

IDE Discussion Papers are preliminary materials circulated
to stimulate discussions and critical comments

IDE DISCUSSION PAPER No. 345

**Environmental Consciousness,
Economic Gain and Consumer
Choice of Energy Efficient Appliances
in Thailand, China and India**

Wakana KUSAKA*, Michikazu KOJIMA**,
Mariko WATANABE***

March 2012

Abstract In developing economies, consumption of electricity in residential and commercial sectors increased with economic development. In order to identify the factors for effective facilitation of standard and labeling programs, this article explores factors that affect consumer choice to energy-efficient products. Main findings are as follows: (1) Consumers in Thailand shows the highest awareness to environmental friendly concepts, followed by India and China. (2) Chosen labeled products include air-conditioners, TVs, refrigerators and washing machines, but not some popular products such as ceiling fans, electric fans or mobile phones. (3) Consumer who has higher energy conservation perception will buy energy efficient products. (4) Consumers in China, India and Thailand are sensitive to energy efficiency of products, primarily because they lead to less expenditure on electricity. (5) Labeling works to make levels of the energy efficiency of products more visible and thus helped consumers to choose the products.

Keywords: Thailand, India, China, Labeling, Energy Efficiency Reference

JEL classification: Q41, L15, L68, D12

This research was conducted as a part of “Pathways to Green Growth in Asian Countries”, an international collaborative research project by Economic Research Institute for ASEAN and East Asia (ERIA), Institute of Developing Economies (IDE), and United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO). * Japan External Trade Organization, Overseas Research Department, Global Marketing Division. E-mail: Wakana_Kusaka@jetro.go.jp . ** Institute of Developing Economies, JETRO E-mail: Michikazu_Kojima@ide.go.jp *** Institute of Developing Economies, JETRO E-mail: Mariko_Watanabe@ide.go.jp

The Institute of Developing Economies (IDE) is a semigovernmental, nonpartisan, nonprofit research institute, founded in 1958. The Institute merged with the Japan External Trade Organization (JETRO) on July 1, 1998. The Institute conducts basic and comprehensive studies on economic and related affairs in all developing countries and regions, including Asia, the Middle East, Africa, Latin America, Oceania, and Eastern Europe.

The views expressed in this publication are those of the author(s). Publication does not imply endorsement by the Institute of Developing Economies of any of the views expressed within.

INSTITUTE OF DEVELOPING ECONOMIES (IDE), JETRO
3-2-2, WAKABA, MIHAMA-KU, CHIBA-SHI
CHIBA 261-8545, JAPAN

©2012 by Institute of Developing Economies, JETRO

No part of this publication may be reproduced without the prior permission of the IDE-JETRO.

Environmental Consciousness,
Economic Gain
and
Consumer Choice of Energy Efficient Appliance
in Thailand, China and India *

Wakana Kusaka [†]
JETRO

Michikazu Kojima [‡]
IDE, JETRO

Mariko Watanabe [§]
IDE, JETRO

25, January, 2012

Abstract

In developing economies, consumption of electricity in residential and commercial sectors increased with economic development. Further, in response to climate change and rising energy prices, the penetration of energy-efficient appliances has become a challenge for developing countries. Standard and labeling on the products are the programs that become popular in developing economies. In order to identify the factors for effective facilitation of the programs, this article explores factors that affect consumer choice to energy-efficient products. Consumer choice behavior was analyzed using extensive information from the Japan External Trade Organization's "Survey on Energy Conservation Awareness and Purchasing Behavior in Thailand, India and, China." Main findings are as follows: (1) Consumers in Thailand shows the highest awareness to environmental friendly concepts, followed by India and China. (2) Chosen labeled products include air-conditioners, TVs, refrigerators and washing machines, but not some popular products such as ceiling fans, electric fans or mobile phones. (3) Consumer who has higher energy conservation perception will buy energy efficient products. (4) Consumers in China, India and Thailand are sensitive to energy efficiency of products, primarily because they lead to less expenditure on electricity. (5) Labeling works to make levels of the energy efficiency of products more visible and thus helped consumers to choose the products.

Keywords: Energy Efficiency Labels and Standard, Thailand, India, China

JEL Classification Number: Q41, L15, L68, D12

*The authors especially thank to all the interviewees. We are responsible for any errors that may remain.

[†]Japan External Trade Organization. E-mail: Wakana.Kusaka@jetro.go.jp

[‡]Institute of Developing Economies, 3-2-2 Wakaba, Mihama, Chiba 261-8545, Japan. E-mail: Michikazu.Kojima@ide.go.jp

[§]Institute of Developing Economies, 3-2-2 Wakaba, Mihama, Chiba, 261-8545, Japan. E-mail: Mariko.Watanabe@ide.go.jp

1 Introduction

As a part of greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction program, energy efficiency policy is now being promoted worldwide at a high pace. This follows the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Kyoto Protocol. Since the 1990s, some programs to improve energy efficiency have been conducted in developing countries with support from the Global Environmental Facility and other donors (Birner and Martinot 2005). However, the International Energy Agency (IEA) still estimates that end-use efficiency will account for 38% of total emissions reduction by 2050 (IEA, 2010a). Energy security in climate change was raised as one of the main agenda items at the 31st G8 Summit at Gleneagles in 2005. Countries are accelerating development of energy efficiency policies for sustainable development (G8, 2005, UNECE, 2006, 2010, Sharker, A., Singh J., 2010).

In fact, the percentage of consumption of electricity in overall energy consumption has rapidly increased in recent 30 years among the world (IEA, 2010b). According to many recent studies, a key driver in the energy consumption by households in developing countries is the fact that people in these countries can now live a comfortable life, using new home electrical appliances such as heaters and air-conditioners (Gleneagles, 2005, Tukker, A., *et. al*, 2008). With the clarity of this situation, policies to promote sustainable consumption in developing countries have become increasingly important (Tukker, A., *et. al*, 2008). In Asian countries, there is a tendency for new home electrical appliances to increase in order to satisfy household demand so that citizen can enjoy a more comfortable lifestyle in urbanization along with industrialization.

In this situation, many literatures claim that China, the top consuming country of energy in the world, needs to promote further energy efficiency measures. However, though Chinese government has been promoting such measures in both supply and demand of energy, but which is not sufficient. Many specific suggestions have been made such as introduction of standard on energy efficiency (Lu, W., 2006, 2007), applying economic measures, including energy taxes (Fan, Y., 2007 *et.al*); completing measurement methods of environmental impact assessments from the viewpoint of energy efficiency (Bian., Y., 2010), and emphasizing energy efficiency policies balanced with other energy measures such as renewable energy policies and the eco-city idea (Caprotti, 2009). India began to import energy in the 1990s, and its energy intensity is higher than that for other countries. Though

the use of fluorescent lamps have been recommended, further energy efficiency measures are needed (Balachandra, P., *et. al*, 2010). Thailand, also an importer of energy, has introduced energy efficiency policies by means of a demand management policy. Thailand was the first country to have introduced the policy in Asia, and it is promoting energy efficiency measures for lighting equipment (Sulyma, I., M., *et. al.*, 2000).

For energy efficiency measures of home electrical appliances, the non-profit organization CLASP based in US advances the view that realization of a proper energy efficiency standard, eliminating non energy-efficient products from the market, will lead to product market change, and this will enable many consumers to easily select energy-efficient products and raise the economic welfare level (Wiel, S., McMahon, J.E., 2005). Thus governments in the world are now recommending an energy efficiency standard and product labeling. China in 2005 and India in 2006 introduced energy efficiency labeling programs for energy-efficient home electrical appliances as a part of their energy efficiency measures. Thailand had already adopted such a program in 1994.

The impact of such programs has been examined by measuring the energy consumption of the “business-as-usual” scenario and alternative scenarios with those involving standards and labeling (Malhia *et.al.*(2004), World Bank(2006), Zhou *et. al.*(2011)). Willingness to pay for energy efficient products has also been estimated by contingent choice experiments (Banfi *et.al.*(2008), Ward *et.al.*(2011), Wang *et.al.*(2011)) and by hedonic approaches (Galaraga, 2011). These studies show the benefits of the standard and labeling programs and the positive response of consumers to such program. But in the actual market, however, consumer may not be well aware of the existence and meaning of standard and labeling. Based on a household survey in Germany, Mills and Schleich(2010) pointed out that knowledge of appliance energy classes is low for all appliances, ranging from 24 percent for households with a washing machines, and 16 percent for households with dishwashers.

In 2011, the Overseas Research Department of the Japan External Trade Organization(JETRO) conducted a questionnaire survey to see the present state and associated problems of energy efficiency measures and energy efficient labeling program in China, Thailand and India (Japan External Trade Organization, 2011). This article provides overviews of the results of this questionnaire survey and statistical analysis of the consumer behavior relative to the energy labeling. Section 2 includes explanation of different policy measures

on standards and labeling energy efficiency of home appliances in the three countries. Section 3 provides an overview of questionnaire survey conducted by the Overseas Department in JETRO, and data analysis is included in Section 4.

2 Energy Efficiency Standard and Labeling Program in China, Thailand and India

There are several types of standards and labeling programs on product energy efficiency. In this section, types and characteristics of standards and labeling programs are explained, to provide a view of the characteristics of the programs in China, Thailand and India.

2.1 Types of Demand Side Management Program to Penetrate Energy Efficient Products

Intervention programs to raise energy efficiency mainly consists of two factors: (1) energy efficiency standards for the product, and (2) labeling of the energy efficiency levels of the products.

2.1.1 Classification of Energy Efficient Standards

Standards, the first pillar of demand side management program, are set primarily from two different philosophies: One involves the minimum requirement which bans too many low energy efficient products from the market. The other involves setting standards on the average efficiency level standard: corporate average efficiency standards (CAFE in the United States, explained later, is an example.). The Top Runner standard (standards are set so as to induce innovation) are variants of this system. Under the average standard system, products can be listed if the average of energy efficiency of total products of the manufactures is higher than required level even though some particular products may be extremely inefficient.

Manufacturers in developing economies are usually required to comply with the “Minimum Energy Performance Standard” (MEPS). MEPS can be voluntary or mandatory. If voluntary, manufacturers can put a label on their products and satisfy the MEPS. Manufacturers can decide whether they follow MEPS and that whether or not put the mark on the products. In the mandatory case, manufacturers must follow the MEPS. They cannot sell goods which do not achieve MEPS. It is a product based requirement for manufacturers.

Table 1: 2 Types of Energy Efficiency Standards

Standards	Contents
<i>Minimum requirement policy</i> Minimum Energy Performance Standards (MEPS)	Set the minimum energy efficiency level such that all market products should comply.
<i>Innovation inductive policy</i> MEPS + HEPS	MEPS sets lower limits, HEPS provides innovation targets.
Average Energy Performance Standards (CAFE in US)	Weighted average energy efficiency level of all products must be higher than reference levels. Levels are set by considering expectation of technological improvement.
Top Runner Standards(Japan)	Weighted average of the energy efficiency level of all products must be higher than the reference levels. Levels are set by considering expectation of technological improvement.

Source: Interviews and reported materials.

Importers also must follow the requirement ¹. In addition to MEPS, corporate average efficiency standard and Top Runner, the Higher Energy Performance Standard (HEPS) has been introduced in some countries presumably to induce innovation and improvement of energy efficiency level of the total market. Usually, HEPS is a voluntary standard. Products satisfying HEPS can have a certain mark put on them. Another type of requirement to manufacturers is “Corporate Average Fuel Efficiency” in the United States. This requires manufacturers to satisfy the energy efficiency levels in terms of average of all sold products. Manufacturers and importers must report the number of and the energy efficiency level of each sold item. Based on the report, the average cooperate energy efficiency level is calculated. One famous program is “Corporate Average Fuel Efficiency” in United States which applies automobile. A modification of “Cooperate Average Product Energy Efficiency” is to impose the requirement on average product energy efficiency by class of products. For example, Japan requires manufacturer and importers to satisfy a certain average energy ef-

¹For example in India, energy efficiency standard for air-conditioner and other three products transferred from the voluntary one to the mandatory in 2010. The governments described the products in the voluntary period as being in the pipeline.

iciency levels for several categories within items, based on types and capacity of products.

Table 2: Energy Efficiency Standards and Labeling of China, India and Thailand

	Law etc	EE Standards	Labeling
China	The Law of Energy Conservation (1998)	MEPS(2005)	Compulsory for 23 products. three to five levels of labels.
India	Energy Conservation Act(2001)	MEPS (2001) Super HEPS(2012) 5 levels of labels	Voluntary for 12 products in 2005. four products compulsory in 2010.
Thailand	Energy Conservation Promotion Act(2007)	MEPS(1995) HEPS(2007)	Voluntary for four products five levels of labels. Only the top level label can be observed in the market.

Source: Interviews and reported materials.

The second pillars of a demand side management program is a labeling program, which can also divided into mandatory or voluntary program ². The International Energy Star program targets relatively higher energy efficient office equipment such as computers, printers and copying machines. Products in top 25 percent in terms of energy efficiency can have the label put on them. This is a single level labeling program. The other type of labeling is multiple level labeling. A product is classified into three to seven energy efficiency levels. The reference level of labeling varies with “stars.” If mandatory MEPS is implemented, the minimum of the lowest level of labeling is set to MEPS. In the case of a voluntary MEPS program, a middle level of labeling is set as MEPS. Another approach, which is implemented in Japan, is to set the reference level as “Top Runner” of energy efficiency in a given reference year. The revision of MEPS and reference level of labeling is important, in order to provide incentives for innovation by manufacturer and for selective purchase by consumers.

²In Thailand, labeling is voluntary programs. As a result, consumer can observe the label of 5 stars, the highest category, on the market, because manufacturers would not put the label on their products when it is classified into four stars or below.

2.1.2 Energy Saving Labeling in China

The Energy Conservation Law in China was approved in 1997 and enacted in January 1998. The state was required to make a list of backward and excessively energy-consuming products and equipment which should be phased out of the market (Article 17). The labeling program is voluntary and is referred in Article 18. The Energy Efficiency Labeling Management Regulation, which is the basis for the China Energy Label, was issued in March 2005. In the revision of the Energy Conservation Act of 2007, which was enacted in 2008, a mandatory labeling scheme (Article 18 was mentioned). There are two types of labeling for energy saving, the “Energy Conservation Certification” and the “China Energy Label”. The “Energy Conservation Certification” targets the top 20% of energy efficient specific products in the market. It is a voluntary and third party certification program. Certification projects were begun in February 1999. The “China Energy Label” is put on the products according to their energy efficiency. Products are classified into three to five categories. The label was launched in March 2005. The lowest category is set above the level of MEPS. Twenty three products have been selected for mandatory labeling.

2.1.3 Energy Efficiency Standards for Labeling Thailand

The Energy Conservation Act was developed in 1992 in Thailand. The government was required to specify high energy efficiency equipment. The Energy Conservation Act revised in 2007 made government set industrial standards on energy efficiency of products mandatory. The “Energy Efficiency Label” was started in September 1994. As of September 2011, 15 products have been covered. It is a voluntary program. The label provides information on the level of energy efficiency in five levels, product categories, average electricity consumption, and expected electricity fee. MEPS has been also established for room air conditioners and refrigerators on a mandatory basis, and for tube fluorescent lamps, light bulbs with ballast and compacted fluorescent lamps on voluntary basis.

2.1.4 Energy Efficiency Standard in India

The Energy Conservation Act was enacted in 2001 in India. Based on this act, the Bureau of Energy Efficiency was established. The bureau has the authority to prohibit production, import and sales of products not satisfying the energy efficiency standard and to conduct

a labeling program. “Standard & Labeling Program” in India was started in May 2006. As of September 2011, the number of products covered by labeling program reaches 12 products. January 2010, energy efficiency labeling has become compulsory to refrigerators, air conditioners, tube fluorescent lamps and “z” transformers.

3 Environmental Consciousness and Purchasing behavior in China, India, Thailand

Whether or not demand side management works efficiently depends on preference and constraints of consumers. To grasp the nature of consumer demand, JETRO carried out a survey in China, India and Thailand in 2010 on perception of product choice and determinants of the choice.

3.1 Profile of the Survey

The Survey was conducted by distributing questionnaires to sampled households in Beijing and the rural area within 40 km of Beijing (electrified households) in China, in Bangkok and the rural area within 80 - 130 km of Bangkok (electrified households) in Thailand and in the Delhi and the rural area within 40 - 80 km of Delhi (electrified households) in India from December 2010 to January 2011. There were 783 responses. General households were quantitatively surveyed to understand the present state of energy efficiency consciousness and purchase behavior of consumers in the target countries. The survey was conducted to grasp the present state of energy efficiency labeling program in China, Thailand and India as reference for surveys of literature and interviews with the organizations implementing energy efficiency labeling programs of the government and other bodies in target countries. Validation following quantitative analysis through totaling and correlation analysis of the field survey by questionnaire is presented below.

3.1.1 Recognition of Energy Efficiency Label

Recognition of energy efficiency labels is substantially high in Thailand and India, but not so much in China. Taking those who reply, “I know well and I am able to explain about the label in detail” and “I know well, but I am not able to explain about the label in detail” as those who know the label, there were more people who knew about the label in Thailand

(76.4%) than compared with in India (55.5%) or China (33.2%). At the same time, labeling is an important determinants of decision of products choice. This is because choosing energy efficient products allows households to save on energy expenditure. Such tendency is the strongest in Thailand. Thailand consumers widely recognized energy efficiency labels (76.4%), which is an important determinant of product choice(90.0%). India followed Thailand with 55.3% of consumer in India recognizing labels but only 32.5% of them following the label’s indication. According to experts interviewed in Delhi in September 2011, this phenomenon may be due to income constraints; Though Indian consumers are aware of labels and their meaning, they cannot afford choice in appliances because many products are simply expensive for them. Table 3 summarizes the data.

Table 3: Recognition and Choice

	Highly recognize labels	Label determines purchase	Label can save electricity fee.
China	33.2%	48.4%	55.5%
India	55.3%	32.5%	91.9%
Thailand	76.4%	90.0%	91.8%

Source: Interviews and reported materials.

3.1.2 Channel to Recognize Energy Efficiency Label

Considering replies by those who know about the energy efficiency labels regarding the recognition channel (the information source from which they knew about the label), in China “Salesperson inside store” was the most, then followed “TV program” and “At the store front”. In Thailand “TV commercial” was mentioned the most, then followed by “TV program” and “Product brochures.” In India “TV commercial” was the most, then followed “TV program” and “Salesperson inside store”. In China, consumers recognized the label “At store front”, while in Thailand and India many consumers recognized the label via mass media. Table 4 shows the distribution of recognition channel. In Thailand and India, TV programs and advertisement shows stronger impact on recognition, but TV’s impact is limited in China.

Table 4: Recognition Channel of Energy Efficiency Label

	China		India		Thailand	
	Obs.	%	Obs.	%	Obs.	%
Sales staff	70	84.3%	49	31.2%	101	52.9%
On the shop	33	39.8%	38	24.2%	127	66.5%
From friends and acquaintance	31	37.3%				
From family	22	26.5%	16	10.2%		
Internet site	22	26.5%				
TV programme	48	57.8%	65	41.4%	132	69.1%
Ad on TV			90	57.3%	147	77.0%
Ad on the shop	21	25.3%	23	14.6%	119	62.3%
Ad on newspaper			41	26.1%	103	53.9%
Ad on magazine			16	10.2%		
Ad at outside					75	39.3%
Ad on transportation/station					57	29.8%
Product catalogue	16	19.3%	41	26.1%	130	68.1%
Magazine article	12	14.5%				
Newspaper article	8	9.6%	20	12.7%	67	39.3%
Free paper article	8	9.6%				
Total	83	100%	157	100%	191	100%

Source: Interviews and reported materials.

3.1.3 Determinants of Decision on Purchasing Home Electrical Appliances

To grasp key factors for consumer purchase of particular home electrical appliances, nine features were listed by seven levels (“Very much”, “Fairly”, “A little”, “Moderate”, “Rather not”, “Fairly not” and “Not at all”). For the tendency from the total of “Very much” and “Fairly” in China, “Quality/functionality/usability” and “After-the-sale service” were valued most, while “The energy efficiency label is attached on product” was valued less. In Thailand, “Quality/functionality/usability” was the most valued, followed by “The energy efficiency label is attached”. In India, “Quality/functionality/usability” and “Design” were highly valued, while “The energy efficiency label is attached” was valued least. Table 5 shows the distribution of valuation factors.

Table 5: Valuation factors to buy home electric appliances

	China %	India %	Thailand %
Price	75.2%	91.5%	82.0%
Quality/Functionality/Usability	97.6%	96.8%	94.0%
Design	75.2%	94.3%	63.6%
Brand image	67.6%	88.3%	59.2%
Popularity	74.4%	86.9%	47.6%
After Service	84.4%	88.0%	80.4%
Nationality	50.0%	71.7%	50.8%
Running Cost	68.4%	87.3%	69.2%
Energy Efficiency Label	48.4%	32.5%	90%
Total Obs.	250	283	250

Source: Interviews and reported materials.

3.2 Purchase Decision by Products

In order to determine which factor encourages consumer to choose energy efficient products, we considered the relationship of consciousness to environmentally friendliness as well as valuation of labeling and products, and their choice by products. The survey asked the interviewees about purchase, ownership and determinants of purchase on 29 products. Due to the richness of this data, we can identify the relationship between environmental consciousness, economic gains and purchase decision.

3.2.1 Choice by Products

Table 6 shows the ratio of respondents who bought products examined here. It provides a measurement of popularity of the products in each country. It can be seen that the configuration of products actually purchased in the three countries is diversified. For example, ceiling fans are very popular in Thailand and India, but not in China. Lightings are purchased less by consumer in China than Thailand and India. On the other hand, air-conditioners, TVs, refrigerators, mobile phones and washing machines are popular in all three countries. This implies that products to be labeled should be selected carefully according to characteristics of each market.

We can further see whether consumers bought labeled or non-labeled products or were indifferent to the labels (Table 7). Here we can see the relative size of labeled or non-labeled

Table 6: Ratio of those who buy the products

	China	India	Thailand
FL ballast	3%	33%	52%
PC	26%	14%	69%
PC display	17%	12%	39%
TV	38%	53%	93%
Air con	40%	30%	76%
Automobile	40%	2%	56%
Ceiling fan	8%	34%	40%
Copy machine	1%	0%	12%
Electric transformer	0%	36%	16%
Electric fan	10%	5%	98%
Refrigerator	45%	48%	98%
Gas range	8%	19%	57%
Heater	8%	19%	0%
IH cooker	16%	0%	92%
Iron	3%	10%	90%
Land phone	4%	19%	64%
Lighting	2%	99%	93%
Microwave	13%	0%	61%
Mobile phone	36%	22%	93%
Printer	2%	1%	46%
Radio	1%	6%	60%
Rice cooker	14%	0%	92%
Ventilation fan	3%	1%	18%
Video player	4%	12%	87%
Washing machine	28%	35%	76%
Water boiler	16%	8%	83%
Water pump	0%	12%	36%
Water supplier	8%	20%	28%

Source: JETRO Survey.

products. This distribution is substantially diversified by products. Among commonly labeled products, air-conditioners, refrigerators, TVs and washing machines, labeled products are more frequently purchased. Electric fans and lightings in India, mobile phones in China, rice cookers in Thailand are the products that non-labeled products are preferred or bought indifferent of labels.

Table 7: Choice of labeled and non-labeled products

Product	China			India			Thailand		
	Not Bought	labeled	Bought no-label	Indifferent	Not Bought	labeled	Bought no-label	Indifferent	Indifferent
Obs	250				283				250
FL ballaster	97%	2%	0%	1%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
PC	74%	13%	8%	5%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
PC display	82%	10%	4%	4%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TV	62%	26%	9%	3%	64%	13%	9%	14%	100%
Air con	60%	35%	3%	1%	70%	20%	5%	5%	25%
Automobile	90%	4%	3%	4%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Ceiling fan	100%	0%	0%	0%	73%	6%	7%	14%	100%
Copy machine	99%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Elec-transformer	100%	0%	0%	0%	64%	13%	9%	14%	100%
Electric fan	98%	2%	0%	0%	1%	7%	45%	47%	100%
Refrigerator	55%	37%	4%	4%	52%	29%	10%	10%	5%
Gas range	92%	4%	2%	2%	83%	2%	5%	10%	100%
Heater	92%	6%	2%	0%	83%	2%	5%	10%	100%
IH cooker	84%	11%	3%	1%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Iron	97%	2%	1%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Land phone	96%	1%	3%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Lighting	98%	2%	0%	0%	1%	7%	45%	47%	100%
Microwave	87%	10%	2%	1%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Mobile phone	65%	11%	17%	7%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Printer	98%	0%	2%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Radio	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Rice cooker	86%	10%	3%	1%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Ventilation fan	97%	1%	1%	1%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Video player	96%	2%	1%	1%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Washing machine	72%	22%	5%	1%	65%	20%	6%	9%	100%
Water boiler	84%	13%	3%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	4%
Water pump	100%	0%	0%	0%	88%	2%	5%	5%	100%
Water supplier	92%	4%	3%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%

Source: JETRO Survey.

Note: For India and Thailand, only information on the labeled product is reported, and the products out of labeling product is regarded as Not Bought, though this may not reflect reality.

3.2.2 Consciousness to energy saving behavior

To explain consumer decision, we were concerned with consciousness for environmental friendly behavior as well as the valuation of products and demographic factors of households. Table 8 presents an index for environmental friendly consciousness. Generally speaking, Thailand consumers are more sensitive to environmental friendly concepts: Thailand consumers more frequently “Remove plug” or “Turn off TV”s, “Set the air-conditioner’s temperatures higher”, or “Do not open fridge frequently”. However, what interesting is “Buy energy efficient products” index are almost the same in average of three countries.

Table 8: Energy Saving Consciousness by Country

		China			India			Thailand	
	Obs	mean	s.d.	Obs	mean	s.d.	Obs	mean	s.d.
Remove plug frequently	7000	1.208	.4525	7924	1.986	.910	7000	2.128	.921
Set air-con temperature higher	7000	2.348	1.604	7924	1.544	.858	7000	1.204	.432
Set heater temperature lower	7000	2.24	1.597						
Buy energy efficient products	7000	1.364	.7743	7924	1.459	.704	7000	1.4	.663
Save water usage	7000	1.184	.4451						
Do not open fridge’s door	7000	1.648	1.225	7924	1.346	.552	7000	1.132	.339
Turn off TV or radio	7000	1.612	.9703	7924	1.432	.587	7000	1.268	.461
Turn off lighting	7000	1.16	.3980	7924	1.420	.706	7000	1.344	.553
Turn off main switch of TV	7000	1.14	.3694	7924	1.353	.560	7000	1.208	.416
Do not buy disposable	7000	1.288	.5187	7924	1.233	.478	7000	1.092	.303

Source: JETRO Survey. *Note:* 1= Do every time. 2= Do sometimes. 3. Do not(sometime do) 4=Do not completely. 5= Do not know. The index is inversely proportional to environmental friendliness.

3.3 Choice by Country

What factors determine decision regarding whether or not to buy energy efficient products? Do these factor work differently among countries? Here, we take a look at the matrix of the decision and several factors, such as, consciousness to the energy efficiency label, age of household head, values of energy efficient products that can lower running costs, interests in buying energy efficient products by country. Following these descriptive statistics, the second section includes conduct probit estimation so as to evaluate the overall impacts of related factors. Table 9 provides a matrix between purchase decisions and evaluation of

product labels. The strength of importance of whether or not the products are labeled or not is indexed in descending order (an index of 1 indicates the strongest importance for the interviewees). The results shows that in China and Thailand the more individual evaluates the label highly, the more tendencies he or she may have to buy labeled products. India's data shows an unexpected results. People value the labels highly but does not buy the products. This implies that penetration of energy efficiency labels is high in India and is independent of the decision or awareness of the consumers.

Table 9: Labels vs Choice of Energy Efficient Products by Country

		Values index									
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total	
<i>Label is the key factor</i>											
China											
Not buy		1,141	1,885	2,013	821	219		27	302	6,408	
		18%	29%	31%	13%	3%		0%	5%	100%	
Buy		143	238	162	12	8		1	1	565	9%
		25%	42%	29%	2%	1%		0%	0%	100%	
India											
Not buy		7,530	22	18	4	3	2			7,579	
		99%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%			100%	
Buy		214	58	49	15	5	2	2		345	5%
		62%	17%	14%	4%	1%	1%	1%		100%	
Thailand											
Not buy		3,549	2,100	475	133	52				6,309	
		56%	33%	8%	2%	1%				100%	
Buy		435	180	60	9	6	1			691	11%
		63%	26%	9%	1%	1%	0%			100%	

Source: JETRO Survey. Note: 1= Take it as highly important. 2= Take it as important. 3. Indifferent 4= Do not take it as so important. 5= Do not take it seriously at all. Hence, the index is inversely proportional to how high the interviewees values the label. The underlined figure is larger than its counterpart on the Buy/Not-buy axis.

Table 10 shows a positive relationship between those who mind running costs and their tendency to buy energy efficient products. Results shows a positive correlation between the awareness of running costs and purchase decision universally among consumers in China, India and Thailand. Particularly in India, 57% of people who bought energy efficient

products were very concerned about the running cost of the appliances. On the other hand, the perception of running costs is not a big factors in determining the purchase of energy efficient products in Thailand. Data may imply that the Thai consumer may evaluates factors other than economic ones such as environmental consciousness, whereas Indian and Chinese consumers value the more economic factors of energy efficient products.

Table 10: Running Cost vs Choice of Energy Efficient Products by Country

		Values index						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total
China								
Not buy	1,525	2,765	1,181	333	522	82		6,408
	24%	43%	<u>18%</u>	<u>5%</u>	8%	1%		100%
Buy	183	287	79	3	10	2		564
	<u>32%</u>	<u>51%</u>	14%	1%	2%	0%		100%
India								
Not buy	3,583	3,013	763	22				7,579
	47%	<u>40%</u>	<u>10%</u>	0%				100%
Buy	197	123	21	4				345
	<u>57%</u>	36%	6%	1%				100%
Thailand								
Not buy	2,384	1,974	1,214	285	303	76	49	6,285
	38%	31%	19%	<u>5%</u>	5%	1%	1%	100%
Buy	276	210	130	23	33	8	7	687
	<u>40%</u>	31%	19%	3%	5%	1%	1%	100%

Source: JETRO Survey. *Note:* 1= Take it as highly important. 2= Take it as important. 3. Indifferent 4= Do not take it as so important. 5= Do not take it serious at all. Hence, the index is inversely proportional to how high interviewees value running cost. The underlined figure is larger than its counterpart of the Buy/Not-buy axis.

Table 11 gives a matrix of age of the household head and purchase decision. This shows a difference among countries. In India, the younger the household heads prefers energy efficient products, but in Thailand, the opposite is true. In China, the age appears to be independent of purchase decision.

Lastly, Table 12 shows a matrix between interest in energy efficient products and decision to purchase. In China and India, there is a clear positive correlation between interest

Table 11: Age vs Choice of Energy Efficient Products by Country?

					Values index				
Age	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	Total
China									
Not buy	644	936	724	920	623	997	806	784	6,434
	10%	15%	11%	14%	10%	15%	13%	12%	100%
Buy	56	100	60	60	49	95	90	56	566
	10%	<u>18%</u>	11%	11%	9%	<u>17%</u>	<u>16%</u>	10%	100%
India									
Not buy	1,088	1,768	1,387	1,207	557	679	514	379	7,579
	14%	23%	18%	<u>16%</u>	7%	9%	7%	5%	100%
Buy	60	80	69	53	31	21	18	13	345
	<u>17%</u>	23%	<u>20%</u>	15%	<u>9%</u>	6%	5%	4%	100%
Thailand									
Not buy	864	1,799	1,121	1,000	687	354	359	125	6,309
	<u>14%</u>	<u>29%</u>	18%	16%	11%	6%	6%	2%	100%
Buy	88	189	139	120	69	38	33	15	691
	13%	27%	<u>20%</u>	17%	10%	5%	5%	2%	100%

Source: JETRO Survey. *Note:* 1= Take it as highly important. 2= Take it as important. 3. Indifferent 4= Do not take it as so important. 5= Do not take it as serious at all. Hence, the index is inversely proportional to how high the interviewees values the concept. The underlined figure is larger than its counterpart on the Buy/Not-buy axis.

in energy efficient products and tendency to buy the appliance. In Thailand, interest is completely independent of purchase decision; those who are interested in energy efficient products do not necessarily buy them, and those who are not interested in the energy efficiency also buy.

Table 12: Interest vs Choice of Energy Efficient Products by Country

	Values index					
	1	2	3	4	5	Total
China						
Not buy	4,766	1,140	360	28	140	6,434
	74%	<u>18%</u>	6%	0%	2%	100%
Buy	526	36	4			566
	<u>93%</u>	6%	1%			100%
India						
Not buy	4,669	2,553	222	28	107	7,579
	62%	<u>34%</u>	3%	0%	1%	100%
Buy	231	107	2	5	345	
	<u>67%</u>	31%	1%	0%	1%	100%
Thailand						
Not buy	4,190	1,891	99	76	53	6,309
	66%	30%	2%	1%	1%	100%
Buy	458	209	13	8	3	691
	66%	30%	2%	1%	0%	100%

Source: JETRO Survey. *Note:* 1= Take it as highly important. 2= Take it as important. 3. Indifferent 4= Do not take it as so important. 5= Do not take it serious at all. Hence, the index is inversely proportional how highly the interviewees values the concept. The underlined figure is larger than its counterpart on the Buy/Not-buy axis.

3.4 Probit Estimation

To understand what factors ultimately determine consumer decisions to buy energy efficient products, we conducted probit estimation on purchase decision (not buy, buy labeled, buy non-labeled and buy but indifferent to label). Results show that whether or not the consumer is concerned with the label is not a significant factor in determining the decision. But, what is interesting is that “Running Cost” and “Popularity” are the determinants of purchasing labeled products (-.096, t-value is 6.11). The negative value indicates positive impact on buying decision because the index is inversely proportional to strength of value. Consumer who buys non-labeled products are more concerned with non-economic/price factors such as “Design” and “ Popularity”. This implies more price sensitive consumers prefer buying energy efficient products.

Table 13: Choice of labeled products

	Buy labeled		Buy Non-labeled		Indifferent	
	Coef.	(z values)	Coef.	(z values)	Coef.	(z value)
<i>Which factors you value most?</i>						
Price	0.071	(4.66)**	0.097	(4.70)**	0.023	(1.00)
Quality	0.020	(0.83)	0.065	(2.20)*	0.075	(2.56)*
Design	0.034	(2.01)*	0.029	(1.23)	-0.045	(1.78)
Brand image	-0.038	(2.06)*	0.049	(1.99)	0.061	(2.49)*
Popularity	-0.039	(2.66)*	-0.085	(4.04)**	-0.088	(4.08)**
After service	0.073	(4.45)**	0.081	(3.73)**	0.170	(8.18)**
Nationality of brand	0.025	(1.95)	0.063	(4.02)**	0.038	(2.43)*
Running cost	-0.100	(6.33)**	-0.027	(1.27)	-0.023	(1.10)
Label	0.016	(1.06)	0.070	(3.66)**	0.05	(2.17)*
<i>Demographic factors</i>						
Household size	0.015	(1.83)	0.013	(1.12)	0.017	(1.61)
Household income	0.000	(5.68)**	-0.000	(1.21)	0.000	(0.15)
Age 20-24	0.142	(2.09)*	-0.120	(1.45)	-0.058	(0.67)
Age 25-29	0.146	(2.29)*	-0.066	(0.86)	-0.033	(0.40)
Age 30-34	0.140	(2.12)*	-0.125	(1.54)	-0.085	(0.99)
Age 35-39	0.081	(1.24)	-0.027	(0.35)	-0.145	(1.66)
Age 40-44	0.060	(0.84)	-0.064	(0.72)	-0.120	(1.25)
Age 45-50	0.123	(1.75)	0.018	(0.21)	-0.073	(0.80)
Age 50-54	0.142	(1.98)*	0.014	(0.16)	-0.073	(0.75)
<i>Energy Saving Consciousness</i>						
Remove plug	-0.018	(1.01)	-0.013	(0.57)	0.049	(2.30)*
Set air-con temperatures high	-0.039	(2.62)**	-0.074	(3.63)**	0.041	(2.06)
Buy energy efficient products	-0.077	(3.13)**	0.072	(2.88)**	-0.043	(1.55)
Do not open fridge door	-0.016	(0.76)	0.012	(0.45)	-0.056	(1.92)
Turn off TV	0.042	(2.23)**	-0.027	(1.01)	-0.023	(0.79)
Turn off lighting	-0.039	(1.36)	-0.016	(0.52)	-0.016	(0.56)
Remove TV and radio plugs	0.006	(0.17)	0.004	(0.11)	0.047	(1.28)
Do not buy disposable	-0.135	(3.46)**	0.102	(2.58)**	-0.011	(0.27)
China	-0.057	(1.23)	0.305	(4.15)**	-0.020	(0.25)
India	-0.454	(11.63)**	0.766	(12.93)**	0.682	(12.35)**
Constant	-1.212	(12.04)**	-2.962	(22.55)**	-2.645	(19.69)**
atroh21	-0.159	(5.25)**				
atroh31	-0.144	(5.07)**				
atroh32	-0.135	(4.40)**				
Number of observation	21,845					

Source: JETRO survey.

Note: * p<0.05; ** p<0.01

The younger the head of household the more preference for buying labeled products: This may be due to their awareness of environmental friendly behavior and partly because of economic conditions. The younger generation may be more constrained by income level. At the same time, results show that the higher the household income is, the more choice for labeled products. Consumers with high awareness of environmental factors appear more likely to buy labeled products. We confirmed here that the consciousness of the consumer certainly affects their behavior, and label that facilitate understanding of energy efficiency information work as instruments in consumer decision to buy energy efficient products.

4 Conclusion

In this article, we have described programs for penetration of energy efficient products including energy efficiency standards and product labeling. Among the two pillars of this program, we focus on the impact of labeling on choice behavior of consumers. Based on the rich information from the JETRO survey, we found the following: (1) Consumers in Thailand shows the highest awareness to environmentally friendly concepts, followed by India and then China. (2) Labeling appears to be a factor in choice of air-conditioners, TVs, refrigerators and washing machines, but it seems not to be a factor in choice of ceiling fans, electric fans or mobile phones. (3) Consumers with higher energy conservation perceptions will buy energy efficient products. At the same time, economic conditions also seem to substantially affect purchase behavior of consumer. (4) Consumers in China, India and Thailand are sensitive to the energy efficiency of products, mainly because it allows them to save on electricity expenditure. (5) Labeling works as an instrument to make the energy efficiency level of products visible and helps consumer in their decision to choose or not choose products.

References

Balachandra, P., Darshini, R., Ravindranath, N.H. (2010), Energy efficiency in India: Assessing the policy regimes and their impacts, *Energy Policy* 38 6428-6438

Birner, Sabrina and Eric Martinot (2005), Promoting energy efficient products: GEF experience and lesson for market transformation in developing countries, *Energy Policy*, 33, pp.1765-1779.

Bian., Y., Yang., F. (2010), Resource and environment efficiency analysis of provinces in China: A DEA approach based on Shannon's entropy, *Energy Policy* 38 1909-1917

Caprotti, F. (2009), China's cleantech landscape: the renewable energy technology paradox, *Sustainable Development Law & Policy* 3, <http://eprints.ucl.ac.uk/16051/1/16051.pdf> (accessed March 9, 2011).

Fan, Y., Hua, L., Wei Y.-M. (2007), Can market oriented economic reforms contribute to energy efficiency improvement? Evidence from China, *Energy Policy*, 35 2287-2295

G8@Information Centre (July 5th, 2005), Gleneagles official documents (WWW), <http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2005gleneagles/index.html> (accessed March 9, 2011)

Japan External Trade Organization(JETRO) (2011), Energy Conservation Awareness and Purchasing Behavior (Thailand, India, China), Survey, Japan External Trade Organization, 2011.

Galarraga, Ibon, Mikel Gonzalez-Eguino and Anil Markandya (2011), Willingness to Pay and Price Elasticities of Demand for Energy-Efficient Appliances: Combining the Hedonic Approach and Demand Systems, *Energy Economics*, Vol.33, pp.566-574.

International Energy Agency (IEA)(2010a), *Energy Technology Perspectives 2010 - Scenarios & Strategies to 2050*.

International Energy Agency (IEA)(2010b), *Key World Energy Statistics 2010*, http://www.iea.org/textbase/nppdf/free/2010/key_stats_2010.pdf (accessed March 9, 2011)

Lu., W. (2006), Potential energy saving and environmental impacts of energy efficiency standards for household refrigerators, *China Energy Policy* 34 1583-1589

Lu., W. (2007), Potential energy saving and environmental impacts of energy efficiency standards for vapor compression central air conditioning units, *China Energy Policy* 35 1709-1717.

Mahila, T.M.I., H.M. Masjuki, R. Saidur, and M. A. Amalina (2004), Cost Benefit Analysis of Implementing Minimum Energy Efficiency Standards for Household Refrigerator-Freezers in Malaysia, *Energy Policy* Vol.32, pp.1819-1824.

Mills, Bradford and Joachim Schleich (2010), What's Driving Energy Efficient Appliance Label Awareness and Purchase Propensity, *Energy Policy*, Vol.38, pp.814-825.

Sharker, A., Singh, J. (2010), Financing energy efficiency in developing countries-lessons learned and remaining challenges, *Energy Policy* 38 55560-5571

Sulyma, I.M. et al. (2000), Taking the pulse of Thailand's DSM market transformation programs, presented at ACEEE Summer Study on Energy Efficiency in Buildings August 20-25,
<http://eec.ucdavis.edu/ACEEE/2000/PDFS/PANEL08/625.pdf> (accessed March 9, 2011).

United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE)(2006), What UNECE does for you?,
http://www.unece.org/energy/se/pdfs/ee21/ece_ener_eff.pdf (accessed March 9, 2011).

United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE)(2010), Background paper on measurement and verification of energy efficiency and renewable energy projects Note by the secretariat. (Oct. 20th-22nd, 2010), Seminar on Policy Reforms to Promote Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Investments. Note by Steering Committee of the Energy Efficiency 21 Project Group of Experts on Energy Efficiency Investments for Climate Change Mitigation.
http://www.unece.org/energy/se/pdfs/eneff/eneff_ahge_16/ECE.ENERGY.WP4.GE1.2010.10_e.pdf (accessed March 9, 2011)

Tukker, A., Emmert, S., Charter, M., Vezzori, C., Sto, E., Andersen, M., Geerken T., Tischner, U., Lahlou, S. (2008), Fostering change to sustainable consumption and production: an evidence based view, *Journal of Cleaner Production* 16, pp.1218-1215.

Wang, Zhaohua, Bin Zhang, Jianhua Yin and Yixiang Zhang (2011), Determinants and policy implications for household electricity-saving behaviour: evidence from Beijing, *China Energy Policy*, Vol.39, pp.3550-3557.

Ward, David O., Christopher D. Clark, Kimberly L. Jensen, Steven T. Yen and Clifford S. Russell (2011), Factors influencing willingness-to-pay for the ENERGY STAR Label, *Energy Policy*, Vol.39, pp.1450-1458.

Wiel, S., McMahon, J.E. (2005), *Energy efficiency labels and standards: A guidebook for appliances, equipment, and lighting*, second edition
http://www.clasponline.org/files/Guidebook_2ndEdition.pdf (accessed March 9, 2011)

World Bank (2006), *Thailand promotion of Electrical Energy Efficiency Project*.

Zhou, Nan, David Fridley, Michael McNeil, Nina Zheng, Virginie Letschert (2011), Analysis of Potential energy Saving and CO2 Emission Reduction of Home Appliances and Commercial Equipments in China, *Energy Policy* Vol.39, pp.4541-4550.

~ Previous IDE Discussion Papers ~

No.	Author(s)	Title	
344	Yuka KODAMA	Young Women's Economic Daily Lives in Rural Ethiopia	2012
343	Etsuyo MICHIDA and Kaoru NABESHIMA	Roles of Supply Chains in Adopting Product Related Environmental Regulations: Case of Vietnam	2012
342	Shunsuke Managi	Trade, Economic Growth and Environment	2012
341	Keiichiro Honda	The Effect of EU Environmental Regulation on International Trade: Restriction of Hazardous Substances as a Trade Barrier	2012
340	Yasushi HAZAMA	Non-Economic Voting and Incumbent Strength in Turkey	2012
339	Yoshihiro HASHIGUCHI and Kuang-hui CHEN	Assessing Agglomeration Economies in the Yangzi River Delta, China: A Bayesian Spatial Econometric Approach	2012
338	Koichiro KIMURA	Diversified Boundaries of the Firm	2012
337	Mami YAMAGUCHI	Migration as a Rural Development Strategy and the Migrants Involved: An Account of a Migrants' Hometown in Sichuan, China	2012
336	Junko MIZUNO	Technology Network for Machine Tools in Vietnam	2012
335	Fernando Gonzalez-Vigil and Tatsuya Shimizu	The Japan-Peru FTA: Antecedents, Significance and Main Features	2012
334	Yuko Tsujita and Hisaya Oda	Caste, Land, and Migration: A Preliminary Analysis of a Village Survey in an Underdeveloped State in India	2012
333	Hisaya Oda	Progress and Issues in Rural Electrification in Bihar: A Preliminary Analysis	2012
332	Koichi Fujita	Development Strategy in Bihar through Revitalizing the Agricultural Sector: A Preliminary Analysis	2012
331	Chirashree Das Gupta	Growth and Public Finance in Bihar	2012
330	Zhe Ren	The Confucius Institutes and China's Soft Power	2012
329	Ikuko OKAMOTO	Coping and Adaptation against Decreasing Fish Resources: Case Study of Fishermen in Lake Inle, Myanmar	2012
328	Takeshi INOUE, Yuki TOYOSHIMA, and Shigeyuki HAMORI	Inflation Targeting in Korea, Indonesia, Thailand, and the Philippines: The Impact on Business Cycle Synchronization between Each Country and the World	2012
327	Yoko IWASAKI	The Business Management Strategy of Iran's Large Apparel Firms: Overview of Results from a Questionnaire Survey and Interviews	2012
326	Koji KUBO	Trade Policies and Trade Mis-reporting in Myanmar	2012
325	Momoko KAWAKAMI	Innovating Global Value Chains: Creation of the Netbook Market by Taiwanese Firms	2012
324	Shawn ARITA and Kiyoyasu TANAKA	Heterogeneous Multinational Firms and Productivity Gains from Falling FDI Barriers	2012
323	Hisatoshi HOKEN	Development of Land Rental Market and its Effect on Household Farming in Rural China: An Empirical Study in Zhejiang Province	2012
322	Yuya KUDO	Returns to Migration: The Role of Educational Attainment in Rural Tanzania	2012
321	Miwa TSUDA	The Gap between Recognition and the 'Compensation Business': The Claim against Britain for Compensation by Kenya's Former Mau Mau	2012
320	Koji KUBO	Restructuring the State Budget System for Disinflation and exchange Rate Unification in Myanmar	2012

No.	Author(s)	Title	
319	Momoe MAKINO	Effects of Birth Order and Sibling Sex Composition on Human Capital Investment in Children in India	2012
318	Kazunobu HAYAKAWA, Kiyoyasu TANAKA, and Yasushi UEKI	Transport Modal Choice by Multinational Firms: Firm-level Evidence from Southeast Asia	2011
317	Yuko TSUJITA	Factors that Prevent Children from Gaining Access to Schooling: A Study of Delhi Slum Households	2011
316	Hiroko UCHIMURA	Health System Reforms in China: Progress and Further Challenges	2011
315	Daisuke HIRATSUKA	Production Networks in the Asia-Pacific Region: Facts and Policy Implications	2011
314	Kaoru NABESHIMA	Growth Strategies in a Greener World	2011
313	Kazunobu HAYAKAWA, Hyun-Hoon LEE, and Donghyun PARK	Do Export Promotion Agencies Increase Exports?	2011
312	Mariko WATANABE	Competition of Mechanisms: How Chinese Home Appliances Firms Coped with Default Risk of Trade Credit?	2011
311	Kazunobu HAYAKAWA	How Serious Is the Omission of Bilateral Tariff Rates in Gravity?	2011
310	Kazunobu HAYAKAWA and Kiyoyasu TANAKA	Export Platform FDI and Firm Heterogeneity	2011
309	Kazunobu HAYAKAWA, Fukunari KIMURA, Kaoru NABESHIMA	Non-conventional Provisions in Regional Trade Agreements: Do They Enhance International Trade?	2011
308	Koichi KAWAMURA	Consensus and Democracy in Indonesia: Musyawarah-Mufakat Revisited	2011
307	Kumudinei DISSANAYAKE	Low Workforce Participation of Educated Female and the Role of Work Organizations in Post-war Sri Lanka	2011
306	Nay Myo Aung	Agricultural Efficiency of Rice Farmers in Myanmar: A Case Study in Selected Areas	2011
305	Takeshi KAWANAKA and Yuki ASABA	Establishing Electoral Administration Systems in New Democracies	2011
304	Kazunobu HAYAKAWA	Bilateral Tariff Rates in International Trade: Finished Goods versus Intermediate Goods	2011
303	Shuji UCHIKAWA	Knowledge Spillover in Indian Automobile Industry The Process and the Coverage	2011
302	Ke DING and Jiutang PAN	Platforms, Network Effects and Small Business Dynamics in China: Case Study of the Shanzhai Cell Phone Industry	2011
301	Kazunobu HAYAKAWA and Kenmei TSUBOTA	Location Choice in Low-income Countries: Evidence from Japanese Investments in East Asia	2011
300	Tatsufumi YAMAGATA and Yoko ASUYAMA	The Rise and Fall in the Price of Food, Fuel and Manufactured Goods: Interdependency between Prices and Technology Determining	2011
299	Takeshi INOUE and Shigeyuki HAMORI	Financial Permeation As a Role of Microfinance: Has Microfinance Actually been Helpful to the Poor?	2011
298	Tatsuya SHIMIZU	Development of Broiler Integration in Peru	2011
298	Kaoru NABESHIMA and Kiyoyasu TANAKA	Innovation Networks among China, Japan, and Korea: Further Evidence from U.S. Patent Data	2011
296	Shawn ARITA and Kiyoyasu TANAKA	Simulating Heterogeneous Multinational Firms	2011
295	Abu S. SHONCHOY and Seiro ITO	Ramadan School Holidays as a Natural Experiment: Impacts of Seasonality on School Dropout in Bangladesh	2011
294	Abu S. SHONCHOY	Seasonal Migration and Micro-credit in the Lean Period: Evidence from Northwest Bangladesh	2011
293	Futaba ISHIZUKA	Economic Restructuring and Regional Distribution of Enterprises in Vietnam	2011
292	Miki HAMADA	Market Discipline by Depositors: Impact of Deposit Insurance on the Indonesian Banking Sector	2011
291	MURAKAMI Kaoru	Negotiating Social Assistance: The Case of the Urban Poor in Turkey	2011

No.	Author(s)	Title	
290	Kazuhiko OYAMADA and Yoko UCHIDA	Domestic, Vertical, and Horizontal Multinationals: A General Equilibrium Approach using the “Knowledge Capital Model”	2011
289	Miwa YAMADA	Is the Anti-Trafficking Framework Really for the 'Victims'?	2011
288	Yasushi HAZAMA	Determinants of Political Tolerance: A Literature Review	2011
287	Hisao YOSHINO	Strategic Trade Policy and Non-Linear Subsidy -In The Case of Price Competition-	2011
286	Natsuko OKA	Neither Exit nor Voice: Loyalty as a Survival Strategy for the Uzbeks in Kazakhstan	2011
285	Ikuo KUROWA, Kaoru NABESHIMA, and Kiyoyasu	Innovation Networks among China, Japan, and Korea: Evidence from Japanese Patent Data	2011
284	Hitoshi SUZUKI	Preliminary Discussions on the Urbanization of Rural Areas in Modern Iran	2011
283	Kozo KUNIMUNE	A Model of Economic Growth with Saturating Demand	2011
282	Etsuyo MICHIDA, Cemal Atici, and Michikazu KOJIMA	Does Quality Matter in the Iron and Scrap Trade?	2011
281	Kazunobu HAYAKAWA, Fukunari KIMURA, and Hyun-Hoon LEE	How Does Country Risk Matter for Foreign Direct Investment?	2011
280	Kazunobu HAYAKAWA and Nobuaki YAMASHITA	The Role of Preferential Trade Agreements (PTAs) in Facilitating Global Production Networks	2011
279	Noriyuki YANAGAWA and Mariko WATANABE	Ex ante bargaining and ex post enforcement in trade credit supply: Theory and Evidence from China	2011
278	Yoko ASUYAMA	Skill Sorting, Inter-Industry Skill Wage Premium, and Production Chains: Evidence from India 1999-2000	2011
277	Yoko ASUYAMA	Skill Distribution and Comparative Advantage: A Comparison of China and India	2011
276	Bo MENG, Norihiko YAMANO and Colin WEBB	Application of Factor Decomposition Techniques to Vertical Specialisation Measurement	2011
275	Kazunobu HAYAKAWA	Measuring Fixed Costs for Firms' Use of a Free Trade Agreement: Threshold Regression Approach	2011
274	Kenmei TSUBOTA, Yujiro KAWASAKI	Myopic or farsighted: Bilateral Trade Agreements among three	2011
273	Ayako OBASHI, Kazunobu HAYAKAWA, Toshiyuki	A Two-dimensional Analysis of the Impact of Outward FDI on Performance at Home: Evidence from Japanese Manufacturing Firms	2010
272	Kazunobu HAYAKAWA, Hyun-Hoon LEE, Donghyun PARK	Investment Promotion Agencies: Do They Work?	2010
271	Takeshi INOUE, Shigeyuki HAMORI	An Empirical Analysis on the Efficiency of the Microfinance Investment Market	2010
270	Bo MENG, Norihiko YAMANO, and Colin Webb	Vertical Specialisation Indicator Based on Supply-Driven Input-Output Model	2010
269	Quoc Hung Nguyen	International Real Business Cycles: A Re-Visit	2010
268	Yoko ASUYAMA, Dalin CHHUN, Takahiro FUKUNISHI, Seiha	Firm Dynamics in the Cambodian Garment Industry: Firm Turnover, Productivity Growth, and Wage Profile under Trade Liberalization	2010
267	Kazunobu HAYAKAWA, Hyun-Hoon LEE, Donghyun PARK	The Role of Home and Host Country Characteristics in FDI: Firm-Level Evidence from Japan, Korea and Taiwan	2010
266	Abu S SHONCHOY	Determinants of Government Consumption Expenditure in Developing Countries: A Panel Data Analysis	2010
265	Dil Bahadur Rahut, Iván Velásquez Castellanos and Pravakar Sahoo	COMMERCIALIZATION OF AGRICULTURE IN THE HIMALAYAS	2010
264	Zhang Yu	Yangtze River Delta's System Integration: Institutional Barriers and Countermeasures	2010
263	Yuichi WATANABE	Tax Differentials and Inflow of Foreign Direct Investments: Evidence from Foreign Operations of U.S. Multinational Companies	2010

No.	Author(s)	Title	
262	Yasushi HAZAMA	The Making of a State-Centered “Public Sphere” in Turkey: A Discourse Analysis	2010
261	Pravakar Sahoo, Ranjan Kumar Dash and Geethanjali Nataraj	Infrastructure Development and Economic Growth in China	2010
260	Takeshi KAWANAKA	The Urban Middle Class in the Instability of New Democracies	2010
259	Jose Ramon Albert, Soya Mori, Celia Reyes, Aubrey Tabuga, and	Income Disparity among Persons with Disabilities Assessed by Education and Sex: Findings from a Field Survey Conducted in Metro	2010
258	Koji KUBO, Nu Nu Lwin	Smuggling and Import Duties in Myanmar	2010
257	Koichi FUJITA, Tamakai ENDO, Ikuko OKAMOTO, Yoshihiro	Myanmar Migrant Laborers in Ranong, Thailand	2010
256	Dil Bahadur Rahut, Ivan Velasquez Castellanos, Pravakar Sahoo	Performance of Financial Institutions in Bhutan	2010
255	Mitsuhiro KAGAMI	Recent Trends in Asian Integration and Japanese Participation	2010
254	Hisaya ODA, Yuko TSUJITA	The Determinants of Rural Electrification in Bihar, India	2010
253	Kiyoyasu TANAKA, Naomi HATSUKANO	The Size Distribution of All Cambodian Establishments	2010
252	Kazunobu HAYAKAWA, Fukunari KIMURA, Tomohiro MACHIKITA	Globalization and Productivity: A Survey of Firm-level Analysis	2010
251	Kuo-I CHANG, Kazunobu HAYAKAWA, Toshiyuki MATSUURA	Location Choice of Multinational Enterprises in China: Comparison between Japan and Taiwan	2010
250	Kazunobu HAYAKAWA, Kiyoyasu TANAKA, Yasushi UEKI	Are Trading Partners Complementary in International Trade?	2010
249	Takeshi INOUE, Shigeyuki HAMORI	How Has Financial Deepening Affected Poverty Reduction in India? Empirical Analysis Using State-Level Panel Data	2010
248	Hisatoshi HOKEN	Restoration of Micro Data of John Lossing Buck’s Survey and Analysis of the Inverse Relationship between Yield and Farm Size in Rural China in the 1930’s	2010
247	Quoc Hung NGUYEN	Liability Dollarization and Fear of Floating	2010
246	Hideki HIRAIZUMI	Trade of Heilongjiang Province (China) with Russia	2010
245	Abu S SHONCHOY	The Dynamics of Spending and Absorption of Aid: Panel Data Analysis	2010
244	KHOO Boo Teik	Cyber-networks, physical coalitions and missing links: Imagining and realizing dissent in Malaysia 1998–2008	2010
243	Miwa TSUDA	Kenya's 2007 Election Crisis	2010
242	Takeshi INOUE	Effectiveness of the Monetary Policy Framework in Present-day India: Have Financial Variables Functioned as Useful Policy Indicators?	2010
241	Kiyoyasu TANAKA	Transport Costs, Distance, and Time: Evidence from the Japanese Census of Logistics	2010
240	Takeshi KAWANAKA	Polical Institutions and Policy Outcomes: Effects of Presidential Vetoes on Budget Making	2010
239	KHOO Boo Teik and Vedi R. HADIZ	Critical Connections: Islamic Politics and Political Economy in Indonesia and Malaysia	2010
238	KHOO Boo Teik	Social Movements and the Crisis of Neoliberalism in Malaysia and Thailand	2010
237	Ikuo KUROIWA Hiromichi OZEKI	Intra-regional Trade between China, Japan, and Korea: Before and After the Financial Crisis	2010
236	KHOO Boo Teik	No Insulation: Politics and Technocracy’s Troubled Trajectory	2010
235	Koichi KAWAMURA	Is the Indonesian President Strong or Weak?	2010
234	Toshiyuki MATSUURA, Kiyoyasu TANAKA, Shujiro URATA	The Determinants of Offshore Production by Multinational Corporations (MNCs): A Comparison of Japanese and US MNCs	2010

No.	Author(s)	Title	
233	Takeshi KAWANAKA	Interaction of Powers in the Philippine Presidential System	2010
232	Takahiro FUKUNISHI	FDI and Export participation of Local Firms in Africa: The Case of the Kenyan Garment Industry	2010
231	Hitoshi SUZUKI	A Critical Review of Opinion Polls relating to Iranian Voting Intentions: Problems of Research Methodology as applied to Complex Societies	2010
230	Mai FUJITA	The Diversity and Dynamics of Industrial Organisation: Transformation of Local Assemblers in the Vietnamese Motorcycle Industry	2010
229	Miki HAMADA, Masaru KONISHI	Related Lending and Bank Performance: Evidence from Indonesia	2010
228	Hisao YOSHINO	Strategic Trade Policy and Non-Linear Subsidy	2010
227	Masahiro KODAMA	Large Fluctuations in Consumption in Least Developed Countries	2010
226	Chiharu TAMAMURA	Cost Reduction Effects of “pseudo FTAs” in Asia - Application of a Price Model Based on a Multilateral I/O Table -	2010
225	Koji KUBO	Natural Gas Export Revenue, Fiscal Balance and Inflation in Myanmar	2010
224	Mariko WATANABE	Separation of Control and Cash-flow Rights of State Owned Listed Enterprises: Channels of Expropriation following Discriminated Share Reform	2010
223	Haruka I. MATSUMOTO	The Taiwan Strait Crisis of 1954-55 and U.S.-R.O.C. Relations	2010
222	Miwa TSUDA	The Experience of National Rainbow Coalition (NARC): Political Parties in Kenya from 1991 to 2007	2010
221	Kensuke KUBO	Inferring the Effects of Vertical Integration from Entry Games: An Analysis of the Generic Pharmaceutical Industry	2010
220	Ikuo KUROIWA Hiroshi KUWAMORI	Shock Transmission Mechanism of the Economic Crisis in East Asia: An Application of International Input-Output Analysis	2010