SECTION ONE

VILLAGE AND AREA SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

1. BACKGROUND OF THE PROJECT

The Integrated Pocket Area Development Program (IPAD) was organized as a joint project between the Thai government and Untied Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control (UNFDAC) to help solve the problem of opium production by hilltribes in highland areas. This project is a continuation of an effort to effect integrated development of different highland areas such as those supported by the United Nations (Pae Por, Wieng Pha, Sam Mun, Doi Yao), and bilateral programs such as those supported by the governments of the United States and Germany. These programs included among their objectives the improvement of the standard of living of the hilltribe peoples, the reduction of opium production and the attenuation of destruction of natural resources.

The IPAD project, as an integrated area development project, is designed to improve the well being of the hilltribe population in the project area in terms of agricultural production, educational opportunity, health and nutrition status including elimination of opium production. The project intends to bring about these improvements are to be brought about in such a manner that they are both ecologically sound and sustainable. Four areas, or pockets, of opium production have been identified by the project in Mae Chaem and Om Koi Districts, Chiang Mai plus Pai and Mae La Noi Districts in Mae Hongson Province.

To further these project goals, the IPAD project requested the Research and Development Institute, Payap University, to conduct a socio-economic baseline survey of three project pocket areas, i.e., Huai Sai Luang, Tambon Pang Hin Fon in Mae Chaem District, Kaeng Hom, Tambon Muang Paeng in Pai District and Mae La, Tambon Mae Na Jang in Mae La Noi District. No such survey had ever been undertaken in these areas.

2. OBJECTIVES

The analysis of the socio-economic data from the Payap Research and Development Institute is intended for use by the IPAD project in planning project development activities through the end of the project, currently scheduled for 1993. The data will also provide a baseline against which project progress can be measured.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Survey data was collected by means of questionnaires which were designed in cooperation with IPAD to provide information on development indicators developed by the project during meetings held in February and March 1991 between IPAD, Payap Research and Development Institute and the Tribal Research Insti-

tute. (The latter organization conducted the socio-economic baseline survey in the Om Koi District project area.)

As agreed upon at these meetings, data was collected at three levels: household level (interviewing household heads), village level (interviewing village headmen) and district level (interviewing district government officials). A separate questionnaire was prepared to obtain required data at each of these levels.

3.2 The PRDI project team was composed of field enumerators, team leaders and researchers. A total of 16 ethnic Karen were selected and hired as field enumerators by PRDI. These individuals were then trained in field interview methods and on how to use the household survey questionnaires.

Two team leaders were also trained. Both were ethnic Karens and graduates of Payap University. They were responsible for interviewing village headmen, supervising the field enumerators and insuring that all household questionnaires were properly completed.

A total of seven individuals, all instructors at Payap University, conducted interviews with district level government officials and conducted the data analysis. This group included the project director and coordinator, field supervisor, and four The team included Asst. Prof. Prasert Bhandhachat, researchers. Director, Payap Research and Development Institute; Dr. G. Lamar Robert, Director, Research Division, Payap Research and Development Institute; Dr. Vachara Sindhuprama, Department of History, Faculty of Humanities; Asst. Prof. Sriwan Wongcharoen, MacCormick Faculty of Nursing; Chaloemsak Khattiya, Acting Director, Development Division, Payap Research and Development Institute, Kobkan Phochanachai, Research Division, Payap Research and Development Institute; Jainsiri Jantasiri, Research Division, Research and Development Institute. Project advisor was Dr Boonthong Poochoaroen, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Payap University.

4. BASELINE SURVEY SCHEDULE

February/March 1991 = meetings with IPAD staff.

26-27 March 1991 = Training of field enumerators by PRDI staff.

28-29 March 1991 = Village Profile and Household Survey questionnaire pre-test and field verification.

30 March - 5 April 1991 = Modification of questionnaires and preparation for field survey.

6 - 10 April 1991 = Survey in Kaeng Hom area, Tambon Muang Paeng, Pai District, Mae Hongson Province. 12 - 18 April 1991 = Survey in Huai Sai Luang area, Tambon Mae Seuk and Tambon Pang Hin Fon, Mae Chaem District, Chiang Mai Province.

20 April - 3 May 1991 = Survey in Mae La area, Tambon Mae Lang Chan, Mae La Noi District, Mae Hongson Province.

4 May - 30 June 1991 = Data analysis and report preparation.

5. ORGANIZATION OF THE BASELINE SURVEY

The results of the analysis of the baseline survey included in this report are included in four sections as follows:

SECTION ONE. Village and area summary. This section provides a brief two-page statistical summary of each of the project villages through selected key statistics. Data in this section was obtained from district, village and household surveys.

SECTION TWO. Village profile. This section includes village level data on the socio-economic status of the villages. The data was obtained from various sources including village profile survey questionnaire.

SECTION THREE. The third section includes summary statistics from the household survey questionnaire.

SECTION FOUR. The final section is composed of individual maps showing the location of houses, schools, health stations, water sources, etc., for each village.

APPENDICES. In the appendices are included the English translation of each of the survey instruments.

SUMMARY OF OBSERVATIONS IN THE PAI POCKET AREA PAI DISTRICT, MAE HONG SON PROVINCE

This pocket area begins 48 kilometers from the district capital at Pai and extends to 83 kilometers from that town. The village access road is usable year round only for the first 48 kilometers. The inter-village connecting roads are easily passable only in the dry season. Some villages are unreachable by vehicle in the rainy season.

Some villages lack a local leader, i.e., they have no village headman or assistant headman. This has a deleterious effect on the efficiency of administration, development and solving of various village problems.

The population includes Karen, Hmong and Lisu hilltribes. This ethnic diversity has lead to internal friction, in some cases rather serious. In terms of religion, there are Buddhists, Christians and Animists. Villages which are primarily Christian have fewer problems with opium addiction than non Christian villages.

There are many primary level government schools in the area; however, there is insufficient adult education. Vocational training and public health training opportunities are also inadequate.

The major public health problem is that there is only one community public health facility in the area. This situation is exacerbated by the poor communication/transportation facilities and results in serious difficulties for villagers in obtaining health care. Another problem resulting from this lack of local health facilities is that sanitation and and health are slow to develop, e.g., encouraging villagers to construct toilets.

In economic terms, most villagers are very poor due to a lack of extension assistance with suitable cash crops and difficulty in marketing those cash crops they do produce. In general, the Hmong and Lisu peoples are better able to take advantage of economic opportunities than the Karen.

SUMMARY TABLE: POPULATION BY VILLAGE

| | | | | | | | | | TOTAL HOUSE- | POPULATION | | |
|-----|-------------------|----|--------|--------|-------|------|------|-----------------|-----------------|------------|---------|-------|
| | · . | Mu | Sub-Di | strict | Distr | ict, | Prov | ince | HOLDS | MALES | FEMALES | TOTAL |
| | | | · | | | | - | | / | | | |
| 301 | PHA SAMRAN | 6 | Muang | Paeng | Pai, | Mae | Hong | Son | 10 | 77 | 56 | 133 |
| 302 | MAK PHRIK | 3 | Muang | Paeng | Pai, | Mae | Hong | Son | 28 | 83 | 95 | 178 |
| 303 | HUAI NAM YEN | 3 | Muang | Paeng | Pai, | Mae | Hong | Son | 13 | 50 | 48 | 98 |
| 304 | HUAI BONG | 1 | Muang | Paeng | Pai, | Mae | Hong | Son | 9 | 23 | 23 | 46 |
| 305 | HUAI MEE | 7 | Muang | Paeng | Pai, | Mae | Hong | Son 🦿 | 19 | 58 | 62 | 120 |
| 306 | HUAI HUNG | 7 | Muang | Paeng | Раi, | Mae | Hong | Son | 3 | 8 | 10 | 15 |
| 307 | HUAI RAI | 7 | Muang | Paeng | Pai, | Hae | Hong | Son | 5 | 13 | 13 | 26 |
| 308 | - KAENG HOM KAREN | 7 | Muang | Paeng | Pai, | Mae | Hong | Son | 24 | 5.0 | 55 | 105 |
| 309 | KAENG HOM MEO | 5 | Muang | Paeng | Pai, | Mae | Hong | Son | 28 | 169 | 162 | 331 |
| | . ' | | | | | | | | / | | | |
| | TOTAL | | | | | | | > > 7 | 139 | 531 | 524 | 1055 |