## Chapter 5

## Summary of the Survey on Hog Slaughtering and Processing Firms in Henan and Jilin

## 1. Outline of Survey

### 1.1 Survey Implementation

The firm survey was conducted in two provinces of China by the Institute of Developing Economies jointly with the Chinese Academy of Agricultural Sciences (CAAS) and the local statistical offices in each province from March to June 2008. In each province, more than 100 firms were interviewed. The questionnaire was prepared by the authors of this report with the consultation of local statistical officers as well as livestock experts in CAAS. A total of 208firms were interviewed in Jilin and Henan provinces.

We chose the pork industry for a variety of reasons. We were fortunate to be ale to collaborate with livestock experts from CAAS in this study and we therefore chose a livestock commodity for the aim of this study. The poultry industry had suffered serious shocks resulting from bird flu and was difficult to study due to potential biases. Also, the government would be reluctant to provide information directly related to bird flu due to the continued concerns by the citizens and media. The price of pork has been fluctuating relatively highly and there are various questions facing the pork industry. Thus, we chose pork (or hog handling firms) as our commodity of focus.

The firm questionnaire included detailed questions primarily on the characteristics, finance, investment plan, cash management, transactions with financial institutions, marketing, procurement, and transaction with contract farmers. The questionnaire was drafted by the authors, pre-tested by local enumerators, checked by the field supervisor and then revised. We finalized the questionnaire according to the results of the pilot surveys and the feedback from the enumerators.

The firm survey was conducted at 103 firms in Jilin province and 105 firms in Henan province. These provinces were chosen from among the few provinces where the local statistical offices provided permission to administer a field survey by CAAS and where the local statistical office and its department that maintains the firm-related information was cooperative in conducting the firm surveys. Without their collaboration, the firm survey would not have been possible. The interviewed firms were selected by stratified random sampling from the list of firms obtained from the local government statistical offices. Stratified by size, we interviewed small, medium, and large firms.

### 1.2 Structure of the survey

In order to capture characteristics of the hog market in China, we conducted a survey in Jilin and Henan Provinces. The objective of the survey was to obtain information, such as price, quantity, and other related transaction issues, of hog slaughtering and processing firms.

All pork marketed to consumers in China follows the same processes. Hogs are bred and produced by farmers, become pork via slaughtering firms and are then marketed to the consumers. The slaughtering firms are located between farmers and consumers and are related to whole types of pork supply chains, thus information from this phase of the process is ideal for capturing an overview of pork product chain. In addition, we are also interested in industry transactions with financial institutions.

Surveyed firms were asked to choose one concrete customers transaction partner among wholesalers, restaurants, supermarkets, and wet markets, and then from middleman, contracted farmer, and independent farmer. After firms made their choice, they were then asked to answer a number of questions related to pricing, quantity, and other transaction conditions with these partners. In addition to this, the surveyed firms were asked to answer regarding historical transaction records with financial institutions and basic information on firms' characteristics.

Figure 5-1 depicts the structure of information obtained through the questionnaire regarding transaction structures of the surveyed firms. Figure 5-1 also gives descriptions on number of transaction partners and their share of the surveyed firms. Hereafter, data on basic profiles of the firms, marketing,
procurement, and transactions with financial institutions are summarized without further comments.

Figure 5-1: Transaction Structure of the Surveyed Firms


## 2. Basic Profiles of Firms

Table 5-1 Basic Profiles of the Surveyed Firm

|  | Obs | Mean | Std. Dev. | Min | Median | Max |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year of firm establishment | 208 | 1997 | 12.6 | 1954 | 2000 | 2008 |
| Sale (0000RMB:2007) | 208 | 15,608 | 152,628 | 0 | 103.7 | $2,184,458$ |
| Asset (0000 RMB:2007) | 208 | 5,304 | 31,299 | 0 | 58 | 402,412 |
| Share of controlling owner(\%) | 199 | $90.1 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| \# of employee | 207 | 173 | 910.4 | 1 | 10 | 12,428 |
| \# of hog procured(=slaughtered:head) | 204 | 58,987 | 230,665 | 21 | 4,000 | $2,267,888$ |
| Pork production voluem (ton) | 200 | 4,638 | 17,736 | 1 | 300 | 153,563 |

Table 5-2 Sales, Assets, Profit, and Investment

| 000RMB |  | Obs | Mean | Std. Dev | Min | Max |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sales | 2007 | 208 | 15,608 | 152,628 | 0 | $2,184,458$ |
|  | 2006 | 185 | 12,642 | 114,396 | 0 | $1,543,135$ |
|  | 2005 | 174 | 11,652 | 102,795 | 0 | $1,345,993$ |
| Asset | 2007 | 208 | 5,304 | 31,299 | 0 | 402,412 |
|  | 2006 | 187 | 4,632 | 29,015 | 0 | 370,420 |
|  | 2005 | 173 | 4,217 | 27,938 | 0 | 350,060 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Profit | 2007 | 207 | 650 | 6,346 | $-2,228$ | 89,067 |
|  | 2006 | 199 | 540 | 5,106 | $-1,278$ | 71,307 |
|  | 2005 | 192 | 467 | 4,897 | $-2,239$ | 67,170 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Investment | 2007 | 176 | 333 | 2,447 | 0 | 27,810 |
|  | 2006 | 172 | 143 | 1,119 | 0 | 11,370 |
|  | 2005 | 167 | 37 | 259 | 0 | 3,200 |

Table 5-3: Registered Capital and Capital Structure

| Variable | Obs | Mean | Std. Dev. | Min | Max |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Registered capital (000RMB) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Capital Structure (\%) | 205 | 1,150 | 6,332 | 0 | 60,600 |
| Share of |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Chairman cum Genaral Mangers | 206 | 45.8 | 47.3 | 0 |
| 100 |  |  |  |  |  |
| General Managers | 205 | 10.1 | 26.3 | 0 | 100 |
| Other managements | 206 | 15.7 | 33.8 | 0 | 100 |
| Employee | 206 | 6.1 | 18.5 | 0 | 100 |
| Foreign Investor | 206 | 6.1 | 20.1 | 0 | 100 |
| Customer | 206 | 0.3 | 3.7 | 0 | 51 |
| Supplier | 206 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local government | 206 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |
| State or Private company | 206 | 7.4 | 25.8 | 0 | 100 |
| Others | 206 | 6.3 | 24.1 | 0 | 100 |
|  | 206 | 2.2 | 12.6 | 0 | 100 |

Table 5-4: Ownership Type

|  | Freq. | Percent |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| State or State controlling firm |  |  |
| Collective owned | 22 | 10.6 |
| Private owned | 10 | 4.8 |
| Foreigne owned | 1 | 44.2 |
| Limited company | 41 | 0.5 |
| Share limited company | 12 | 5.8 |
| Individual owned | 10 | 4.8 |
| Contract management | 3 | 1.4 |
| Others | 17 | 8.2 |
|  |  |  |
| Total | 184 | 100 |

Table 5-5: Types of Controlling Owners

|  | Freq. | Percent |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Chairman |  |  |
| Chairman cum General manager | 53 | 11.9 |
| Private outside firm | 8 | 26.4 |
| State company | 22 | 4.0 |
| Private company | 46 | 22.0 |
| Foreign Owned | 2 | 1.0 |
| Others | 46 | 22.9 |
| Total |  |  |

Table 5-6: Corporate Reform Experience
Did the firm experienced corporate reform?

|  | Yes | No | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year refomed | $\#$ | $\#$ | $\#$ |
| 1990 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 1993 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 1995 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 1999 | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| 2000 | 5 | 0 | 5 |
| 2001 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 2002 | 9 | 0 | 9 |
| 2003 | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| 2004 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| 2005 | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| 2006 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| 2007 | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| 2008 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| $?$ | 1 | 84 | 85 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Total | 40 | 84 | 124 |

## 3. Marketing

Table 5-7: Sales Amount and Products Structure

|  | Obs | Mean | Std. Dev. | Min | Max |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sales amount in 2007 | 207 | 6,223 | 26,858 | 0.3 | 241,151 |
| Share of products \% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hog raising | 201 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 80 |
| Slaughtering and fresh meat | 201 | 84 | 32 | 0 | 100 |
| Freezed meat | 201 | 12 | 27 | 0 | 100 |
| Processed meat | 201 | 2 | 10 | 0 | 100 |
| Restaurant | 201 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 30 |
| Others | 201 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 100 |
| Number of slaughted hog (0000 head) | 205 | 6 | 23 | 0.0002 | 227 |
| Prok production volume (ton) | 171 | 2,337 | 8,258 | 1.4 | 73,555 |
| Cleaned pork volume (ton) | 200 | 4,638 | 17,736 | 1.4 | 153,563 |

Table 5-8: Number of Customers
Number of customers

|  | Obs | Mean | Std. Dev. | Min | Max |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of customer tota | 206 | 46 | 142 | 1 | 1,580 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wholsaler | 207 | 20 | 84 | 0 | 920 |
| Supermarket | 206 | 4 | 22 | 0 | 300 |
| Restaurant | 206 | 3 | 17 | 0 | 180 |
| Wet market | 206 | 12 | 32 | 0 | 250 |
| Brand outlet | 206 | 9 | 46 | 0 | 515 |
| Export | 206 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 30 |

Table 5-9: Production Amount per Transactions

| Quantity of transaction with the transaction partner |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| KG | With wholesaler | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2005 | 2006 |
| Supermarket | 2007 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Obs | 108 | 117 | 131 | 38 | 41 | 47 |
| Mean | $1,131,985$ | $1,263,597$ | $1,016,752$ | 128,852 | 161,099 | 156,130 |
| Std. Dev. | $6,850,985$ | $7,514,401$ | $5,090,503$ | 332,959 | 450,708 | 352,497 |
| Min | 375 | 450 | 400 | 450 | 420 | 440 |
| Max | $70,000,000$ | $80,000,000$ | $55,000,000$ | $1,700,000$ | $2,500,000$ | $2,000,000$ |


| Restaurant |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| KGG | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 |
| Obs | 19 | 20 | 23 | 136 | 141 | 156 |
| Mean | 51,974 | 64,659 | 72,869 | 235,095 | 216,073 | 297,309 |
| Std. Dev. | 139,932 | 154,282 | 161,774 | 697,805 | 613,056 | $1,629,660$ |
| Min | 700 | 1000 | 1000 | 100 | 150 | 220 |
| Max | 620,000 | 700,000 | 780,000 | $6,384,000$ | $5,274,000$ | $19,600,000$ |

Table 5-10: Quality Control Criteria
Which items of quality control your firm is taking?

| \% | Yes | No | Total \# |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hig fat ratio | 14.9 | 85.1 | 208 |
| Hig lean meat ratio | 29.6 | 70.4 | 208 |
| Low antibiotic | 26.9 | 73.1 | 208 |
| Low bacteria | 20.9 | 79.1 | 208 |
| Low heavy metal | 16.8 | 83.2 | 208 |
| Low meat increaser | 32.9 | 67.1 | 208 |
| Low dead meat | 39.9 | 60.1 | 208 |
| Others | 4.6 | 95.4 | 208 |

Table 5-11: Brand, Trademark, and Quality Certification

|  | Do your firm have any your own brand/trade mark/quality certificate |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | No | 110 | 56.7 |
| 2 | Corporate brand | 11 | 5.67 |
| 3 | Trade mark | 6 | 3.09 |
| 4 | Quality certificate | 41 | 21.13 |
|  | 1+3 | 1 | 0.52 |
|  | 2+4 | 2 | 1.03 |
|  | 3+4 | 2 | 1.03 |
|  | 2+3+4 | 21 | 10.82 |
|  | Total | 194 | 100 |

Table 5-12: Transaction Method and Transportation Cost Bearing

|  | Wholesaler |  | Supermarket |  | Restaurant Freq. | Wetmarket |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Freq. | Percent | Freq. | Percent |  | Percent | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 Slaughtering firm promotes | 40 | 31.3 | 24 | 49.0 | 11 | 45.8 | 48 | 31.0 |
| 2 Firm's own outlet | 5 | 3.9 | 1 | 2.0 | 2 | 8.3 | 8 | 5.2 |
| 3 Wholesaler comes the firm to buy | 63 | 49.2 | 14 | 28.6 | 9 | 37.5 | 85 | 54.8 |
| 4 Long term Fixed contract | 6 | 4.7 | 6 | 12.2 | 2 | 8.3 | 5 | 3.2 |
| 5 Others | 10 | 7.8 | 1 | 2.0 |  |  | 8 | 5.2 |
| Total | 128 | 100 | 49 | 100 | 24 | 100 | 155 | 100 |

Table 5-13: Sources of Hogs Sold to Respective Customers

|  | Wholesaler |  | Supermarket |  |  | Restaurant |  |  | Wet market |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Freq | Percent |  | Freq. | Percent |  | Freq. | Percent |  | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 Firm's own farm | 1 | 0.8 |  | 1 | 2.0 |  | 1 | 4.2 |  | 3 | 1.9 |
| 2 Contracted farmer | 10 | 8.4 |  | 4 | 8.2 |  | 3 | 12.5 |  | 5 | 3.2 |
| 3 Procurement team | 18 | 15.1 |  | 10 | 20.4 |  | 7 | 29.2 |  | 23 | 14.6 |
| 4 Middleman | 50 | 42.0 |  | 20 | 40.8 |  | 3 | 12.5 |  | 83 | 52.5 |
| 5 Farmers send hogs | 7 | 5.9 |  | 3 | 6.1 |  | 1 | 4.2 |  | 8 | 5.1 |
| 6 Not fixed | 16 | 13.5 |  | 4 | 8.2 |  | 4 | 16.7 |  | 22 | 13.9 |
| 12 | 1 | 0.8 | 12 | 1 | 2.0 | 14 | 1 | 4.2 | 14 | 1 | 0.6 |
| 14 | 1 | 0.8 | 14 | 1 | 2.0 | 23 | 1 | 4.2 | 23 | 2 | 1.3 |
| 23 | 2 | 1.7 | 23 | 1 | 2.0 | 34 | 2 | 8.3 | 24 | 2 | 1.3 |
| 24 | 1 | 0.8 | 34 | 2 | 4.1 | 45 | 1 | 4.2 | 34 | 3 | 1.9 |
| 34 | 3 | 2.5 | 45 | 2 | 4.1 |  |  |  | 36 | 1 | 0.6 |
| 35 | 1 | 0.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 45 | 3 | 1.9 |
| 45 | 2 | 1.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 124 | 1 | 0.6 |
| 46 | 1 | 0.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 235 | 1 | 0.6 |
| 124 | 1 | 0.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 234 | 2 | 1.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 235 | 1 | 0.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1234 | 1 | 0.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 119 | 100 | Tota | 49 | 100 | Total | 24 | 100 | Total | 158 | 100 |

Table 5-14: Trade Credit to Customers
Ratio of cash on delivery of the transaction in 2007 (\%)

|  | Obs | \# of 100 | Mean | Std. Dev. | Min | Max |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wholesaler | 129 | 104 | 94.8 | 12.7 | 40 | 100 |
| Supermarket | 47 | 33 | 89.2 | 21.3 | 20 | 100 |
| Restaurant | 23 | 12 | 82.3 | 26.2 | 10 | 100 |
| Wetmarket | 152 | 137 | 98.0 | 7.3 | 50 | 100 |

## 4. Procurement

Table 5-15: Share of Procurement Sources

|  | Obs | Mean | Std. Dev. | Min | Max |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Hogs procured | 204 | 58,987 | 230,665 | 21 | $2,267,888$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Share of procurement source (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Firm's own farm | 204 | 1.9 | 10 | 0 | 100 |
| Contract farmer | 204 | 6.6 | 20 | 0 | 100 |
| Firm's procurement team | 204 | 15.4 | 31 | 0 | 100 |
| Middleman | 204 | 59.4 | 43 | 0 | 100 |
| Independent farmer | 203 | 13.3 | 30 | 0 | 100 |
| Other | 203 | 3.5 | 17 | 0 | 100 |

Table 5-16: Number of Procurement Source Partners
Number of procurement partner

| Variable | Obs | Mean | Std. Dev. | Min | Max |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Firm's own firm |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contracted farmer | 208 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Procurement team | 208 | 97 | 507 | 0 | 5,000 |
| Middelman | 208 | 11 | 109 | 0 | 1,570 |
| Independent farmer | 208 | 14 | 59 | 0 | 566 |
| Others | 208 | 0 | 52 | 0 | 500 |

Table 5-17: Hog Procurement Volume per Transaction

Hog procurement volume per transaction

|  | Obs | Mean | Std. Dev. | Min | Max |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Contracted farmer |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 | 31 | 11,903 | 25,124 | 3 | 99,622 |
| 2006 | 33 | 14,042 | 31,455 | 3 | 141,612 |
| 2007 | 36 | 16,252 | 39,497 | 5 | 171,034 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Independent farmer |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 | 62 | 3,716 | 10,606 | 10 | 51,000 |
| 2006 | 67 | 3,418 | 9,733 | 12 | 49,000 |
| 2006 | 71 | 3,187 | 9,048 | 4 | 45,000 |
| 2007 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Middleman |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2005 | 157 | 7,261 | 38,382 | 10 |
| 420,000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2006 | 168 | 7,613 | 40,177 | 10 | 460,000 |
| 2007 | 189 | 7,406 | 40,695 | 10 | 480,000 |
| Pig raising days |  |  | 11 |  |  |
| Contract farmer | 36 | 146 | 25 | 100 | 200 |
| Independent farmer | 71 | 148 | 22 | 100 | 190 |
| Middleman | 184 | 156 | 21 | 110 | 289 |

Table 5-18: Transaction Method


Table 5-19: Timing of Inspection

| Timing of hog inspection |  | Contracted farmer |  | Independent farmer |  | Middleman |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Freq. | Percent | Freq. | Percent | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 | No inspection | 2 | 5.6 | 11 | 15.9 | 22 | 11.5 |
| 2 | On slaughtering | 8 | 22.2 | 22 | 31.9 | 70 | 36.7 |
| 3 | Prior to slaughtering | 26 | 72.2 | 36 | 52.2 | 97 | 50.8 |
|  | 2+3 |  |  |  |  | 2 | 1.1 |
|  | Total | 36 | 100.0 | 69 | 100 | 191 | 100 |

Table 5-20: Market of Hog Products of From Respective Procurement Sources

|  | Contract farmer |  |  | Independent farmer |  | Middleman |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Freq. | Percent |  | Freq. | Percent |  | Freq. | Percent |
| 1 Overseas | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| 2 Supermarket | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 1.4 |  | 3 | 1.8 |
| 3 Restaurant | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0.0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| 4 Wet market | 8 | 22.9 |  | 27 | 38.6 |  | 83 | 49.7 |
| 5 Brand outlet | 1 | 2.9 |  | 2 | 2.9 |  | 2 | 1.2 |
| 6 Wholesaler | 7 | 20.0 |  | 11 | 15.7 |  | 25 | 14.97 |
| 7 No fixed | 8 | 22.9 |  | 17 | 24.3 |  | 28 | 16.77 |
| 23 | 1 | 2.9 | 23 | 1 | 1.4 | 23 | 1 | 0.6 |
| 26 | 1 | 2.9 | 45 | 1 | 1.4 | 24 | 2 | 1.2 |
| 45 | 1 | 2.9 | 46 | 4 | 5.7 | 27 | 1 | 0.6 |
| 46 | 2 | 5.7 | 246 | 1 | 1.4 | 34 | 1 | 0.6 |
| 67 | 1 | 2.9 | 267 | 1 | 1.4 | 46 | 9 | 5.39 |
| 2456 | 3 | 8.6 | 456 | 1 | 1.4 | 56 | 1 | 0.6 |
| 2467 | 1 | 2.9 | 467 | 1 | 1.4 | 246 | 2 | 1.2 |
| 12356 | 1 | 2.9 | 2456 | 2 | 2.9 | 256 | 3 | 1.8 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 456 | 4 | 2.4 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 2345 | 1 | 0.6 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 2457 | 1 | 0.6 |
| Total | 35 | 100 |  | 70 | 100 |  | 167 | 100 |

Table 5-21: Trade Credit with Procurement Sources
Ratio of cash on delivery of the transaction in 2007 (\%)

|  | Obs | \# of 100 | Mean | Std. Dev. | Min | Max |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contracted farmer | 36 | 29 | 95.2 | 17.4 | 0 | 100 |
| Independent farmer | 70 | 57 | 95.4 | 11.1 | 50 | 100 |
| Middleman | 190 | 161 | 96.0 | 11.9 | 20 | 100 |

## 5. Transactions with Financial Institutions

Table 5-22: The Financial Institutions with which Firms Transact

| Name of Banks | Freq. | Percent |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| 1 Industrial Bank of China | 28 | $14 \%$ |
| 2 Agricultural Bank of China | 73 | $38 \%$ |
| 3 Bank of China | 7 | $4 \%$ |
| 4 Construction Bank | 10 | $5 \%$ |
| 5 Share banks | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| 6 City Commercial banks | 6 | $3 \%$ |
| 7 Rural Credit Cooperatives | 66 | $34 \%$ |
| 8 Others | 3 | $2 \%$ |
| 1+2 | 1 | $1 \%$ |
|  |  |  |
| Total | 194 | 100 |

Table 5-23: Access to Financial Institutions
Lag of Bank access

|  | Freq. | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year of bank account opened - Year of firm's establishemeı |  |  |
| -6 | 1 | 0.5 |
| -3 | 1 | 0.5 |
| -1 | 4 | 2.0 |
| 0 | 139 | 70.6 |
| 1 | 16 | 8.1 |
| 2 | 9 | 4.6 |
| 3 | 3 | 1.5 |
| 4 | 1 | 0.5 |
| 5 | 3 | 1.5 |
| 6 | 4 | 2.0 |
| 7 | 1 | 0.5 |
| 8 | 2 | 1.0 |
| 10 | 1 | 0.5 |
| 11 | 3 | 1.5 |
| 17 | 2 | 1.0 |
| 24 | 1 | 0.5 |
| 37 | 2 | 1.0 |
| 40 | 1 | 0.5 |
| 42 | 2 | 1.0 |
| 49 | 1 | 0.5 |
| Total | 197 | 100 |

Table 5-24: Firms Having Bank Accounts

| Year bank account opened |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Freq. | Percent |
| Not yet | 10 | 4.8 |
| 1957 | 2 | 1.0 |
| 1958 | 4 | 1.9 |
| 1963 | 1 | 0.5 |
| 1965 | 1 | 0.5 |
| 1980 | 1 | 0.5 |
| 1987 | 1 | 0.5 |
| 1990 | 2 | 1.0 |
| 1991 | 1 | 0.5 |
| 1992 | 2 | 1.0 |
| 1993 | 5 | 2.4 |
| 1994 | 1 | 0.5 |
| 1995 | 10 | 4.8 |
| 1996 | 13 | 6.3 |
| 1997 | 8 | 3.9 |
| 1998 | 14 | 6.8 |
| 1999 | 12 | 5.8 |
| 2000 | 18 | 8.7 |
| 2001 | 11 | 5.3 |
| 2002 | 16 | 7.7 |
| 2003 | 18 | 8.7 |
| 2004 | 12 | 5.8 |
| 2005 | 10 | 4.8 |
| 2006 | 15 | 7.3 |
| 2007 | 17 | 8.2 |
| 2008 | 2 | 1.0 |
|  |  |  |
| Total | 207 | 100 |

Table 5-25: Investment Experience and Future Plan

|  | Have investment plan |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No | Yes | Total |  |
| Investment plan in the |  |  |  |
| last 3 years | $\#$ | $\#$ | $\#$ |
| No \# | 84 | 26 | 110 |
| Yes \# | 42 | 43 | 85 |
| Total | 126 | 69 | 195 |

Table 5-26: Loan Default Experience
Have you met the customer defaulted in the last 3 years?

|  | Obs | Mean | Std. Dev. |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| No | 206 | 0.75 | 0.43 |
| Delayed, but paid finally | 206 | 0.13 | 0.33 |
| Defaulted | 207 | 0.12 | 0.33 |

Table 5-27: Investment Volume and Financing Structure 2007

|  | Variable | Obs | Mean | Std. Dev. | Min | Max |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2007 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Investment | 70 | 1,780 | 8,729 | 0 | 66,425 |  |
| Financed amount (000RME Self capital | 67 | 547 | 2,320 | 0 | 17,010 |  |
|  | Bank loan | 67 | 282 | 1,576 | 0 | 10,800 |
|  | Interfirm borrowing | 66 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 50 |
|  | Borrowing from friend | 65 | 16 | 84 | 0 | 605 |
|  | Issuing securities | 65 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Outsider's investment | 65 | 5 | 37 | 0 | 300 |
|  | Government subsidy | 65 | 2 | 14 | 0 | 113 |
|  | Others | 65 | 2 | 12 | 0 | 100 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Share (\%) |  | 70 | $74.1 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $167 \%$ |
|  | Self capital | 70 | $24.4 \%$ | $77 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $600 \%$ |
|  | Bank loan | 70 | $0.3 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $13 \%$ |
|  | Interfirm borrowing | 70 | $6.9 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
|  | Borrowing from friend | 70 | 70 | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
|  | Issuing securities | $70 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Outsider's investment | 70 | $0.2 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $12 \%$ |
| Government subsidy | 70 | $1.4 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ |  |
|  | 70 | $0.3 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $20 \%$ |  |

Table 5-28: Investment Volume and Financing Structure 2006

|  | Variable | Obs | Mean | Std. Dev. | Min | Max |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Investment | 2006 | 53 | 1,461 | 8,877 | 1 | 64,206 |
| Financed amount (000RME | Self capital | 47 | 141 | 678 | 0 | 4,664 |
|  | Bank loan | 32 | 172 | 825 | 0 | 4,663 |
|  | Interfirm borrowing | 21 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 |
|  | Borrowing from friend | 26 | 26 | 104 | 0 | 529 |
|  | Issuing securities | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Outsider's investment | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Government subsidy | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Others | 23 | 15 | 73 | 0 | 350 |
| Share (\%) | Self capital | 53 | 77.4\% | 42\% | 0\% | 100\% |
|  | Bank loan | 53 | 13.2\% | 34\% | 0\% | 100\% |
|  | Interfirm borrowing | 53 | 0.0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
|  | Borrowing from friend | 53 | 13.2\% | 48\% | 0\% | 300\% |
|  | Issuing securities | 53 | 0.0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
|  | Outsider's investment | 53 | 0.0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
|  | Government subsidy | 53 | 0.0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
|  | Others | 53 | 1.9\% | 14\% | 0\% | 100\% |

Table 5-29: Investment Volume and Financing Structure 2005

|  | Variable | Obs | Mean | Std. Dev. | Min | Max |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2005 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Investment | 43 | 1,061 | 6,005 | 1 | 39,387 |  |
| Financed amount (000RME Self capital | 39 | 73 | 259 | 0 | 1,600 |  |
|  | Bank loan | 28 | 70 | 301 | 0 | 1,600 |
|  | Interfirm borrowing | 22 | 18 | 61 | 0 | 250 |
|  | Borrowing from friend | 22 | 21 | 92 | 0 | 430 |
|  | Issuing securities | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Outsider's investment | 21 | 29 | 133 | 0 | 610 |
|  | Government subsidy | 21 | 3 | 14 | 0 | 63 |
|  | Others | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 43 | $66.1 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Share (\%) | Self capital | 43 | $12.0 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
|  | Bank loan | 43 | $3.9 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $75 \%$ |
|  | Interfirm borrowing | $5.5 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ |  |
|  | Borrowing from friend | 43 | $5.5 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
|  | Issuing securities | 43 | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |  |  |
|  | Outsider's investment | 43 | $2.3 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
|  | Government subsidy | 43 | $12.6 \%$ | $74 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $485 \%$ |
|  | Others | 43 | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |

Table 5-30: Numbers of Applied and Approved Loans since Establishment of the Firm

| Number of loan applied |  | Number of loan approved |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | Cum. |  | Percent | Cum. |
| $\#$ |  | $\%$ | $\#$ |  |  |
| 0 | 13 | 10.7 | 0 | 27 | 23.3 |
| 1 | 38 | 31.2 | 1 | 38 | 32.8 |
| 2 | 25 | 20.5 | 2 | 16 | 13.8 |
| 3 | 10 | 8.2 | 3 | 8 | 6.9 |
| 4 | 2 | 1.6 | 4 | 2 | 1.7 |
| 5 | 6 | 4.9 | 5 | 3 | 2.6 |
| 6 | 6 | 4.9 | 6 | 5 | 4.3 |
| 8 | 2 | 1.6 | 8 | 1 | 0.9 |
| 10 | 2 | 1.6 | 9 | 2 | 1.7 |
| 11 | 1 | 0.8 | 10 | 4 | 3.5 |
| 13 | 2 | 1.6 | 12 | 1 | 0.9 |
| 15 | 2 | 1.6 | 13 | 1 | 0.9 |
| 16 | 2 | 1.6 | 16 | 1 | 0.9 |
| 18 | 3 | 2.5 | 18 | 2 | 1.7 |
| 20 | 3 | 2.5 | 20 | 1 | 0.9 |
| 25 | 1 | 0.8 | 25 | 1 | 0.9 |
| 26 | 2 | 1.6 | 26 | 2 | 1.7 |
| 31 | 1 | 0.8 | 41 | 1 | 0.9 |
| 41 | 1 | 0.8 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 122 | 100 | Total | 116 | 100 |

