บทความวิจัยนี้เป็นงานวิจัยเชิงคุณภาพโดยใช้การวิเคราะห์เอกสารและการสัมภาษณ์ซึ่งมีวัตถุประสงค์การวิจัย 1) เพื่อศึกษาประเด็นที่เบี่ยงไปจากนโยบายการศึกษาอาเซียนปีค.ศ. 2009-2015และ 2) เพื่อกำหนดประเด็นแก้ไขปุ่ปุ่งให้ตรงต่อที่กับแผนแม่บทการพัฒนาพลเมืองอาเซียนอย่างยั่งยืนด้วยกรอบแนวคิดดาว 5 แฉกตามเป้าหมายโลกปีค.ศ. 2030และยุทธศาสตร์อาเซียนปีค.ศ. 2025

การเลือกผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยใช้การกำหนดคุณสมบัติแบบเฉพาะเจาะจงซึ่งผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยคือโรงเรียนพี่น้องและโรงเรียนแนวตะเข็บชายแดนและโรงเรียนศูนย์อาเซียนจำนวน 10 แห่งผู้ให้สัมภาษณ์จำนวน 31 คนซึ่งเป็นผู้บริหารสถานศึกษา ครูรับผิดชอบโครงการอาเซียนและครูสอนสาระอาเซียน เครื่องมือการวิจัยเป็นการสังเคราะห์เอกสารแบบอุปนัยและแบบสัมภาษณ์ซึ่งผ่านการประเมินคุณภาพค่าสอดคล้องระหว่างข้อคำถามกับวัตถุประสงค์หรือ IOC จำนวนทั้งสิ้น 34 ข้อ ข้อค้นพบการวิจัยเมื่อวิเคราะห์นโยบายทางการศึกษาและบริการการศึกษาพบประเด็นจำนวนมากที่ต้องการปรับปรุงแก้ไขเนื่องจากทางการศึกษายังเบี่ยงจากแนวคิดหลักเมื่อนำไปปฏิบัติจริงในระดับโรงเรียนอาทิ 1) การเบี่ยงแนวคิดหลักทางเลือกนโยบายในความเป็นจริงนโยบายการศึกษาได้มาจากนโยบายที่นำเสนอเกี่ยวกับอาเซียนและวัฒนธรรมแห่งชาติตามวัตถุประสงค์และเป้าหมายอย่างไรก็ตามกรณีของนโยบายการศึกษาอาเซียนนี้ไม่ได้พิจารณาถึงการวิเคราะห์ความต้องการทุนทรัพย์มนุษย์ระดับภูมิภาคในมุมความต้องการและความต้องการระดับชาติเพื่อให้ตอบสนองความต้องการทุนทรัพย์มนุษย์ระดับภูมิภาคอย่างจริงจังเมื่อเข้าสู่ประชาคมอาเซียนปีค.ศ. 2016-2025 2) การขาดความเข้าใจแนวปฏิบัติระหว่างสภาพการณ์โลกและปรากฏการณ์ในระดับชาติและวัฒนธรรมอาเซียนเพียงอย่างเดียวไม่ครอบคลุมถึงสภาพการณ์ความต้องการความมั่นคงและการเมืองสังคมประชาคมอาเซียนในอนาคตและวัฒนธรรมอาเซียนที่ก่อขึ้นจริงปีค.ศ. 2016ซึ่งคาดหวังปรากฏการณ์การเคลื่อนย้ายพลเมืองเสรีระหว่างภูมิภาคอาเซียนและระดับโลกอย่างยั่งยืนตามเป้าหมายโลกปีค.ศ. 2030และยุทธศาสตร์อาเซียนปีค.ศ. 2025เป็นต้น
Abstract

The research was qualitative research and aimed to answer two following questions. 1. Is there any misleading ASEAN school policy before entering ASEAN during 2009-2015 that is not ready to serve Three Pillars of ASEAN and under the framework of 5-Point-Star of ASEAN Sustainability goals? 2. Is there any points to refine ASEAN school public policy under the framework of 5-Point Stars of ASEAN Sustainability?

There were 32 interviewees (school directors, ASEAN Focus School project managers, teachers). The research tools included 1) synthesized policy documents with induction method and 34-item- interview questionnaires which passed IOC (> .66). The research findings from an analysis of education management found several areas of improvement. 1) There was misconception of the main policy of ASEAN people connectivity in real life of ASEAN needs. The ASEAN school policy followed the national and domestic conditions of Thai context focusing on national culture (languages, costume, symbol, dance) which have not yet been compatible to the needs of ASEAN citizenship in international arena and demands on people value, technical and professional skills to support highly shortage of workforce and warm welcome of ASEAN transformation atmosphere to fit European, American and China’s perspectives. 2) There was a lack of synchronized policy practice among three pillars of ASEAN, for example, Political and Security Pillar, Economics and Trade Pillars from top policy to individual schools and student levels. The bureaucratic nature of Thai school administration policy and the educational sector could not get access to any real and virtual information regarding trades and industries either in Thailand and oversea investors and ASEAN key political and trade players. 3) The outcome of policy revealed that the ASEAN school administration was not in accordance to the global citizenship demands for high skills and international mindset and a global and ASEAN citizenship as per 2017 human capital plan in Year 2016. The 2016 onward expectation to fulfill Thai citizen gap was focused on ASEAN-Thai students and highly skilled workforce mobility both for ASEAN and global levels as per execution of ASEAN strategy 2025 as Sustainability and Development in Global Agenda (SDGs) 2030.

KeyWords: ASEAN School Policy, ASEAN Roadmap 2025, Global Agenda 2030, Sufficiency Economy, ASEAN Connectivity Building 2025, China and ASEAN
Introduction

After 2015, Thailand had already become an ASEAN membership with a decade of several successful transformations under ASEAN Roadmap 2004-2015 which was the result of ASEAN Declaration and three-pillars of ASEAN strategy during 2009-2015. At an initial stage, Thailand focused on the development of ASEAN citizens and personnel continuously with regular updates on development strategy, by preparing for guidelines in management of public schools between 1999-2013 (Wisalaporn et al., 2010) Until 2015, the government had announced the urgent needs to make students ready to be a member of ASEAN by building ASEAN awareness and understanding cultural differences among ethnics (Rattanasuwan, 2015).

By considering the total outcome of 2009-2015 ASEAN school policy implementation in order to as per ASEAN roadmap 2015 and Three Pillars of ASEAN strategy in reality for 2016-2025. It was found that Thailand has strongly focused on openness to all ethnicities and cultural differences which was a part of three pillars of ASEAN. However, Thai students are not yet prepared to support economics of trading, also high-skilled labor with universal and political views to be able to adapt to the global and ASEAN transformation. In addition, there was the areas of improvement ASEAN School Policy Implementation for Sustainability 2025. The results from inefficient 2009-2015 Policy in Action and implementation as per ASEAN school implementation (Secretariat of ASEAN, 2016) were some mismatched and Policy Predictions and Alternatives of ASEAN educational policy to fit ASEAN Blueprint 2025 and Global demands 2030 which escalated from inefficient 2009-2015 policy building and alternatives. There were still much room of future ASEAN school system policy and resources improvement in remote borders next to the ASEAN neighboring countries (Jawantoom & Phoonsuk, 2012)

By considering existing school policy execution with expected outcome of Sufficiency Economy Philosophy of King Rama IX (hereafter SEPs) (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2016), there were 6 misconceptions regarding core of the theory in its implementation and not fit to current situations and life styles. Heavy investment in traditional agriculture-based knowledge in school system was unlikely to fit the digital world and existing economy and sources of community local household income structures, ignoring all digital commercial skills in schools which was the primary citizenship skills in the 21st century. There was a lack of modernization and synchronized policy practice among three pillars of ASEAN, for instance, Political and Security Pillar, Economics and Trade Pillars from top policy to individual schools and student levels. The bureaucratic nature of Thai school administration policy and the educational
sector could not get access to any real and virtual information regarding trades and industries either in Thailand and oversea investors and ASEAN key political and trade players during 2016-2030.

Together with other developments on trading and investment stage under World Economic Forum 2017 (World Economic Forum, 2016) and Sustainability and Development in Global Agenda (SDGs) 2030 for human resources sustainability of the United Nations (UNESCO, 2017) as well as ASEAN Connectivity Building of Regional level in 2025 (ASEAN, 2016), it seemed that public schools still not included in the ASEAN community existing economic trends and community sustainability into their student skills, knowledge and attitudes as expected in 2016.

Therefore, if the change of ASEAN borderline economic system entire the Thailand country and ASEAN mobility as its mission since ASEAN Roadmap 2015 ASEAN, 2016). With the needs of free mobility and oversea investment flow in, there were assessed insufficient cross-nationalities, working attitudes, and respect the differences of ethnic and religions of the 21st century professional skills as human capital demands. There was assessed at the high level of urgent development of AEC knowledge for the modern world which was consistent with exact global demands of skilled workforce from World Economic Forum in 2017 and Professional Qualification Association (2014) While it was found that some ASEAN-Thai citizens still lack of international calibers and visual understanding about the changing lifestyles to fit different historical roots, races in-depth level including the diverse political system beliefs. There were strong resistance in cross cultural adaptability when foreigners applied for a permanent job in some areas and anti-feeling to impractical and intangible education based on Sufficiency Economy Philosophy (SEPs) in ASEAN school policy implementation because the theory cannot synchronize to real life incomes for basic costs of living. The ASEAN school given knowledge was not equipped with skills and generated income for students and their communities.

The ASEAN school policy implementation was based on economics and career model of SEPs in 1999. Therefore, during 2015-2016, the economic lifestyles and trends of ASEAN had been shifted to cyber lifestyles and harmony one belt initiatives focus. However, the learning method and school administration had not yet been changed. Its The classroom lectures were still focused on agricultural careers causing the lowering income of household at ASEAN borders comparing to 2010-2014. The misconception of curricular design was also slowing down the rate of growth in ASEAN economics development (AEM and ARC Council, 2017). Moreover, the national policy was changed to workforce skills development program.
2014-2016 to serve the Government to Government level (G2G) in pure agriculture projects at high risk of non-export market commitment from China and EU merging because it was not the trend and local people demands. The root cause of misconception SEPs is agriculture-based education regarding Sufficiency Economy Philosophy (SEPs) deployment (Wibulswasdi, et al., 2011) were recognized that it was the 1990’s model by Man-Pattana foundation but not suitable for 2016-2030 domestic and oversea industrial and community and market demands. The non-predictable ASEAN student competencies made Thais failed to supply the strong demands during 2009-2016. For example, emerging modern skills of cyber marketing and heritage tourism entrepreneurialism, micro-industrial skills in healthcare industries and electronics and automotive manufacturing were actual causes of unclear ASEAN educations policy in 2016. Besides, even students pertained emerging modern skills 2016-2030 trends but the political differences between Thailand and the western countries since 2014 impacted non-committed Thai labor force employment from free trade market investors. The ASEAN growth plan in 2016 onward which even more making ASEAN education directions were unclear demands and intangible outcome to ASEAN people connectivity and development in 2014-2017. Also, the ASEAN-EU collaboration for foreign education and teacher exchanges were ceased.

Therefore, in order to exercise public school policy effectively and sustainably at the 4th era of industry, the policy might be changed skills and ratios of workforce needs based on Sustainability and Development in Global Agenda (SDGs) 2030 labor market and its real supply chain for Thailand cases also partnership countries with ASEAN Roadmap and ASEAN connectivity building demands for 2025 as predicted in World economic forum 2017. The ASEAN school policy makers must increase human capital values at border trades serving a high demand on cultural and heritage tourism and other highly skilled in food producers, handmade and arts, electronics, and healthcare and hospitality service industries which were strengths of Thailand rather than focusing on only basic agricultural education and occupations in public formal school learning for SEPs (Wibulswasdi, et al., 2011) which is not fit to nowadays workforce demand and commercial life style.

This qualitative research was aimed to respond to research questions in order to solve real ASEAN school policy implementation. (1) Is there any misleading in ASEAN school policy before entering ASEAN during 2009-2015 that is not ready to serve Three Pillars of ASEAN and under the framework of 5-Point-Star of ASEAN Sustainability goals? (2) Is there any points to refine ASEAN school public policy under the framework of 5-Point Stars of ASEAN Sustainability?
The findings of research would be beneficial to analyze which part of educational policy needs to be improved for entire public school system to serve modern situation and world socio and economics trends. As a result, the research result would be applied for educational policy driving ASEAN school citizens to enable them to fit into ASEAN connectivity building 2025, ASEAN Roadmap 2025, Human Capital Needs of 2017 ASEAN investment in Thailand from World Economic Forum 2016 meeting, and Global Agenda 2030 with a sustainability concept of H.M. the King Rama IX in nowadays situations.

Objectives

There were two objectives which included:

1. Is there any misleading in ASEAN school policy before entering ASEAN during 2009-2015 that is not ready to serve Three Pillars of ASEAN and under the framework of 5-Point-Star of ASEAN Sustainability goals?

Conceptual Framework

2. Is there any points to refine ASEAN school public policy under the framework of 5-Point Stars of ASEAN Sustainability?

The researcher analyzed the ASEAN school policy based on 10 core concepts regarding ASEAN people development as follows.

Part I: Public Policy Analysis Process: Implementation

From the Figure 1 Policy Analysis derived from the empirical situations which nation stated public problems with interfere national development. To solve the problems, policymakers must conduct analysis from various sources of information to identify exact root cause problems. Then, policy makers design policy alternatives which can hit to the problems right away at the cost wise and do the Feasibility and Affordability and Desirability Summary for Policy Decision makers to approve and forward to planning and implementation steps. By doing so, if the results are good, issues are solved, impact is good then this plan go ahead.

If the Impact (“C”) is not as expected, then policy makers go for the Faults in Policy (“D”) implementation to revise planning (“E”) and implementation (“F”) with a modification of plans. Finally, after re-implementation, the policy makers must do analysis again to ensure that all policy turn results as expected.

Most of the times, people assess impacts and evaluated without going to detail of situation and planning revision and used very generic outcome achievements that not really server situations problems. Then, after the policy are expired, the old problems were still continued without visible changes after policy implementation.
Part II: Before entering ASEAN 2015: human resources development direction

2.1 Three Pillars of ASEAN in Education:

Three Pillars of ASEAN was the initial concepts of preparing each nation of ASEAN membership to ready being as a union by giving a conceptual framework of ASEAN Strategy 2015 which were 1) ASEAN Political – Security Community (APSC) 2) ASEAN Economic Community (AEC) 3) ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community (ASCC), and for Educational was a part of ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community (ASCC) focusing on creating a cultural ethnical and languages differences to serve ASEAN strategy in producing ASEAN citizenship skills and mindset at the national level of Thailand’s Policy.
Part III: After entering ASEAN 2016: human resources development direction

The 5-Point-Star of ASEAN demands on human capital needs 2016-2025 were composed of 5 sources of human capital demands by following blueprints and Philosophy

3.1 ASEAN Sustainability and Development in Global Agenda 2030 (SDGs): UNESCO and UNDP’s 2030 Agenda has announced the concept of sustainable development of human resources for modern human and global citizens in the future on 1st January, 2016 to develop human resources to be into the era of Global agenda 2030 or “17 Goals to transform our World with Sustainable Development Goals” This is to preserve stability, happiness, safety, and well-being of the citizens and better the world and society.

The report on the needs for human resources from Human Capital Outlook Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), the needs for human resources labor of ASEAN on global stage from the study and assessment of the World Economic Forum that predicts 2017. When considering from the actual condition and research data, it was found that Thailand, when compared to the ASEAN member countries, is still not ready for Start-up, or the digital economy of new industries.

3.3 Sufficiency Economy Philosophy (SEPs) 1999 of H.M. The King Rama IX:
The key principles of philosophy of developing Thai citizens on ASEAN stage is on the reason of morality, sufficiency economy philosophy. It focuses on the building of good mind, ethics, patience, and perseverance and sharing and kindness towards human being without discrimination against religion or race. (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of Thailand, 2016).

However, there were always found misconception for SEPs implementation to 1997 context and practices caused ignorance the existing 2017 situations and technology and natural disasters causing Thais had never overcome the poverty in 4th era of digital economy (Wibulswasdi, et al., (2011) which the research would give nowadays examples for recommendation i.e. pure agricultural based which over supply causing non-skilled labors, lack of awareness of logical and creativity based on Thai arts into application to theoretical research for publication, sufficiency misleading to 1) self-sufficient causing ignorance and no motivation for healthy wealth and self-development. 2) Focusing own heritage and cultural roots was misinterpreted into anti- Western-culture and promoting extreme nationalism causing to poverty and out of date country to the reality. 3) The community financial independence was misinterpreted to be conventional monoculture of agriculture which
might not fit to the future situations and people had no accounting and entrepreneurial mindset to make village commerce. 4) Cutting all comfort home appliance and living in caves or huts to be non-materialism which not reasonable and rationale of spending habit. 5) Anti-technology of agriculture, water shortage solutions to dig the pond by overlooking other low cost less water technology in nowadays desert agricultures practices. 6) Wrong Forecast Demand/Supply of plantation by only the regular orders without caring the one year pre-plan for natural disasters and the oversupply products.

3.4 ASEAN Roadmap 2015 and recent ASEAN Roadmap 2025 of Thailand:

During the ASEAN summit between 21-22 November, 2015 at Kuala Lumpur, the leaders had signed in Kuala Lumpur Declaration on the ASEAN Roadmap 2025: forgoing Ahead together, which was the announcement to certify the ASEAN Connectivity Building 2025 and AEC Blueprint 2025. Such plan specifies the direction for economic integration of ASEAN within 10 years ahead (2016-2025).

For Thailand Adoption on economy, the prime minister proposes that ASEAN should maintain a balance between the building of strong economy together with sustainable development so that the people would be taken care of and can befit from the economic expansion comprehensively and equally, with the use of innovation.

For Thailand Adoption on human resources development: Thailand proposes that the development of potential of people of all ages should be done with balance, including juveniles who are important in driving ASEAN community in the industrial revolution era 4 called Thailand 4.0, by providing knowledge and education and training from government, at the same time. It must be prepared for handling the change into the society of the elderly in the future, in order to promote good quality of lives and the participation in economic activities.

For Thailand Adoption on connectivity: The prime minister encourages the connectivity and growth of economy of ASEAN together with the maintaining of stability and security within the region so that the traveling among people could be smoothly done. The prime minister proposes that ASEAN should speed up in promoting connectivity in 5 aspects including sustainable infrastructure, digital innovation, seamless logistics, excellence in rules and regulations, and transportation of people.

3.5 ASEAN Connectivity Building Strategy 2025: According to the ASEAN Summit 17th in October, 2010 at Hanoi, Vietnam, the MPAC was certified as the framework of cooperation in order to build connectivity among one another by focusing on the expansion and association within ASEAN as the primary one, which would be the basic in connecting
out to ASEAN in the future. The ASEAN Connectivity Building Strategy has divided the link into three main aspects including physical connectivity, institutional connectivity, and People to People connectivity. The members of committee focuses on the existing link in the region (enhance ASEAN connectivity) by focusing on the missing links in various aspects including (1) investing national infrastructure development covering multi-modal transportation and supply chain & logistic systems. (2) Modifying rules and regulations of trading and investment to be consistent. (3) Promoting of people to travel to meet one another conveniently by building understanding and boosting good relationship among people via the exchange of study, culture, and tourism.

Part IV: A Balancing and Harmonious Society Philosophy

4.1 Lao Zi’s Yin-Yang Philosophy: The concept of Yin Yang Philosophy was created by Lao Zi, a Chinese ancient philosopher. It was counted as the east countries roots of belief. The core of the concept is that everything in the world had two sides black and white. Sometimes the society would fall into conflicts and poverty. The pure goodness with white society were impossible, the middle points and paths of every world creature was the best position to make all citizens happy and have peace. The law of balance and harmony was a universal law. The wisdom leaders must look for a balance of a total world success to be successful in ruling people with happiness and sustainability in Globalization with Sustainability.

Research Methodology

Theoretical framework

The theoretical framework of ASEAN 5-Point-Star concept derived from integrating the five cores of conceptual theories from the literature review in the previous part to make a harmonious and balanced society as the ASEAN unity. “Lao Zi’s Yin and Yang Philosophy” has driven the entire ASEAN countries into the middle path of races, beliefs, political points of view, trade systems, educational systems with no crashes among ASEAN countries as well as Western countries and North Asian investors gaps. As a result, a total outcome become even more at peace for the global citizenship than being separately among east/west people by universal and cosmic laws.
Research Sampling

The research samples were applied specific sampling techniques to attain 10 schools in ASEAN borders, locations, and interviewed 31 people between 2014-2017 by the structured interview questions based on a combination of School System theory and Internet of Things (IoT) of smart school applications for the global transformation in 21st century. The 36 items qualified interviews and observation tools was validated by two experts of e-learning tool with the IOC values > .66 that was appropriate with ASEAN school needs.

There were 31 interviewees from 10 out of 64 specific sampling schools. The school population were 1) ASEAN buffer schools, 2) sister schools, 3) ASEAN spirit school implementation announced by Ministry of Education since 2009. All sampling schools were located at the borderline areas of provinces connected with ASEAN member countries or the Thailand special economic zones in the provinces connected with neighboring countries including Burma, Laos, and Malaysia.

Results

This research studied the ASEAN educational policy which has been implemented since 2009-2015. There were some certain misconception and misleading of ASEAN school policy plan and implementation at a school level which also interfered in the development. There was not linked among each core policies before 2015 and also not linked any school implemented human capital demands during 2016-2030 yet (B. to F. from the Table 1 below).
As per Table 1, a timeline of relevant ASEAN school implementations by each sources of human capital needs information and research predicted the expected school policy outcome which this researched analyzing policy impact, policy plan, policy implementation and alternatives by applying POLICY ANALYSIS PROCESS framework to ensure complete all analysis as per Figure 1 mentioned before. The key findings were as follows:

1) Misleading policy misleading alternatives in reality

The educational policy derived its policy of introducing ASEAN and each national cultures as objectives and goals.. However, the policy lacked of in-depth macro policy research about exact human capital knowledge and skills that Thai students needed to support the community changes after entering ASEAN to welcome new people and investments in 2016-2025.
2) Missing linkage among policies of ASEAN adoption in Thailand

The sources of policy formulation were relied on only local ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community (ASCC) while were not designed for education of ASEAN Political–Security Community (APSC) as well as not connected to ASEAN Economic Community (AEC). Moreover, in the policy implementation plan and execution, it was found that schools gained no support from non-school sectors because of the characters of silo management of bureaucratic management style.

3) Misleading global and ASEAN workforce and human capital demand strategy based upon 5 Point-Star Framework

In order to develop ASEAN workforce and human capital demand in designing policy alternatives from research process resulting fault in policy plan. Once entering ASEAN, both teachers and students lack of comprehensive ASEAN understanding and knowledge by 5 Point-Star sources of human capital needs index of ASEAN students in 2016-2025 even 2009-2015 there were found incomplete policy plans. Such as:

3.1) The First Point Star was implemented to serve “human capital needs for the World Economic Forum 2017”. There was a skilled labor shortage on the ASEAN borders of Thailand. In addition, failure to integrate education, economics and security demands and the existing cross borders acts for free mobility were discovered. The gap of the First Point Star was between existing World Human capital demands, especially in 2017 and demands for high skilled labors.

3.2) The Second Point Star served the “Global Agenda 2030 for human resources sustainability”. There was still no integration of school contents and activities in public schools. In addition, by implementing Global Agenda 2030 on sustainability for the people and communities and ASEAN schools needed to improve people’s attitude about environmental sustainability. In reality, there was no community involvement into school and right fit core curricula after 2016. The gap of the Second Point Star was between significant health and environment concerns by the government. However, for the people, the real life situation and the problems of human rights and local people conflict through 2014-2016 and the concerns for health issues and becoming a full members of ASEAN.

3.3) The Third Point Star which served “ASEAN Roadmap 2025” and the existing policy execution in 2016 resulting from 2009-2015 ASEAN school roadmap did meet only ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community (ASCC) out of a total three pillars strategies expected goals while there were absence of ASEAN Security Community–ASC Pillar and ASEAN Economic Community Pillar to existing school administration, during the research gaps were found,
required integration education in all entire society economy and political and security purposes with tangible outcome. In addition, school leaders and teachers still lacked of real multi-cultural diversity experience, efficient change communication system and tools among ASEAN schools. The problem of the gap of the Third Point Star, ASEAN Roadmap 2025 and National Thailand 4.0, was no short-term and quick-win strategy of human capital development program that generated income and overcome poverty’ when compared with other prior researches.

3.4) The Fourth Point Star which served the “ASEAN Connectivity Building 2025” in which there was much room for improvement in serving the existing goals of connecting ASEAN members and giving them free mobility for a decade e.g. such members cannot enter another country without visas, which prevents them from working and studying aboard, although ASEAN had assured its members that they would be able to do so.

There also continued to exist a lack of visualization and understanding of future ASEAN mobility lifestyles by school administration, teachers and students in 2016. People continue to focus only on a strategic plan of building infrastructure and construction of transportation, e.g. railroads, while at the same time, they ignore the problems of the absence of a lingua franca, such as English, which would help ASEAN members communicate among each other. ASEAN members also seemed to misunderstand ASEAN community expectations of the roles of community members.

3.5) The Fifth Point Star served the “Sufficiency Economy Model of H.M. King Rama IX”. The Thai political system transformed itself dramatically from being an extreme capitalism to the “Sufficiency Economy Model of H.M. King Rama IX” in 1999. The gap of the Fifth Point Star concerned differences between the Thai school policy implementation and expectations of the “Sufficiency Economy Philosophy (SEPs) of H.M. the King Rama IX”. Thai people nowadays practice it since it was established in 1999. While not adaptive to existing global demand 2017- 2030, the local people were frustrated on lowering half of their income before ASEAN opening transformation. 1) self-sufficient causing ignorance and no motivation for healthy wealth and self-development. 2) Focusing own heritage and cultural roots was misinterpreted into anti- Western-culture. 3) The community focused on monoculture of agriculture. 4) Extremely show off or economical. 5) Anti-technology of Agriculture. 6) Wrong Forecast Demand/ Supply of plantation. In conclusion of all 5 Point-Star research frameworks findings, there were still found room for school policy improvements regarding problems of misunderstanding culture and political system that overlook the poverty and environment issues in the rural and borders of Thailand and minorities well-being, inequality of races,
gender, religion and insufficient basic social welfare. This political view gap of trade and local community stuck ASEAN Roadmap 2015 and also 2025 local community economic expansion.

Discussion

During 2009-2015, the school policies achieved its Ministry of Education policy plan successfully. When compared details of the real AEC customer demand side in community 2016, it was found that the prior decade ASEAN school administration system was focused on only culture and language skills. This development was incapable to produce AEC 2016 onward toward industrial and economics demands it was consistent to the policy statement of (Rattanasuwan, D., 2015). It was found that:

1) Policy misleading alternatives in reality: The educational policy derived its policy of introducing ASEAN and each national cultures as objectives and goals problem. However, the policy lacked of in-depth macro policy research about exact human capital knowledge and skills Thai students needed to support the community changes after entering ASEAN to welcome new people and investments in 2016-2025.

2) Linkage among policies of ASEAN adoption in Thailand: The sources of policy formulation were relied on only local ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community (ASCC) that was not designed for education of ASEAN Political – Security Community (APSC) as well as not link up to ASEAN Economic Community (AEC). Moreover, in the policy implementation plan and execution, it was found that schools gained no support from non-school sectors because the characters of silo management of bureaucratic management style.

3) Missing global and ASEAN strategy based upon 5 Point-Star Framework In order to develop ASEAN workforce and human capital demand in designing Policy Alternatives from research process resulting in fault policy planning. Once entering ASEAN, both teachers and students lacked of comprehensive ASEAN understanding and knowledge by 5 Point-Star sources of human capital needs index of ASEAN students in 2016-2025 even 2009-2015 there were found incomplete policy plans. Such as:

3.1) The First Point Star “human capital needs for World Economic Forum 2017”. There was a high skilled labor shortage on the ASEAN borders of Thailand. In addition, failure to integrate education, economics and security demands and the existing cross borders acts for free mobility were discovered. The gap of the First Point Star was between existing World Human capital demands, especially in 2017 and demands for highly skilled labor. This was consistent with Human Capital Outlook 2017 of World Economic Forum.
3.2) The Second Point Star, there was a gap between significant health and environment concerns by the government. However, for the people development sides, the real life situation and the problem of human right and local people conflict through 2014-2016 and the concerns for health issues and becoming a full members of ASEAN. This was consistent with the report of ASEAN investment plan (2017) that expands the investment in ASEAN found the needs of improvement in the transportation of capital and labor force of Thailand.

3.3) The Third Point Star, the existing policy execution in 2016 resulting from 2009-2015 ASEAN school roadmap did meet only ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community–ASCC out of a total three pillars strategies expected goals while there were absence of ASEAN Security Community–ASC Pillar and ASEAN Economic Community Pillar to existing school administration, during the research gaps were found, required integrated education in all entire society, economy, political and security purposes with the tangible outcome. In addition, school leaders and teachers still lacked real multi-cultural diversity experience, efficient change communication system and tools among ASEAN schools. The problem of the gap of the Third Point Star, ASEAN Roadmap 2025 and National Thailand 4.0 was no short-term and quick-win strategy human capital development program that generated income and overcome poverty. When compared with other prior research, this high skilled labor mismatch was consistent with the report of the Kasikorn Thai Research Center (2015) and the report of Professional Qualification Association in the year of 2014. Also the finding was consistent to the 2017 Human capital outlook for ASEAN in World Economic Forum 2017 forecast (2016).

3.4) The Fourth Point Star the “ASEAN Connectivity Building 2025” in which there is much room for improvements in serving the existing goals of connecting ASEAN members and giving them free mobility for a decade, e.g. such members cannot enter another country without visas, which prevents them from working and studying aboard, although ASEAN had assured its members that they would be able to do so. There also continued to exist a lack of visualization and understanding of future ASEAN mobility lifestyles by school administrations, teachers and students in 2016. People continued to focus only on strategic planning of building infrastructure and construction of transportation. ASEAN members also seemed to misunderstand ASEAN community expectations of the roles of community members which was consistent to the right e-learning content and mobile tool design comply to the expected professional skills consistent were critical on for new skills and attitude change as a finding of Jane-akson et al., (2014) who found that new media
e-learning system would help increase efficiency of ASEAN students and teachers for new topic of course development.

3.5) The Fifth Point Star. The gap of the Fifth Point Star concerned between the Thai school policy implementation and what to the “Sufficiency Economy Philosophy (SEP) of H.M. the King Rama IX” expects Thai people to do and sustainability in nowadays life practice 1) Self-sufficiency caused ignorance and no motivation for healthy wealth and self-development. 2) Focusing own heritage and cultural roots was misinterpreted into anti-Western culture and promoting extreme nationalism causing to poverty. 3) The community financial independence was misinterpreted to be conventional monoculture of agriculture which might not fit to the future situations and people had no accounting and entrepreneurial mindset to make village commerce. 4) Cutting all comfort home appliance and living in cave or hut to be non-materialism which not reasonable and rationale of spending habit. 5) Anti-technology of Agriculture, Water shortage solutions to dig the pond by overlooking other low cost less water technology in nowadays desert agricultures practices. 6) Wrong forecast demand/ supply of plantation by only the regular orders without caring the one year pre-plan for natural disasters and the oversupply products which was consistent to a practical approach toward Sustainable Development. Sufficiency Economy Philosophy (SEP) of Ministry of Foreign Affairs version but not fit to the remark in application introduced often misconception of SEP by Wibulswasdi et al., (2011) which the Gist of SEP originated by H.M. the King Rama 9 in 1999.

In conclusion, by following the balance model “Five-Point-Star Analysis of ASEAN Human Capital Development Needs”, the public school policy makers and school leaders will be able to catch up to the trend by their own communities and drive Thailand growth and sustainability.

Recommendations

Research Implication

1. There should be connectivity of needs of the community, trade, commerce, industry and tourism into the academic part of the provincial educational institute to become a single picture.

2. There should be a revision of local educational policy and administration which fits to human capital outlook 2017 and border conflicts causing from the differences of races and religion and political points of views.
3. There should be a digital mobile e-learning that visualized the workforce mobility, emerging opportunity and how to perform jobs for school leaders, school teachers, parents and students to see the expected outcome in 2025 and 2030.

Future Research

1. There were multiple ASEAN school types. In order to support the exact demands of human capital from the elementary to secondary schools and authentic needs of community on the borders of Thailand.

2. The research samples should focus on border schools and update the list school by geographical location not the announcement for gaining exact atmosphere.

3. The school public policy should include economic, trade and security demands into the ASEAN policy development to be constructed validity for analysis.
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