

## **Authors and contact details:**

1. Prayong Upa-sen  
Community Organization Development Institute Public Organization (CODI)  
Bangkok, Thailand  
Email: prayong@codi.or.th

2. Prathurng Hongsrnagon, PhD \*  
College of Public Health Sciences  
Chulalongkorn University  
Bangkok, Thailand  
Email: [arbeit\\_3@hotmail.com](mailto:arbeit_3@hotmail.com)

\* To whom correspondence should be addressed.

**Title:** Societal Progress Indicators Proposal for Bann Luek Sub-district,  
Photaram District, Ratchaburi Province, Thailand

## **Abstract**

Due to a focus on a paradigm of industrialization and modernization over the past four decades, Thailand's national development plans have emphasized economic and technological progress reflected by indicators of gross national and gross domestic products. However, the national government's indicators of progress fail to take into account the unique features and cultures of different communities and ignore the concept of societal progress in terms of issues such as mental health, spirituality, society, and the environment. This paper outlines one example of a local community's efforts in determining its own indicators of societal progress and the changes and anticipated development brought about by this action. It provides a model for societal progress through collective action resulting in the improved well-being of the local community.

**Keywords:** indicators, societal progress, Bann Luek Sub-district, Photaram District, Ratchaburi, Thailand, beyond GDP.

**Title:** Societal Progress Indicators Proposal for Bann Luek Sub-district,  
Photaram District, Ratchaburi Province, Thailand

## **Gross Domestic Product as an Economic Growth Indicator**

For the past 60 years, Gross Domestic Product (GDP) has been the measure of a country's economic progress. It is calculated by the addition of the nation's personal consumption expenditure (payments by households for goods and services), government expenditure (public spending on such things as the provision of goods and services, infrastructure, and debt payments), net exports (the value of exports minus imports), and net capital formation (the increase in the value of the total stock of monetized capital goods) based on estimates and survey data maintained in a country's System of National Accounts (SNA)<sup>(1)</sup>. GDP and SNA were developed in the United States of America (USA) and the United Kingdom (UK) in the 1930s and '40s during the Great Depression and were used to assess the ability of the economies of those countries to provide sufficient funds for the Second World War effort at the same time as maintaining adequate production of consumer goods and services<sup>(2)</sup>. Since its introduction, GDP has played a prominent role as a measure of a nation's overall well-being and national and international decision-makers use it as an indicator to guide policy and evaluate growth<sup>(1)</sup>.

### **A Paradigm Shift**

Robert F. Kennedy's comment that "Our Gross National Product... measures everything, in short, except that which makes life worthwhile" raised concerns about the elimination of the central roles of individuals in social life (full quotation see footnote)<sup>(1)</sup>. The growth of capitalism aroused some suspicions and encouraged policy-makers to find a more balanced approach. Discussions focusing on the misuse of GDP as a proxy measure of people's well-being, the importance of "societal progress" and "economic growth," and the establishment of a new set of indicators to gauge "societal progress" became common<sup>(3)</sup>.

Costanza et al. (2009) categorized a number of ways to measure progress. These include:

(1) indexes that address issues by making 'corrections' to existing GDP and SNA accounts, such as an Index of Sustainable Economic Welfare, Genuine Progress Indicator, Green GDPs, and Genuine Wealth

(2) indexes that measure aspects of well-being directly, such as Ecological Footprint, Subjective Well-Being, Gross National Happiness, and Gross Happiness Index

(3) composite indexes that combine approaches, such as Human Development Index, Living Planet Report, and Happy Planet Index.

(4) indicator suites based not on the aggregation of a large number of variables into a composite index but simply report many indicators separately and leave the question of their meanings and/or significance to the user. Some examples of these are National Income Satellite Accounts, Calvert-Henderson Quality of Life Indicators, and Millennium Development Goals and Indicators<sup>(1)</sup>.

## **Societal Progress in Thailand**

For the past four decades, Thailand's First to Seventh National Development Plans focused on mainstream 'modernization' and 'development path' paradigms. As a developing country, Thailand aspired for material comforts through export-led growth based on agricultural and industrial products. While some economic progress was made, the country was faced with social deterioration and exploitation of natural resources and the environment in the forms of deforestation, high consumption of energy, and heavy and improper use of hazardous chemicals.

The impact of the 1997 Asian economic crisis on Thailand made the country realize the need for an alternative developmental paradigm. With more than 50 years of first-hand experience in rural development, His Majesty the King recognized problems with the impact of the mainstream development path at local and national levels and introduced the philosophy of Sufficiency Economy (SE). The nation's Eighth National Development Plan marked a change in emphasis with a human-centered approach and this has been continued in the Ninth (2002-2006) and Tenth (2007-2010) Plans. SE has been applied as the framework for the country's development to achieve well-balanced and sustainable growth that takes a middle-path approach to development considering economic, social, and natural resources. The integration of the three characteristics of moderation, reasonableness, and self-immunity with the two conditions of knowledge and ethics allows SE to be applied at household, community, and national levels and its principles are influential on thinking and practice in a range of sectors<sup>(4)</sup>.

This paper describes an example of the introduction of indicators of societal progress based on the philosophy of SE initiated by villagers in Bann Luek Sub-district in central Thailand. The paper includes sections outlining definitions of social indicators (SI), SI functions, SI framework, participatory democracy in community planning projects, citizen participation and performance management, Bann Luek as an example of a community planning project, the mechanism for community-based indicator determination in the village, the project in action, lessons learnt at Bann Luek, discussion, and a conclusion.

### **Definition of Social Indicators**

There are a number of definitions of SI. Bauer described them as forms of evidence that help assessment of present position and future directions<sup>(5)</sup>. The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) stated that a SI is a "direct and valid statistical measure which monitors levels and changes over time in a fundamental social concern."<sup>(6)</sup> A social concern is "an identifiable and definable aspiration or concern of fundamental and direct importance to human well-being"<sup>(7)</sup>. Indicators may be material, such as numbers related to economic growth, and/or immaterial, such as values or goals<sup>(8)</sup>. Atkinson et al. saw SI as "a parsimonious set of specific indices covering a broad range of social concerns"<sup>(9)</sup>. This set includes statistics similar to economic statistics of the national accounts which are intended to provide a basis for making concise,

comprehensive and balanced judgments about the conditions of major aspects of society as accurate measures of a good society<sup>(10)</sup>. The concept covers interpretation of cultural signs, simple statistical measures, and complex statistical indexes related to sets of domains<sup>(11)</sup>. These are used to assess the effectiveness of policy in addressing important social issues<sup>(12)</sup>.

### **Functions of Social Indicators**

Generally, SI perform one or more of three functions, providing a basis for information for decision-making, evaluating policies, and/or searching for a common good and deciding how to reach it<sup>(3)</sup>. Indicators should be phrased in such a way that they can be interpreted by the general public so that members of the community can provide feedback to promote the development of the organization. Identifying community needs are counted as social indicators<sup>(10)</sup>.

### **Framework of Social Indicators**

Progress can be considered as a broad notion of a community's well-being that changes over time. While *life satisfaction* focuses on the subjective assessment of different elements that affect individual lives, *well-being* has been used to refer to objective living conditions. Both concepts refer to the condition of the current generation but *sustainable development* attempts to consider the well-being of future generations, introducing an inter-generational dimension often absent in other frameworks. Societal progress occurs when there is an improvement in the "sustainable and equitable wellbeing of a society..." to "...encourage communities to consider for themselves what 'progress' means in the 21st century"<sup>(8)</sup>.

Salvaris (2000) described a rapid growth in the development of community-based planning projects using benchmarks and indicators to measure progress. For the past 30 years, these projects have occurred in many countries at different levels. Five dominant features are involved in these types of projects:

- (1) the integration of the economic-social-environmental domains to respond to the 'well-being' of people in a well-rounded manner
- (2) the pronouncement of the benchmarks and indicators to monitor ongoing progress
- (3) the participation of the community in the production of the benchmarks and indicators
- (4) the acquisition of a lengthy period of time to proceed
- (5) the realization of legitimate policy-making.

All of these produce an innovation with a sense of civil society<sup>(13)</sup>.

### **Participatory Democracy in Community Planning Projects**

To achieve a shift from *growth* to *progress* and from economic production to sustainable human well-being requires operations to be conducted at individual levels. An integrated indicator system is needed to respond to different elements affecting individual lives<sup>(1)</sup>. It is considered that strengthening and transforming local governance through participative processes to reach the definition of community well-

being is essential<sup>(3)</sup>. When a country fails to protect and advance the political, civil, and economic liberties of its citizens, its long-term prosperity is negatively affected<sup>(14)</sup>. As indicated by Giovannini, “people today expect to be in control of their own evaluations and life choices ... progress must increasingly be measured against criteria more closely aligned with public aspirations and notions of what a better life means.” The people are the owners of the goals of societal progress and the motivators to achieve these goals. The ultimate outcome is the improved well-being of people by better allocation of resources in corresponding to the needs of community development<sup>(15)</sup>.

### **Citizen Participation and Performance Management**

Involving citizens in the development and implementation of performance measurement systems can legitimize such initiatives among elected officials and enhance their value in the decision-making process<sup>(16)</sup>. This involvement is more likely to be achieved if citizens acknowledge that they can influence their local environment through knowledge and participation. Adopting a sustainable development strategy requires changes in cultural, economic, political, and social practices but citizens will only reform their cultural and social behavior if they understand the importance of adopting new attitudes<sup>(17)</sup>. In democratic societies, indicators provide an important source of information to leaders about the well-being and concerns of citizens<sup>(18)</sup>. Experience shows that approaches to measure progress work best when they engage a cross-section of society in deciding what measures to use. While it is true that a bottom-up approach can be cumbersome and may take time to deliver results, the difficulties in building consensus can provide the legitimacy necessary to develop a shared view of societal goals that resonates within the whole community<sup>(8)</sup>.

### **Bann Luek as an Example of a Community Planning Project**

Bann Luek Sub-district is described in regards to its community-based indicator determination process through citizen participation and performance management reflecting participatory democracy.

One hundred years ago, Bann Luek Sub-district was a strong livestock area with many horses, cows, and buffalos and the region was well-known for its high standard of horse-breeding. Situated on a plateau along the Mae Klong River in Photaram District, Ratchaburi Province in central Thailand, it continues to be a predominantly agricultural area now specializing in the production of corn. Presently, there are 9 villages with a total population of 9,500 (4,566 males and 4,934 females).

Bann Luek Sub-district is one of the communities that have applied the philosophy of SE in their regular way of life. Previously, the area followed a capitalist paradigm of “wealth as well-being” and Bann Luek tended to be a loosely-knit community where people lived independently of each other. There was a poor sense of community and a general lack of care for others.

Under the guidance of Mr Paiboon Wattanasiritham, a former deputy Prime Minister and the Chairman of the Volunteer Work Foundation, the Community Organization Development Institute Public Organization (CODI) decided to

implement a community-based indicator determination process to address the situation in Bann Luek Sub-district in 2007.

Mr Wattanasiritham believed that community development should result in a sustainable ‘happiness’ in terms of physical (satisfaction of basic human needs), mental (maintenance of a worry-free lifestyle with a clear mind), spiritual (achievement of belief, faith, serenity, and security), and social (harmonious and caring community). Bann Luek aimed to develop a skilled style of management by stating key goals, methods, and indicators for community development. The indicators did not need to be numerous but must be frequently monitored and evaluated. Mr Wattanasiritham stated that community-based indicator determination should be holistic in terms of content, process and manner. Three core foundations were recommended:

- (1) goodness or merit
- (2) capability or capacity
- (3) well-being or holistic health.

Such a design for community development requires a people-centered, community-oriented, multi-sector approach involving public, private, and government support. Citizen participation is at the heart of the organization.

Bann Luek Sub-district is one of only a few pilot sites that showed a willingness for community development by the villagers and the internal stakeholders without interference from other partners and faced the challenge to define and measure their own *progress* and *well-being*<sup>(19)</sup>.

### **Mechanism for Community-based Indicator Determination by Bann Luek Sub-district Villagers**

The role of CODI as a process facilitator headed by Prayong Upa-sen during the 2007-2009 period enabled Bann Luek to understand how to formulate and implement a community development plan. Villagers became more experienced in the process through different networks and work procedures and perceived that community problems were shared and required the involvement of local organizations<sup>(20)</sup>.

The following is a description of some of the stages of the Bann Luek project.

1. *Nomination of participants* – the three levels of local government, namely, the village head and team, the executive sector (Sub-district organization), and Community Organization Council (COC), and other stakeholders, such as monks, teachers, police, and public health personnel, were included as participants in the community-based indicator determination project. The objective of this nomination of participants was to clearly establish ownership and responsibility of the tasks.

2. *Agenda-setting/problem identification* – this involved an identification of the Sub-district’s assets and potential in terms of analyzing:

- local context and background
- ecology of culture, social capital, local wisdom, and existing knowledge
- social structure, institutes, leadership, leaders, and relative networking
- economy and livelihood, including a community resource base

- experiences in community development work, community organization groups, and learning centers
- problems, obstacles, and needs for community development
- learning system of the community, database development, various external positive and negative impacts on the community
- local alliances and networking with other community organizations

3. *Establishment of key goals, methods, indicators, and persons in charge of the tasks* – this stage served as a holistic plan for community development in which expected achievements were clearly set, guidelines for community development were stated, and action plans responding to community needs were spelt out. Simple questions asked were (1) what is/are the key success/es that will take place in one to two years time? (2) how much success should be expected? (3) what does one have to do to achieve the targeted goals? (4) how can one improve the situation? (5) how to go about doing the project? (6) who are the project owners? (7) how can one know the milestones of each goal?

The process of the establishment of the indicators focused on the ideas of individuals. It was made clear that each indicator had to be clearly stated, tangible, measurable and easy to be measured, reflect change, and be simply but firmly based. In general, indicators should be unique to the specific community as each locality would have a different emphasis on needs and stages, be the product of all participants, and cover social, cultural, political, economic, and environmental dimensions.

4. *Individual community workforce* – information related to these indicators was conveyed to the villagers and networks via local public sessions for specific groups. At this stage, the holistic view of the indicators was emphasized to each group to stress the integrated nature of the different groups in the overall process.

5. *Role of Community Organization Council (COC)* – after the public sessions for each specific group, the groups reported to COC to identify commonly-shared agendas. In this way, a consensus on community planning emerged that acted as a guide to future collaboration with external alliances.

6. *Implementation* – when actions were formulated and agreed to and input-process-output-outcome-impact of the project were identified plans were implemented under the responsibility of the appropriate groups.

7. *Evaluation* – this stage aimed to learn about the consequences of the actions and to check the achievement of goals through an analysis of statistics. Monthly COC meetings were used for project evaluation followed by an official public announcement. External and concerned organizations were encouraged to take part in these evaluation meetings to provide appropriate feedback, resulting in attendance by executives of different levels of local government, Sub-district health personnel, health volunteers, Sub-district agricultural personnel, Bank of Agriculture and Agricultural Cooperative (BAAC), and working groups at the provincial level.

8. *Publicity* – a project report was published to assess progress, to report to the Bann Luek community, and to provide a record for other communities interested in a similar community-based indicator determination process<sup>(20)</sup>.

## **Project in Action**

A saying at Bann Luek is that “the initiation of goals and indicators in community development is the creation of the villagers’ ability to determine changes in their quality of life in a number of areas, including their physical environment, income and economy, mental capabilities, society, learning, integrity, and confidence in the community. This is “the goal of success in community development and is driven by local people and organizations.”

From 2007 to 2009, the process facilitator for CODI headed by Prayong Upa-sen established nine goals that the Bann Luek Sub-district villagers would like to achieve. These goals are described below in terms of goal statement, situational analysis, indicator set, and planned activities to arrive at the stated indicators:

### **Goal 1**

*Goal statement* - a sub-district with better health and good living among the populace

*Situational analysis* - it was found that villagers had health problems. For example, people over 30 years of age typically had chronic diseases such as hypertension and diabetes mellitus. The illnesses became more severe due to lack of knowledge of self-care. Children and teenagers usually suffered from dengue fever in the rainy seasons. Local food was found to be contaminated by chemical substances from the heavy use of insecticides in the fields. Knowledgeable health volunteers were not keen to disseminate information

*Indicators* - (1) more preventive measures through self-care (2) reduced number of patients with communicable diseases (3) increased number of households participating in campaigns for the promotion of safe food (4) higher number of public health volunteers with basic knowledge of patient care

*Planned activities* - included (1) organizing campaigns and public relation activities about healthy life (2) provision of health education programs for patients, household members, and villagers (3) offering training courses for the community’s public health volunteers.

### **Goal 2**

*Goal statement* - the sub-district with unity

*Situational analysis* - it was found that villagers (including the elderly, teenagers, farmers, and housewives) did not often join meetings and local activities, perhaps due to low motivation. People lacked knowledge and understanding of the purpose of locally arranged activities. Acceptance and trust were issues of concern

*Indicators* - (1) more villagers who constantly joined meetings (2) increased number of people who listened to other’s ideas and opinions (3) higher number of public and private organizations who gave support for local activities

*Planned activities* - included (1) arrangement of public relations activities to promote constant participation in meetings and local activities (2) encouraging people to be good listeners to other people’s ideas and opinions. Tactics suggested were door-

knocks on the meeting day, being on time for meetings, developing effective ways to conduct meetings, and encouraging people in public participation.

### **Goal 3**

*Goal statement* - the sub-district with secure income and less debt

*Situational analysis* - it was found that though villagers held jobs such as manufacture workers, farmers, and traders, they still acquired out-of-the-system loan

*Indicators* - (1) increased number of employed people (2) higher number of people with extra jobs (3) increased savings (4) more activities aimed at reduction of household expense

*Planned activities* - included campaigns to (1) motivate villagers to organize groups to do extra jobs (2) promote informal sector for production of local goods.

### **Goal 4**

*Goal statement* - the sub-district with public participation for community development and for finding solutions to local problems

*Situational analysis* - it was found that public relations activities in Bann Luek were low and there were a small number of group members

*Indicators* - (1) increased number of people taking part in groups to solve local problems (2) increased group membership (3) increased number of alliances (public and private) participating in solution of local problems

*Planned activities* - included (1) campaigns and public relations activities stressing the importance of groups working for community development and local problem-solving (2) development of stronger and more trustworthy groups to encourage more membership participation.

### **Goal 5**

*Goal statement* - the sub-district free from drug abuse

*Situational analysis* - it was found that the problem of drug abuse still prevailed in some villages

*Indicators* - (1) more evidence of a better quality of life among household members, such as more savings, more income, less expenses, and more participation in local activities) (2) reduced number of cases regarding drug abuse (3) decreased number of sources of drug abuse and associated crimes such as robbery

*Planned activities* - included (1) support for teenager group activities (2) promotion of sports and recreation activities (3) campaigns and public relations activities for improved knowledge and understanding of drug abuse (4) encouragement for villagers to live sufficiently (5) promotion of extra jobs and more savings.

### **Goal 6**

*Goal statement* - the sub-district that preserves culture, tradition and local wisdom.

*Situational analysis* - it was found that there were a number of ethnicities in Bann Luek Sub-district such as Mon, Lao, and Chinese. The Lao-Viang language was spoken in some villages but efforts to preserve it were not consistent

*Indicators* - (1) increased number of learning centers regarding culture, tradition, and local wisdom of Lao-Viang (2) higher number of local curricula on language, culture, tradition, and local wisdom of Lao-Viang (3) increased number of conservation groups for Lao-Viang culture, tradition, and local wisdom

*Planned activities* - included (1) support for groups to preserve culture, tradition, and local wisdom (2) promotion of projects about local wisdom learning to secure

teenager's participation (3) enhancement of collaboration with educational institutes to compile body of knowledge on culture, tradition, and local wisdom of the village.

### **Goal 7**

*Goal statement* - the sub-district with good leaders who are honest, transparent, ethical, innovative, and dedicated

*Situational analysis* - it was found that the leaders with such qualifications were in a small number

*Indicators* - (1) more leaders who were accepted locally and externally (2) increased number of activities in which leaders took part constantly (3) higher number of villagers who were cooperative and joined in local activities

*Planned activities* - included (1) establishment of a project to develop leaders (2) determination of preferred qualifications of leaders (3) provision of certificate for leaders with preferred qualifications (4) establishment of a club for local leaders.

### **Goal 8**

*Goal statement* - the sub-district with good welfare.

*Situational analysis* - it was found that a small number of people maintained membership of welfare groups, such as the rice fund group, funeral fund group, and savings fund group

*Indicators* - (1) more villagers of all ages to receive community welfare (2) increased number of community welfare funds (3) higher number of villagers who held the membership of community welfare groups

*Planned activities* - included (1) campaigns for the establishment of more community welfare groups (2) collaboration with external organizations to establish local community welfare schemes.

### **Goal 9**

*Goal statement* - the sub-district with strong local organizations.

*Situational analysis* - it was found that there were a total of 139 groups but only 75 were recognized as having group status as most lacked indicators. Consequently, only 50% had good management system in place

*Indicators* - (1) increased number of acceptable and clear rules for group members (2) higher number of joint meetings (3) increased registered members on an annual basis (4) establishment of group's working plan (5) good governance in conduct of the community

*Planned activities* - included (1) encouragement of the endorsement for all groups (2) promotion of strong organizations with good governance (3) continue development of the potential and capability of committees and members of the groups<sup>(20)</sup>.

## **Lessons Learnt at Bann Luek**

Opportunities for local people to participate in the establishment of indicators of societal progress helps them create, develop, investigate, monitor, and measure the quality of their lifestyle. Major lessons learnt from Bann Luek are as follows:

(1) the pilot site for a community-based indicator determination can be divided into four: a role model area (the best practice case); a learning area; an area equipped with social capital but requiring a good management system; and an area with limited social capital requiring motivation and support from external organizations. As a result, the indicator set for each type of pilot site is different.

(2) through a community-base indicator determination process, the community becomes cohesively stronger as villagers integrate community work to achieve common goals.

(3) the three local levels of government, locals with expertise, and community members cooperate in a community development project

(4) a community's problems are stated multi-dimensionally and solutions sought are well-rounded in nature.

(5) requests for resource allocation from external authoritative organizations can match community needs and requirements.

(6) indirectly, the missions of COC can be well defined and strengthened.

(7) the importance of statistical compilation is recognized.

(8) mutual discussion in various meetings makes things more transparent and accountable.

(9) affiliation with the community increases. People perceive their identity and potential from the resources they currently possess.

After two years working with the Sub-district, CODI headed by Prayong Upa-sen has learnt that Bann Luek could achieve the 5 set goals of a sub-district with better health and good living, a preservation of culture, tradition, and local wisdom of Lao-Viang, an improved welfare, public participation for community development and problem-solving, and a strong local organization<sup>(20)</sup>.

## **Discussion**

The development of indicators to measure the well-being of a community is an ever-changing task as societies grow<sup>(21)</sup>. Policy-makers realize that while economic development is important, so is the happiness of citizens. Happy citizens create more social capital, work harder, are healthier, and are more self-sufficient. Government interest in happiness is fuelled by both a humanitarian and a productivity viewpoint<sup>(22)</sup>. It is, thus, a useful measure by which to identify areas of relative need and also as a way of tracking the effectiveness of government interventions that involve the allocation of resources<sup>(22)</sup>. Well-being and ill-being measures should be seen as part of the democratic process in which citizens and their leaders are given information that can be useful in policy debates. Measures of subjective well-being and ill-being do not override other sources of information, but serve as one potentially useful type of knowledge that can be used to create better policies<sup>(18)</sup>. An increase in human well-being should be counted as the final goal of societal progress<sup>(8)</sup>.

## **Conclusion**

The community-based planning project on indicator determination process at Bann Luek Sub-district is one of a few projects in Thailand that has evolved due to the will of local people without influence from external sectors. Research staff from CODI headed by Prayong Upa-sen has assisted Bann Luek as process facilitators in village meetings. Community indicators are context-specific and require citizen participation and performance management. Through the process, villagers at Bann Luek became more knowledgeable and their participation had an influence on the outcomes of the development. The aspirations of the community were spelt out and

the villagers learnt the conditions that drive the success for set goals, both resources and constraints. By their legitimacy, these indicators create powerful pressure for policy-makers to consider the priorities of the community.

### **Acknowledgements**

The authors express sincere appreciation to Mr Paiboon Wattanasiritham, a former deputy Prime Minister and Chairman of the Volunteer Work Foundation, and Mr Suthep Chaiyakhan of the Community Organization Development Institute Public Organization (CODI) for their guidance in the community-based indicator determination process at Bann Luek Sub-district. Appreciation is also extended to all Bann Luek villagers for their vigorous drive to achieve their own indicators of well-being. Thanks go to Bob Tremayne for his English language assistance.

### **Footnote:**

Full quotation (p.7) “Our Gross National Product...counts air pollution and cigarette advertising, and ambulances to clear our highways of carnage. It counts special locks for our doors and the jails for the people who break them. It counts the destruction of the redwood and the loss of our natural wonder in chaotic sprawl. It counts napalm and counts nuclear warheads and armored cars for the police to fight the riots in our cities..., and the television programs which glorify violence in order to sell toys to our children. Yet the Gross National Product does not allow for the health of our children, the quality of their education or the joy of their play. It does not include the beauty of our poetry or the strength of our marriages, the intelligence of our public debate or the integrity of our public officials. It measures neither our wit nor our courage, neither our wisdom nor our learning, neither our compassion nor our devotion to our country, it measures everything, in short, except that which makes life worthwhile. And it can tell us everything about America except why we are proud that we are Americans.”

### **About the authors**

#### *Mr Prayong Upa-sen*

Mr Upa-sen is currently working in the Section of Learning Process Development, Human Resource Development Department, Community Organization Development Institute Public Organization in Bangkok, Thailand. Mr Upa-sen and his team have been serving as process facilitators at Bann Luek Sub-district, Photaram District, Ratchaburi Province for the past two years. His ultimate aim is to see a model developed by Bann Luek people for their own well-being.

#### *Dr Prathurng Hongsrnanagon*

Dr Hongsrnanagon is currently an Assistant Dean in Academic Affairs in the College of Public Health Sciences at Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand. She has a doctoral degree in Integrated Sciences from Thammasat University, Bangkok and is interested in the area of integral community development. Dr Hongsrnanagon has a strong belief that indicators of GDP growth alone do not reflect the quality of life of communities and her observations of the establishment of

societal progress indicators in Bann Luek Sub-district, Photaram District, Ratchaburi Province reveal an achievable model for local people's well-being.

## References

1. Costanza, R., Hart, M., Posner, S., and Talberth, J. *Beyond GDP: The Need for New Measures of Progress*. 2009. Boston: Boston University.
2. Marcuss, R. D. and Kane, R.E. US National Income and Product Statistics: Born of the Great Depression and World War II. *Bureau of Economic Analysis: Survey of Current Business* 2007; 87(2): 32–46.
3. Franchet, Y. and Renault, M. Societal indicators of territorial well being. The 3<sup>rd</sup> OECD World Forum on “Statistics, Knowledge and Policy”. *Charting Progress, Building Visions, Improving Life*. Busan, Korea, 27-30 October 2009.
4. Sathirathai, S. and Piboolsravut, P. Sufficiency Economy and a Healthy Community. *Proceedings at the Third IUCN World Conservation Congress*, Bangkok, Thailand, 17-25 November 2004.
5. Bauer, R. A. (ed.) *Social indicators*. 1966. Cambridge: MIT Press.
6. OECD. *Measuring Social Well-Being: A Progress Report on the Development of Social Indicators*. 1976. Paris: OECD.
7. OECD. *List of social concerns common to most OECD countries*. 1973. Paris: OECD.
8. Giovannini, E., Hall, J., Morrone, A., and Ranuzzi, G. A framework to measure the progress of societies. 2009. Draft OECD Working Paper.
9. Atkinson, T., Cantillon, B., Marlier, E., and Nolan, B. *Social Indicators*. 2002. The EU and Social Inclusion. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
10. Armstrong, A., Francis, R., Bourne, M. and Dussuyer, I. Difficulties of Developing and Using Social Indicators to Evaluate Government Programs: A critical review. Paper presented at the 2002 Australasian Evaluation Society International Conference, Wollongong Australia, October/November 2002, retrieved October 20, 2009 from [www.aes.asn.au](http://www.aes.asn.au).
11. Frones, I. Theorizing Indicators – on Indicators, Signs and Trends. *Social Indicators Research* 2007; 83:5–23.
12. OECD. *Society at a Glance: OECD Social Indicators*. 2001. Paris: OECD.

13. Salvaris, M. Community and social indicators: How citizens can measure progress - An overview of social and community indicator projects in Australia and internationally. 2000. Hawthorn: Swinburne University of Technology.
14. Choi, J. Measuring Progress using the Drivers of Prosperity – Legatum Institute. The 3<sup>rd</sup> OECD World Forum on “Statistics, Knowledge and Policy”. Charting Progress, Building Visions, Improving Life. Busan, Korea, 27-30 October 2009.
15. Giovannini, E. Why measuring progress matters?. OECD Observer, retrieved October 20, 2009 from [www.oecdobserver.org](http://www.oecdobserver.org).
16. Ho, A.T.K and Coates, P. Citizen Participation: Legitimizing Performance Measurement as a Decision Tool. Government Finance Review 2002: 8-10.
17. Menegat, R. Participatory democracy and sustainable development: integrated urban environmental management in Porto Alegre, Brazil. Environment & Urbanization 2002;14:181-206.
18. Diener, E. Guidelines for national indicators of subject well-being and ill-being. Journal of Happiness Studies 2006; 7:397–404.
19. Promduang, P. et al. Community Organization Council on Sub-district level: a case study of Bann Luek Community, Photaram District, Ratchaburi province. Conference paper on “Community Organization Council”. Community Organization Development Institute Public Organization (CODI). 2007.
20. Upa-sen, P. An establishment of community targeted indicators. 2009. Bangkok: Community Organization Development Institute Public Organization (CODI).
21. Gallardo, G. The human development index as an effort to measure well-being in Honduras, The 3<sup>rd</sup> OECD World Forum on “Statistics, Knowledge and Policy”. Charting Progress, Building Visions, Improving Life. Busan, Korea, 27-30 October 2009.
22. Cummins, R.A. Measuring population happiness to inform public policy. The 3<sup>rd</sup> OECD World Forum on “Statistics, Knowledge and Policy”. Charting Progress, Building Visions, Improving Life. Busan, Korea, 27-30 October 2009.