UTS ePRESS

Cosmopolitan Civil Societies: An Interdisciplinary Journal

Vol. 18, No. 3
2026

© 2026 by the author(s). This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) License (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), allowing third parties to copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format and to remix, transform, and build upon the material for any purpose, even commercially, provided the original work is properly cited and states its license.

Citation: Krueanuan, C., Akarapattananukul, Y., Isariyanon, S., Isariyanon, M., Tantrajin, P., Snitwongse Na Ayudhya, P., Cousnit, S. 2026. Developing and Improving Democratic Citizenship for Social Mobilizers in Eastern Thailand. *Cosmopolitan Civil Societies: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 18:3, 37–52. https://doi.org/10.5130/ccs.v18.i3.10481

ISSN 1837-5391 | Published by UTS ePRESS | https://epress.lib.uts.edu.au/journals/index.php/mcs

ARTICLE (REFEREED)

Developing and Improving Democratic Citizenship for Social Mobilizers in Eastern Thailand

Chainarong Krueanuan, Yared Akarapattananukul*, Sakrit Isariyanon, Methina Isariyanon, Patcharapa Tantrajin, Pimprapai Snitwongse Na Ayudhya, Shotisa Cousnit

Burapha University, Chon Buri, Thailand

Corresponding author: Yared Akarapattananukul, Burapha University, 169 Long Had Bangsaen Rd, Saen Suk, Chon Buri District, Chon Buri 20131, Thailand yared.ak@buu.ac.th

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5130/ccs.v18.i3.10481
Article History: Received 24/05/2026; Revised 27/09/2026; Accepted 28/09/2026; Published 16/11/2026

Abstract

This paper examines democratic citizenship formation in Eastern Thailand through qualitative research using document analysis, in-depth interviews, and focus group discussions. It identifies how legal and theoretical frameworks, community institutions and civic networks, and intermediary actors interact to shape the conditions and practices of democratic citizenship. The findings demonstrate that community councils and civic networks provide spaces for political learning, negotiation, and collective problem-solving, while community leaders and social studies teachers function as social mobilizers who connect democratic principles with everyday civic practices. Overall, democratic citizenship in Eastern Thailand is not merely a formal legal status, but an ongoing social and political process shaped by the interaction of structural conditions, community practices, and intermediary actors. Democracy is manifested not only through institutional rules but also through community spaces and individual actions that sustain democratic values over time.

Keywords

Civil Society; Democratic Citizenship; Democracy; Eastern Thailand; Social Mobilizer

DECLARATION OF CONFLICTING INTEREST The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article. **FUNDING** This work was supported by Burapha University (BUU), Thailand Science Research and Innovation (TSRI), and National Science, Research and Innovation Fund (NSRF) (Fundamental Fund: 2024/2567) under Grant No. 82/2567.

Introduction

Within the framework of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), the construction of democratic states and societies has become a critical condition for development in the twenty-first century. The pillars of development in democratic systems are not limited to economic growth and environmental sustainability but also encompass the creation of equitable and inclusive societies (Gobi et al. 2026; Xetor & Mensah 2025). This requires citizens who actively participate in social life, assume responsibility for the collective good, and demonstrate public civility. Citizen-centered development therefore functions as a crucial mechanism linking economic, environmental, and social dimensions in a balanced manner, thereby strengthening the foundations of democracy and ensuring long-term sustainability (Tantisunthorn 2012; Kongkirati 2015).

In the Thai political context, the concept of citizenship has gained increasing attention since the 1990s, following the expansion of civil society movements and the promulgation of the 1997 'People's Constitution'. This milestone constitution guaranteed civil liberties, created mechanisms for monitoring state power, and expanded channels for public participation at both national and local levels (Burikul et al. 2012). Subsequently, both state institutions and civil society organizations promoted citizenship development through agencies such as the King Prajadhipok's Institute, the Election Commission, the Thailand Research Fund, and various international organizations. During the Abhisit Vejjajiva administration in 2011, amid unprecedented political conflicts and societal polarization over democracy, the Ministry of Education integrated the concept of citizenship into its core agenda under the 'Education for Citizenship Strategy', reflecting policy-level efforts to strengthen civic engagement (Tantisunthorn 2012, p. 4).

Over the past decade, prolonged and deep political conflicts have raised new questions regarding the role and value of citizenship in Thailand. Ideological divisions that have extended across multiple levels of Thai society have also highlighted the challenges of sustaining constructive political engagement and civic relations (Kongkirati 2015). These developments make the cultivation of civil politics and public civility increasingly important to the development of citizenship. The meaning of citizenship shifts according to political regimes. That is to say, under authoritarian systems, citizens tend to be limited to compliance with laws and policies, whereas under more open political environments, citizens are expected to play proactive roles, cultivate public-mindedness, and collaboratively pursue public interests alongside the state. Theoretical debates must therefore be connected with analyses of legal structures and political institutions in Thailand, which simultaneously function as both enabling mechanisms and constraints.

The tension between state authority and citizen expression in Thailand also reflects a longstanding divide in Western political thought between civic republicanism and liberal citizenship. Civic republicanism emphasizes civic virtue, public responsibility, and participation in the common good, whereas liberal citizenship places greater emphasis on individual rights and freedoms (Honohan 2002, pp. 1-11; Oldfield 1990, pp. 1-6). In the Thai context, this tension is reflected in the continuing negotiation between expectations of citizens to conform to institutional norms and contribute to the public good, and demands for greater individual rights, political expression, and participation (Boontinand & Petcharamesree 2018). The political crises surrounding the 2006 and 2014 coups illustrate how civil society and constitutional institutions can become sites of political contestation rather than straightforward mechanisms for democratic inclusion and accountability (Kuhonta & Sinpeng 2014). As McCargo (2002, pp. 52–53, 63-64) argues, while state authority was historically justified through national security, political participation has increasingly become a central currency of legitimacy through which citizens challenge state dominance and demand rights. Such an approach makes it possible to understand citizenship in Thailand as both an aspirational ideal and an empirical reality shaped by the limitations of political regimes.

The context of Thailand's Eastern region further reinforces these issues. This region has become a strategic hub for national economic development through initiatives such as the Eastern Seaboard

Development Program (ESB) and the Eastern Economic Corridor (EEC). As a major industrial center coexisting with agricultural production and tourism, the Eastern region represents a convergence point for diverse populations that share resources and economic opportunities. This diversity has generated both cooperation and conflict, particularly regarding land use, resource management, and the impacts of industrial expansion (Guoxue & Li 2025; Tontisirin & Anantsuksomsri 2021). These dynamics challenge the capacity of centralized state mechanisms to resolve conflicts independently and highlight the importance of local institutions, community networks, community leaders, and teachers in creating learning spaces, facilitating negotiation, and cultivating democratic values.

This article synthesizes findings from six interrelated subprojects conducted under a broader research program on democratic citizenship in Eastern Thailand in 2024 – 2025[1]. These subprojects examined different aspects of democratic citizenship, including community institutions, citizenship theory, social studies teachers, legal structures, community leaders, and civic networks. Building on these studies, the present article synthesizes their empirical and theoretical findings to develop an integrated understanding of democratic citizenship formation in Eastern Thailand. Thus, rather than presenting an independent research project, this article serves as an umbrella analysis that brings together and interprets findings generated across the six subprojects.

Drawing on the data and findings generated across these six subprojects, this article employs a qualitative research approach, including documentary research, in-depth interviews, and focus group discussions conducted between March and July 2025. The study involved three main groups of participants. The first group consisted of seven social studies teachers and related academics who participated in in-depth interviews, as well as fourteen participants who joined a workshop organized in Chonburi Province. The workshop aimed to enhance teachers' capacities in teaching citizenship-related subjects and to establish a regional network of social studies teachers in Eastern Thailand as a Professional Learning Community (PLC). The second group included actors involved in promoting and advancing democratic citizenship through community-based organizations in the Eastern region. This group comprised fifteen participants, including presidents and members of Community Organizations Councils, university-based and independent academics, as well as five local community leaders. The third group consisted of thirty key informants who possessed knowledge, experience, or direct involvement with the National Community Self-Management and the New Land Network of the National Local Self-Management Community (KTC). Participants in this group included local citizens, government officials, and academics who were directly connected to the network and its activities.

In this paper, community leaders and social studies teachers constitute the two principal categories of social mobilizers examined in Eastern Thailand. Other participants, including academics, local officials, community members, and network participants, were included because of their knowledge, experience, or direct involvement in the community-based processes and networks examined in this study. Their perspectives were used to contextualize and triangulate the roles of social mobilizers rather than to classify them as social mobilizers themselves.

1 The six project reports drawn upon in this article are the formal accountability reports submitted for the respective research projects: Krueanuan, C. 2025, The Role of Community Organization Councils in the Development of Democratic Citizenship in Eastern Thailand, Fundamental Fund Research Project, Burapha University, Chonburi; Akarapattananukul, Y. & Cousnit, S. 2025, Conceptions of Citizenship and Democracy: A Theoretical Exploration in Political Science, Fundamental Fund Research Project, Burapha University, Chonburi; Tantrajin, P. 2025, The Role of Social Science Teachers in the Development of Democratic Citizenship in Eastern Thailand, Fundamental Fund Research Project, Burapha University, Chonburi; Snitwongse Na Ayudhya, P. 2025, A Critical Legal Study of the Development of Democratic Citizenship in Thailand, Fundamental Fund Research Project, Burapha University, Chonburi; Isariyanon, M. & Isariyanon, S. 2025, Democratic Citizenship of Local Community Leaders: A Comparative Study Between Areas Within and Outside the Eastern Economic Corridor, Fundamental Fund Research Project, Burapha University, Chonburi; and Isariyanon, S. & Isariyanon, M. 2025, The Role of the New Land Network of the National Local Self-Management Community (KTC) in the Development of Democratic Citizenship in Eastern Thailand, Fundamental Fund Research Project, Burapha University, Chonburi.

The term 'social mobilizers' is used as an analytical concept rather than as a formal occupational or institutional designation. It refers to individuals who act as intermediaries between citizens, communities, institutions, and broader political structures by facilitating civic learning (Jennings et al. 2021), connecting people and resources, encouraging collective participation, and translating democratic values into everyday social practices (e.g., Perrin 2005, pp. 1049–1050). In doing so, these mobilizers help construct 'political microcultures', civic contexts that foster environments for political discourse and provide resources for active citizenship (Perrin 2005, pp. 1050, 1076). Community leaders mobilize citizens primarily through community organization, collective problem-solving, negotiation with state agencies, and the articulation of local interests and rights (Clark 2018). Social studies teachers, in turn, mobilize civic learning by cultivating democratic values, encouraging critical discussion, connecting students with social issues, and, in some cases, participating in community and public activities beyond the classroom (Epstein 2013; Kawashima-Ginsberg et al. 2025; Marri 2005).

This distinction is important because the term 'social mobilizers' does not imply that community leaders and social studies teachers perform identical functions. Rather, the concept captures their shared intermediary capacity to connect individuals with collective processes and to transform knowledge, values, and experience into forms of civic engagement (Jennings et al. 2021; Perrin 2005). Community leaders primarily operate through grassroots networks and community-based collective action (Clark 2018), whereas social studies teachers operate through education, civic learning, and broader social engagement (Epstein 2013). Despite these differences, both groups contribute to the formation of democratic citizenship by creating opportunities for learning, participation, dialogue, and collective action. This conceptualization provides the basis for examining social mobilizers as a connecting mechanism between structural conditions, community institutions, and individual citizenship in Eastern Thailand.

Building on this conceptualization, this study seeks to explain how democratic citizenship is formed and sustained in Thailand's Eastern region. It focuses particularly on how legal and structural conditions, community-based practices, and intermediary actors interact to shape citizens' opportunities through practical civic engagement. The study therefore examines how legal and institutional arrangements shape the space for citizenship, how community institutions and civic networks create opportunities for political learning and rights negotiation, and how community leaders and social studies teachers function as social mobilizers who connect democratic principles with everyday civic practices.

Theory and Law: The Boundaries of Citizenship

The development and advancement of democratic citizenship cannot be fully understood without considering the structural conditions shaped by legal frameworks and political institutions. A critical examination of legal mechanisms and state security measures in Thailand clearly reveals that certain legal provisions do not function as mechanisms that safeguard citizens' rights and freedoms. Instead, they are frequently used as instruments to regulate and control the boundaries of expression, association, and civic mobilization (Cogan 2026; Streckfuss 2011). As a result, the political space available to citizens is reduced, and citizenship in practice becomes confined within limits sanctioned by the state. Public participation, therefore, ceases to function as a right freely exercised by citizens and instead becomes contingent upon state approval (Khumsupa 2021, pp. 59–61; Streckfuss 2011, pp. 1–15).

This dynamic is particularly evident in laws governing public assemblies (Internet Law Reform Dialogue [iLaw], 2025a) and the establishment of associations (Internet Law Reform Dialogue [iLaw], 2024). Although these laws are formally justified as necessary for maintaining public order, in practice they are often interpreted and enforced in restrictive ways (Internet Law Reform Dialogue [iLaw], 2025a), leading to the prosecution of various citizen groups (Internet Law Reform Dialogue [iLaw], 2025b). The fear of legal repercussion discourages many citizens from participating in political activities. Consequently, the

development of 'active citizenship' is constrained, and instead of empowering citizens, these conditions contribute to their withdrawal from public engagement.

At the same time, an exploration of conceptual debates on citizenship and democracy demonstrates that these tensions are not new but have been central to political thought since antiquity. In the Greek city-state (*polis*), citizenship was defined by direct participation in community affairs. The assembly functioned as a space where citizens used reasoned deliberation to determine the direction of society (Piyachart 2011). Classical Athenian citizenship was tied to active involvement in public life, religious participation, and the shared obligations that sustained the city-state (Bellamy 2011; Blok 2017; Chaiyaphorn 2009; Smith 2001). Roman *civitas*, by contrast, increasingly came to denote a legal status defined by rights, duties, and protection under the state rather than direct self-governance (Bellamy 2011; Hoipkemier 2015; Kiwan 2005; Smith 2001). Both Athens and Rome are foundational for later civic republicanism, but they contribute differently: Athens is often linked to participatory citizenship, while Rome is especially central to the Roman or neo-Roman tradition of republicanism, liberty, and civic virtue (Bellamy 2011; Connolly 2010; Digeser 2004). Roman law can also be read as helping shape a legal-constitutional tradition in which individual freedom is secured through rights and limits on arbitrary power, a core concern of liberalism (Conway 2012; Pejo & Kolaneci 2024; Schuck 2002; Searing, Conover & Crewe 2003).

As societies entered the modern era, liberal and civic-republican traditions increasingly overlapped and sometimes came into tension. Contemporary liberal perspectives further emphasize equality among citizens and respect for individual differences within a value-neutral state (Milner 2021; Jones 2022; Searing, Conover & Crewe 2003). Meanwhile, democratic theory has expanded beyond institutional arrangements to conceptualize democracy as a way of life, emphasizing deliberation and meaningful participation (Fishkin 2011; Mascheroni & Murru 2017; Michelbach 2014; Nishiyama 2019; Perrin 2005; Ruminski, Reedy & Black 2021). The concept of deliberative democracy thus becomes an important foundation, suggesting that citizenship is not limited to voting or electoral participation but involves cultivating a political culture in which individuals engage in dialogue, listen to differing viewpoints, and seek shared collective judgment (Michelbach 2014; Rostbøll 2011; Wall 2015). This historical distinction offers a useful lens for understanding contemporary conflicts in Thailand between state authority and citizen expression, especially where questions of rights, participation, and political legitimacy are contested. In the Thai context, this tension can be understood as an ongoing negotiation between expectations that citizens conform to institutional norms and contribute to the public good, and demands for greater individual rights, political expression, and meaningful participation (Dressel 2010; Leelapatana & Asanasak 2022; Sae Chua 2025; Suebvises 2018).

When these theoretical frameworks are applied to the Thai legal context, a clear structural contradiction emerges. While democratic theory emphasizes rights, freedoms, and diverse forms of political participation, legal and administrative frameworks in Thailand's Eastern region often operate more as constraints than as enabling mechanisms. Under these conditions, citizenship development unfolds within structural and institutional limitations shaped by centralized planning, land-use reorganization, and uneven access to meaningful participation (Karthikeya et al. 2024; Kumar et al. 2023; Ponok et al. 2021). Citizens may therefore seek alternative avenues for political engagement, including community forums, community organization networks, and activities that connect economic concerns with political participation.

Examining the legal and political-theoretical dimensions thus highlights how formal legal and institutional arrangements can create differentiated conditions for citizenship and political participation, particularly in Thailand's Eastern region (Akarapattananukul & Cousnit 2025; Snitwongse Na Ayudhya 2025). Accordingly, this dimension highlights that the development and strengthening of citizenship in the Eastern region must begin with an understanding of the structural constraints shaped by legal and political institutions. At the same time, it underscores the importance of theoretical foundations that integrate rights, freedoms, civic virtue, and deliberation. Once the legal and political-theoretical dimensions

clarify these structural conditions, the next question concerns how individuals and communities respond to such constraints. The answer becomes evident in the practical actions of local institutions and community networks, which form the focus of the following section.

Councils and Networks: Arenas of Rights and Citizen Negotiation

The dynamics of democratic citizenship formation in Thailand's Eastern region do not emerge solely at the level of ideas or legal structures; they are also clearly manifested at the local level through the practices of local institutions and community networks, particularly the Community Organizations Councils (COCs) and the New Land Network of the National Local Self-Management Community (KTC). These two cases operate differently, yet they complement one another in fostering vibrant citizenship and strengthening the capacity of citizens to negotiate with state structures (Krueanuan 2025; S. Isariyanon & M. Isariyanon 2025).

Community Organizations Councils were originally established as mechanisms to open space for community self-management. However, in practice, these councils have evolved beyond the original state design. They have developed into 'schools of democracy' that provide opportunities for citizens to learn politics through practical engagement. Such activities include managing water resources for agriculture linked to everyday life, addressing household debt that undermines local economies, and developing solutions for the housing needs of vulnerable groups through the Baan Mankong program and community housing initiatives. These processes enable communities to move beyond viewing themselves as passive recipients of state policies. Instead, they increasingly recognize their value as agents capable of managing their own challenges and collectively shaping their future (Community Organizations Development Institute 2019, 2021, n.d.).

More important than the physical outcome of problem-solving is the political learning that emerges among council members. Each meeting that involves discussion and collective decision-making provides villagers with opportunities to develop skills in debate, reasoned dialogue, acceptance of differing opinions, and consensus-building. These processes constitute the core of democratic citizenship because they allow ordinary citizens to become familiar with exercising their rights and responsibilities as holders of sovereign power. Such experiences transform many individuals from passive recipients of policy outcomes into active citizens who are ready to participate in public affairs and political processes at various levels (Krueanuan & Charoenwong 2013; Community Organizations Development Institute n.d.).

In addition, the work of Community Organizations Councils integrates economic dimensions into democratic practice. Activities such as promoting organic agriculture, forming community enterprises, and managing local markets directly influence household income and quality of life. When citizens recognize that collective participation can produce tangible economic stability, they begin to perceive democracy not merely as an abstract concept related to elections or constitutions, but as something embedded in everyday life through food security, housing, and stable livelihoods. In this sense, democracy becomes a 'livable' or 'edible' democracy – tangible and meaningful in the lived experiences of citizens (Community Organizations Development Institute n.d., 2021).

On another front, the KTC network reflects another dimension of citizenship formation through negotiation with state structures. Land issues in the Eastern region have been long-standing and deeply accumulated over several decades. Many farmers and families are landless or reside in areas designated as forest reserves, where the law does not fully permit land utilization. As reflected in an interview with a KTC Eastern working group member:

> **The state's land management under the KTC framework is unfair because it applies the same rules to every group of people… If the state only looks at documents without considering how many**

> generations we have lived here, then it is unjust… We did not wait for someone else to manage things for us; we stood up and did it ourselves. Every house here was built by the community members themselves. (KTC Eastern leader (1), interview, 18 March 2025)

This is consistent with an interview from the KTC Rayong working group:

> We have made our living here since our grandparents' generation. We have been here for decades, and then they come and say we are trespassers. How is that fair?... If we do not have a voice in the policy arena, people who know nothing about our lives will speak on our behalf. (KTC Rayong working group, interview, 20 April 2025)

Under these conditions, the emergence of the KTC network represents a collective mobilization of communities to affirm their rights to land and to manage the resources necessary for their livelihoods.

Although the KTC initiative was announced as a public policy, in practice it remains constrained by insufficient budgets, legal complexities, and a centralized bureaucratic culture that resists genuine decentralization. As a result, many communities are still unable to fully govern themselves. Nevertheless, the most significant outcome lies in the collective learning processes that have emerged within the network. Communities participating in the KTC network have developed skills in negotiating with state agencies, using legal reasoning and human rights discourse to assert their legitimacy, and mobilizing collective power to express their ownership rights over resources. Although the KTC network remains constrained by centralized governance structures, interview findings indicate that its broader significance lies in its ability to strengthen grassroots political capacities and expose unequal power relations:

> KTC is about developing people… it provides tools… it makes visible the ongoing struggles of those at the grassroots level. (KTC Eastern leader (2), interview, 20 April 2025)

These learning processes have cultivated citizens' awareness that they possess rights worth protecting and that they can utilize political mechanisms to negotiate with both the state and capital interests (Phecharaburin 2012). The work of the KTC network therefore extends beyond land management. It creates a rights-based arena where citizens engage directly in political practice. Through these experiences, many citizens in the Eastern region move from being subjects of policy decisions to becoming agents who shape their own futures and those of their communities. Although outcomes remain incomplete and constrained by structural limitations, the learning processes have fostered a new political consciousness grounded in rights, dignity, and justice (Phecharaburin 2012).

When synthesizing these two cases, it becomes evident that democratic citizenship formation in the Eastern region emerges through two closely interconnected pathways. The first pathway involves addressing everyday challenges through Community Organizations Councils, which cultivate participatory culture and make democracy tangible. The second pathway involves confronting and negotiating with state structures through the KTC network, enabling citizens to learn how to exercise rights and construct their own language of legitimacy. Together, these pathways demonstrate that democratic citizenship is formed through direct experience, collective organization, deliberation, and negotiation with both internal community challenges and external power structures. However, for learning through institutions and networks to be sustained, intermediary actors are essential. These include community leaders who remain closely connected to local challenges and social studies teachers who cultivate democratic values among younger generations.

Social Mobilizers: Community Leaders and Social Studies Teachers in Cultivating Democratic Citizenship

As learning processes through institutions and community networks reveal the power of collective organization and negotiation with the state, another crucial dimension emerges: the role of individuals

who serve as intermediaries in nurturing and extending this collective capacity. These individuals include community leaders and social studies teachers. What makes these two groups analytically comparable as 'social mobilizers' is their shared intermediary function: both connect individuals with collective processes and contribute to transforming knowledge, values, and experience into civic engagement. The empirical findings show how this intermediary role operates differently across the two groups. While both contribute to democratic citizenship, they do so through distinct social spaces and practices. Community leaders primarily operate through grassroots organization and collective action, while social studies teachers work primarily through education, civic learning, and broader social engagement (M. Isariyanon & S. Isariyanon 2025; Tantrajin 2025).

Community leaders are viewed as empirical reflections of citizenship shaped more by everyday life conditions than by demographic factors. The findings indicate that levels of citizenship among leaders within and outside the Eastern Economic Corridor do not significantly differ based on gender, age, or education. Instead, they are closely associated with income levels, access to information, and the frequency of following political developments. These conditions suggest that active citizenship is shaped by socio-economic environments. When community leaders possess stable income, they tend to have more time and intellectual resources to access information and engage in public roles. At the same time, access to diverse information channels, from traditional media to newer forms, such as online networks, enhances their capacity to accumulate knowledge capital and transform it into collective action within communities. Conversely, limited income and restricted access to information reduce opportunities for individuals to develop into active citizens. This pattern reflects the deep relationship between citizenship and everyday life structures (M. Isariyanon & S. Isariyanon 2025).

In another dimension, social studies teachers in the Eastern region play a crucial role in cultivating citizenship among younger generations. Teachers are not merely transmitters of knowledge in classrooms; they also create early political learning experiences. Through teaching practices that foster understanding of rights and responsibilities, awareness of participation, and skills for reasoned discussion, teachers function as 'seed planters' who embed democratic values in students. This role supports the development of politically aware citizens capable of navigating future political challenges.

Interview findings further indicate that teachers perceive democratic citizenship not simply as the transmission of formal knowledge, but as the cultivation of internal values and civic consciousness among students. As one social studies teacher explained:

> **It is necessary to cultivate people in such a way that a strong democracy can emerge. This is fundamentally a challenge for teachers first. Therefore, teachers have to think carefully about curricula and learning activities. It is difficult to teach students because they must truly recognize the advantages of democracy… if we become citizens in a democratic system, the country will progress and develop. What needs to be built is something internal, rather than merely providing knowledge through media or textbooks. (Social Studies Teacher (1), interview, June 24, 2025)**

The role of teachers also extends beyond classrooms into public life. Many teachers participate in volunteer activities, build collaborative networks with communities, and develop local projects addressing real community needs. These practices transform teachers into role models of citizenship, not only through teaching but also through concrete public engagement. Citizenship in this context is expressed both in classroom practice and in broader social participation, contributing to tangible community transformation (Tanjaphatkul 2020).

Despite these important contributions, interview findings also reveal significant structural constraints that limit the capacity of social studies teachers to effectively cultivate democratic citizenship. A major obstacle repeatedly identified in literature reviews, interviews, and workshops concerns the extensive non-teaching workloads imposed on secondary school teachers by the Ministry of Education, other state

agencies, and institutional performance requirements (Tantrajin 2025). Teachers are expected to perform numerous administrative and organizational duties, including documentation, procurement tasks, policy implementation, community service activities, supervision responsibilities, and various reporting obligations. In the case of social studies teachers, additional expectations related to religious ceremonies and social activities further intensify these burdens.

These responsibilities significantly reduce the time available for lesson preparation, pedagogical development, and knowledge enhancement. As a result, many teachers become increasingly dependent on centrally produced textbooks for immediate classroom instruction rather than developing independent teaching methods or broader forms of citizenship education. One social studies teacher explained:

> In schools, most teachers actually spend very little time teaching. If a subject is officially allocated forty hours per semester, in reality we may teach less than half of that time in classrooms. There are holidays, activities requiring teachers to take students outside classrooms, and projects assigned by the Office of the Basic Education Commission and educational districts. Therefore, from forty hours, some semesters we cannot even complete half of the content required by the official indicators. In the end, we simply do what we can according to circumstances. Some students may follow, others may not, and the indicators are not truly achieved. This is a systemic problem within schools, the Ministry, and the Office of the Basic Education Commission. Teachers must constantly perform duties outside the classroom. (Social Studies Teacher (1), interview, June 24, 2025)

Another social studies teacher similarly noted:

> Teachers' time is consumed by policy tasks that emerge year after year and continuously change. Teachers become social workers, psychologists, and many other things besides being teachers. We must constantly monitor students and perform numerous additional responsibilities, leaving little opportunity to develop teaching processes. As a result, we rely heavily on textbooks in our teaching. Once textbooks become the main driver of instruction, we become trapped within them and cannot move beyond books that are centrally designed for nationwide use. (Social Studies Teacher (2), interview, June 13, 2025)

These findings suggest that time constraints and administrative burdens not only weaken the role of social studies teachers in cultivating democratic citizenship, but may also reduce their broader potential as active citizens capable of mobilizing knowledge, critical pedagogy, and civic engagement within society.

Interview findings further suggest that teachers view citizenship education as closely connected to broader questions of democratic culture, historical consciousness, and global citizenship. Rather than treating citizenship as merely a formal curriculum subject, teachers emphasize the need to cultivate civic values and critical understanding that enable students to connect local citizenship with global democratic norms. As one social studies teacher explained:

> Therefore, issues concerning the historical development of Thai democracy and the problems within Thai history become important… Thai people must first become good citizens of Thailand before becoming global citizens. Students should be both good Thai citizens and global citizens. However, the concept of 'global citizenship' itself remains unclear. What does it actually mean, and how can students become global citizens? What are the characteristics of global citizens in well-established democratic societies? And how does our current situation compare? Can the two be connected? We should examine global citizens in countries with strong democracies to understand their characteristics, and then consider whether the way Thai people are educated can truly connect to the idea of global citizenship… (Social Studies Teacher (1), interview, June 24, 2025)

These perspectives demonstrate that democratic citizenship in the Eastern region is not constructed solely through formal political institutions, but also through everyday educational and community-based practices that shape civic consciousness and participation. When considered together, community leaders and social studies teachers function as two foundational pillars supporting democratic citizenship development in Thailand's Eastern region. Community leaders represent citizenship shaped through empirical everyday experiences, while social studies teachers cultivate future citizens through education and social engagement (M. Isariyanon & S. Isariyanon 2025; Tantrajin 2025). Both groups share a common function as intermediaries linking structures with individuals, theory with practice, and past experiences with the democratic future of the region. When legal structures provide frameworks, community institutions create participatory arenas, and intermediary actors inspire civic engagement, these elements converge into an integrated process. Examining these two groups therefore reveals how democratic citizenship is formed in Thailand's Eastern region not only through formal political institutions but also through spaces of participation and everyday practices that connect theoretical ideas with practical experience.

Democratic Citizenship in Eastern Thailand: From Legal Frameworks to Community Power and Social Intermediaries

Understanding democratic citizenship in Thailand's Eastern region requires a multi-layered synthesis that spans structural conditions embedded in legal frameworks and political theory, the practical roles of local institutions and community networks, and the reinforcement provided by individuals who serve as intermediaries in cultivating and transmitting democratic values. The integration of these three levels reveals that citizenship is a social process constructed and sustained through negotiation, practice, and the cultivation of political culture.

At the structural level, the findings show that legal and institutional arrangements shape the space within which citizenship is exercised. Certain laws claim to protect rights and maintain social order, yet in practice function as mechanisms that restrict rights and place political expression and collective action under state control. This condition limits citizens' practical political space and reflects an imbalance of power among the state, capital, and citizens (Snitwongse Na Ayudhya 2025). At the same time, both classical and contemporary theoretical perspectives, including civic republicanism and liberal citizenship, affirm that genuine citizenship requires rights, freedoms, public responsibility, and meaningful participation. The tension between restrictive legal frameworks and empowering theoretical ideals becomes a structural condition that generates ongoing negotiation within society (Akarapattananukul & Cousnit 2025). The study therefore suggests that democratic citizenship develops within a structural tension between constraints imposed by legal and political institutions and citizens' efforts to expand opportunities for participation and rights negotiation. In Thailand, this space involves an ongoing negotiation between institutional expectations, collective responsibilities, and demands for individual rights and political participation.

At the community level, local institutions and community networks demonstrate how citizenship emerges through lived experiences and collective practices. Community Organizations Councils have evolved into 'schools of democracy', where citizens engage in deliberation, collective decision-making, and the management of issues directly affecting everyday life (Krueanuan 2025). Meanwhile, the New Land Network of the National Local Self-Management Community functions as an 'arena of rights', where citizens mobilize to assert their rights to land and natural resources (S. Isariyanon & M. Isariyanon 2025). These processes generate both tangible outcomes, such as housing projects and community initiatives, and intangible outcomes, including political capital and rights-based consciousness that shape citizens' understanding of their civic status. These practices demonstrate that democracy becomes visible through everyday problem-solving, participation, and negotiation (Krueanuan 2025; S. Isariyanon & M. Isariyanon 2025).

At the level of intermediary actors, community leaders and social studies teachers play essential roles in connecting structures, communities, and individuals. Community leaders illustrate how citizenship is closely linked to socio-economic conditions, such as income and access to information, which shape individuals' capacity for political participation (M. Isariyanon & S. Isariyanon 2025). At the same time, social studies teachers cultivate citizenship among younger generations through classroom practices while also engaging in public activities as socially active individuals. These two groups serve as conduits through which citizenship is continuously nurtured and transmitted through instruction, community engagement, and tangible role modeling (Tantrajin 2025).

Taken together, the three levels show how structural conditions, community practices, and intermediary actors shape opportunities for civic action in the Eastern region. Structural conditions shape the possibilities and constraints of civic action, while community institutions and networks create practical spaces in which citizens can exercise and negotiate their rights, and intermediary actors help individuals develop and exercise civic agency within those spaces. Social mobilizers further connect these spaces to everyday learning and civic engagement. Democratic citizenship therefore emerges not from any single institution or actor, but from the interaction among these three levels.

Conclusion

The synthesis of findings from six interrelated subprojects demonstrates that democratic citizenship in Thailand's Eastern region cannot be understood merely as a legal status, but rather as an ongoing social and political process shaped through everyday experience, negotiation, learning, and participation. The findings show that legal frameworks and political theories establish the conditions within which citizenship is exercised, while community-based practices provide concrete spaces in which citizens can experience democratic participation and negotiate rights. The practices of Community Organizations Councils and the New Land Network of the National Local Self-Management Community demonstrate how citizens develop political experience through addressing everyday problems and asserting claims over resources. The findings also highlight the importance of community leaders and social studies teachers as social mobilizers. Although they operate in different social spaces, community leaders through grassroots organization and social studies teachers through civic education, both perform intermediary functions that connect individuals with communities, institutions, knowledge, and opportunities for participation. These processes create both 'arenas of life' and 'arenas of rights', making democracy tangible at the local level.

Overall, the findings demonstrate that democratic citizenship in the Eastern region is shaped by the interaction of structural conditions, community practices that generate new meanings, and individual actors who sustain and transmit democratic values. This process is complex and dynamic, characterized by negotiation, learning, and socio-political innovation. The analysis underscores that democracy in Thai society becomes more deeply rooted when citizens are recognized as active agents whose capacities develop through practical engagement, interaction with structures and communities, and the creation of shared meanings in public life. This perspective also highlights the importance of social mobilizers in connecting formal democratic principles with everyday civic practices.

The findings concerning social studies teachers also point to a structural challenge in Thailand's education system. Heavy administrative and non-teaching workloads, together with reliance on centrally designed curricula and textbooks, can limit teachers' time and autonomy to develop critical and participatory forms of civic education. This suggests that strengthening democratic citizenship through education requires more than revising curriculum content alone. Educational reform should also reduce unnecessary administrative burdens, provide teachers with greater pedagogical autonomy, and create institutional conditions that enable discussion, critical inquiry, and engagement with contemporary social and political issues. Such reforms

would strengthen the capacity of teachers to function not only as transmitters of prescribed knowledge but also as social mobilizers who foster democratic learning and civic participation.

Such an understanding opens broader debates about democratic citizenship in contemporary Thailand. Strengthening democratic citizenship requires not only supportive institutional and legal frameworks but also opportunities for meaningful grassroots participation and sustained civic learning. Creating spaces in which citizens can deliberate, negotiate rights, address shared problems, and develop democratic values may contribute to a more resilient democratic culture. In this sense, democratic citizenship is not simply an outcome of formal institutions but an ongoing process through which everyday actors translate democratic principles into civic engagement, enabling democracy to be learned, practiced, and reproduced in everyday social life. Through these interconnected processes, democracy can evolve into a living and resilient system embedded across all dimensions of contemporary society.

Disclosure of AI Use

ChatGPT was used to translate portions of the manuscript into English, and the paper was then reviewed by a scholar with knowledge of English for accuracy and appropriateness.

References

Akarapattananukul, Y. & Cousnit, S. 2025, มโนทัศน์ว่าด้วยความเป็นพลเมืองและประชาธิปไตย: บทสำรวจทางทฤษฎีการเมือง (Manothat Wa Duai Khwam Pen Phonlamueang Lae Prachathipatai: Bot Samruat Thang Thritsadi Kan Mueang), Fundamental Fund Research Project, Burapha University, Chonburi.

Bellamy, R. 2011, 'Citizenship', In: Klosko, G. (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Political Philosophy*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 586-598. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199238804.003.0034

Blok, J. 2017, *Citizenship in Classical Athens*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781139017916

Boontinand, V. & Petcharamesree, S. 2018, 'Civic/citizenship learning and the challenges for democracy in Thailand', *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 36–50.https://doi.org/10.1177/1746197917699413

Burikul, T., Saengmahamad, R., Merieau, E. & Volpe, M. 2012, ความเป็นพลเมืองในประเทศไทย (Khwam Pen Phonlamueang Nai Prathet Thai), In: *Proceedings of the 13th King Prajadhipok's Institute Congress: Citizenship and the Future of Thai Democracy*, King Prajadhipok's Institute, Bangkok, pp. 289–316. https://kpi-lib.com/elib/opac?op=mmvw&db=Main&skin=S&mmid=14222&bid=17116

Chaiyaphorn, C. 2009, สถานะความเป็นพลเมืองในประชาธิปไตยเอเธนส์ (ตอนที่สอง): สิทธิและหน้าที่ (Sathana Khwam Pen Phonlamueang Nai Prachathipatai Athen (Ton Thi Song): Sitthi Lae Nathi), *King Prajadhipok's Institute Journal*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 41–48.

Clark, J.K. 2018, 'Designing public participation: Managing problem settings and social equity', *Public Administration Review*, vol. 78, no. 3, pp. 362–374. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12872

Cogan, M.S. 2026, 'Transnational repression in contemporary Thailand: Building capacity to suppress dissent beyond borders', In: Chachavalpongpun, P. (ed.), *Routledge Handbook of Contemporary Thailand*, 2nd ed., Routledge, Abingdon. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003659242-41

Community Organizations Development Institute 2019, รวมบทเรียน นวัตกรรมชุมชนท้องถิ่นจัดการตนเอง และพื้นที่ปฏิบัติการเรียนรู้ใหม่ พัฒนาคน พัฒนาชุมชนท้องถิ่นเข้มแข็ง (Ruam Botrian, Nawattakam Chumchon Thongthin Chatkan Ton-eng, Lae Phuenthi Patibatkan Rianru Mai: Phatthana Khon, Phatthana Chumchon Thongthin Khemkhaeng), (*Lessons Learned: Local Community Innovation and New Learning Spaces for Strengthening Local*

Communities), Community Organizations Development Institute (Public Organization), Bangkok. https://web.codi.or.th/printing_media/20190903-8366/

Community Organizations Development Institute 2021, ชุดความรู้งานพัฒนาในพื้นที่ของขบวนองค์กรชุมชน ประจำปี 2564 ชุดที่ 2 พื้นที่รูปธรรมตำบลเข้มแข็งหลากมิติ (Chut Khwamru Ngan Phatthana Nai Phuenthi Khong Khabuan Ongkon Chumchon Pracham Pi 2564 Chut Thi 2 Phuenthi Ruptham Tambon Khemkhaeng Lak Miti), (*Knowledge Series on Community Development Practices 2021: Strong Multi-dimensional Subdistrict Initiatives*, vol. 2), Community Organizations Development Institute (Public Organization), Bangkok. https://web.codi.or.th/printing_media/20210917-27318/

Community Organizations Development Institute n.d., พื้นที่นวัตกรรมชุมชน ภาคกรุงเทพฯ ปริมณฑลและตะวันออก (Phuenthi Nawattakam Chumchon Phak Krungthep, Parimonthon Lae Tawan-ok), (*Community Innovation Areas in Bangkok, Metropolitan Region, and Eastern Thailand*), Community Organizations Development Institute (Public Organization), Bangkok. https://web.codi.or.th/printing_media/20200902-18535/

Connolly, J. 2010, 'Political theory', In: Barchiesi, A. & Scheidel, W. (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Studies*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 713-727. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199211524.013.0046

Conway, D. 2012, 'Liberalism', In: Chadwick, R. (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Applied Ethics*, 2nd ed., Academic Press, pp. 858–865. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-373932-2.00226-X

Digeser, E.D. 2004, 'Citizenship and the Roman *Res publica*: Cicero and a Christian corollary', In: Nadeau, C. & Weinstock, D. (eds.), *Republicanism: History, Theory, Practice*, 1st ed., Routledge, pp. 5–21. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203497548

Dressel, B. 2010, 'When notions of legitimacy conflict: The case of Thailand', *Politics & Policy*, vol. 38, pp. 445–469. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-1346.2010.00243.x

Epstein, S.E. 2013, 'Independent voices, social insight, and action: An analysis of a social action project', *The Journal of Social Studies Research*, vol. 37, no. 3, pp. 123–136. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jssr.2013.04.002

Fishkin, J.S. 2011, 'Deliberative democracy and constitutions', *Social Philosophy and Policy*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 242–260. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0265052510000129

Gobi, I., Lahdir, F., Al-Maadeed, F., Muhammed, A., Al-Khalifa, N., Neama, S., Al-Qahdi, N., Al-Yafei, R., Al-Hamad, M. & Hahladakis, J. N. 2026, 'The SDG prosperity cluster: Integrating economic dynamism, social equity, and environmental sustainability', *Sustainability*, vol. 18, no. 13, article 6559. https://doi.org/10.3390/su18136559

Guoxue, L. & Li, X. 2025, 'Eastern Economic Corridor in Thailand', In: Fang, C., Nolan, P. & Linggui, W. (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of the Belt and Road* (3rd ed.), Routledge, Abingdon, chapter 97. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003660750

Hoipkemier, M. 2015, 'Citizenship: Political', In: Wright, J.D. (ed.), *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, 2nd ed., Elsevier, pp. 650–654. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.93016-2

Honohan, I. 2002, *Civic Republicanism*, Routledge, London. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203460894

Internet Law Reform Dialogue (iLaw) 2024, ร่าง พ.ร.บ. สมาคมและมูลนิธิ ที่ไทยเสนอ กำลังคุกคามภาคประชาสังคมและสื่อของเมียนมา (Rang P. R. B. Samakhom Lae Mulanithi Thi Thai Sanoe Kamlang Khukkham Phak Prachasan Khom Lae Sue Khong Myanmar), (*Thailand's Proposed Association and Foundation Law Threatens Civil Society and Myanmar Media*). https://www.ilaw.or.th/articles/48685

Internet Law Reform Dialogue (iLaw) 2025a, ถอดบทเรียน พ.ร.บ. ชุมนุมฯ: มาตรา 7 ใช้จำกัดพื้นที่แล้ว แต่ทางปฏิบัติยังมีข้อห้ามเพิ่มมาอีก (Thot Botrian P. R. B. Chumnum: Mattra 7 Chai Chamkat Phuenthi Laeo, Tae Thang Patibat Yang Mi Khoham Phoem Ma Ik), (*Lessons from the Public Assembly Act: Section 7 Restricts Areas but Additional Restrictions Remain in Practice*). https://www.ilaw.or.th/articles/52506

Internet Law Reform Dialogue (iLaw) 2025b, พ.ร.บ.ชุมนุมฯ คือกฎหมายปิดปากประชาชน หากไม่ปฏิรูปต้องยกเลิก (P. R. B. Chumnum Khue Kotmai Pitpak Prachachon, Hak Mai Patirup Tong Yokloek), (*The Public Assembly Act as a Law Silencing Citizens: Reform or Repeal*). https://www.ilaw.or.th/articles/52683

Isariyanon, S. & Isariyanon, M. 2025, บทบาทของเครือข่ายที่ดินแนวใหม่ชุมชนท้องถิ่นจัดการตนเองแห่งชาติ (คทช.) กับการพัฒนาพลเมืองในระบอบประชาธิปไตยในภาคตะวันออก (*Botbat Khong Khrueakhai Thidin Naeo Mai Chumchon Thongthin Chatkan Ton-eng Haeng Chat (Khothocho) Kap Kan Phatthana Phonlamueang Nai Rabop Prachathipatai Nai Phak Tawan-ok*), Fund Research Project, Burapha University, Chonburi.

Isariyanon, M. & Isariyanon, S. 2025, ความเป็นพลเมืองในระบอบประชาธิปไตยของผู้นำชุมชนท้องถิ่น: ศึกษาเปรียบเทียบระหว่างพื้นที่ในเขตและนอกเขตระเบียงเศรษฐกิจพิเศษภาคตะวันออก (Khwam Pen Phonlamueang Nai Rabop Prachathipatai Khong Phunam Chumchon Thongthin: Sueksa Priapthiap Rawang Phuenthi Nai Khet Lae Nok Khet Rabiang Setthakit Phiset Phak Tawan-ok), Fundamental Fund Research Project, Burapha University, Chonburi.

Jennings, B., Gusmano, M.K., Kaebnick, G.E., Neuhaus, C.P. & Solomon, M.Z. 2021, 'Civic learning for a democracy in crisis', *Hastings Center Report*, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. S2–S4. https://doi.org/10.1002/hast.1221

Jones, P. 2022, 'Toleration and neutrality', In: Sardoč, M. (ed.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Toleration*, Palgrave Macmillan, Cham, pp. 299-323. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-42121-2_7

Kawashima-Ginsberg, K., Siegel-Stechler, K. & Faraci, N. 2025, 'Understanding and promoting civic skills: Toward an integrated conception of civic competencies', In: Janmaat, J.G. & Dijkstra, A.B. (eds.), *Research Handbook on Education and Democracy*, Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham, pp. 102–124. https://doi.org/10.4337/9781803928111.00014

Karthikeya, N.V.B.S.S., Tripathi, N.K., Mozumder, C., Pal, I. & Pramanik, M. 2024, 'Impact of land transition around Eastern Economic Corridor in Thailand in the context of SDG 11.3.1 using urban heat islands, nighttime light intensity and machine learning', *Environmental and Sustainability Indicators*, vol. 24, article 100499. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indic.2024.100499

Khumsupa, M. 2021, 'The lens of micro counter-public in authoritarian Thailand 2006–2016', *Thammasat Review*, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 59–88. https://sc01.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/tureview/article/view/239975

Kiwan, D. 2005, 'Human Rights and Citizenship: An unjustifiable conflation?', *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, vol. 39, no. 1, pp. 37–50. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0309-8249.2005.00418.x

Kongkirati, P. 2015, การเมืองวัฒนธรรมไทย ว่าด้วยความทรงจำ/วาทกรรม/อำนาจ (Kan Mueang Watthanatham Thai Wa Duai Khwam Song Cham/Wathakam/Amnat), Sky Books, Bangkok.

Krueanuan, C. 2025, บทบาทของสภาองค์กรชุมชนกับการพัฒนาพลเมืองในระบอบประชาธิปไตยในภาคตะวันออก (Botbat Khong Sapha Ongkon Chumchon Kap Kan Phatthana Phonlamueang Nai Rabop Prachathipatai Nai Phak Tawan-ok), Fundamental Fund Research Project, Burapha University, Chonburi.

Krueanuan, C. & Charoenwong, S. 2013, การสร้างประชาธิปไตยชุมชนท้องถิ่นในจังหวัดสระแก้ว: ฐานการพัฒนาองค์กรปกครองท้องถิ่นจากภาคประชาชน (Kan Sang Prachathipatai Chumchon Thongthin Nai Changwat Sa Kaeo: Than Kan Phatthana Ongkon Pok Khrong Thongthin Chak Phak Prachachon), Thailand Research Fund, Bangkok.

Kuhonta, E.M. & Sinpeng, A. 2014, 'Democratic regression in Thailand: The ambivalent role of civil society and political institutions', *Contemporary Southeast Asia*, vol. 36, no. 3, pp. 333–355. https://doi.org/10.1355/cs36-3a

Kumar, A., Pal, I., Roy, J., Benjachat, N. & Pimpakhun, K. 2023, 'Critical infrastructure resilience in Eastern Economic Corridor of Thailand - A review', In: Pal, I. & Shaw, R. (eds.), *Multi-Hazard Vulnerability and Resilience Building*, Elsevier, pp. 363–382. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-323-95682-6.00021-8

Leelapatana, R. & Asanasak, S. 2022, 'Constitutional struggles and polarised identities in Thailand: The Constitutional Court and the gravitational pull of Thai-Ness upon liberal constitutionalism', *Federal Law Review*, vol. 50, no. 2, pp. 156–173. https://doi.org/10.1177/0067205X221087476

Marri, A.R. 2005, 'Building a framework for classroom-based multicultural democratic education: Learning from three skilled teachers', *Teachers College Record: The Voice of Scholarship in Education*, vol. 107, no. 5, pp. 1036–1059. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9620.2005.00503.x

Mascheroni, G. & Murru, M.F. 2017, '"I can share politics but I don't discuss it": Everyday practices of political talk on Facebook', *Social Media + Society*, vol. 3, no. 4. https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305117747849

McCargo, D. 2002, 'Security, development and political participation in Thailand: Alternative currencies of legitimacy', *Contemporary Southeast Asia*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 50–67. http://www.jstor.org/stable/25798579. https://doi.org/10.1355/CS24-1D

Michelbach, P.A. 2014, 'Deliberative democracy', In: Gibbons, M.T. (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Political Thought*, Wiley, pp. 842-851. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118474396.wbept0247

Milner, H.V. 2021, 'Is global capitalism compatible with democracy? Inequality, insecurity, and interdependence', *International Studies Quarterly*, vol. 65, no. 4, pp. 1097–1110. https://doi.org/10.1093/isq/sqab056

Nishiyama, K. 2019, 'Enabling children's deliberation in deliberative systems: Schools as a mediating space', *Journal of Youth Studies*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 473–488. https://doi.org/10.1080/13676261.2018.1514104

Oldfield, A. 1990, *Citizenship and Community: Civic Republicanism and the Modern World*, Routledge, London.

Pejo, E. & Kolaneci, E. 2024, 'The role of Roman Law in the formation of the state and modern law', *Statute Law Review*, vol. 45, no. 2, article hmae027. https://doi.org/10.1093/slr/hmae027

Perrin, A.J. 2005, 'Political microcultures: Linking civic life and democratic discourse', *Social Forces*, vol. 84, no. 2, pp. 1049–1082. https://doi.org/10.1353/sof.2006.0028

Phecharaburin, R. 2012, "เครือข่ายที่ดินแนวใหม่ท้องถิ่นจัดการตนเอง": วางผัง พัฒนาคน พิชิตความจนจากฐานราก ("Khrueakhai Thidin Naeo Mai Thongthin Chatkan Ton-eng": Wang Phang, Phatthana Khon, Phichit Khwam Chon Chak Than Rak). https://www.isranews.org/content-page/item/17599

Piyachart, C. 2011, *Greek–Roman Civilization: The Intellectual Foundations of Western Civilization*, Gypsy Publishing, Bangkok.

Ponok, N., Arunrat, N., Pumijumnong, N., Hamasaki, H. & Sereenonchai, S. 2021, 'Challenges of water policy involvement of the community in the East Coast River Basin of Thailand', *Water*, vol. 13, no. 23, article 3395. https://doi.org/10.3390/w13233395

Rostbøll, C.F. 2011, 'Freedom of expression, deliberation, autonomy and respect', *European Journal of Political Theory*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 5–21. https://doi.org/10.1177/1474885110386003

Ruminski, E.L., Reedy, J. & Black, L.W. 2021, 'Communication for development through dialogue, deliberation and civic media: How deliberative democracy and civic capital support social justice', In: Melkote, S.R. & Singhal, A. (eds.), *Handbook of Communication and Development*, Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham, pp. 15–39. https://doi.org/10.4337/9781789906356.00010

Sae Chua, B. 2025, 'Youth movements and evolving discourses of human rights in Thailand', In: Savirani, A. & Setiawan, K.M.P. (eds.), *Routledge Handbook of Human Rights in Southeast Asia*, Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003413813-32

Snitwongse Na Ayudhya, P. 2025, การสำรวจเชิงวิพากษ์กฎหมายที่เกี่ยวข้องกับการพัฒนาพลเมืองในระบอบประชาธิปไตยของประเทศไทย (Kan Samruat Choeng Wiphak Kotmai Thi Kiaokhong Kap Kan Phatthana Phonlamueang Nai Rabop Prachathipatai Khong Prathet Thai), Fundamental Fund Research Project, Burapha University, Chonburi.

Schuck, P. H. 2002, 'Liberal citizenship', In: Isin, E. F. & Turner, B. S. (eds.), *Handbook of Citizenship Studies*, Sage, London, pp. 132–144. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781848608276.n8

Searing, D. D., Conover, P. J. & Crewe, I. 2003, 'Citizenship in the age of liberalism', *Parliamentary Affairs*, vol. 56, no. 4, pp. 634–651. https://doi.org/10.1093/pa/gsg107

Smith, R.M. 2001, 'Citizenship: political', In: Smelser, N.J. & Baltes, P.B. (eds.), *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, Pergamon, pp. 1857–1860. https://doi.org/10.1016/B0-08-043076-7/01278-X

Streckfuss, D. 2011, *Truth on Trial in Thailand: Defamation, Treason, and Lèse-Majesté*, Routledge, London. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203847541

Suebvises, P. 2018, 'Social capital, citizen participation in public administration, and public sector performance in Thailand', *World Development*, vol. 109, pp. 236–248. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2018.05.007

Tanjaphatkul, N. 2020, ประชาธิปไตย-สิทธิมนุษยชนไม่ใช่แค่เนื้อหา แต่เป็นกระบวนการเรียนรู้และปฏิสัมพันธ์ระหว่างครู-นักเรียน (*Prachathipatai-Sitthimanutsayachon Mai Chai Khae Nueaha, Tae Pen Krabuankan Rianru Lae Pathisamphan Rawang Khru-Nakrian*) – Thai Civic Education, *The101.world*, 24 August. https://www.the101.world/thai-civic-education-interview/

Tantisunthorn, T. 2012, การศึกษาเพื่อสร้างพลเมือง (*Kan Sueksa Phuea Sang Phonlamueang*), Institute of Public Policy Studies, Bangkok.

Tantrajin, P. 2025, บทบาทของครูสังคมศาสตร์กับการพัฒนาพลเมืองในระบอบประชาธิปไตยในภาคตะวันออก (*Botbat Khong Khru Sangkhommasat Kap Kan Phatthana Phonlamueang Nai Rabop Prachathipatai Nai Phak Tawan-ok*), Fundamental Fund Research Project, Burapha University, Chonburi.

Tontisirin, N & Anantsuksomsri, S. 2021, 'Economic development policies and land use changes in Thailand: From the Eastern Seaboard to the Eastern Economic Corridor', *Sustainability*, vol. 13, no. 11, article 6153. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13116153

Wall, S. 2015, 'Liberalism, neutrality, and democracy', In: Wall, S. (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Liberalism*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 163–186. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139942478.010

Xetor, L. E. & Mensah, J. 2025, 'Inclusive growth and sustainable development nexus: where is the synergy?', *Sustainable Development*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 6189–6197. https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.3430