

Social Impact of the Establishment Kalasin Rajabhat University of Song Plueai Subdistrict, Na Mon District, Kalasin Province

Chaitach Jansamood

Faculty of Liberal Arts and Science, Kalasin Rajabhat University, 46230 Kalasin, Thailand

Abstract: Social Impact Assessment (SIA) is a methodology used to review the social effects of infrastructure projects and other development interventions. The development of Kalasin Rajabhat University influenced the environmental impact and social impact with community around the university. This research aimed to study the effect of social impact of the establishment Kalasin Rajabhat University of Song Plueai sub-district, Na Mon district, Kalasin province. This research also surveyed the opinions of population in Song Plueai subdistrict, Na Mon district, Kalasin province about social impact in the community. The samples of this study were 333 household agents with stratified random sampling techniques. The questionnaires were developed and used to collect data and were used to assess the reliability. The data were analyzed by using percentage, mean, standard deviation and multiple regression testing. The results revealed that: the value of human resource showed that social impact was at the (+) very low level. The value of quality of life showed that social impact was at the (+) low level. Factors that effects the social impact of establishment of Kalasin Rajabhat University included that occupation. This information can be used in to build a regression equation of the form: $SIA = 0.969 - 0.045 (\text{occupation})$.

Key words: Social impact, environment impact assessment, establishment, university, the value of human resource, the value of quality of life

INTRODUCTION

Social Impact Assessment (SIA) includes the processes of analyzing, monitoring and managing the intended and unintended social consequences, both positive and negative of planned interventions (policies, programs, plans, projects) and any social change processes invoked by those interventions (Michael, 2011). Social impact assessment has no single, universally accepted definition. However, its content and subject matter consist of distinguishable components that consistently appear when the SIA process is implemented. According to the International Association for Impact Assessment (Rauno and Kumpulainen, 2006).

Usually, social impacts have contextual features and they represent complex social relations or dynamics. The nature of social change will vary with the type and size of a development project (or plan) as well as with the nature of the community in which the project is located. To study social change social scientists must switch from their traditional focus on structure in social organizations to a more dynamic assessment of the social impacts of planned change (Burdge, 1998). SIA is a tool for developing alternatives and determining the full range of consequences for each alternative and for developing mitigation, adaptation or compensation measures for the

harmful social impacts. It is done in advance during the planning phase in order to offer better knowledge-base for the decision-making processes and which SIA is relative to Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) (Burdge, 1998). Which environmental impact assessment is an integrative process that looking at the environment in a holistic way, integrating all the aspects of total environment ecologically, socially and economically. Officers who are responsible in operation must necessarily be knowledgeable and well-aware of EIA's command which is to protect a negative effects which would happen to the projects and surrounding communities (Jansamood *et al.*, 2009).

EIA is an important opponent in local sustainable development planning and environmental management. The building construction projects are associated to the issue of environmental impact assessment in order to propose before applying on constructing permission. The local administration. Public involvement (or public participation) and social impact assessment are (and should be) clearly interactive in a planning process. The issue of community participation raises many questions about the extent and validity of the knowledge and opinion of local communities and about the right of local communities to determine their own destinies independent of outside interference (Burdge, 1998). Firstly, the public

involvement process can serve as a means of collecting valuable data on specific SIA variables. Interviews, surveys, workshops, etc. are all frequently used as public involvement tools and can easily be used to study effects on local social structures.

Secondly, the general community does not necessarily know what the likely effects of development will be. Thirdly, strong public support for a project does not mean that there will not be any major social impacts. Therefore, the researcher as an university lecturer had studied the social impact for development and improvement of Kalasin Rajabhat University by surveying to solving those problems. The purposes of this research were to study the effect of social impact in the establishment of Kalasin Rajabhat University in Song Plueai sub-district, Na Mon district, Kalasin province.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The sample of this research were 333 peoples in Song Plueai sub-district, Na Mon district, Kalasin province which had been selected by stratified random sampling technique. The contents of this research were importantly divided into three sections which are:

Section 1: General data are fourteen items.

Section 2: Social impact in community in the rating scale of seven is in the amount all together of forty three items.

Section 3: Approach to solve the problem is in the amount all together of seven items.

They were examined by five experts for an evaluation form IOC which is indicated that they were between 0.05-1.00. Improving and collecting them which according to the five expert's suggestions and opinions which leaded them to find out without the thirty household agents sampling random group, it's indication was discrimination value that also using in the point of Pearson coefficient correlation by choosing the items with positive discrimination value which having a higher score than 0.02, the discrimination value in range of 0.02-0.80, the reliability value that using the Cronbach Alpha Coefficient and the reliability is equally to 0.93. Then, they were analyzed for collecting data by mean (\bar{x}) Standard Deviation (SD) and testing hypothesis by multiple regression analysis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The major findings revealed as following: the local household agents have shown their total social impact of

Table 1: Social impact on the value of human resource aspect

Social impact	\bar{X}	SD	Level
Land use	0.65	1.04	(+) very low
Water and using	0.68	1.02	(+) very low
Drainage and prevent flooding	0.53	1.11	(+) very low
Waste water management	0.50	1.29	(+) very low
Traffic	0.96	1.33	(+) low
Solid waste management	0.52	1.39	(+) very low
Electrical energy	1.09	1.16	(+) low
Total	0.70	0.95	(+) very low

Table 2: Social impact on the value of quality of life aspect

Social impact	\bar{X}	SD	Level
Economic and social	1.33	0.76	(+) low
Aesthetics/scenery	0.99	0.78	(+) low
Value of cultural	1.24	1.01	(+) low
Occupational health and safety	1.19	1.03	(+) low
Total	1.19	0.72	(+) low

-2.25 to -3.00 = (-) high -1.51 to -2.25 = (-) medium; -0.76 to -1.50 = (-) low 0.00 to -0.75 = (-) very low; 0.00-0.75 = (+) very low 0.76-1.50 = (+) low 1.51-2.25 = (+) medium 2.25-3.00 = (+) high

Table 3: Relationship between independent variables

Variables	b	SE	Beta	t-value	p-value	VIF
SIA	0.969	0.058	-	16.729	0.000	-
Occupation	-0.045	0.018	-0.139	-2.556	0.011	1.000

the value of human resource aspects was at the positive low ($\bar{X} = 0.70$) level the maximized mean showed that the electrical energy at (+) low level ($\bar{X} = 1.09$) and the minimized mean showed that the waste water management at (+) very low level ($\bar{X} = 0.53$) (Table 1). In addition, total social impact of the value of quality of life showed that at (+) low level ($\bar{X} = 1.19$) the maximized mean showed that the economic and social at (+) low level ($\bar{X} = 1.33$) and the minimized mean showed that the aesthetics/scenery at (+) low level ($\bar{X} = 0.99$) (Table 2).

Relationships between independent variables are included, number of family members and occupation is associated with positive and negative social impact of the establishment Kalasin Rajabhat University. However, when introduced into the equation are found to be predictive variables into the equation, just an occupation which can be written as the following equation in the form of raw score (Table 3).

CONCLUSION

The overall of social impact of the value of human resource aspects and the value of quality of life are in the (+) low level which is showed that community of Song Plueai sub-district, Na Mon district, Kalasin province could benefit from establishment of Kalasin Rajabhat University by participation process which is accorded to Tang *et al.* (2008)'s research who find that concludes that the poor prospects of SIA and collaborative planning in China lie not only in the weak framework for

environmental legislation but also in all institutions concerning state-society relations, the socialist governing ideology and traditional Chinese culture.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research has completed perfectly with a support and kindness of Assoc. Prof. Suttipong Hoksuan, Assist Prof. Wirat Pansila, Dr. Rittirong Junggoth, Dr. Somsak Sripugdee, Dr. Supasak Mueangprom who have greatly given a useful advice and weakness verification from the beginning till its completion.

REFERENCES

- Burdge, R.J., 1998. Aconceptual Approach to Social Impact Assessment. Social Ecology Press, Madison.
- Jansamood, C., P. Jitto, R. Junggoth and W. Pansila, 2009. Knowledge and awareness on environmental impact assessment of local government officers. Pak. J. Social Sci., 6: 236-238.
- Michael, R., 2011. Social Impacts Guidance: Key Assessment Issues for Forest Carbon Projects. In: Building Forest Carbon Projects, Ebeling, J. and J. Olander (Eds.), Forest Trends, Washington, DC.
- Rauno, S. and S. Kumpulainen, 2006. Assessing social impact sinurban water front regeneration. Environ. Impact Assess. Rev., 26: 120-135.
- Tang, B.S., S.W. Wong and M.C.H. Laua, 2008. Social impact assessment and public participationin China: A case study of land requisitionin guangzhou. Environ. Impact Assess. Rev., 28: 57-72.