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Abstract

Perceptions of grassroots economies during the modernizing process can fluctuate between the view that they should be reduced as they are less productive and too informal, and that they should be maintained in an effort to realize an inclusive society. This paper focuses on the ‘Policy of Returning Walkways to the Public’ (PRWP), implemented in Bangkok, Thailand, which is a strict policy to control street vending businesses, a typical informal grassroots economy. We analyze the consequences of the policy, and clarify how a government should best address the issue.

The PRWP was initiated in 2014, drastically reducing the Temporary Permitted Areas (TPAs) for street vending in Bangkok, and resulting in a huge decrease from 683 TPAs with 20,275 vendors to 205 TPAs with 6,069 vendors in 2018. The strict clearing of street food vendors (SFVs) from the main streets caused tri-polarization of SFV businesses as follows: (1) relocating to backstreets if businesses were small with low costs (majority); (2) moving to private areas if their business was good and high rent affordable; and (3) giving up the SFV business and changing jobs. However, SFVs that upgraded to permanent restaurants, shops, or stalls in shopping malls were a minority. Although the PRWP achieved smooth pedestrian traffic in Bangkok main streets, it has destroyed economic and living opportunities, especially among vulnerable groups (lower educated female workers from poor regions), and they have become more marginalized by relocating to backstreets.
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1. Introduction

Perceptions of grassroots economies during the modernizing process fluctuates between the view that they should be reduced as they are less productive and too informal, and that they should be supported in the effort to realize an inclusive society. A grassroots economy is one “that meets every-day needs by providing taken-for-granted services and goods” (Bentham et al., 2013). Sometimes, a ‘grassroots economy’ is called an ‘informal economy’ because it is “very large, mostly unglamorous, rather heterogeneous, and distributed across the country” (Bentham et al., 2013). Porter and Haller (2002) found that the term grassroots economy was interpreted as an “urban way of doing things”, as it is: (1) easy to enter with little skill or capital; (2) a form of family business; (3) a small-scale operation; (4) uses labour and outdated technology; (5) is an unorganized and highly competitive market; and (6) features low productivity and low capital accumulation. Thus, in the development process, grassroots economies play an important role, representing half of gross domestic product (GDP) in 110 countries around the world (Schneider, 2002), involving a huge portion of employment.
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In the modernizing process with high economic growth, however, states tend to be impatient to formalize their socioeconomics and accelerate the shift of the labour force to more productive sectors. This often goes against the concept of inclusive development. Street food vendor (SFV) businesses in a typical grassroots economy are an easy target for such formalization policies, due to their informality and occupation of public spaces, creating obstacles for pedestrian traffic, as well as raising hygiene and city beautification issues. Governments face the issue of how best to manage public road space properly while ensuring employment/income opportunities for SFVs and access to the fruits of economic growth for vulnerable groups.

The status of street vending in Bangkok has also oscillated with the modernization of Thai society and changes of government policy in areas such as economic development, urban management, and health and hygiene (Maglumtong and Fukushima, 2018). Due to the implementation of the ‘Policy of Returning Walkways to the Public’ (PRWP) in 2014, which sought to cancel all the Temporary Permitted Areas (TPAs) for street vending in Bangkok, the number of registered street vendors decreased dramatically, from 20,275 persons in 683 TPAs in 2014 to 6,069 persons in 205 TPAs in 2018. This number includes both food vending (61.0%) and non-food vending (39.0%) businesses (BMA, 2013). It appears that street vending will disappear soon, although the number of unregistered vendors is unknown.

We can abstract the PRWP as a radical formalization of street vending in a modernizing society. This raises some questions: what are consequences of this policy on street vendors and their businesses? Thus, this study has three main objectives: (1) to clarify the PRWP framework and actual implementation; (2) to evaluate the impact of PRWP on the street vendors by analyzing characteristics of survivors of the policy and its impact by different implementation areas; and (3) to analyze the way the government should treat street vending from the viewpoint of inclusive development. It seeks to provide an overall understanding of the policy impact on SFVs, and to clarify the implications for creating more inclusive street management. As the majority of street vendors engage in food vending business, this study focuses on SFVs.

Several studies have discussed contemporary street vending in Bangkok. Nirathron (2005) observed that the majority of street vendors were females in an age range from 30s–60s, originating in the Northeast region, the poorest part of Thailand. Maneepong and Walsh (2012:37) revealed that after the Asian Financial Crisis in 1997, a new generation of street vendors emerged who sell value-added products in strategic locations or tourist areas, earn a high income, work less than six hours a day, and are well-educated. Maglumtong and Fukushima (2018) reviewed the history of street vendors, their businesses, and related government policy in the socio-economic development of Bangkok. However, there has been no study of the SFVs that survived the PRWP implementation, or evaluation of its impact on SFVs.

2. Analytical Framework and Major Surveys

2.1 Analytical Framework

First, we overview the framework of the PRWP and actual state of the policy implementation (Objective 1). Then, we examine the impact of PRWP on SFVs by comparing SFV businesses before and after the implementation of PRWP (Objective 2), while paying attention to newcomers entering the SFV business under the PRWP. The Bangkok Metropolitan Administration (BMA) implements the PRWP in three forms: (1) clearing of vendors from the main streets; (2) rearranging of space; and (3) gentler implementation. We thus examine the impact of the policy by each form. Finally, we evaluate the PRWP from the viewpoints of urban
street space management and inclusive development in a modernizing society (Objective 3) (see Figure-1).

There is a limitation to this study in that the policy was implemented in 2014 and has resulted in the disappearance of a huge number of street vendors. Thus, we could not trace vendors no longer present in the study area in 2018 due to this policy. However, during the survey, we discovered that the Ari area is an exceptional case, which the BMA exempted from the PRWP due to an agreement with the Government Savings Bank (GSB) supporting the grassroots economy by promoting street food. As a result, this area still contains original SFVs that existed before PRWP was implemented. In order to fill in the missing gap of disappearing SFVs, we explore the decisions the Ari SFVs would make if the BMA were to implement the PRWP there.

**Figure-1: Analytical framework**

*Source: Authors*

### 2.2 Major Surveys

Two major surveys were conducted for this study. The first was a field survey conducted to observe and photograph SFVs in the study area. In the second, we administered a questionnaire survey between July and September 2018 to SFVs, which addressed the characteristics of the vendors and their businesses, and the impacts of the PRWP. To implement the second survey, we selected two districts around the city center, the Phayathai and Ratchathewi districts (see Figure-2), which are the most popular areas for SFVs. Although there had been 80 TPAs with 1,577 registered SFVs, including 32 TPAs in the Phayathai district and 48 in the Ratchathewi district (BMA, 2013), the PRWP abolished 47 of these TPAs. As a result, 33 TPAs with 551 registered SFVs currently remain. Among the 224 samples in our study, 22 were conducted in private open spaces, with businesses that had relocated due to clearing by the PRWP, because we recognized these survivors of the policy (see Table-1).

The study areas were within about a 500-m radius from five sky train stations (Bangkok Mass Transit System: BTS), namely, Sanam Pao Station, Phayathai Station, Ratchathewi Station, Victory Monument Station, and Saphan Khwai Station, which include a total of 33 TPAs of the remaining 205 TPAs active in Bangkok.
Figure-2: The study area of Phayathai and Ratchathewi Districts

Table-1: Number of TPAs after PRWP Implementation in Selected Sites

| District     | No. | %     | No.  | %         | No. | %     |
|--------------|-----|--------|------|-----------|-----|--------|
| Phayathai    | 32  | 42.7%  | 16 (10) | 50.0% (62.5% | 16  | 50.0%  |
| Ratchathewi  | 48  | 57.3%  | 17 (15) | 35.4% (88.2%) | 31  | 64.5%  |
| Total        | 80  | 100.0% | 33 (25) | 41.3% (75.75%) | 47  | 58.8%  |

Source: BMA (2015) and Authors’ survey in 2018

3. The Policy of Returning Walkways to the Public (PRWP)

Since the 1980s, Bangkok street vending has been controlled by the BMA in the form of TPAs, although non-TPA SFVs were still socially accepted. In the process of formalizing the country, however, public perceptions regarding informality have sometimes changed due to three main conditions of SFVs: (1) the use of public space; (2) the safety of the food, and (3) the issue of tax evasion. Thus, BMA policy has fluctuated in formalizing street vending businesses and supporting a grassroots economy.

During the political crisis in Bangkok (2006 – 2014), many commercial buildings were burnt down, and many affected shop owners operated their businesses in the street. After the situation returned to normal, these shop owners did not all move to new locations; some continued to operate their shops in the street, which made the streets more crowded and led the BMA to devise the PRWP. The PRWP was originally initiated by the Metropolitan Police Bureau (MPB) in 2011, who concluded that every TPA caused traffic problems and resulted in crimes against public property and people (BMA, 2018). Thus, the MPB proposed the cancellation of all the TPAs in Bangkok. In 2014, the BMA decided to implement the PRWP in 453 out of 658 TPAs.

The main objective of PRWP was to return the walkways in Bangkok to the public by canceling TPAs without providing alternate places. The BMA had five criteria for canceling TPAs in order of urgency: (1) areas with an urgent need based on public complaints, as well as traffic and security problems; (2) areas where street vending hindered tourism; (3) TPAs alongside major roads such as Grand Palace, Rama I, Phayathai, Ratchadamri, Phloen Chit, Petchaburi, Ratchaprarob, Phaholyothin, and Sukhumvit Roads; (4) TPAs near government offices, schools, historical buildings; and (5) TPAs with illegal street vendors. It changed the streetscape in many
districts as it cleared SFVs from the walkways, making it easy for pedestrians to commute, but rendering the streets lifeless (see Figure-3).

Figure-3: Streetscape before and after PRWP implementation (Siam BTS Station Area)
Source: Authors

Overall, as mentioned, the PRWP resulted in the dramatic decrease of TPAs in Bangkok from 683 to 205 by the end of 2018. Only 6,069 registered vendors survived out of a total of 20,275 (70.0% decrease). As shown in Figure-4, TPAs in the outer and inner suburbs of Bangkok were canceled, and even in central areas, reducing the size of accumulation. According to Bangkok City Law Enforcement, canceled TPAs will not be reinstated, but the fate of the 205 remaining TPAs is still unknown (BMA, 2018). The BMA has been strengthening control over SFVs’ use of walkways, even for TPAs with continued permits. In addition to Ari, two major street food destinations, Yaowarat and Khaosan Roads, are being treated as exceptions by the PRWP due to their importance to tourism. However, the BMA decided to slow down the cancellation of TPAs as world headlines reporting that the BMA was eliminating SFVs in Bangkok caused heightened criticism from vendors, locals, and tourists.

Figure-4: TPA distribution before and after PRWP implementation
Source: Made by Authors, based on BMA (2013)

4. Survivors of the PRWP

We analyze SFV businesses that survived the PRWP in four sections on the following topics: (1) definition of the survivors in both broad and narrow contexts; (2) analysis of the general
characteristics of the surviving businesses and comparison to previous data to clarify the changes in SFVs under the PRWP; (3) types of survivors and their SFV businesses; and (4) newcomers under the PRWP.

4.1 Definition of the Survivors

In this study, we consider SFVs who were still operating after the implementation of the PRWP to be “survivors”. The broad and narrow definitions of this term are as follows. (1) In the broad context, survivors include all SFVs still existing and operating their businesses in the street after the PRWP implementation, or ‘currently working at this moment’ when the study was conducted. (2) In the narrow context, survivors are SFVs who were directly affected by the PRWP.

We analyzed 224 samples from our fieldwork (see 2.2). They can be divided into six types by PRWP impact patterns as follows: (1) inter-relocation and reduced space (10.8%); (2) inter-relocation and space not reduced (2.2%); (3) intra-relocation and reduced space (0.0%); (4) intra-relocation and space not reduced (23.2%); (5) no relocation and reduced space (35.7%); and (6) no relocation and space not reduced (28.1%). Thus, we regroup these six types of survivors into two main groups: (1) those affected (survivors in the narrow context) (71.9%); and (2) those not affected (28.1%) (see Table-2). Hereafter, we will use the definition of survivors in the broad context.

Table-2: Types of impacts of the PRWP on survivors (n=224)

| Impact Patterns          | Reduced Space | Space Not Reduced | Total |
|--------------------------|---------------|-------------------|-------|
| Inter-relocation         | 10.8%         | 2.2%              | 13.0% |
| Intra-relocation         | 0.0%          | 23.2%             | 23.2% |
| No Relocation            | 35.7%         | 28.1%             | 63.8% |
| Total                    | 46.5%         | 53.5%             | 100.0%|

Remarks: (1) ***: p < 1%, (2) Affected: ☒ Not affected: ☐
Source: Authors’ survey in 2018

4.2 Characteristics of the Survivors and Their SFV Businesses

(1) General Attributes

The majority of SFVs are female (69.6%) in their 40s and 50s (53.6%), but the SFV business continues to attract the younger generation (30s or less: 26.3%). Most vendors have a primary education or less (56.3%) or secondary education (35.7%). The majority came from provincial areas (71.9%), in particular, from the northeast (45.5%), the country’s poorest region, although more than one-quarter are from the BMR (28.1%).

There were many changes in the characteristics of the SFVs with the adoption of the PRWP. First, the percentage of female vendors rose from 63.1% to 69.6%, and the percentage with a primary education rose from 47.2% to 56.3%. Conversely, the percentage with a bachelor’s degree or higher decreased from 20.3% to 8.0%. It can be seen that the PRWP discouraged male vendors, who may have an easier time than females finding jobs in other sectors, as their fraction declined from 36.9% to 30.4%. In terms of origin, the percentage of vendors from the northeast rose from 33.0% to 45.5%, in contrast to vendors who came from relatively wealthy regions such as the BMR and the central region. These evidences indicate that more marginalized groups have remained as survivors after the PRWP (see Table-3).
Table-3: Survivor characteristics (1)

| Characteristics | Total Registered SFVs before PRWP BMA (2013) (N=13,006) | Survivors by Authors’ Survey (2018) (n=224) |
|-----------------|----------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| Gender          |                                                          |                                           |
| Male***         | 36.9%                                                    | 30.4%                                     |
| Female***       | 63.1%                                                    | 69.6%                                     |
| Age             |                                                          |                                           |
| 30s or less     | *29.7%                                                   | 26.3%                                     |
| 40s – 50s       | *53.7%                                                   | 53.6%                                     |
| 60s or more     | *16.6%                                                   | 20.1%                                     |
| Education       |                                                          |                                           |
| Primary or less*| ^47.2%                                                   | 56.3%                                     |
| Secondary       | *32.5%                                                   | 35.7%                                     |
| Bachelor’s or higher*** | *20.3%                                               | 8.0%                                      |
| Origin          |                                                          |                                           |
| BMR*            | 32.5%                                                    | 28.1%                                     |
| Central         | 15.3%                                                    | 14.3%                                     |
| North           | 6.0%                                                     | 5.8%                                      |
| Northeast***    | 33.0%                                                    | 45.5%                                     |
| Other***        | 13.2%                                                    | 6.3%                                      |

Remarks: (1) ***: p <5%, *: p < 15%, (2) ^: Nirathron’s survey in 2005 (n=400)

(2) Survivors’ SFV Businesses

The majority of SFVs had operated their businesses for more than 10 years (60.3%), while 25.4% had started their business recently under the PRWP. The food items sold varied widely, and included main courses (34.4%), fruit (20.1%), appetizers (17.9%), and drinks (15.6%). The locations were also diverse, ranging from main streets (47.3%) to backstreets (42.9%), public spaces, and private areas (9.8%). Their shop styles could be divided into mobile vending, a food shop able to mobilize with wheels (58.0%), and food stalls without wheels (42.0%) (see Figure-5).

![Mobile Vending](image1)
![Food Stall](image2)

Figure-5: Difference Between Mobile Vending and Food Stall

Source: Authors

The PRWP impacted the SFV businesses in terms of location, food items sold, and shop style, as it was intended to clear many SFVs from main streets and rearrange the walkway space. The percentage of SFVs on main streets declined from 81.1% to 47.3%, as the PRWP targeted canceling the TPAs on main streets. In response, the fraction of SFVs in backstreets increased from 18.9% to 42.9% compared to before PRWP implementation. This shows that Bangkok society still accepts SFVs in backstreets even though the city has been modernizing rapidly. Some SFVs evicted from main streets relocated to private areas (9.8%) nearby to seek a more secure location, even though it required them to pay expensive rent.

In terms of food items, main courses significantly decreased from 49.0% to 34.4%, as serving such foods requires more operating space. In contrast, appetizers, fruit, and drinks...
increased because they required less space, and due to increasing demand. One survivor said that she changed from selling a main course to Takoyaki, a kind of snack, because she could use a smaller shop and attract younger customers. Based on the rearrangement guidelines of PRWP (see Figure-9 in 5.2), such foods correspond to a shop style that is more traditional for mobile vending (58.0%), which has less space, and is more flexible in terms of location.

The PRWP also impacted SFVs with 5–9 years of business experience, and who therefore may be relatively young. This group declined from 25.1% to 14.3% (see Table-4). Thus, it may have been easier for this group to change jobs and leave street food business behind. For those engaged in a SFV business for more than 10 years (60.3%), it may have been difficult to change jobs. A middle-aged female survivor with 20 years of experience and little education said that she had only 2–3 alternatives for work, such as a factory worker or a housemaid, which were less profitable. So, she preferred to continue to work in the SFV business, even if she had to move to a backstreet.

| Table-4: Businesses of Survivors (1) |
|-------------------------------------|
| **Business Duration**               |
| 1 – 4 Years                         | 26.7% | 25.4% |
| 5 – 9 Years***                     | 25.1% | 14.3% |
| >10 Years***                       | 48.2% | 60.3% |
| **Food Type**                      |
| Appetizers                         | 12.4% | 17.9% |
| Main Course***                    | 49.0% | 34.4% |
| Desserts                          | 11.6% | 8.9% |
| Fruit***                          | 13.8% | 20.1% |
| Drinks***                         | 9.3%  | 15.6% |
| Raw Ingredients                   | 4.0%  | 3.1% |
| **Shop Style**                    |
| Traditional Mobile***             | 43.5% | 55.8% |
| Modern Mobile**                   | 0.2%  | 2.2% |
| Stall***                          | 56.3% | 42.0% |
| **Location**                      |
| Main Street***                    | 81.1% | 47.3% |
| Backstreet***                     | 18.9% | 42.9% |
| Private Area***                   | 0.0%  | 9.8% |

Remarks: (1) ***: p < 5%, **: p < 10%, (2) a: Nirathron’s survey in 2005 (n=400)

4.3 Survivor Types and Their SFV Businesses

Here we clarify the six major types of SFVs that survived the PRWP in terms of age and education classifications. They are (1) young, lower-educated vendors (YLEV: 30s or less with a primary education: 5.8%); (2) young, intermediate-educated vendors (YIEV: 14.7%); (3) young, well-educated vendors (YWEV: 5.8%); (4) middle-aged, lower-educated vendors (MLEV: 33.0%); (5) middle-aged, intermediate-educated vendors (MIEV: 18.8%); and (6) senior, lower-educated vendors (SLEV: 17.4%). We excluded middle-aged well-educated vendors, senior intermediate-educated vendors, and senior well-educated vendors due to their low percentages (see Table-5).
Table-5: Survivor Types by Age and Education (n=224)

| Age       | Education | Total |
|-----------|-----------|-------|
|           | Primary or below | Secondary | Bachelor’s or higher |
| 30s or less | 5.8%        | 14.7%  | 5.8%    | 26.3% |
| 40s – 50s   | 33.0%       | 18.8%  | 1.8%    | 53.6% |
| 60s or more | 17.4%       | 2.2%   | 0.4%    | 20.1% |
| Total      | 56.3%       | 35.7%  | 8.0%    | 100.0%|

Remarks: (1) ***: p <1%, (2) Major Survivor Types:  
Source: Authors’ Survey in 2018

The relationships between survivor type and food type are as follows (see Table-6). (1) The majority of YLEV sell fruit (38.5%), the lowest value-added food, while YIEV mostly sell more profitable items such as a main course (36.4%) and appetizers (24.2%). (2) YWEVs choose to sell appetizers (30.8%), desserts (23.1%), and drinks (23.0%) that are more contemporary, creative, fashionable, and popular among the younger generation. (3) MLEV and MIEV showed similar tendencies in food types, with the majority selling a main course (43.2% and 45.2%, respectively). SLEV had diversified food types, such as fruit and appetizers (25.6% and 20.5% respectively), main course (17.9%), desserts (15.4%), drinks (10.3%) and raw ingredients (10.3%), which other groups rarely sell.

Table-6: Survivor Types and Their SFV Businesses

| Business      | Survivor Type | Total |
|---------------|---------------|-------|
| Food Type **  |               |       |
|                | YLEV (n=13)   | YIEV (n=33) | YWEV (n=13) | MLEV (n=74) | MIEV (n=42) | SLEV (n=39) |
| Appetizers    | 7.7%          | 24.2%  | 30.8%  | 20.3%       | 7.2%        | 20.5%       | 18.2%       |
| Main Courses  | 23.1%         | 36.4%  | 15.4%  | 43.2%       | 45.2%       | 17.9%       | 35.0%       |
| Desserts      | 0.0%          | 0.0%   | 23.1%  | 8.1%        | 9.5%        | 15.4%       | 8.9%        |
| Fruit         | 38.5%         | 12.1%  | 7.7%   | 16.2%       | 23.8%       | 25.6%       | 19.6%       |
| Drinks        | 30.7%         | 21.2%  | 23.0%  | 10.8%       | 14.3%       | 10.3%       | 15.0%       |
| Raw Ingredients| 0.0%        | 6.1%   | 0.0%   | 1.4%        | 0.0%        | 10.3%       | 3.3%        |
| Future Plan   |               |       |
| Food Street   | 100.0%        | 78.8%  | 61.5%  | 79.7%       | 71.4%       | 89.7%       | 79.9%       |
| Food Truck    | 0.0%          | 0.0%   | 0.0%   | 1.4%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 0.5%        |
| Restaurant    | 0.0%          | 15.2%  | 30.8%  | 16.2%       | 28.6%       | 10.3%       | 17.3%       |
| Food Court    | 0.0%          | 6.0%   | 7.7%   | 2.7%        | 0.0%        | 0.0%        | 2.3%        |

Remarks: (1) **: p < 5%, (2) Food Street refers to SFV in an authorized area  
Source: Authors’ survey in 2018

In Maneepong and Walsh’s study (2012) about a ‘new generation’ of street vendors who quit their formal jobs during the Asian Economic Crisis in 1997 to pursue street vending businesses, the new generation is made up of well-educated ex-white-collar workers who were in their 20s and 30s at that time. Now, they are in their 40s and 50s with around 20 years of SFV business experience. However, there is almost no one who meets the new generation’s conditions, though Nirathron’s survey indicated that around 20% of SFVs were university graduates in 2005. It may be said that some new-generation vendors have built up their careers and shifted to more permanent shops or restaurants. The PRWP may have facilitated this trend of exiting from the street vending business.

Among the six groups, the YWEV group is most likely to be the successors of the new generation, as they share characteristics like being well-educated and operating in strategic areas
such as under the BTS station or in shopping mall plazas (open-air place). The YWEV group has positive future goals such as upgrading to restaurant owner (30.8%) or locating in a shopping mall’s food court (7.7%). Some of these groups mentioned that they had worked in a private office for 2–5 years, then left those formal jobs because they want to be independent and have their own business. They choose to sell in strategic locations such as backstreets near the sky train station, and when they have enough savings, they will open their permanent shop.

4.4 Newcomers Under the PRWP

There are newcomers (25.4%) who entered this business within the past four years. We are interested in this group, as they joined the market during the implementation of the PRWP, which forced more than two-thirds of SFVs out of business. Thus, we hoped to identify the intention, characteristics, businesses, and future perspectives of the newcomers.

Table-7: Characteristics of Newcomers

| Characteristics | Newcomers (n=57) | SFVs work before PRWP (n=167) | All (n=224) |
|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|------------|
| Gender **       | Male            | 21.1%                         | 33.5%      | 30.4%      |
|                 | Female          | 78.9%                         | 66.5%      | 69.6%      |
| Age **          | 30s or less     | 40.4%                         | 21.6%      | 26.3%      |
|                 | 40s – 50s       | 47.4%                         | 55.7%      | 53.6%      |
|                 | 60s or above    | 12.3%                         | 22.8%      | 20.1%      |
| Education       | Primary or less | 47.4%                         | 59.3%      | 56.3%      |
|                 | Secondary       | 40.4%                         | 34.1%      | 35.7%      |
|                 | Bachelor’s or higher | 12.3% | 6.6% | 8.0% |
| Origin          | BMR             | 26.3%                         | 28.7%      | 28.1%      |
|                 | Central         | 8.8%                          | 16.2%      | 14.3%      |
|                 | North           | 7.0%                          | 5.4%       | 5.8%       |
|                 | Northeast       | 47.4%                         | 44.9%      | 45.5%      |
|                 | Other           | 10.5%                         | 4.8%       | 6.3%       |

Remark: **: p < 5%
Source: Authors’ survey in 2018

As may be seen in Table-7, the newcomers include more females (78.9%) and more people in their 30s or less (40.4%), although people in their 40s–50s also entered this business (47.4%) as another major age group. There are more well-educated individuals in this group than in the existing SFVs; 12.3% have graduated from university and 40.4% have a secondary education, while their origins are quite similar to the SFVs working before the PRWP. Some of newcomers mentioned that even under PRWP, there is still room for them to work in this business in the backstreets.

In terms of their businesses, the newcomers deal with more diversified food items such as main courses (29.8%), appetizers (19.3%), and fruit (19.3%). However, their shop style is quite similar to that of existing SFVs before PRWP, as they somewhat prefer a mobile vending setup to a food stall. Their locations are diversified, with more in the backstreets (59.7%), reflecting a tendency to avoid risk, but within close distance (less than 200 m) from the BTS stations (45.6%) (see Table-8).
Table-8: Businesses of Newcomers

| Business | Newcomers (n=57) | SFVs working before PRWP (n=167) | All (n=224) |
|----------|------------------|----------------------------------|-------------|
| Food Type |                  |                                  |             |
| Appetizers | 19.3%            | 17.4%                            | 17.9%       |
| Main Courses | 29.8%           | 35.9%                            | 34.4%       |
| Desserts | 12.3%            | 7.8%                             | 8.9%        |
| Fruit | 19.3%            | 20.4%                            | 20.1%       |
| Drinks | 15.8%            | 15.5%                            | 15.6%       |
| Raw Ingredients | 3.5%               | 3.0%                             | 3.1%        |
| Shop Style |                  |                                  |             |
| Traditional Mobile | 59.6%             | 54.5%                            | 55.8%       |
| Modern Mobile | 1.8%              | 2.4%                             | 2.2%        |
| Stall | 38.6%            | 43.1%                            | 42.0%       |
| BTS Station ** |                  |                                  |             |
| <200 m | 45.6%            | 31.7%                            | 35.3%       |
| >200 m | 54.4%            | 68.3%                            | 64.7%       |
| Location *** |                  |                                  |             |
| Main Street | 29.8%            | 53.3%                            | 47.3%       |
| Backstreet | 59.7%            | 37.1%                            | 42.9%       |
| Private Area | 10.5%            | 9.6%                             | 9.8%        |

Remark: ***: p < 1%, **: p < 5%
Source: Authors’ survey in 2018

5. Different Impacts of PRWP in Study Areas

BMA implemented the PRWP differently depending on the targeted area conditions. We observed four different implementations: (1) strict implementation in terms of clearing the main streets; (2) strict implementation by rearranging street space; (3) strict implementation by both clearing main streets and rearranging street space; and (4) gentler implementation. These had their own characteristics, which we analyze in detail.

5.1 Strict Implementation by Clearing Main Streets

In two areas, Sanam Pao Station and Phayathai Station, strict implementation by clearing SFVs from main streets was carried out.

(1) Sanam Pao Station

Sanam Pao Station, located in the south of the Phayathai district, faces a large military camp to the east. There were 3 TPAs (numbers 11–13 in Figure-6) that contained 91 SFVs near the station before 2014, plus an unregistered food street and two private areas (an open space in front of an office building) for street food business. Even though the walkway is 3 meters wide, all TPAs were cleared from the main street and connected alleys.

Most of the evicted SFVs had disappeared from this area. There are only a few backstreets that connect to the main street, so it is difficult to find a good location for business in the backstreets. There were no intra-relocators in backstreets, while private areas attracted both inter-relocators (62.5%) and intra-relocators (37.5%), if they could afford to pay rent. As an unregistered backstreet food street was not targeted for clearing, survivors including inter-relocators run their business there (8.3%) (see Table-9). Although the most serious impact of the PRWP in this area was clearing and disappearance of SFVs, many survivors were also affected by the policy in terms of reduction of space (45.0%), inter-relocation (20.0%), and intra-relocation (25.0%) (see Table-10).
(2) Phayathai Station

Phayathai Station is located in a high-density residential area. There were 3 TPAs along Petchaburi Road (number 10, 11, and 35 in Figure-7) that contained 25 SFVs, and a TPA on Sri Ayutthaya Road (number 8 in Figure-7) that contained 14 SFVs. All of them were cleared. Moreover, there were plenty of unregistered food streets, both in the backstreets and along Phaholyothin Road. One of the unregistered backstreet food streets was cleared because the road was too narrow without any walkway. The unregistered food street along Phaholyothin Road was cleared, and these SFVs moved to a nearby backstreet, forming a new unregistered food street.

Thus, the impact of the PRWP in Phayathai Station included reduction of space (31.0%) and intra-relocation (23.8%) to the backstreet. However, the number of unaffected SFVs in Phayathai was quite high (31.9%), because they continued working in the backstreets (see Table-9). The difference is that the majority (83.3%) of intra-relocators ended up in the backstreets, while only 16.7% ended up in private areas (a covered market in front of an office building), mainly because there was space in the backstreets within the residential community that could accept intra-relocation. They also accepted some inter-relocators from other areas (9.5%) (see Table-10).

5.2 Strict Implementation by Rearranging Street Space

Ratchathewi Station is located in midst of a commercial and high-density residential area. It contained 3 TPAs with 26 SFVs (see Figure-8). This area underwent a rearranging street space along the main street and the backstreet, because the walkway here is wider than that of other study areas, around 4-m wide (see Figure-9). However, it also had a small clearing of one TPA that contained only 2 SFVs on Phetchaburi Road (number 41 in Figure-8), and two unregistered food streets, which had less than 10 SFVs in each area.
Overall, the BMA rearranged the stall space, balancing the needs of SFVs and pedestrians. The rearrangement requested that 41.7% of the SFVs reduce their shop space in both the main streets (47.1%) and backstreets (38.7%) (see Table-9). The rearrangement not only limited the width of food stalls to 1 m, but also reduced the length of the TPAs. This approach also caused intra-relocators (29.2%), but their relocation distance was not far, just within 50 m of their former location. This area accepted inter-relocators (10.4%), as there was some space for outsiders. Although most of the SFVs in this area were affected by the rearrangement measure (81.3%), the level of the impact was moderate, basically due to no evictions in the two major TPAs (see Table-10).

**Figure-8: Implementation of PRWP on SFVs in Ratchathewi Station**
Source: Made by Authors, based on BMA (2013)

**Figure-9: Rearranging of Shop Space due to PRWP in Ratchathewi Station**
Source: Made by Authors

### 5.3 Strict Implementation by Both Clearing Main Street and Rearranging Street Space

Victory Monument Station, located between the Phayathai and Ratchathewi districts, is one of the city’s main transportation hubs, including the sky train, bus, and minibus. This area is surrounded by many hospitals, government offices, and shopping malls. There were 19 TPAs with 584 SFVs before 2014 (see Figure-10). Due to traffic congestion in this area, the BMA implemented the PRWP by combined clearing of main streets and rearranging of street space.

The BMA canceled 9 TPAs with 182 SFVs on Din Daeng and Phayathai Roads, as well as an unregistered food street. Many of the evicted SFVs exited or disappeared from canceled TPAs. The policy caused intra-relocation (26.2%) into many surviving TPAs in the main streets (24.0%), the backstreets (30.0%), and two private areas such as shopping mall plazas (40.0%) (see Table-9). The surviving areas accepted many intra-relocators; thus, space for inter-relocators was limited (6.2%). In the 10 surviving TPAs along the northern part of Ratchawithi and Din Daeng Roads, many of the survivors were also affected by the policy in terms of reduction of space (40.0%), as they had to share with those intra-relocators and inter-relocators (see Table-10).
Although, the percentage of unaffected SFVs in Victory Monument appeared quite high (27.6%), in fact, many evicted SFVs had to relocate outside of the area or close their businesses, which means that the real effect of the PRWP in this area was much higher. One SFV said that he had to move to three different locations a day to avoid BMA staff, while enjoying more income from different customers. Another said she wished BMA had designated Victory Monument as an authorized food street, as it is one of the major transportation hubs with many passersby.

5.4 Gentler Implementation

Saphan Khwai Station is located in the north of Phayathai district, near the popular Chatuchak Weekend Market. There were 9 TPAs with 280 SFVs before 2014, and 7 of the 9 survived the PRWP in 2018 (see Figure-11). The approach of PRWP in this station was gentler than in other areas, as the majority of TPAs on the main street was secured, and there was no rearranging of stall space by the policy, although there was a small clearing of two TPAs with 32 registered SFVs and two unregistered food streets. On the other hand, we observed voluntary arrangements by SFVs, such as reducing their stall space, and relocating to a connected alley from the main streets, and forming a new unregistered backstreet food street in order to avoid being targets of the PRWP. As a result, the impact of the PRWP on the survivors was 43.1% with no effect, 27.3% with reduction of space, and 9.1% with intra-relocation (see Table-9). This area also accepted a lot of inter-relocators (20.5%), mainly those fleeing from the street around the Chatuchak Weekend Market after PRWP implementation. Some intra- and inter-relocators (9.1%) chose to be in a private area (a plaza in front of a shopping mall) as it was more secure even with the high rent (see Table-10).
The following tables (9 and 10) show how the BMA implemented the PRWP in the 5 surveyed areas, and what the impacts of the PRWP were.

### Table-9: PRWP Impact in Each Station Area

| Implementation | Area | Site | Main Street | Backstreet | Level of Effect* |
|----------------|------|------|-------------|-------------|------------------|
|                |      |      | Clearing    | Rearranging | Number of Evicted SFVs by Clearing |
|                |      |      | Clearing    | Rearranging | Not Affected | Inter Relocated | Intra Relocated | Reduced Space Only |
| Clearing       | SP   | ●    | x           | v           | 91           | 10.0%          | 20.0%           | 25.0%           | 45.0%             |
|                | PT   | ●    | x           | o           | 25           | 31.9%          | 14.9%           | 25.5%           | 27.7%             |
| Rearranging    | RT   | ○    | ●           | x           | 2            | 18.7%          | 10.4%           | 29.2%           | 41.7%             |
|                | VM   | ●    | ●           | x           | 182          | 27.6%          | 6.2%            | 26.2%           | 40.0%             |
| Gentler        | SK   | ○    | v           | v           | 32           | 43.1%          | 20.5%           | 9.1%            | 27.3%             |

Remarks: (1) *: p < 10%, (2) = fully implemented, ○ = partial/minor implementation, x = not implemented, v = voluntary, (3) SP: Sanam Pao, PT: Phayathai, RT: Ratchathewi, VM: Victory Monument, SK: Saphan Khwai

Source: Authors’ survey in 2018

### Table-10: Survivors and Their Locations in Each Station Area

| Implementation | Station | Area | Survivors | Total |
|----------------|---------|------|-----------|-------|
|                |         | Main Street | Inter Relocation | Intra Relocation | Reduction of Space Only | No Effect | Total |
|                | Sanam Pao *** (n=20) | No Survivors | 8.3% | 0.0% | 75.0% | 16.7% | 60.0% |
|                | Phayathai *** (n=47) | No Survivors | 9.5% | 23.8% | 31.0% | 35.7% | 89.4% |
|                | Ratchathewi (n=48) | Main Street | 9.7% | 32.3% | 38.7% | 19.3% | 64.6% |
|                | Victory Monument *** (n=65) | Main Street | 0.0% | 24.0% | 46.0% | 30.0% | 76.9% |
|                | Saphan Khwai ** (n=44) | Main Street | 12.0% | 12.0% | 32.0% | 44.0% | 56.8% |
|                | Total *** (n=224) | Main Street | 5.7% | 23.6% | 40.6% | 30.1% | 47.3% |

Remarks: (1) ***: p < 1%, **: p < 5%, (2) Private area: selected sample who relocated from the main street due to the PRWP

Source: Authors’ survey in 2018
6. Evaluation of the PRWP and Issues for Achieving a More Inclusive Street Management

6.1 The Impacts of the PRWP on SFVs

In 1982, the BMA introduced TPAs to allow street vending. The former Prime Minister Thaksin government, which had a populist policy, increased the number of TPAs from 164 to 683 in 2005 (Nirathron, 2005). This was a positive government action from the viewpoint of creating a more inclusive urban society. The political change in 2006 reversed this government action into a radical street formalization policy. Although the PRWP achieved smooth pedestrian traffic in the main streets, it has done damage to the economic and living opportunities of the vulnerable, and of lively street food life, as more than two-thirds of registered street vendors were evicted from the canceled TPAs.

To clarify where the evicted SFVs from the canceled TPAs went, we conducted a supplemental survey in the Ari area (see Table-11). As the Ari area contained the original SFVs without influence from the PRWP, we were able to obtain an overall picture of what they would do if the BMA were to apply the PRWP to this area. The results showed that most of the SFVs in the main street would relocate to a backstreet (36.0%) or private area (32.0%) within the area or nearby, while some (20.0%), mainly the senior group, would want to retire from street vending. Only a few (12.0%) would upgrade to formal/permanent status, such as restaurants or stalls in a food court of a shopping center. This suggests that many of the evicted SFVs might struggle to find alternative vending sites in backstreets/alleys or private areas to avoid the risk of clearing by the BMA. In the five studied areas, 23.2% and 12.9% of the survivors were intra- and inter-relocators respectively. Yet, 35.7% of the survivors had reduced stall space voluntarily or by the space arrangement of the PRWP. Together, the results of the PRWP caused many difficulties to the lives and livelihoods of SFVs.

Table-11: Responses of SFVs in Ari, if the PRWP Were Applied

| Sites            | Relocating to the Backstreet | Relocating to Private area | Giving up/Retiring | Upgrading to Restaurant | Continuing in the Backstreet | Total |
|------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|-------|
| Main Street (n=25) | 36.0%                        | 32.0%                      | 20.0%               | 12.0%                   | -                           | 50.0% |
| Backstreet (n=25)  | -                            | 8.0%                       | 16.0%               | -                       | 76.0%                       | 50.0% |
| Total (n=50)      | 18.0%                        | 20.0%                      | 18.0%               | 6.0%                    | 38.0%                       | 100.0%|

Source: Authors’ survey in 2020

6.2 More Inclusive Street Management

In managing streets and walkways with many street vendors, it is important to consider the following four points: (1) inclusive street management, taking into account the livelihood of socially vulnerable street vendors; (2) securing walking and transportation space; (3) development and maintenance of a vibrant street life and street food culture; and (4) securing the legitimacy of public space occupancy.

Inclusive development is a concept that “includes marginalized people, sectors and countries in social, political and economic processes for increased human well-being, social and environmental sustainability, and empowerment” (Gupta et al., 2015). In contrast to the PRWP, it helps to increase the well-being of vulnerable people by capacity enhancement with equal opportunities to affordable access and control over one’s own affairs (Ali and Hyun, 2007; Zhuang and Ali, 2009; Rauniyar and Kanbur, 2010).

The BMA should take a long-term strategy to formalizing street vending in association with modernizing Thai society. The PRWP was too radical a formalization approach in terms of the
large scale of TPA cancelations within a short period. Not only economic opportunities, but also freedom and autonomy in the work and life of many vulnerable people have been damaged. As SFV businesses offered vulnerable groups such as lower educated female workers from poor regions (see Table-3 in 4.2) a chance to earn a better income, and enjoyment of an intermediate level of life (2), the management of streets with SFVs must be conducted in a more inclusive manner.

Street food is a very important part of urban identity in Bangkok, making streets lively and attractive. Citizens who use the sidewalks not only pass through, but also enjoy eating and drinking on the streets, and purchasing take-out food from SFVs. From our interviews with customers of SFVs, they appreciate these multifaceted street functions. On the other hand, pedestrian space plays an important role in traffic movement. One of the social media communities in Thailand, "Footpath Thai," which has 13,436 accounts in this community, defends the PRWP from the standpoint of protecting pedestrians' traffic rights. Looking at the comments made by the members of this community, there are many who argue for the rights of pedestrian traffic and call for the exclusion of street vendors by the PRWP; but there are also those who are considerate of the lives of street vendors and suggest that alternative spaces be provided.

The BMA should manage the SFVs carefully, working to create a good balance between pedestrian traffic and street vending. In this regard, rearranging street space was effective in securing workplaces for SFVs, which is the most crucial issue in the business. If SFVs lose their workplace, they will lose their customers and have to rebuild their reputation in another area, which takes time and might not be successful (see Table-11 in 6.1). Although the rearranging of street space forced SFVs to reduce their stall space, many said that the 1x2 m space was sufficient for their operation (see Figure-9). In addition, some SFVs have voluntarily reduced their stall space to provide more pedestrian space, so as not to be criticized by pedestrians and the community for being an obstacle to walking.

On the other hand, eligibility to occupy a street and public space are important issues. The public might think that it is unfair to let some groups of people occupy the street. At least, the government should control the franchise stalls that have recently emerged. But if street vending is a stepping stone for marginalized people to overcome poverty, the BMA should treat them more gently and allow it as a temporary occupation.

Presently, the BMA is considering the creation of One Food Street by each district. The concept of One Food Street is good in terms of providing secured stall places for SFVs, but at this time, it would be difficult to include all the SFVs there. Looking at the reality of SFVs’ circumstances, BMA should utilize streets and other underutilized open public spaces, applying space or time-sharing wisely. Supporting SFVs in the shift from street vending to more permanent and formal business locations is also important. The GSB started providing loans, knowledge-development programs for food business management, online payment system to SFVs in the Ari area in 2016. This could be expected to become a platform for supporting the gradual upgrade and formalization SFV businesses.

Since this study discusses inclusive street management, focusing on SFVs as a socially vulnerable group, further research is needed, as well as an inclusive discussion involving pedestrian and community perspectives and the legitimacy of public space occupancy.

7. Conclusion

The PRWP had a tremendous negative impact on SFVs in Bangkok, as 70.0% of the registered street vendors were evicted from canceled TPAs. BMA implemented the PRWP
differently depending on the targeted area conditions. We observed four different implementations: (1) strict implementation by clearing the main streets; (2) strict implementation by the rearranging street space; (3) strict implementation by both clearing and rearranging main streets and space; and (4) gentler implementation.

The clearing approach affected SFVs very seriously and caused their ‘tri-polarization’ based on their business capacities and other attributes as follows: (1) relocating to backstreets/alleys; (2) shifting to private areas if they could pay a relatively high rent; or (3) giving up street vending and changing jobs or retiring (see Table-10). Very few have upgraded to permanent restaurants/shops or food courts in shopping centers (based on Ari case in Table-11). Yet it is very difficult for most SFVs to find formal jobs with better income, because the majority of them have little education, and are female, middle or senior aged workers (see Table-3). The PRWP achieved formalization of the main streets and returned the walkways to pedestrians, but could not formalize street vending, and forced many to backstreets/alleys, marginalizing them further.

The characteristics of the survivors and their businesses have changed under the PRWP as follows: (1) SFVs shifted to backstreets (37.2%) or private areas (21.7%) to achieve a more stable workplace; (2) their shop style and size changed to be more mobile so as to be more flexible in terms of location (53.1%); and (3) the food items sold also changed from mostly main courses to appetizers, desserts, and drinks, which are more convenient for mobile food vending and require less stall space.

Even under the PRWP, SFV remains active in Bangkok, as 25.4% of the respondents were newcomers. Most of were females (77.9%) who came from provincial areas, in particular the northeast, while around one-quarter were from the BMR, with a wide range of ages between 30s and 50s (67.6%) and a low-to-intermediate educational background. Street vending may attract those populations due to the work freedom, lower investment, and better income opportunity compared to other sectors. Thus, the food vending business still provides job opportunities for a population similar to that before the policy was implemented.

The ‘new generation of street vendors’ identified by Maneepong and Walsh (2012) seems to have disappeared from the street. Among the six groups, the YWEV group is likely to be the successors of the new generation, as they share characteristics like being well-educated, selling more value-added items, and operating in strategic areas such as near BTS stations or shopping mall plazas. They also have future goals to leave street vending to open their own restaurant/shop (30.8%) or join the food court in a shopping complex (7.7%). Other groups with intermediate levels of education such as the YIEV and MIEV also seem to be following the path of the new generation. The majority of SFVs, however, are still of the traditional type, with a less educated background, and many survivors chose more stable areas for food vending to avoid being targeted by the PRWP.

In view of street management with the PRWP, the clearing approach should be used carefully, while the rearranging of streets should have increased implementation, as it is more inclusive due to ensuring the same workplace for SFVs, with guidelines for keeping the streets clean and convenient for pedestrians. For ambitious SFVs, street vending could be a stepping stone to a formal/permanent business. The government sectors are expected to establish a platform to support them by providing secured temporary business places, loans, and knowledge-development programs, like the Street Food Program of the GSB.

In conclusion, street vending businesses, as a grassroots economy, should be supported in their development process, and included in the formalization to be part of modern society under
the wise management of streets and public spaces by local authorities balancing the need for smooth pedestrian traffic, with strengthening of lively streets with street food culture, and ensuring economic opportunity for vulnerable groups. If this ensues, it will be a useful urban management tool for the BMA in creating a more inclusive and sustainable society.
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Note

(1) The statistical significance of the difference between the two ratios (BMA’s survey in 2013, Nirathron’s survey in 2005, and our survey in 2018) is examined from the perspective of sampling error (confidence interval).

(2) According to Nirathron (2017), average monthly income of SFVs’ household in Bangkok was 46,600 THB, which is the similar level of average household income of Bangkok, 45,700 THB per month (based on NSO, 2020).
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