

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS



As mentioned in the previous chapter that out of 1,156 Japanese firms that invest directly in Thailand located in both Bangkok and suburban area, the sample size of 298 companies is needed. Unfortunately, despite of 400 questionnaires sent out, only 75 companies respond. There are several reasons why I only collected less 93 samples. The main reason is I overestimated how many answer Japanese companies response to my questionnaire. The questionnaire might be too long and complicated. And Japanese company tends to dislike opening their information to the public.

This study is based on the answers of only 75 companies as follows:

#### 4.1 General Aspects of Sample Group

##### 4.1.1 Location

In this study, 43% of the sample group of 75 Japanese firms which invest directly in Thailand established their businesses in Bangkok, followed by Choburi 15.3%, Ayuttaya 11.1%, Samuthprakarn 9.7%, Prathumthani 8.3%, and Rayong 4.2%. The least favourable locations are Samutsakorn, Nakornprathom and Chachoengsao, which have the same percentage (2.8%).

Table 4.1

## Location

General Status of the Sample Group	Frequency	Percent
Quantity of Sample Group	75	100
<b>Location</b>		
Bangkok	32	43
Cholburi	12	15.3
Ayuttaya	9	11.1
Samutprakarn	7	9.7
Prathumthani	6	8.3
Rayong	3	4.2
Samutsakorn	2	2.8
Nakornprathom	2	2.8
Chachoengsao	2	2.8

#### 4.1.2 Year of Establish

It was found that the majority of sample groups, which answer the questions are different year of establish. We can illustrate by the period as 1951-1980, the sample group, which were established in these period is 20% or only 15 Japanese FDI companies. The year between 1981-1990 is 36% or 27 sample group and follow by the period 1991-2005 is 44% or 33 sample group, which is the most group in these period.

**Table 4.2**  
**Year of Establish**

General Status of the Sample Group	Frequency	Percent
<b>Quantity of Sample Group</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Established Year</b>		
1951-1980	15	20
1981-1990	27	36
1991-2005	33	44

#### 4.1.3 Nature of Business

The majority of this sample group is in Manufacturing & Selling business, which is accounted for 64.4%. 15.1% is in “Other” type of businesses which include several businesses The rest are in trading, construction, and transportation business, which accounted for 9.6%, 8.2% and 2.7% respectively.

**Table 4.3**  
**Nature of Business**

General Status of the Sample Group	Frequency	Percent
<b>Quantity of Sample Group</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Nature of Business</b>		
Manufacturing & Selling	48	64.4
Others	12	15.1
Trading	7	9.6
Construction	6	8.2
Transportation	2	2.7

#### 4.1.4 Ownership Structure

The ownership structure of the firms was analyzed by using the ratio of the ownership between Thai and Japanese. It was found that the patterns of ownership vary among companies in our sample group. The majority fell into the “Other” ratio, which cannot be grouped into one single pattern (47.2%). The most frequently used pattern is the ratio of 51:49, followed by the ratio of 52:48 (7.5%), 2.5:97.5 (5.6%). The patterns of the ratio 60:40 and 48:52 own the same percentage of 3.8%

**Table 4.4**  
**Ownership Structure**

<b>General Status of the Sample Group</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>Quantity of Sample Group</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Ownership Structure of Thai : Japanese</b>		
51:49	24	32.1
52:48	6	7.5
60:40	3	3.8
48:52	3	3.8
2.5:97.5	4	5.6
Others	35	47.2

#### 4.1.5 Employee

According to the definition given by Ministry of Industry of Thailand, Invested capital and number of employees define the numbers of employees in the industry. In this study, we used only the number of employee for our simplification to classify. The sampling was divided into 3 groups, which are “Small-scale”, “Medium-scale”, and “Large-scale”. The small-scale means that the company has no more than 50 employees while medium-scale means that the company has more than 50 but not more than 200 employees, and large-scale is the company that has more than 200 employees. The majority of our sample group in this study fell into

the medium-scale industry (37.3%), followed by the large-scale industry (33.3%), and the small-scale industry (25.3%).

**Table 4.5**  
**Employee**

<b>General Status of the Sample Group</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>Quantity of Sample Group</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Employee</b>		
Small scale industry	20	26.4
Medium Scale industry	29	38.9
Large Scale industry	26	34.7

#### **4.1.6 Fixed Asset Value**

In our study of Fixed asset value, the majority of our sample group owns more than 100 million baht fixed asset value, which is accounted for 41.3% of total sampling. The second one is the group of the firms which owns 1-10 million baht, which is 23.8% of total sampling. The third one are the group of firms which owns 11-20 million baht and 91-100 million baht fixed asset value, which accounted for the same percentage of 6.3% of total sampling, followed by the group which owns 51-60 million baht fixed asset value or around 4.8%. The rest are the groups of companies which invest 31-40 million baht, 41-50 million baht, 61-70 million baht, 71-80 million baht, and 81-90 million baht, which accounted for the same percentage of 3.2%. The lowest percentage of 1.5% fell into the sample group with 21-30 million baht fixed asset value.

**Table 4.6**  
**Fix Asset Value**

General Status of the Sample Group	Frequency	Percent
<b>Quantity of Sample Group</b>	75	100
<b>Fix Asset Value of Firm</b>		
1-10 Million Baht	18	23.8
11-20 Million Baht	5	6.3
21-30 Million Baht	1	1.5
31-40 Million Baht	2	3.2
41-50 Million Baht	2	3.2
51-60 Million Baht	4	4.8
61-70 Million Baht	2	3.2
71-80 Million Baht	2	3.2
81-90 Million Baht	2	3.2
91-100 Million Baht	5	6.3
More than 100 Million Baht	31	41.3

#### **4.1.7 Ratio of Activities for Affiliates Domestic Customer: Oversea Customer**

It was found that the sample group shows more interest in the affiliates domestic customer than the affiliates oversea customer. 25% of total sampling focuses 100% on affiliates domestic customer, followed by the group which still spend most of their time on affiliates domestic customer, which is the group with the ratio 90:10 (12.5%) and 99:1 (8.2%). The group with the ratio 80:20 is accounted for 5.6% of total sampling as well as the group with the ratio 70:30. Another two groups which own the same 4.2 percentage are 50:50 and 40:60. Also, the percentage of the group with the ratio 95:5, 60:40, 30:70 are the same at 2.8%.

The lowest percentage fell into the group with the ratio 5:95, which is only 1.3% of total sampling. The rest belongs to other group which is 25% of total sampling.

**Table 4.7**

**Ratio of Activities for Affiliates Domestic Customer: Oversea Customer**

<b>General Status of the Sample Group</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>Quantity of Sample Group</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Ratio of Activities for Affiliates Domestic Customer : Oversea Customer</b>		
100:0	19	25
99:1	6	8.2
95:5	2	2.8
90:10	10	12.5
80:20	4	5.6
70:30	4	5.6
60:40	2	2.8
50:50	3	4.2
40:60	3	4.2
30:70	2	2.8
5:95	1	1.3
Others	19	25

**4.1.8 Ratio of Activities for Company Corporation : External Clients**

The sample group is more interested in activities for company corporation than external clients. The group with the ratio of 0:100 shows the highest percentage of 27.4% while the group with other ratios that can not be grouped is also rather high at 24.3%. The next groups are the ones with the ratio 10:90

(10.6%), 20:80 (9.1%), and 5:95 (6.1%). The groups with the ratio 40:60 and 30:70 have the same percentage of 4.5%. The rest are the groups of companies with the ratio of 100:0, 95:5, 90:10, 1:99, each of these groups is accounted for only 3% of the total sampling.

**Table 4.8**  
**Ratio of Activities for Company Corporation : External Clients**

General Status of the Sample Group	Frequency	Percent
<b>Quantity of Sample Group</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Ratio of Activities for Company Corporation : External Clients</b>		
100:0	2	3
95:5	2	3
90:10	2	3
40:60	4	4.5
30:70	4	4.5
20:80	7	9.1
15:85	1	1.5
10:90	8	10.6
5:95	5	6.1
1:99	2	3
0:100	20	27.4
Others	18	24.3

As mentioned in the previous chapter, there are 6 main investigative factors, which are cost factor, material factor, quality factor, economic policy factor, marketing factor, and other factors. These factors will be used to investigate the perception of sample group when they started to invest in Thailand as well as to investigate the perception of these companies after they invested until now.



Japanese FDI companies did the questionnaires that responded in this purpose and the results are as shown below.

## **4.2 Evaluation of Perceptions toward Competitiveness Factor When Started to Invest in Thailand**

The procedure is that all factors are ranked in the descending order by using the mean value of 5 steps point and the average value. When the sample group just started to invest in Thailand, the most important factor that they took into consideration was the quality factor, which has the highest score of 3.51 points in the study. The second most important factor is the economic policy factor, which shows the mean value of 3.41 and the third rank is the material availability factor and market factor, which are equally ranked at 3.13 points. Other factor is at the fourth rank with 3.11 points. The least important factor among these 6 main factors is the cost factor. Our sample group considers it to be fair because the mean value is only 2.98 as follows.

**Table 4.9**  
**Ranking Perception of Factors: When Started Investment**

<b>Competitiveness Factors</b>	<b>Mean Value</b>
1. Quality Factors	3.51
2. Economic Policy Factors	3.41
3. Material Availability Factors	3.13
4. Marketing Factors	3.13
5. Other Factors	3.11
6. Cost Factors	2.98

The results of the evaluation of the 6 main competitiveness factors when Japanese FDI companies started to invest in Thailand can be evaluated as a percentage and a mean value as follows.

### 4.2.1 Cost Factors

Cost factors compose of material, labor, capital, communication, transportation, real estate, utility, exchange rate, and interest rate. From the evaluation the frequency, percentage and mean value toward these factors when the companies started to invest in Thailand. It was found that the mean value of cost factor is 2.89. It means that the companies percept cost factor as the almost fair level. If we consider sub-factors in cost factor, it was found that the mean value of interest rate is the highest of all factors that is 3.53. It is follow by capital cost is 3.38 and the mean value of communication cost is 3.28. However, labor cost is so low perception in vision of Japanese FDI companies that is 1.92 while the mean value of real estate cost is 2.63, material cost is 2.88, and material cost is 2.89. When we average the mean value of Cost Factor, its mean value is only 2.89, which is fair level.

**Table 4.10**  
**Cost Factors when started to Invest**

Competitiveness Factors	Excellence		Good		Fair		Poor		Too Bad		Total		Mean Value
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
<b>1. Cost Factors</b>													<b>2.89</b>
Material Cost	3	4.2	20	26.8	22	29.1	25	32.8	5	7.1	75	100	2.88
Labor Cost	1	1.4	1	1.4	10	13.6	41	54.4	22	29.2	75	100	1.92
Capital Cost	7	9.7	19	25.0	44	58.4	5	6.9	0	0	75	100	3.38
Communication Cost	8	10.6	19	25.3	36	47.7	10	13.6	2	2.8	75	100	3.28
Transportation Cost	5	7.0	13	16.8	35	47.1	21	27.7	1	1.4	75	100	3.00
Real Estate Cost	1	1.4	12	15.7	26	34.7	31	41.5	5	6.7	75	100	2.63
Utility Cost	4	5.6	11	15.2	44	58.2	16	21.0	0	0	75	100	3.06
Exchange Rate	5	6.6	17	22.8	40	52.7	10	13.7	3	4.2	75	100	3.14
Interest Rate	14	18.6	23	30.7	29	38.2	8	11.1	1	1.4	75	100	3.53

We will consider each sub-factor of Cost Factor toward period of established year that we can separate to be 3 periods as 1951-1980, 1981-1990, and 1991-2005. Its purpose is considered for when they started to investment in Thailand, how they percept to each factor so we divide to be 3 periods for consideration and for easy to compare those factors to present period time as the below.

#### 4.2.1.1 Material Cost

When Japanese FDI companies started their business in each period, their perception about material cost were different. We can explain about material cost by consider the result in the table as follow.

On the below table, we found that when Japanese FDI companies started to investment in Thailand, they consider about material cost as

Japanese FDI companies were in established year of period 1951-1980, considered material cost to be poor level, which is 40.0% and it is the same perception, Japanese FDI companies were in establish year of 1981-1990 also considered material cost to be poor level, which is 37.0%. And then the last establish year of 1991-2005, Japanese FDI companies considered the material cost to be fair level that is 36.4%.

**Table 4.11**  
**Material Cost Considered by Started Year of Investment**

COST FACTOR	1951-1980		1981-1990		1991-2005		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
<b>Material Cost</b>							
Excellence	0	0.0%	1	3.7%	2	6.1%	3
Good	2	13.3%	8	29.6%	10	30.3%	20
Fair	5	33.3%	5	18.5%	12	36.4%	22
Poor	6	40.0%	10	37.0%	9	27.3%	25
Too Bad	2	13.3%	3	11.1%	0	0.0%	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>75</b>

#### 4.2.1.2 Labor Cost

When Japanese FDI companies started their business in each period, their perception about labor cost were different. We can explain about labor cost by consider the result in the table as follow.

Japanese FDI companies were in established year of period 1951-1980, considered labor cost to be poor level, which is 46.7% and it is the same perception, Japanese FDI companies were in establish year of 1981-1990 also considered labor cost to be poor level, which is 63.0%. And then the last establish year of 1991-2005, Japanese FDI companies considered the labor cost to be poor level that is 51.5%.

**Table 4.12**  
**Labor Cost Considered by Started Year of Investment**

COST FACTOR	1951-1980		1981-1990		1991-2005		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
<b>Labor Cost</b>							
Excellence	1	6.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1
Good	0	0.0%	1	3.7%	0	0.0%	1
Fair	1	6.7%	2	7.4%	7	21.2%	10
Poor	7	46.7%	17	63.0%	17	51.5%	41
Too Bad	6	40.0%	7	25.9%	9	27.3%	22
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>75</b>

#### 4.2.1.3 Capital Cost

When Japanese FDI companies started their business in each period, the perceptions about capital cost in each period were different and so swing. We can explain about capital cost by consider the result as the table.

In established year of period 1951-1980, Japanese FDI companies percept about capital cost to be fair level, which is 46.7% and it is the same perception, Japanese FDI companies were in establish year of 1981-1990 also considered capital cost to be fair level, which is 63.0%. The last period year 1991-2005, capital cost was considered to be the same as of 60.6%.

**Table 4.13**  
**Capital Cost Considered by Started Year of Investment**

COST FACTOR	1951-1980		1981-1990		1991-2005		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
<b>Capital Cost</b>							
Excellence	2	13.3%	3	11.1%	2	6.1%	7
Good	4	26.7%	5	18.5%	10	30.3%	19
Fair	7	46.7%	17	63.0%	20	60.6%	44
Poor	2	13.3%	2	7.4%	1	3.0%	5
Too Bad	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>75</b>

#### 4.2.1.4 Communication Cost

In established year of period 1951-1980, Japanese FDI companies' percept about communication cost to be good and fair level, which is 40.0% and in established year of 1981-1990 considered communication cost to be fair level, which is 44.4%. The last period year 1991-2005, communication cost was considered to be fair level as of 54.5%.

**Table 4.14**  
**Communication Cost Considered by Started Year of Investment**

COST FACTOR	1951-1980		1981-1990		1991-2005		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
<b>Communication Cost</b>							
Excellence	1	6.7%	5	18.5%	2	6.1%	8
Good	6	40.0%	4	14.8%	9	27.3%	19
Fair	6	40.0%	12	44.4%	18	54.5%	36
Poor	1	6.7%	6	22.2%	3	9.1%	10
Too Bad	1	6.7%	0	0.0%	1	3.0%	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>75</b>

#### 4.2.1.5 Transportation Cost

In period of 1951-1980 and 1981-1990, and then 1991-2005, Japanese FDI companies' percept about transportation cost as fair level, which are 40.0%, and 51.9% and then 45.5%. It means that every period when started investment, their attitude about transportation cost was fair level.

**Table 4.15**  
**Transportation Cost Considered by Started Year of Investment**

COST FACTOR	1951-1980		1981-1990		1991-2005		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
<b>Transportation Cost</b>							
Excellence	1	6.7%	2	7.4%	2	6.1%	5
Good	4	26.7%	5	18.5%	4	12.1%	13
Fair	6	40.0%	14	51.9%	15	45.5%	35
Poor	4	26.7%	5	18.5%	12	36.4%	21
Too Bad	0	0.0%	1	3.7%	0	0.0%	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>75</b>

#### 4.2.1.6 Real Estate Cost

In established year of period 1951-1980, Japanese FDI companies' percept about real estate cost to be poor level, which is 40.0% and the period year 1981-1990, was considered real estate cost to be fair level, which is 48.1%. The last period year 1991-2005, real estate cost was considered to be poor level, which is 39.4%. It means that when established year of 1951-1980 and 1981-1990 are remain the perception about real estate cost until 1991-2005, their perception are changed to be worst that went to poor level.

**Table 4.16**  
**Real Estate Cost Considered by Started Year of Investment**

COST FACTOR	1951-1980		1981-1990		1991-2005		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
<b>Real Estate Cost</b>							
Excellence	1	6.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1
Good	2	13.3%	2	7.4%	8	24.2%	12
Fair	2	13.3%	13	48.1%	11	33.3%	26
Poor	6	40.0%	12	44.4%	13	39.4%	31
Too Bad	4	26.7%	0	0.0%	1	3.0%	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>75</b>

#### 4.2.1.7 Utility Cost

In established year of period 1951-1980, Japanese FDI companies' percept about utility cost to be fair level, which is 40.0% and the period year 1981-1990, was considered utility cost to be fair level, which is 63.0%. The last period year 1991-2005 was considered to be fair level, which is 63.6%. It means that every period of established year considered utility cost to be fair level.

**Table 4.17**  
**Utility Cost Considered by Started Year of Investment**

COST FACTOR	1951-1980		1981-1990		1991-2005		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
<b>Utility Cost</b>							
Excellence	2	13.3%	2	7.4%	0	0.0%	4
Good	3	20.0%	2	7.4%	6	18.2%	11
Fair	6	40.0%	17	63.0%	21	63.6%	44
Poor	4	26.7%	6	22.2%	6	18.2%	16
Too Bad	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>75</b>

#### 4.2.1.8 Exchange Rate

The perception of Japanese FDI companies about exchange rate in the established year period of 1951-1980 is fair level, which is 66.7% and the period year 1981-1990, is also fair level, which is 63.0%. The last period year 1991-2005, exchange rate was considered to be fair level, which is 39.4%. It means that every period of established year when they started to investment they considered exchange rate to be fair level.

**Table 4.18**  
**Exchange Rate Considered by Started Year of Investment**

COST FACTOR	1951-1980		1981-1990		1991-2005		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
<b>Exchange Rate</b>							
Excellence	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	15.2%	5
Good	2	13.3%	6	22.2%	9	27.3%	17
Fair	10	66.7%	17	63.0%	13	39.4%	40
Poor	2	13.3%	3	11.1%	5	15.2%	10
Too Bad	1	6.7%	1	3.7%	1	3.0%	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>75</b>

#### 4.2.1.9 Interest Rate

The perception of Japanese FDI companies about interest rate in the established year period of 1951-1980 is fair to good level because the percentage of fair level and good level are the same, which is 40.0%. In the period year 1981-1990, the Japanese FDI companies considered interest rate to be fair level, which is 33.3%. The last period year 1991-2005, interest rate was considered to be fair level, which is 42.4%. It means that every period of established year, Japanese FDI companies considered interest rate to be between fair and good level.



**Table 4.19**  
**Interest Rate Considered by Started Year of Investment**

COST FACTOR	1951-1980		1981-1990		1991-2005		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
<b>Interest Rate</b>							
Excellence	1	6.7%	5	18.5%	8	24.2%	14
Good	6	40.0%	8	29.6%	9	27.3%	23
Fair	6	40.0%	9	33.3%	14	42.4%	29
Poor	2	13.3%	4	14.8%	2	6.1%	8
Too Bad	0	0.0%	1	3.7%	0	0.0%	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>75</b>

#### 4.2.2 Availability Factor

It composes of material, labor, capital, real estate, utility, and raising funds. When they started to invest in Thailand, the sample group vision toward availability factors is at 3.13 of mean value. If we consider sub-factors in availability factor, it was found that the mean value of capital availability is the highest of all factors that is 3.50. It is follow by material availability is 3.39 and the mean value of raising funds is 3.32. However, real estate is the lowest perception in vision of Japanese FDI companies that is 2.92 while the mean value of utility availability is 3.13. So when we average the mean value of availability factor, its mean value is at 3.39, which is fair level.

**Table 4.20**  
**Availability Factors When Started to Invest**

Competitiveness Factors	Excellence		Good		Fair		Poor		Too Bad		Total		Mean Value
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
<b>2. Material Availability</b>													3.13
Material	8	10.9	29	38.7	22	29.0	12	15.8	4	5.6	75	100	3.39
Labor	3	4.2	6	8.2	24	31.8	33	43.3	9	12.5	75	100	2.49
Capital	6	8.3	35	47.2	23	30.0	11	14.5	0	0	75	100	3.50
Real Estate	2	2.8	14	18.7	38	51.1	18	23.2	3	4.2	75	100	2.92
Utility	2	2.8	19	25.1	42	55.6	11	15.1	1	1.4	75	100	3.13
Raising Funds	4	5.6	30	40.0	28	37.3	11	14.3	2	2.8	75	100	3.32

We will consider each sub-factor of Material Availability Factor toward period of established year that we can separate to be 3 periods as 1951-1980, 1981-1990, and 1991-2005. It can consider like these.

#### 4.2.2.1 Material Availability

The perception of Japanese FDI companies about material availability in the established year period of 1951-1980 is good level, which is 40.0%. In the period year 1981-1990, the Japanese FDI companies also considered material availability to be good level, which is 51.9%. The last period year 1991-2005, material availability was considered to be fair level, which is 30.3%.

**Table 4.21**  
**Material Availability Considered by Started Year of Investment**

Availability Factor	1951-1980		1981-1990		1991-2005		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
<b>Material Availability</b>							
Excellence	0	0.0%	2	7.4%	6	18.2%	8
Good	6	40.0%	14	51.9%	9	27.3%	29
Fair	5	33.3%	7	25.9%	10	30.3%	22
Poor	3	20.0%	4	14.8%	5	15.2%	12
Too Bad	1	6.7%	0	0.0%	3	9.1%	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>75</b>

#### 4.2.2.2 Labor Availability

The perception of Japanese FDI companies about labor availability in the established year period of 1951-1980 is fair to good level, which is the same percentage of 33.3%. In the period year 1981-1990, the Japanese FDI companies also considered labor availability to be worst that is poor level is 55.6%. The last period year 1991-2005, labor availability was considered to be poor level, which is 39.4%.

**Table 4.22**  
**Labor Availability Considered by Started Year of Investment**

Availability Factor	1951-1980		1981-1990		1991-2005		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
<b>Labor Availability</b>							
Excellence	1	6.7%	0	0.0%	2	6.1%	3
Good	1	6.7%	1	3.7%	4	12.1%	6
Fair	5	33.3%	7	25.9%	12	36.4%	24
Poor	5	33.3%	15	55.6%	13	39.4%	33
Too Bad	3	20.0%	4	14.8%	2	6.1%	9
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>75</b>

#### 4.2.2.3 Capital Availability

The perception of Japanese FDI companies about capital availability in the established year period of 1951-1980 and 1981-1990 include of 1991-2005 are good level, which are 40.0%, and 44.4%, and then 51.5%. It means that every period of established year, Japanese FDI companies considered capital availability are not different perception.

**Table 4.23**

#### Capital Availability Considered by Started Year of Investment

Availability Factor	1951-1980		1981-1990		1991-2005		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
<b>Capital Availability</b>							
Excellence	1	6.7%	2	7.4%	3	9.1%	6
Good	6	40.0%	12	44.4%	17	51.5%	35
Fair	5	33.3%	8	29.6%	10	30.3%	23
Poor	3	20.0%	5	18.5%	3	9.1%	11
Too Bad	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>75</b>

#### 4.2.2.4 Real Estate Availability

The perception of Japanese FDI companies about real estate availability in the established year period of 1951-1980 is poor level, which is 33.3%. In the period year 1981-1990, the Japanese FDI companies considered real estate availability to be better that is fair level is 51.9%. The last period year 1991-2005, real estate availability was considered to be fair level, which is 60.6%.

**Table 4.24**  
**Real Estate Availability Considered by Started Year of Investment**

Availability Factor	1951-1980		1981-1990		1991-2005		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
<b>Real Estate</b>							
Excellence	1	6.7%	1	3.7%	0	0.0%	2
Good	3	20.0%	7	25.9%	4	12.1%	14
Fair	4	26.7%	14	51.9%	20	60.6%	38
Poor	5	33.3%	5	18.5%	8	24.2%	18
Too Bad	2	13.3%	0	0.0%	1	3.0%	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>75</b>

#### 4.2.2.5 Utility Availability

The perception of Japanese FDI companies about utility availability in the established year period of 1951-1980, 1981-1990, and 1991-2005 all are the same level that are fair level. The percentages in each period are 40.0%, 63.0, and 57.6%.

**Table 4.25**  
**Utility Availability Considered by Started Year of Investment**

The mean value is 3.13

Availability Factor	1951-1980		1981-1990		1991-2005		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
<b>Utility Availability</b>							
Excellence	0	0.0%	1	3.7%	1	3.0%	2
Good	5	33.3%	7	25.9%	7	21.2%	19
Fair	6	40.0%	17	63.0%	19	57.6%	42
Poor	3	20.0%	2	7.4%	6	18.2%	11
Too Bad	1	6.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>75</b>

#### 4.2.2.6 Raising Fund Availability

The perception of Japanese FDI companies about raising funds availability in the established year period of 1951-1980, and 1981-1990, all are the same level that are fair level. The percentages in each period are 46.7%, and 48.1%. In the period of 1991-2005, Japanese FDI companies considered raising fund to be better that is good level of 54.5%.

**Table 4.26**

#### Raising Fund Availability Considered by Started Year of Investment

Material Availability Factor	1951-1980		1981-1990		1991-2005		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
<b>Raising Funds</b>							
Excellence	0	0.0%	2	7.4%	2	6.1%	4
Good	4	26.7%	8	29.6%	18	54.5%	30
Fair	7	46.7%	13	48.1%	8	24.2%	28
Poor	4	26.7%	3	11.1%	4	12.1%	11
Too Bad	0	0.0%	1	3.7%	1	3.0%	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>75</b>

#### 4.2.3 Quality Factor

Component factors of quality factors are material, equipment, skill of labor level, and utility reliability, which are considered for percentage and mean value to investigate the perception factors for their investment when they started to invest in Thailand. However the majority of sample group vision to quality factor as the mean value is 3.51. The vision level to these factors are nearly good level. When we consider sub-factors in quality factor, it was found that the mean value of equipment quality is the highest of all factors that is 3.59. It is follow by utility reliability is 3.53. The mean value of material quality and skill labor level is the same, which is 3.47. So when we average the mean value of quality factor, its mean value is at 3.51, which is fair level.

**Table 4.27**  
**Quality Factors When Started to Invest**

Competitiveness Factors	Excellence		Good		Fair		Poor		Too Bad		Total		Mean
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Value
<b>Quality Factors</b>													<b>3.51</b>
Material Quality	10	13.6	32	43.0	18	23.4	12	15.7	3	4.3	75	100	3.47
Equipment Quality	8	11.0	36	47.9	19	25.5	12	15.6	0	0	75	100	3.56
Skill of Labor Level	6	8.4	30	40.0	31	41.8	8	9.8	0	0	75	100	3.47
Utility Reliability	7	9.8	32	42.7	31	40.5	5	7.0	0	0	75	100	3.53

Each sub-factor of Quality Factor is considered toward period of established year that we can separate to be 3 periods as 1951-1980, 1981-1990, and 1991-2005. It can consider like these.

#### 4.2.3.1 Material Quality

The perception of Japanese FDI companies about material quality in the established year period of 1951-1980 is two levels that are good level and poor level. All of those levels are the same percentage of 6.4%. In established year 1981-1990, the material quality is considered to be good level, which is 15.5%. In the last period of 1991-2005, Japanese FDI companies considered material quality to be the same level of middle period that is good level that is 21.4%. When we consider total period, the most perception of material quality is also still good level, which is 43.0% of all, follow by fair level is 23.4%, and poor level is 15.7%, excellent level is 13.6% and the lowest perceptions is too bad level, which is 4.3%. When we consider the mean value of material quality its value is 3.47 that is good level.

**Table 4.28**  
**Material Quality Considered by Started Year of Investment**

Quality Factor	1951-1980		1981-1990		1991-2005		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
<b>Material Quality</b>							
Excellence	2	13.3%	5	18.5%	3	9.1%	10
Good	5	33.3%	11	40.7%	16	48.5%	32
Fair	3	20.0%	9	33.3%	6	18.2%	18
Poor	5	33.3%	2	7.4%	5	15.2%	12
Too Bad	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	9.1%	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>75</b>

#### 4.2.3.2 Equipment Quality

The perception of Japanese FDI companies about equipment quality in the established year period of 1951-1980 is fair level, which is 10.6%. In established year 1981-1990 and 1991-2005, the equipment qualities are considered to be good level, which is 19.9% and 18.6%. When we consider total period, the most perception of equipment quality is good level, which is 47.9% of all, follow by fair level is 25.5%, and poor level is 15.6%, excellent level is 11.0% and the perception of equipment quality in too bad level was not considered, which is 0%. When we consider the mean value of equipment quality its value is 3.56 that is good level.

**Table 4.29**  
**Equipment Quality Considered by Started Year of Investment**

Quality Factor	1951-1980		1981-1990		1991-2005		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
<b>Equipment Quality</b>							
Excellence	0	0.0%	4	14.8%	4	12.1%	8
Good	7	46.7%	15	55.6%	14	42.4%	36
Fair	8	53.3%	3	11.1%	8	24.2%	19
Poor	0	0.0%	5	18.5%	7	21.2%	12
Too Bad	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>75</b>



### 4.2.3.3 Skill Labor Level

The perception of Japanese FDI companies about skill labor level in the established year period of 1951-1980 is good level, which is 9.3%. In established year 1981-1990, skill labor level are two levels that are good level and fair level, which is 14.5% and 1991-2005, the skill labor level was considered to be fair level, which is 19.4%. When we consider total period, the most perception of skill labor level is fair level, which is 41.8% of all, follow by good level is 40.0%, and poor level is 9.8%, excellent level is 8.4% and the perception of skill labor level in too bad level was not considered, which is 0%. When we consider the mean value of skill labor level its value is 3.47 that is fair and nearly to good level.

**Table 4.30**

#### **Skill Labor Level Considered by Started Year of Investment**

Quality Factor	1951-1980		1981-1990		1991-2005		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
<b>Skill labor Level</b>							
Excellence	0	0.0%	3	11.1%	3	9.1%	6
Good	7	46.7%	11	40.7%	12	36.4%	30
Fair	6	40.0%	11	40.7%	14	42.4%	31
Poor	2	13.3%	2	7.4%	4	12.1%	8
Too Bad	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>75</b>

### 4.2.3.4 Utility Reliability

The perception of Japanese FDI companies about utility reliability in the established year period of 1951-1980 and 1981-1990 are fair level, which are 9.3% and follow by 15.6%. In established year of 1991-2005, the utility reliability was considered to be good level, which is 22.8%. When we consider total period, the most perception of utility reliability is good level, which is 42.7% of all, follow by fair level is 40.5%, and excellent level is 9.8%, poor level is 7.0% and the perception of utility reliability in too bad level was not considered, which is 0%.

When we consider the mean value of utility reliability its value is 3.53 that is good level.

**Table 4.31**  
**Utility Reliability Considered by Started Year of Investment**

Quality Factor	1951-1980		1981-1990		1991-2005		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
<b>Utility Reliability</b>							
Excellence	2	13.3%	3	11.1%	2	6.1%	7
Good	5	33.3%	10	37.0%	17	51.5%	32
Fair	7	46.7%	12	44.4%	12	36.4%	31
Poor	1	6.7%	2	7.4%	2	6.1%	5
Too Bad	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>75</b>

#### 4.2.4.1 Corporation Tax

The perception of Japanese FDI companies about corporation tax in period of 1951-1980 is fair level, which is 60%. In 1981-1990 is also fair level that is 55.6%, and 1991-2005 are fair level, which 51.5%. So the corporation taxes in the vision of investors are all at fair level.

**Table 4.32**  
**Corporation Tax Considered by Started Year of Investment**

Economic Policy Factor	1951-1980		1981-1990		1991-2005		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
<b>Corporation Tax</b>							
Excellence	0	0	1	3.7	3	9.1	4
Good	3	20	6	22.2	5	15.2	14
Fair	9	60	15	55.6	17	51.5	41
Poor	3	20	3	11.1	5	15.2	11
Too Bad	0	0	2	7.4	3	9.1	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>75</b>

#### 4.2.4.2 Customs

In established year of period 1951-1980, Japanese FDI companies' percept about customs to be fair to good level, which is 33.3% and the period year 1981-1990, customs was considered to be good level, which is 44.4%. The last period year 1991-2005, customs was considered to be good level, which is 51.5.9%. We can conclude about perception of all investor customs as good level when they started to invest in Thailand.

**Table 4.33**  
**Customs Considered by Started Year of Investment**

Economic Policy Factor	1951-1980		1981-1990		1991-2005		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
<b>Customs</b>							
Excellence	2	13.3	4	14.8	8	24.2	14
Good	5	33.3	12	44.4	17	51.5	34
Fair	5	33.3	9	33.3	5	15.2	19
Poor	3	20	2	7.4	2	6.1	7
Too Bad	0	0	0	0	1	3.0	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>75</b>

#### 4.2.4.3 Non-Customs Barrier

In established year of period 1951-1980, Japanese FDI companies' percept about non-customs barrier to be good level, which is 46.7%. And the period year 1981-1990, non-customs barrier was considered to be fair level, which is 48.1%. The last period year 1991-2005, non-customs barrier was considered to be good level, which is 45.5%. The perception about non-customs barrier is better in vision of investors It is good level when the investors started to invest in Thailand.

**Table 4.34**  
**Non-Customs Barrier Considered by Started Year of Investment**

Economic Policy Factor	1951-1980		1981-1990		1991-2005		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
<b>Non Customs Barrier</b>							
Excellence	2	13.3	5	18.5	4	12.1	11
Good	7	46.7	8	29.6	15	45.5	30
Fair	3	20	13	48.1	12	36.4	28
Poor	3	20	1	3.7	2	6.1	6
Too Bad	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>75</b>

#### 4.2.4.4 Regulation Investment

In established year of period 1951-1980, Japanese FDI companies' percept about regulation investment to be good to excellent level, which is 33.3%. The period year 1981-1990, regulation investment was considered to be fair level, which is 51.9%. It is worst in investors' vision when compression to the past. After that, in the next period year 1991-2005, regulation investment was considered to be good level, which is 42.4%. So we can conclude about perception of all investors to regulation investment as fair level when the investors started to invest in Thailand.

Table 4.35

**Regulation Investment Considered by Started Year of Investment**

Economic Policy Factor	1951-1980		1981-1990		1991-2005		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
<b>Regulation Investment</b>							
Excellence	5	33.3	4	14.8	3	9.1	12
Good	5	33.3	7	25.9	14	42.4	26
Fair	4	26.7	14	51.9	12	36.4	30
Poor	1	6.7	2	7.4	3	9.1	6
Too Bad	0	0	0	0.0	1	3.0	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>75</b>

**4.2.4.5 Incentive**

In established year of period 1951-1980, Japanese FDI companies' percept about incentive to be 2 levels, which are good level and some group consider it to be poor level with the same percentage of 26.7%. In the period year 1981-1990, the out standing of incentive factor was considered to be fair level, which is 51.9%. It is not good and not poor when compare to the last period. In the next period year 1991-2005, incentive factor was considered to be fair level, which is 39.4% as the last period.

**Table 4.36**  
**Incentive Considered by Started Year of Investment**

Economic Policy Factor	1951-1980		1981-1990		1991-2005		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
<b>Incentive</b>							
Excellence	2	13.3	0	0.0	3	9.1	5
Good	4	26.7	7	25.9	8	24.2	19
Fair	3	20	14	51.9	13	39.4	30
Poor	4	26.7	4	14.8	8	24.2	16
Too Bad	2	13.3	2	7.4	1	3.0	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>75</b>

#### 4.2.4.6 Labor Law

In established year of period 1951-1980, 1981-1990, and 1991-2005 Japanese FDI companies' percept about labor law to be the same levels, which are fair level with the percentage of 53.3%, 48.1% and 51.5% in each period. It is not so difference in perception when the time past. Labor laws in Thailand also stay and not better or worst. Concluded about perception of all investors to labor law in Thailand that is fair level.

**Table 4.37**  
**Labor Law Considered by Started Year of Investment**

Economic Policy Factor	1951-1980		1981-1990		1991-2005		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
<b>Labor Law</b>							
Excellence	3	20	2	7.4	3	9.1	8
Good	2	13.3	8	29.6	11	33.3	21
Fair	8	53.3	13	48.1	17	51.5	38
Poor	2	13.3	4	14.8	2	6.1	8
Too Bad	0	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>75</b>

#### 4.2.4.7 Infrastructure

In established year of period 1951-1980 infrastructure in Japanese FDI companies' perception is fair level that is 46.7%. Until 1981-1990, and 1991-2005, Japanese FDI companies' percept about infrastructure is changed to be good level, which are 48.1% and 48.5%. It means that Thailand has developed infrastructure to be better when compare the attitude with the last period. Concluded about perception of all investors to infrastructure in Thailand that is good level

**Table 4.38**  
**Infrastructure Considered by Started Year of Investment**

Economic Policy Factor	1951-1980		1981-1990		1991-2005		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
<b>Infrastructure</b>							
Excellence	2	13.3	2	7.4	6	18.2	10
Good	5	33.3	13	48.1	16	48.5	34
Fair	7	46.7	10	37.0	7	21.2	24
Poor	1	6.7	2	7.4	4	12.1	7
Too Bad	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>75</b>

#### 4.2.5 Marketing Factor

Marketing factors are included of market scale and market potential that are different scale. When the sample group started to investment in Thailand they vision to marketing factors as the fair vision level because the mean value of marketing factor is show the result at 3.13. When we consider sub-factors in marketing factor, it was found that the mean value of market scale is the highest of all factors that is 3.33 and the mean value of market potential is 2.92. The average of the mean value of marketing factor is 3.13, which is fair level.

**Table 4.39**  
**Market Factors When Started to Invest**

Competitiveness Factors	Excellence		Good		Fair		Poor		Too Bad		Total	Mean	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Value
<b>Marketing Factors</b>													3.13
Market Scale	7	9.7	21	27.9	38	50.3	8	11.0	1	1.4	75	100	3.33
Market Potential	1	1.4	18	23.7	33	44.1	20	26.6	3	4.2	75	100	2.92



Each sub-factor of Marketing Factor is considered toward period of established year that we can separate to be 3 periods as 1951-1980, 1981-1990, and 1991-2005. It can consider as follow.

#### 4.2.5.1 Marketing Scale

In established year of period 1951-1980, 1981-1990, and 1991-2005, Japanese FDI companies' perception about marketing scale are fair level that are 60%, 51.9%, and 45.5%. Concluded about perception of all investors in each period to marketing scale in Thailand is fair level.

**Table 4.40**  
**Marketing Scale Considered by Started Year of Investment**

Marketing Factor	1951-1980		1981-1990		1991-2005		Total No.
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
<b>Market Scale</b>							
Excellence	0	0.0	3	11.1	4	12.1	7
Good	3	20.0	10	37.0	8	24.2	21
Fair	9	60.0	14	51.9	15	45.5	38
Poor	3	20.0	0	0.0	5	15.2	8
Too Bad	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.0	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>75</b>

#### 4.2.5.2 Marketing Potential

In established year of period 1951-1980, the perception about marketing potential in Thailand is poor level, which is 53.3%. Until 1981-1990, marketing potential is went to better in vision of investors, it is fair and good level, which are 40.7%. In 1991-2005, Japanese FDI companies' perception about marketing

potential is fair level that is 54.5%. Concluded about perception of all investors to marketing potential in Thailand is only fair level.

**Table 4.41**  
**Marketing Potential Considered by Started Year of Investment**

Marketing Factor	1951-1980		1981-1990		1991-2005		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
<b>Market Potential</b>							
Excellence	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.0	1
Good	2	13.3	11	40.7	5	15.2	18
Fair	4	26.7	11	40.7	18	54.5	33
Poor	8	53.3	5	18.5	7	21.2	20
Too Bad	1	6.7	0	0.0	2	6.1	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>75</b>

#### 4.2.6 Other Factors

For consideration of competitiveness factors, those are included of social stability, political stability, and language problem. It was found that the sample group perceives to these factors when started to invest in Thailand, the result is showed by the means value of other factors is 3.11. When we consider sub-factors in other factors, it was found that the highest perception is language problem, which the mean value is 3.53. It means that language in host country is not effect to the decision of Japanese FDI companies when they decide to invest in Thailand. While they considered social stability and political stability in Thailand are poor level. The mean value of social stability is the lowest of all factors that is 2.83. It means that the vision of investors to Thailand' social stability is not good vision and the mean value of political stability is 2.96. It is also not good level. But all of them are not effect to their decision for investment in Thailand because the language factor is so high so the average of the mean value of other factor is 3.11, which is fair level.

**Table 4.42**  
**Other Factors When Started to Invest**

Competitiveness Factors	Excellence		Good		Fair		Poor		Too Bad		Total		Mean Value
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
<b>Other Factors</b>													3.11
Social Stability	1	1.4	19	25.0	26	34.7	25	33.3	4	5.6	75	100	2.83
Political Stability	5	6.8	18	23.6	23	30.8	27	36.0	2	2.8	75	100	2.96
Language Problem	10	13.8	23	30.7	38	49.9	4	5.6	0	0	75	100	3.53

Each sub-factor of Other Factors is considered toward period of established year that we can separate to be 3 periods as 1951-1980, 1981-1990, and 1991-2005. It can consider as follow.

#### 4.2.6.1 Social Stability

In established year of period 1951-1980, the perception about social stability in Thailand is fair level, which is 40.0%. Until 1981-1990, social stability is went to poor level in vision of investors, which is 33.3%. In 1991-2005, Japanese FDI companies' perception about social stability is still poor level to fair level that is 36.4%. Social stability in vision of investors to Thailand is not good

**Table 4.43**  
**Social Stability Considered by Started Year of Investment**

Other Factors	1951-1980		1981-1990		1991-2005		Total No.
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
<b>Social Stability</b>							
Excellence	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.0	1
Good	4	26.7	8	29.6	7	21.2	19
Fair	6	40.0	8	29.6	12	36.4	26
Poor	4	26.7	9	33.3	12	36.4	25
Too Bad	1	6.7	2	7.4	1	3.0	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>75</b>

#### 4.2.6.2 Political Stability

In established year of period 1951-1980, the perception about political stability in Thailand is fair level, which is 53.3%. In the period of 1981-1990, political stability has two periods of good level and poor levels, which are 33.3%. In the last period of 1991-2005, Japanese FDI companies' perception about political stability is still poor level that is 48.5%. The political stability in vision of investors to Thailand is not good.

**Table 4.44**

#### Political Stability Considered by Started Year of Investment

Other Factor	1951-1980		1981-1990		1991-2005		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
<b>Political Stability</b>							
Excellence	2	13.3	2	7.4	1	3.0	5
Good	2	13.3	9	33.3	7	21.2	18
Fair	8	53.3	6	22.2	9	27.3	23
Poor	2	13.3	9	33.3	16	48.5	27
Too Bad	1	6.7	1	3.7	0	0.0	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>75</b>

#### 4.2.6.3 Language Problem

In established year of period 1951-1980, the perception about language problem in Thailand is fair level, which is 46.7%. In the period of 1981-1990, language problem is fair level, which is 55.6%. In the last period of 1991-2005, Japanese FDI companies' perception about language problem is still fair level that is 48.5%. So the perception of investor for language problem is fair level.

**Table 4.45**  
**Language Problem Considered by Started Year of Investment**

Other Factor	1951-1980		1981-1990		1991-2005		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
<b>Language Problem</b>							
Excellence	2	13.3	0	0.0	8	24.2	10
Good	5	33.3	10	37.0	8	24.2	23
Fair	7	46.7	15	55.6	16	48.5	38
Poor	1	6.7	2	7.4	1	3.0	4
Too Bad	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>75</b>

### **4.3 Evaluation of Perceptions toward Competitiveness Factors at the present that sample group evaluate**

The next step is that 6 main investigative factors are still our tools but the purpose is now changed to investigate the perception toward factors at present. It was found that the most important factor for the sample group is economic policy factor, which scores 3.23, followed by the quality factor, which scores 3.13. The third rank is the cost factor, which scores 2.89 point. Then, material cost factor follows with the point of 2.88. The least important factor is of other factors, which gets 2.60 point.

**Table 4.46**  
**Ranking Perception of Factors: at the Present**

Factors	Mean Value
1. Economic Policy Factors	3.23
2. Quality Factors	3.13
3. Cost Factors	2.89
4. Material Availability Factors	2.88
5. Market Factors	2.66
6. Other Factors	2.60

The results of each perceptual factors are discussed in more details below.

#### 4.3.1 Cost Factors

At the present, the attitude of the sample group toward competitiveness of cost factor remains the same. It was found that the mean value of cost factors is 2.89.

**Table 4.47**  
**Cost Factors at the present**

Competitiveness Factors	Excellence		Good		Fair		Poor		Too Bad		Total		Mean Value
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
<b>Cost Factors</b>													<b>2.89</b>
Material Cost	3	4.2	16	20.8	35	47.2	17	22.2	4	5.6	75	100	2.96
Labor Cost	0	0	5	6.9	27	36.1	30	40.3	13	16.7	75	100	2.33
Capital Cost	4	5.6	18	23.6	42	55.6	10	13.9	1	1.3	75	100	3.18
Communication Cost	1	1.3	7	9.7	51	68.1	13	16.7	3	4.2	75	100	2.88
Transportation Cost	1	1.3	10	12.7	45	60.6	19	25.4	0	0	75	100	2.90
Real Estate Cost	0	0	17	22.2	36	48.6	19	25.0	3	4.2	75	100	2.89
Utility Cost	4	5.6	10	13.9	46	61.1	15	19.4	0	0	75	100	3.06
Exchange Rate	0	0	13	16.9	47	63.4	14	18.3	1	1.4	75	100	2.96
Interest Rate	5	7.0	13	16.9	31	40.8	20	26.8	6	8.5	75	100	2.87

### 4.3.2 Material Availability Factors

The sample group gave 2.88 point to the availability factor at the present. The perception on this factors at the present declines comparing to the perception when they just started their businesses in Thailand.

**Table 4.48**  
**Availability Factor at the present**

Competitiveness Factors	Excellence		Good		Fair		Poor		Too Bad		Total		Mean Value
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
<b>Availability factor</b>													2.88
Material	2	2.8	18	23.6	31	41.7	19	25	5	6.9	75	100	2.90
Labor	1	1.4	5	6.9	36	47.2	30	40.3	3	4.2	75	100	2.61
Capital	1	1.4	18	23.6	40	52.8	16	22.2	0	0	75	100	3.04
Real Estate	1	1.4	12	15.5	47	63.4	14	18.3	1	1.4	75	100	2.97
Utility	0	0	11	15.3	49	65.3	15	19.4	0	0	75	100	2.96
Raising Funds	2	2.7	11	15.3	37	48.6	21	27.8	4	5.6	75	100	2.82

### 4.3.3 Quality factors

The score of quality factor given by the sample group at the present is 3.13 of mean level. It is at the fair level.

**Table 4.49**  
**Quality Factor at the present**

Competitiveness Factors	Excellence		Good		Fair		Poor		Too Bad		Total		Mean Value
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
<b>Quality Factors</b>													3.13
Material Quality	2	2.8	22	29.2	29	38.9	19	25	3	4.1	75	100	3.01
Equipment Quality	2	2.8	27	36.1	28	37.5	18	23.6	0	0	75	100	3.18
Skill of Labor Level	5	4.1	19	25.0	37	52.8	14	18.1	0	0	75	100	3.15
Utility Reliability	2	2.8	19	25.4	43	57.7	11	14.1	0	0	75	100	3.17

#### 4.3.4 Economic Policy Factors

The mean value of the economic policy factor at the present is 3.23. Comparing to the mean value given to this factor prior to the investment, the mean value of this factor shows a little bit downward trend.

**Table 4.50**  
**Economic policy Factor at the present**

Competitiveness Factors	Excellence		Good		Fair		Poor		Too Bad		Total		Mean
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Value
<b>Economic Policy</b>													3.23
Corporation Tax	6	8.3	14	18.1	41	54.2	9	12.5	5	6.9	75	100	3.08
Customs	13	16.7	31	41.7	20	26.4	10	13.9	1	1.3	75	100	3.58
Non Customs Barrier	7	9.7	27	36.1	33	43.1	8	11.1	0	0	75	100	3.44
Regulation Investment	5	6.9	11	15.3	41	54.2	16	20.8	2	2.8	75	100	3.03
Intensive	4	5.6	15	19.4	44	58.3	10	13.9	2	2.8	75	100	3.10
Labor Law	7	9.7	20	26.4	41	54.2	7	9.7	0	0	75	100	3.36
Infrastructure	3	4.2	18	23.9	32	42.3	22	29.6	0	0	75	100	3.03

#### 4.3.5 Market Factors

According to the results derived from the questionnaires, the result of evaluation in this factor is showed in percent and mean value that we can conclude the average value of mean and get the result of 2.66. It is rather low to middle level.

**Table 4.51**  
**Market Factor at the present**

Competitiveness Factors	Excellence		Good		Fair		Poor		Too Bad		Total		Mean
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Value
<b>Marketing Factors</b>													2.66
Market Scale	1	1.4	13	16.7	30	40.3	27	36.1	4	5.5	75	100	2.72
Market Potential	1	1.4	11	13.9	24	31.9	36	48.6	3	4.2	75	100	2.60





From the zone ranking (Table 4.30), South East Asia is the most popular area for Japanese investment, which accounted for 28.0% of total sampling. To be more specific, Indonesia is the first rank of interested country in this zone, which is 17.3% (Table 4. 31). It means that the majority of sample groups are more interested to invest in Indonesia than to invest in the other countries. Malaysia is the second rank, which is 13.3% of interest. Singapore is the third rank with 8.0%. Vietnam is 5.3%, followed by the Philippines at 2.7% while Cambodia is 1.3%, which seems to be out of our sample group interest. In second rank, Indonesia and Malaysia are both at the highest rank. Singapore is their first choice in the third rank. The Philippines are ranked in the first sequence of the fourth rank. Moreover, Vietnam is the first country in the fifth rank while Cambodia is the first country in the sixth rank.

**Table 4.54**  
**Illustrate Country in South East Asia**

Sequence	1st Rank		2nd Rank		3rd Rank		4th Rank		5th Rank		6th Rank		7th Rank	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<b>COUNTRY</b>														
South East Asia														
Indonesia	13	17.3	9	12.0	0	0	1	1.3	0	0	1	1.3	1	1.3
Singapore	6	8.0	3	4.0	5	6.7	0	0	1	1.3	0	0	2	2.7
Malaysia	10	13.3	9	12.0	1	1.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Philippine	2	2.7	3	4.0	1	1.3	4	5.3	0	0	1	1.3	0	0
Myanmar	0	0	0	0	1	1.3	0	0	1	1.3	1	1.3	2	2.7
Cambodia	1	1.3	0	0	1	1.3	0	0	1	1.3	2	2.7	0	0
Vietnam	4	5.3	1	1.3	2	2.7	2	2.7	2	2.7	0	0	0	0
No Choose	39	52.1	50	66.7	64	85.4	68	90.7	70	93.4	70	93.4	70	93.3
Total	75	100	75	100	75	100	75	100	75	100	75	100	75	100

The second most popular zone is East Asia, which is accounted for 24.0% of the total sampling (Table 4.30). In the first rank, China gains the highest interest (20%) comparing to other countries in this zone (Table 4.32) while the second highest interest goes to Taiwan with 13.3% of interest. Hong Kong is the third rank, with 4% of interest. In the second rank, the first choice of these countries is South Korea (6.7%), and followed by Taiwan (5.3%), which is chosen as the second country in this rank. In the third rank, Hong Kong is the first choice with 6.7% of interest. From 5th rank onwards, the sample group selected no country in this zone.

**Table 4.55**  
**Illustrate Country in East Asia**

Sequence	1st Rank		2nd Rank		3rd Rank		4th Rank		5th Rank		6th Rank		7th Rank	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<b>COUNTRY</b>														
East Asia														
<b>Taiwan</b>	10	13.3	4	5.3	1	1.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Hong Kong</b>	3	4.0	1	1.3	5	6.7	1	1.3	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>South Korea</b>	2	2.7	5	6.7	1	1.3	2	2.7	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>China</b>	15	20.0	3	4.0	3	4.0	2	2.7	0	0	0	0	0	0
No Choose	45	60.0	62	82.7	65	86.7	70	93.3	75	100	75	100	75	100
Total	75	100	75	100	75	100	75	100	75	100	75	100	75	100

The third most popular zone for Japanese investors is North America, which accounted for 6.7% (Table 4.30). After analyzing the rank of countries in this zone (Table 4.33), it was found that in the first rank goes to America with 20.0% of interest while the second rank is Canada with 8.0% of interest.

**Table 4.56**  
**Illustrate Country in North America**

Sequence	1st Rank		2nd Rank		3rd Rank		4th Rank		5th Rank		6th Rank		7th Rank	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<b>COUNTRY</b>														
North America														
<b>America</b>	15	20.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Canada</b>	0	0	6	8.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
No Choose	60	80.0	69	92.0	75	100	75	100	75	100	75	100	75	100
Total	75	100	75	100	75	100	75	100	75	100	75	100	75	100

Latin America is the fourth most popular zone which gets 1.3% (Table 4.30). When we consider the rank of countries in this zone (Table 4.34), Brazil is the first rank of country that is accounted for 4.0% and followed by Mexico (2.7%). Panama and Keiman are not interested to be the first rank of countries. For the second rank, Brazil is the first country that they interested while no other countries are interested from the third rank onwards.

**Table 4.57**  
**Illustrate Country in Latin America**

Sequence	1st Rank		2nd Rank		3rd Rank		4th Rank		5th Rank		6th Rank		7th Rank	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<b>COUNTRY</b>														
Latin America														
Panama	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mexico	2	2.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Brazil	3	4.0	1	1.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Keiman	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
No Choose	70	93.3	74	98.7	75	100	75	100	75	100	75	100	75	100
Total	75	100	75	100	75	100	75	100	75	100	75	100	75	100

Ocean is also the fourth most popular with as well as Latin America with 1.3% interest of total sampling (Table 4.30). When we consider rank of each country (Table 4.35), in the first rank, Australia is the first most popular place in this zone (1.3%) while New Zealand is not considered in the first rank. There are not any more ranks of these countries.

**Table 4.58**  
**Illustrate Country in Ocean**

Sequence	1st Rank		2nd Rank		3rd Rank		4th Rank		5th Rank		6th Rank		7th Rank	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<b>COUNTRY</b>														
Ocean														
Australia	1	1.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Zealand	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
No Choose	74	98.7	75	100	75	100	75	100	75	100	75	100	75	100
Total	75	100	75	100	75	100	75	100	75	100	75	100	75	100

Europe is also the fourth most popular zone for Japanese investors as well as Latin America and Ocean, which also accounted for 1.3% of total sampling (Table 4.30). When we consider the rank of each country in this zone (Table 4.36), in the first rank, England is the first choice in this zone for Japanese investors (4.0%) while German is the second choice in the first rank (1.3%). If we consider the second rank, Spain and Italy are considered to be the first countries. In the third rank, the first country is German. In the fourth rank, the first country is Holland. In the fifth rank, France is the first country while no companies are considered to be in the sixth rank. In the seventh rank, the first country is Ireland.

**Table 4.59**  
**Illustrate Country in Europe**

Sequence	1st Rank		2nd Rank		3rd Rank		4th Rank		5th Rank		6th Rank		7th Rank	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<b>COUNTRY</b>														
Europe														
England	3	4.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
France	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.3	0	0	0	0
Holland	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.3	0	0	0	0	0	0
German	1	1.3	0	0	1	1.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Spain	0	0	1	1.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ireland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.3
Italy	0	0	1	1.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
No Choose	71	94.7	73	97.4	74	98.7	74	98.7	74	98.7	75	100	74	98.7
Total	75	100	75	100	75	100	75	100	75	100	75	100	75	100

Now let's consider the zones that are not considered to be in the first rank (Table 4.30) but, in the second rank, Japanese FDI companies chose India to be their first choice of this zone with 2.7% of total sampling (Table 4.37) while other countries in South Asian zone are not considered.

**Table 4.60**  
**Illustrate Country in South Asia**

Sequence	1st Rank		2nd Rank		3rd Rank		4th Rank		5th Rank		6th Rank		7th Rank	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<b>COUNTRY</b>														
South Asia														
India	2	2.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sri Lanka	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pakistan	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nepal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bangladesh	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
No Choose	73	97.3	75	100	75	100	75	100	75	100	75	100	75	100
Total	75	100	75	100	75	100	75	100	75	100	75	100	75	100

Middle East and African zones are not considered to be the first rank (Table 4.30). No countries in this zone gain any interest from our study group. None of those companies chose them. In this study, Middle zone comprises of 3 countries which are Israel, Kuwait, The United Arab Emirates while African zone comprises of Siberia and South Africa (Table 4.38 and Table 4.39)

**Table 4.61**  
**Illustrate Country in Middle East**

Sequence	1st Rank		2nd Rank		3rd Rank		4th Rank		5th Rank		6th Rank		7th Rank	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<b>COUNTRY</b>														
Middle East														
Israel	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kuwait	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
United Arab	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
No Choose	75	100	75	100	75	100	75	100	75	100	75	100	75	100

**Table 4.62**  
**Illustrate Country in Africa**

Sequence	1st Rank		2nd Rank		3rd Rank		4th Rank		5th Rank		6th Rank		7th Rank	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<b>COUNTRY</b>														
Africa														
Siberia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Africa	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
No Choose	75	100	75	100	75	100	75	100	75	100	75	100	75	100
Total	75	100	75	100	75	100	75	100	75	100	75	100	75	100

#### 4.5 Company's Investment Plans Over the Next 2-3 years

In this part, the questions are focused on the future plan of each company in order to run their business in Thailand. The results can be concluded as follows.

It was found that the majority of countries in the sample group want to slightly expand (48.5%) while 33.8% of the group wants to maintain existing business level. Some of them aim to significantly expand (16.2%) while those who want to slightly reduce their business is only 1.5%. It means that nearly 50% of sample groups expect to continue their business in Thailand because only 1.5% of total sampling plans to reduce their investment. While the attitude of significantly reduce and exit country are 0%. It means that they have no plan to significantly reduce or exit the country. The mean value is at 2.21, it means that Japanese FDI need to slightly expand.

**Table 4.63**  
**Illustrates the Investment Plan Over the Next 2-3 Years in Thailand**

<b>Investment Plan Over the Nest 2-3 Years</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>Quantity of Sample Group</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>100</b>
1. Significantly Expand	12	16.2
2. Slightly Expand	36	48.5
3. Maintain Existing Business Level	25	33.8
4. Slightly Reduce	2	1.5
5. Significantly Reduce	0	0
5. Exit the Country	0	0

The mean value is 2.21

#### **4.6 Relocation Plan in the Next 3 Year in Thailand**

Almost all of the companies in the sample group have no plan to relocate in the next 3 year (97.1%). Only 2.9% of these companies plan to relocate their companies. There are various reasons, for example, some companies plan to move the warehouse to be at the same area as the office in the suburban area, or some companies want to reestablish their office in the area that is close to their customers.

**Table 4.64**  
**Illustrates the Relocation Plan in the Next 3 Years**

<b>Relocation Plan Next 3 Years</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>Quantity of Sample Group</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>100</b>
1. No	73	97.1
2. Yes	2	2.9

## **4.7 Opinion about Taking Incentives and Suggestion to Improve Investment Environment**

### **1. The opinion questions about taking incentive from Thai Government**

36% of the companies in our sample group do not get any incentive from the government while 49.33% get various kinds of incentives. The rest are companies that give us no response (14.67%). The examples of incentives are as follows:

1.1 They get tax exemption and reduction of income tax for 8 years after that reduction of it for 5 years

1.2 Exemption and reduction from customs for import tax of materials and machinery for purpose of export and facility.

1.3 Exemption of corporation tax for 7-8 years.

1.4 Receive BOI privileges corporation tax for 7 years and exempt export tax for products and machinery on industrial real estate zone.

1.5 Having proprietary right of lands.

1.6 Getting issue working permit

1.7 Taking the registered exporter.

1.8 Getting many support from EPZ, IEAT and BOI.

### **2. The suggestion of how to improve the current investment environment and business climate for industry.**

To answer the question of how to improve the current investment environment and business climate for industry, it was found that 21.33% of the sample group did not answer while 78.67% did. To be clear, let me conclude and illustrate these data by table as follows.



**Table 4.65**  
**Factor and Reason of improving the current investment environment and  
 business climate**

<b>Factor of Improving</b>	<b>Suggestion</b>
<b>Policy Stability</b>	Government should have more efficiency over the counter
<b>Infrastructure</b>	There should be more infrastructure in order to create the business efficiency and support the growth. To be specific, some companies advise that because automobiles and motorcycles industry grows significantly in Thailand, this country needs to improve the numbers and quality of infrastructure especially the high technology ones, in order to support the investment.
<b>Regulation and Law</b>	<p>Sometimes it is difficult to reorganize the business because firms do not have any advantages, so the Government should relax some regulations for investment in order to get more transferred technology.</p> <p>Some firms suggested that they expect the abolishment of the regulation regarding the foreign capital. Also, there should be more transparency in laws and regulation.</p>

Table 4.65 (Continued)

**Factor and Reason of improving the current investment environment and  
business climate**

<b>Exchange Rate</b>	Exchange rate should be more stable.
<b>Society</b>	Society should be improved because there are some unfair behaviors in society.
<b>Staff and Labor</b>	Improvement of skills of local worker is needed because most of companies always lack expert and quality workers. Moreover, Thai managers have less management skill so it is difficult to develop advanced industry unless the quality of technician and officer is improved.
<b>Wage and Labor</b>	<p>There is some wage gap between China and Thailand, the sample group wants the labor wage in Thailand to be cheaper than that of China in order for a better competition.</p> <p>Another suggestion is cut down some labor law</p>
<b>Tax</b>	<p>It is not easy to levy tax from foreign company and unfair tax system should be changed.</p> <p>In another way, VAT rate is too high and should be quickly returned while the Revenue officers should have better quality and be moral.</p> <p>Some suggested that import tax should be reduced because part production is difficult to obtain competitiveness.</p>

Table 4.65(Continued)

**Factor and Reason of improving the current investment environment and  
business climate**

<b>Management</b>	<p>There are complicated procedures in order to import materials, so it is important to cut down an import procedure as much as possible.</p> <p>Working permit application procedures are difficult and complicated because there are many steps involved.</p>
<b>Incentive</b>	<p>There should be more incentives and more improvement in the environment in Thailand</p>
<b>Tariff Barrier</b>	<p>Material cost is increasing so the tariff should be reduced to support export products in order to lower prices and increase the competitiveness.</p> <p>The promotion of export is important and it needs government policy to support because Thailand is now taking a risk of losing the production base to China.</p> <p>Some importers suggest that the government should improve tariff barriers because it is too expensive to import some part-products from oversea. Now they are patient on 20-40% of tariff.</p>
<b>Marketing</b>	<p>It should not consider only price because it will lose the position in international market.</p>
<b>Availability</b>	<p>It is hard to obtain material parts and export. We should negotiate to WTO, EPZ, and AFTA</p>