decision-making power to city administration, which should not just have the role of coordination like at present. The centralized governance makes city administration inefficient and does not facilitate solving problems sufficiently quickly when compared to the city's rapid growth. Moreover, they mentioned that decentralization of power to local government can also lighten the burdens of central government and provincial level administration.

Budget distribution to the local government is another proposal that locals consider a means to tackle the city's existing problems, especially, to streamline the provision of basic public services to the inhabitants in sufficient quantity and quality. The locals reasoned those local authorities in a border area like Mae Sot, have additional responsibilities, to take care of the population of the city which is not only Thai. There is also a humanitarian obligation to look after the population groups from Myanmar. These groups are entering the country as migrant workers used by labor-intensive industries in the city to support economic growth. They then use public health services for education. The income and/or tax collected in the area, such as the Bt87 billion approximately collected from customs inspection at the Mae Sot border post in the period January-October 2021, must be sent to the central government. However, the budget that has been allocated to Mae Sot is only on a per capita basis of the Thai population. As a result of this imbalance, the local government does not have enough budget to manage the city and to meet the needs of the people (Thai and Burmese) in the area. The leader of the local government explained that Mae Sot town is expanding rapidly. The city has been declared as an SEZ, but the administrative power of the city is nothing special. Therefore, the city administration cannot solve the problems that arise within the city. One respondent stated:

“The central government should really decentralize to the local authority; the local government should play a greater role to be flexible in solving problems of the city. Budget tax must also be distributed, but now it is centralized. So, the management of Mae Sot must be a special form.”

Local people have further argued that the centralization of Thai state power is exacerbated through the process of city planning as a mechanism to regulate / govern urban growth. They feel that the design of the SEZ was determined by a combination of the central government agencies and the provincial government. This is an obstacle to urban development because the responsible agency,

Department of Public Works and Town and Country Planning, came down to the area for just a few days to develop a city plan. Through this process, the locals get a city plan that is inconsistent with the actual conditions of the area. Urban planning should be a function of the local authorities and allow people in the area to participate as stated by the private sector representatives who stated that the major problem of the Mae Sot economic development is decentralized city planning. Everything has to be controlled by the central government. They noted various obstructions when a business person or investor needs permission to build a factory or other establishment in the area. It is complicated in practice because development does not match the boundaries of the administrative units. Therefore, the process of urban design using city planning formal regulations/standards has not yet responded to the needs and is not consistent with the city's growth. Decentralization of governance to the local area is a solution.

Local government capabilities

The city stakeholders pointed out that the municipal government is the focus host of urban governance, so they expected the Mae Sot Municipality to have a role in urban planning connected with both national and neighboring countries' development policy. That would achieve urban development in line with area potentials and needs. It has become necessary for the city government to earn income from unofficial sources, crowd-funding campaign, to address the problem of insufficiency in the urban development budgets. Local government budget administration must be efficient, with good governance for providing adequate and quality basic services to urban citizens.

Leaders of CSOs and urban inhabitants said: If the local government wants to govern the city efficiently, the participation of the inhabitants is important. At present, in meetings arranged by the local government, people still have no opportunity to express their opinions and needs. If some of them do not have the capacity, organization, status, or resources. Development that has taken place does not

meet the needs of the people as it is concentrated on infrastructure development. Although this has improved the quality of life, more attention is needed to be budget for employment, education and environmental development.

In terms of civic engagement, local agencies shared the opinion that local governments should ensure that the city's vulnerable groups - the elderly, disabled people, children, youth groups and ethnic groups - have more opportunities to participate in urban development projects to reduce the inequality that is arising from urban development. This will create problems for the city in the future. A business leader mentioned:

“Effective city governance must include all groups of people in the city. Today, the participating group is largely the middle class, more knowledgeable and educated, and therefore urban design does not yet meet the needs of the elderly, the disabled people, children, youth and ethnic groups.”

Local residents also believe that the local government needs to have its own urban development plan to govern the city. At present, the city is driven by provincial policies. There is no separation between the provincial development plan and the municipal development plan. The city is changing rapidly, but the city administration uses the regulations and structure created by the provincial government. The problem is that the provincial government agencies have their own duties to performed which can be different from the municipal area. Although the provincial governor, has the power to intervene, operating across his authority to other function-based agencies can cause problems.

In addition, leadership is important for effective city governance. The local people state that the Mae Sot city leader (mayor) should have an integrated business and development vision. In terms of business vision, the leader should look for channels and opportunities to trade with neighboring countries to strengthen the economy of the city and its population. In terms of development capacity, the city leaders as a

group are expected to understand the problems and needs of the people. They should take care of basic necessities, such as roads, drainage systems, and waste management, which should be planned and provided to meet inhabitants' needs. Good governance is another characteristic of the city leaders that is very much in demand. Local people, especially, wish to see both a transparent budget and administrative system.

Some agencies propose to manage Mae Sot the appointment of a City Manager, who would hire experts to govern a city not under government bureaucracy, but rather under the oversight of an executive committee comprising all city stakeholders. This is another concept proposed to resolve the city leaders' bureaucratic problems and the many constraints that hinder the governance of the complex city environment and to control the rapid growth of Mae Sot.

Power of the private business sector towards urban policy

Mae Sot has been an important inland trading city in Thailand for a long time. Based on its economically strategic location, the city's capital accumulation has been continuous driven by merchants of different ethnic groups. Based on their accumulation of wealth, the private sector has become a key actor in the city in both the political and economic dimensions and from local to country level. They played an important role to advocate for the Mae Sot SEZ establishment. Thus, the private sector has an important role on the city planning, policy advocacy.

The wider group of stakeholders, therefore, believe in the capabilities of the private sector. They express the view that the business sector must be involved in setting policies and directions for urban development. Particularly the private sector should take a leadership role in setting the economic and urban development vision through acting as consultants for city leaders or offering opinions on behalf of business organizations. In these words of a civil society leader:

“The private business sector, especially the members of the Federation of Thai Industries and the Chamber of Commerce, should come together to support urban development based on the SEZ development policy, both working to define the vision of the city along with the local government organization and helping people and the community in market connections for the ensuring of the benefits of local people from the SEZ.”

Local people believe that the business sector should support the budget in order to cope with a limitation of financial resources in the city development. They are urged to co-invest in the production of goods or in contracting by local governments in the provision of services and utilities that take into account the environmental impact that meets the needs of vulnerable groups of people, including women, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly.

Role of CSOs in urban policy advocacy and governance

Local stakeholders also feel that Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) in Mae Sot have an important role in the city development. These organizations have always played a crucial role in balancing the state development policy with the local people's benefit. Three key roles of the CSOs in the city were proposed; firstly, involvement in presenting the problems and needs of people; secondly, participation in decision-making prior to the implementation of projects; and, finally, monitoring the work of the relevant departments to ensure that the city population's needs are met by the local government.

Mae Sot people think that the CSOs have the power to force local governments and leaders to uphold the commitments they made to the communities. The CSOs should play a role in acting as a bridge between the various sectors in city development, but acting passively in the form of a/the "City Council" which is a platform for various stakeholders of the city to voice and determine the direction of urban development.

The participation of the residents

Since it has long been an important border inland trading post, and also because of its abundance of natural resources, Mae Sot has attracted various people from inside and outside the country to settle in the area for trading and farming. The city, therefore, is an area with a diversity of ethnic groups consisting of Thai, Chinese, Muslim, Karen, Mon, Burmese, and Shan. Despite this diversity, traditionally they have lived amicably together, with good co-operation.

The inhabitants have been urged to be more involved in presenting problems, needs, formulating policies, decision-making, and monitoring the work of the local government organizations. Public sector leaders express the view that:

“People are allowed to participate in various development activities of the city through public hearings but most of the people did not pay attention and did not join the activities. Only a minority of the educated and middle class participate, those who are not the persons actually negatively affected or suffering as a result of the developments.”

Besides general participation, local agencies also have requested urban residents to have a conscious love for the city, have a sense of belonging to the city by cooperating with government agencies and local government in the development of their communities.

DISCUSSION

The arguments of this research argues that the present governance system can no longer be effective. This is primarily because power of control and decision-making rest with central government. This affects the capacity of local administration to handle rapid urban growth because it requires rapid response, and is complicated, and is varied. The state should decentralize its power, its budget, and give greater responsibility to local stakeholders to participate in governing their own city. This will reduce problems and impacts caused by development policy imposed on the area.

The SEZ policy has been used to improve competitiveness of domestic industry, create employment, and technological advancement, and creation of social infrastructure (Parwez,2018) in many countries. However, The SEZ in China and India have driven not only rapid economic growth with high-level of export, import and FDI but also rapid growth of the city consisting of structural change, globalization and social problems. The SEZ have affected the rise in inequalities between urban and rural economic income, a huge rise of pollution, and migration to the SEZ areas cause a rapid urbanization (Valli & Saccone, 2015). As the study of SEZs in the Lanchang-Mekong countries of Mekong Institute (2019) has proposed measures to contribute to better management and promotion of SEZs including engagement of the private sector to increase efficiency and effectiveness in SEZ development, future improvement in policies investment and capacity development for SEZ developer. This study does not include the participation of all stakeholders in SEZ management, and also improvement quality of life of the people in development sites are neglected.

Urban governance is both an academic debate and in planning practice and policy promotion. The findings are similarity to the element and essence of philosophy and foundation to the concept of new public governance, new public service, and new public management that focused on decentralization to local government and civil society, focus on networking, a diversity of mutual cooperation (Sriram, Missomnai, Metasuttarat & Rajphaetyakhom,2019). This is also in line with collaborative governance concept defined by Ansell & Gosh (2012) as a governing arrangement where public agencies directly engage non-state stakeholders in a collective decision-making process in public policy or manage public programs or assets. Actors and institutions are essential to urban governance, the absence of local people in the city governance relates to the imbalance of political power, this creates inconsistent with local needs (Avis, 2016, p.5-8).

The study has highlighted the need to decentralize central state governance and improve the capacity of local government. Dillinger and Fay (1999) stated that decentralization can bring political stability and economic development, and be able to improve the efficiency and responsiveness of the public sector by bringing decision-making closer to citizens. Local government being able to provide public services to the city is dependent on a good relationship with higher levels of government (Devas,2001). Decentralization to local government will balance governance between the city and the central government.

These findings raise a direct issue of capacity of city government which is in consonant to a number of previous studies. For instance, Kalyanamitra, Tatiyalapa, Mala & Yaowanit (2018) have analyzed the bureaucracy revolution which hold the good governance were the local administrative organization must be concerned that people are centered, decentralize decision making based on community participation, and developing the local government administration. Public participation provides on public issues to support government decision-making and foster a spirit of cooperation and trust between the government and the people (Hao, Nyaranga and Hongo, 2022). Local government collaboration is the idea emerge to aid local government in transforming to address a new era of financial and public service improvement challenges, and more efficient government. The steps to foster more productive local government includes: monitoring local government collaboration, building knowledge on local government collaboration, and investigating potential collaboration (Hoornbeek et al.,2009) Finally, Kokpol (2016) concluded that urban growth has become a problem of modern local administration because it requires rapid response, and is complicated, and varied. The main capacities required by local government therefore include: 1) development consistent with local capacity and contexts; 2) development of new approaches; 3) financial generation to solve the budget limitation problem;4) public participation opportunity.

No one system of urban governance is likely to work equally well for all local bodies. As in Africa, effective urban governance hinges on efficient local government to synergy and collaboration of all stakeholders, multilevel public and private partnership, and greater space for public participation (Azu,2018). In the context of the fastest growing economies and has obvious implication for urban growth pose enormous challenge to urban governance of India, Ahluwalia (2019) identifies the lack of cities empowerment is constraining the ability to translate the urban development agenda into action, the importance of bridging the urban infrastructure deficit and argues that institutional reforms are crucial for reaching out to the private sector for sharing the financing burden and ensuring that it results in improved service delivery for the urban population. The civil society members involved in urban governance are seen more as expert resource persons in a special area to put forward proposals and suggestions, but generally are not permitted to vote (Singh & Parthasarathy, 2016).

Where in Southeast Asia, Urban administration has been traditionally dominated by national and subnational governments. Many countries started to implement constitutional and statutory changes to decentralize and devolve authority to local governments. This brought broadened sphere of urban governance recognized the vital role of civil society, and local governments started using principles of good governance such as democratic participation and representation, accountability and transparency (Dahiya, 2014) for public services deliver to ensure not only productive but also inclusive and sustainable urban development (Sheng,2010).

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Given these practical, research and data challenges, there is a good deal of urban governance going on in cities but not all the time, not for all the groups, not for all the neighborhoods and not so much for the

peripheries of the city. This feeds the rise for new policy instruments to increase governing capacity in the context of the rapid growth of a city. The efficiency of urban governance system cannot only be achieved under the old paradigm of the existing governmental structure and mechanism that is through the public agencies' power, resources, and knowledge but there must be collaboration among multi-stakeholder, central policy makers, local government capabilities, and the power of the private business sector, a role for civil society organizations, and participation of the inhabitants. Our findings are particularly important for the following policies: 1) the state should create a new urban governance model that decentralizes power, resources, and responsibilities for local government; 2) the central government should continuously encourage capacity building of local government to be able to cope with the rapid and complex trends in urban growth; 3) local agencies should provide opportunities for the full range of the city's stakeholders including the private sector, civil society, and individual resident involved in urban governance in order to input their needs and guide urban policy.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that they have no potential conflicts of interest.

Acknowledgments

This article was generously supported by the Research Group on Wellbeing and Sustainable Development (WeSD), Faculty of Humanity and Social Sciences, Khon Kaen University.

Reference

- [1] Ahluwalia J. I. (2019). Urban Governance in India. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 41:1, 83-102, DOI: 10.1080/07352166.2016.1271614.
- [2] Ansell. C., & Gash, A. (2020). Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18 (4), 543-571.
- [3] Asian Development Bank. (2016). *The Role of Special Economic Zones in Improving Effectiveness of GMS Economic Corridors*. Manila: Asian Development Bank.
- [4] Avis, W, R. (2016): *Urban Governance (Topic Guide)*. Birmingham, UK: GSDRC. University of Birmingham.
- [5] Azu, V, N. (2018). Challenges of Urban Governance in Africa: The Nigerian Experience. *Global Journal of Political Science and Administration* 6 (2),1-12.
- [6] Corbetta, P. (2003). *Theory, Methods and Techniques*. New Delhi: SAGE Publications.
- [7] Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Research Design Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. New Delhi: SAGE Publications.
- [8] Dahiya, B. (2014). Southeast Asia and Sustainable Urbanization. *A Journal of The East Asia Foundation*, 9 (3), 84-91.
- [9] Devas, N.(ed.). (2001). *Urban Governance and Poverty: Lessons from A Study of Ten Cities in The South*, Birmingham: The School of Public Policy, University of Birmingham.
- [10] Dociu, M. & Dunarintu, A. (2012). *The Socio-Economic Impact of Urbanization*. *International Journal of Academic Research in Accounting, Finance and Management Sciences*, 2,47-52.
- [11] Farrell, K. (2017). *The Rapid Urban Growth Triad: A New Conceptual Framework for Examining The Urban Transition in Developing Countries*. *Sustainability* 2017,9,1-19.
- [12] Halfani, M.S., MaCarney, P.L.& Rodiguez, A. (1995). *Toward an Understanding of Governance: The Emergence of An Idea and Its Implication for Urban Research in Developing Countries*. In Stren, R. & Bell, J. (Eds.). *Urban Research in The Developing World: Volume Four: Perspective on The City*. (pp.91-141). Toronto: Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto.
- [13] Hao, C., Nyaranga, S. M. & Hongo, O. H. (2022). *Enhancing Public Participation in Governance for Sustainable Development: Evidence from Bungoma Country, Kenya*.

- [16] SAGE Journals. <http://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221088855>.
- [17] Hoornbeek, J., Macomber, K., Phillips, M. & Satpathi, S. (2009). Local Government Collaboration in Ohio: Are We Walking the Walk or Just Talking the Talk?. The Center for Public Administration and Public Policy, Kent State University.
- [18] Kalyanamitra, P., Tatiyalapa, D., Mala, T. & Yaowanit, K. (2018). The Success of Putting Good Governance into Practice of the Local Administrative Organizations in Central Region of Thailand. *International Journal of Crime, Law and Social Issues*, 5 (1), 164-175.
- [19] Kokpol, O. (2016). Urbanization When "Urban" Becomes a Problem of Modern Local Administration. Bangkok: King Prajadhipok's Institute.
- [20] Leftwich, A. (1993). "Governance, Democracy and Development in The Third World". *Third World Quarterly*, 14 (3), 605-624.
- [21] Mekong Institution. (2019). Management and Promotion of Special Economic Zone (SEZ) in the Lanchang-Mekong Countries. Khon Kaen: Thailand.
- [22] Office of the National Economic and Social Development Board. (2015). Analysis Report State of Poverty and Inequality in Thailand in 2013. Office of The Database
- [23] Development Commission and Indicators of Social Status, Office of the National Economic and Social Development Board.
- [24] Parwez, S. (2018). Enterprising SEZ Enclaves and Economy Development in India. *Journal of International Business and Economy*, 19 (1), 1-33.
- [25] Pierre, J. (1999). Models of Urban Governance: The Institutional Dimension of Urban Policies. *Urban Affairs Review*, 34 (3), 372-396.
- [26] Promphakphing, B. (2013). Concepts and Theories of Development: From Material Wealth to the Wellbeing of Nation. Khon Kaen: Khon Kaen University Printing Press.
- [27] Sheng, k., Y. (2010). Good Urban Governance in Southeast Asia. *Environment and Urbanization ASIA*, 1 (2), 131-147.
- [28] Silva, J. D., Kernaghan, S. & Luque, A. (2012). A System Approach to Meeting The Challenges of Urban Climate Change. *International Journal of Urban Sustainable Development*, 4, 125-145.
- [29] Singh, B. and Parthasarathy, D. (2010). Civil Society Organization Partnerships in The Mumbai Experience. *Indian Sociological Society*, 59 (1), 92-110.
- [30] Sriram, N., Missomnai, C., Metasuttarat, J., & Rajphaetyakhom, C. (2019). A Comparative Analysis of New Public Management New Public Service New Public Governance. *Asian Political Science Review*, 3(2), 32-39.
- [31] Tidawadee, S., & Yoshihisa, M. (2018). Urban Growth Prediction of Special Economic Development Zone in Mae Sot District, Thailand. *Engineering Journal*, 22 (3), 267- 277.
- [32] UN-Habitat. (2016). Urbanization and Development: Emerging Future. Nairobi: Kenya.
- [33] Valli, V. & Saccone, D. (2015). Structural Change, Globalization and Economic Growth in China and India. *The European Union Journal of Comparative Economic*, 12 (2), 133- 163.
- [34] World Bank. (1991). Urban Policy and Economic Development an Agenda for the 1990s. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.