National Competition of Human Resources in Ten Southeast Asia Nations*

Yu-Cheng Lai **, Chin-Ho Lin***, Chiang Kao****

Abstract

The research will investigate the national competition for human resources in the ten Southeast Asia states (Brunei, Burma, Cambodia, Indonesia, Loas, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, and Vietnam). The main purpose of this paper is to establish a general manpower index for Southeast Asia nations. The index consists of four major categories, namely, manpower utilization, cost of wages and employee benefit, turnover, and labor or industrial disputes and union power. In compiling the index, we have collected scholars in most famous university in those countries. The index is then established by the following five major steps: (1) selection of the appropriate relevant statistics for each category (2) data collection, (3) conversion of all the relevant statistics into index, (4) determination of appropriate weight for each category and (5) calculate the weight sum to obtain the aggregated human resources index. Under the method of indexation, we measure the competition for human resources. We try to find the rank for national competition in these ten states, providing the information of business investment.

1. Introduction

As a result of geographic location, Taiwan has close relation with Southeast Asian States (SEAS) in trade, politics, and culture. Starting from the late 1980s, the environment of management for manufacture in Taiwan had been encountered some difference. A lot of lower competition firms are moving out, or hiring some foreign workers to lower labor cost for manufacture. Under the partnership of manufacturing as well as regional free trade area, it enhances the relationship between Taiwan and SEAS.

In the years since the financial crisis, proposals for regional collaboration in East Asia have proliferated at multiple levels: for bilateral free trade arrangements; for sub-regional trade liberalization; and, most ambitiously, for various forms of cooperation in the monetary field. These developments have led some authors suggest that we are moving towards a "three bloc world" in which a newly-integrated East Asia will rival the European Union and North American economic association. Today's world markets accelerates once a country opens its borders to international trade. With WTO membership, SEAS will see this trend further speeding up and inevitably leading to an erosion of its traditional comparative advantages (cheap production due to low labor costs). SEAS companies will be under duress to meet international competition both at home and abroad. The need for world class human resources will be required to be a world class economic power.

If the Low Development Country adopts a comparative advantage following strategy, the upgrading of its factor endowments will occur rapidly, and consequently, the upgrading of its industry and technology will also be very rapidly. Upgrading is an innovation by nature, even through the process is an imitation of an existing industry and technology from more advanced countries. The manager and workers will face and will need to handle uncertainty in skills, production, marketing, and so on in the upgrading process. The managers and workers also need to make many adoptions of borrowed technologies to fit them to local conditions. Increasing the manager and workers human capital will increase his or her ability to handle these kinds of uncertainties and to carry out necessary adaptation.

Education must be a key element in the development strategy. The most critical challenge is to match educational output with labor market and development needs, which requires sustained reform efforts in several areas. Training and educating workers and managers is therefore of strategic importance which in turn means that training providers have to be at sufficiently high quality in order to supply high

2

quality training education, the crucial role of education and training in fostering economic growth. Countries therefore in general seek to ensure that their whole population is well equipped to contribute to, and participate in, the process of economic development. Education enables them to face the challenges of technological change and global commercial integration. Through its capacity to provide skills and enable effective participation in the work force, education is crucial to economic adjustment. Provisions of needed training and education could come from national or international sources. Countries with low quality education and low quality education and low quality training services will face increasingly competition from foreign providers.

The research will investigate the national competition for human resources in the ten Southeast Asia states (Brunei, Burma, Cambodia, Indonesia, Loas, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, and Vietnam). Under the method of indexation, we measure the competition for human resources. We try to find the rank for national competition in these ten states, providing the information of business investment.

2. National competition for human resources

Porter (1990) has conducted an extensive comparative research of ten countries and came up with reasons why some nations succeed in some industries but fail in others. According to Porter, the home base plays a critical role in that firms tend to build up competitive advantage in industries for which local environment is the most dynamic and challenging. He has conceptualized his findings in his analytical "diamond" frame which consists of (a) factor condition (e.g. labor, capita;, land) (b) demand conditions (c) dynamism of related and supporting industries and (d) firm strategy, structure and rivalry. In addition to the four factors, chance (e.g. inventions, war, etc.) and government also plays an important role in supporting a nation's aim of achieving economic success. Concretely, a successful region according to Porter's Diamond would show the following features namely:

(a) several competing companies belonging to the same regional key industry.
(b) a large dynamic and sophisticated internal market (Demand conditions)
(c) suppliers specialized in the activities of the regional key industry.
(d) qualified and highly qualified manpower specialized in the activities of the regional key industry; educational and research institutes (Factor conditions) (Borner, Porter, Weder, Enright, 1991)

Applying M. Porter's concepts, Koellreuter (1997) has organized comparative studies of regions in order to identify possible key factors which help a region become more competitive and prosperous. Summarizing the results of a cross-regional survey covering 20 regions in Europe and North America, Koellreuter (1997) identify 50 factors, which have an influence on a region's economic advantage. Many of the factors listed in Koellreuter's chart fall into the sphere of responsibility of the respective regional government (development of highly skilled labor force, efficient tax system and issuing of permits etc.). Creating the right mix of efficient economic factor conditions, effective (consistent and predictable) regulatory framework, transparent and efficient administrative services, and high quality social and cultural institutions and services all combined obviously constitutes the right ingredients for a truly competitive region.

Knowledge, innovation, and technology are also shown to play a central role in the present world. As previous research has shown, technological advancement represents a key driver of national competitiveness and economic growth. In the current research, technological progress has been found to be a function of a complex set of variables, including the level of education of a country's population; the mix of public and private institutions that support innovation, the diffusion of ideas across sectors, the inflow of ideas from foreign economies into domestic economy, the availability of venture capital, and tax laws favorable to new start-ups.

Quality of products and services in turn depends on the availability of well trained and educated human resources. Thurow (2001) " In today's economic world, countries without educated work forces simply cannot set sail economically-what ever their desires. This leads to a simple conclusion. If countries cannot organize a good educational system, there is no such thing as catching up economically.

Dryers and Reeves (1995) claims that the organizational effectiveness. First, human resource outcomes such absenteeism, turnover and individual or group performance; Second, organizational outcomes such as productivity, quality and service; and third, financial or accounting outcomes such as return on invested capital or return on assets. For the human resources outcomes, Baird and Bleechler (1995) believe that the factors affect human resources including business ethic, average length of tenure, promotion of employees, and turnover of employees.

Under the Council of Economic Planning and Development request (CEPD, 1995), BERI (Business Environment Risk Intelligence) measures Taiwan's industry by QWI (Quality of workforce Index). By using fixed weight, there are three

dimensions, including the workforce performance, working characteristics and workforce organization and practice. Based on the BERI standards for human resources of quality, San et. al. (1997) claims, there are seven dimensions affecting the index of human resources in Taiwan. It includes labor productivity, training, education, labor-capital relationship, the labor structure change, labor safety and health, worker living quality. Under the survey of Taiwanese businessman who invests in Southeast Asia, there are five dimensions affecting human resources (Tseng et. al, 2002), including labor quantity, labor cost, the labor quality, labor-capital relationship, and culture in the society.

Based on above studies, we can conclude the dimensions affecting the human resources in table 1, including the labor quantity (labor supply, labor productivity), labor quality (education, training), labor cost, labor disputes or industrial disputes and union power (labor-capital relationship, culture in the society, labor safety and health, labor structure change, working living quality). To the weight of each nation, Tseng et. al (2002) know that Singapore and Malaysia, the questionnaire answers pay more attention to the labor quality. In Thailand, Philippine and Indonesia, the questionnaire answers place more emphasis on the labor-capital relationships. In Vietnam, questionnaire answers care more about the labor cost.

Finally, the aggregate index for manpower, Tseng et. al (2002) claims that Taiwanese businessman prefers the labor quality Singapore first, then Vietnam, Malaysia, Philippine, Thailand, the last is Indonesia.

There are seven sections in this paper. The second section will discuss the national competition for human resources, using the theory of scholars to talk the idea of quality of human resources. The third section mentions more detail and definition for each variable of index. The fourth section will talk about the data we collect, the time, the background of observations. The fifth section will discuss the methodology, how to calculate the index for each variable as well as the total index for each states in SEAS. The sixth section will discuss the results for national competition for human resources. The last section will conclude all these results.

3. Theoretical Expectation

Based on discusses in section 2, the dimension affect the national competition of general manpower. For the labor cost, we divide it for two dimensions, cost of wages and employee benefits, and turnover. At the same time, we also combine the labor quantity and quality to the single dimension of manpower utilization. Therefore, there

are four dimensions to measure the national competition for general level of human resources; it includes manpower utilization, cost of wages and employee benefit, turnover, labor disputes or industrial disputes and manpower utilization.

3.1 Manpower Utilization

Manpower utilization includes two sub-categories, including both quantity and quality for manpower. Higher labor quantity and quality will represent higher competition for national economy. The labor quantity includes both labor force participation as well as weekly working hours, and the higher labor quantity can have higher productivity.[1] The quality of labor will include the each education level (primary, secondary and tertiary education). Human capital is usually calculated by enrollment ratios or literacy rates. At best, however, enrollment ratios represent investment levels in human capital, and literacy is a stock variable[2] (Benhabib , Spiegel 1994). Not only the enrollment rate, have we also considered the pupil teacher ratio for each education level. Therefore, we calculated the index of labor quality by their enrollment ration and pupil teacher rate. Since the higher enrollment ratio implies the higher education quality. In contrast to enrollment ratio, the lower pupil teacher ratio can have higher education quality.

3.2 Cost of wages and employee benefit

Cost of wages and employee benefit will include the average hourly wage rates, real wage inflation rates and the benefit level. This dimension includes cost of wage and fringe benefit, higher these labor cost will lower national competitions. The wage cost mainly indicates average hourly wage and the real wage inflation. The real wage inflation represents the labor cost stabilization. The stabilization of labor cost will affect the competition of manpower, and the higher real wage inflation will have lower manpower competition.[5] The fringe benefits are other cost for non-wage cost. Since it cannot direct measure from hard data, we will measure from the soft data. The

---

[1] Arthur (1994) and Dyer and Reeves (1995) believe that the number working hours can represent the labor productivity.
[2] Tallman and Wang (1994) claims that the increased productivity of additional education by weighting the educational levels assuming that more educated workers are more productive. Specifically, we attach weights of 1 to workers completing only a primary education, 1 to those completing secondary education, and 1 for those completing higher education in the first index measure of human capital. This weighting scheme is typical in the literature of the economics of growth and education (Maddison, 1987; Pencavel, 1991).
[5] Based on the based year 1990, we calculate average hourly wage by GNI per capital (Gross National Income) divided by average working hours for a year Since we have difficult to find the average wage for all ten states. We use the national income (Gross National Income) as the average wage for all sectors.

higher level of the fringe benefits implies higher labor standards and labor cost.

3.3 Turnover

Turnover cost includes hiring and firing cost; higher turnover cost will lower employers' willingness to hire full-time workers. Therefore, it will be negative index for national competition. The level of recruitment cost and the level of training cost are hiring cost, but the level of severance payment is the firing cost. Higher recruitment cost means that employers have more difficult to find the employees. After hiring new employees, employers need to pay training cost for the new hiring employees. For general manpower, higher training cost implies that employees need more training after schooling. It implies that the lower quality for general manpower.

Higher severance payment implies that higher labor cost, more employers pay more severance payment which employees have more job security. Higher job security implies employment rigidity. The higher level of turnover cost implies higher labor standards as well as labor cost. Therefore, the high level of turnover cost will lower national competition.

3.4 Labor or industrial disputes and union power

Labor disputes or industrial disputes and union power. It includes two sub-categories, labor or industrial disputes and union power. Labor or industrial disputes include number of strikes and lockouts, working days lost, the enforcement degree of labor legislation, the coverage degree of labor legislation. Higher frequency of disputes will create the problem of investment. In the other side, as a result of the power of labor protection, the higher coverage of labor legislation will also create the problems of employment rigidity. It will block out the business investment to lower the national competition of human resources.

Union power will include the union effect on wage rates and the labor existing power on foreign companies. Higher union power will lower employer's power to manage workers. It may block out the interests for investment. Therefore, the higher level for labor or industrial disputes and union power will lower national competition for human resources.[4]

---

[4] Arthur (1994) claims that management's attempt to implement a classic control system for reducing labor costs by unilaterally increasing performance standards and maintaining wages and benefits is likely to be met by strong resistance from a unionized work force

4. Data

Under the project of Southeast Asian study, we collect ten nation data for soft and hard data. The survey will not only ask the index of each factor, but also have weight. The data collect from government officers, businessman (employers and employees), and academy workers.[5] Each nation will collect 50 samples. The hard data we collect from 1999, 2000, and 2001 three years, and soft data are based from 2000.[6] The figure 1 list those variables used to calculate the index of human resources.

The means and standards deviation for soft data will be based on the Singapore. The soft data of the nation other than Singapore are based on Singapore. Since the survey of those nation's soft data have compare to Singapore.[7] The Singapore data will be based on other nation's view and Singapore; there is a ten-nation view for Singapore soft data.

5. Methodology

For the index of each factor, there are four dimensions for human resources; it includes manpower utilization, cost of wages and employee benefit, turnover, labor disputes or industrial disputes and manpower utilization.

For the weight of each index, we calculate those weights of index under government officers, business and scholars of each nation. We collect every survey for each nation, and calculate the means of weight for each index in every nation.

We use below measure the index of each factor.

---

[5] Academy Workers include Department of Economics, Department of Public Finance, Department of Business Administration, Department of Business Policy, Department of Labor Relationship, Department of Human Resource Management, Department of Public Administration, and Department of Politic. Government Officers include Officers for Department of International Trading, Officers for Department of Human Resources, Officers for Department of National Accountancy, Officers for Department of Labor Relationships, Officers for Department of National Statistics Taiwanese, and Officers in those States Business: Managers in Taiwanese Business, Human Resources, Managers in Domestics Business Human Resources, Managers in International Business Taiwanese Bankers in those states, International and Domestics Bankers, and Representatives of Labor Union

[6] In order to measure the index for both soft and hard data, we calculate the hard data for the average index for 1999, 2000 and 2001,because the soft data only have 2000 data.

[7] On the right-hand side of each statement, please kindly check in the appropriate box ranking from the lowest ("1") to the highest ("7") for (Country I) and (Country II) according to the best of your knowledge about their human resource.

$$I_i = 50 \pm \left[\frac{s_i - \bar{s_i}}{\sigma} \times \frac{100}{6} \right] \quad (5\text{-}1)$$

Where I_i is Index for each variable

s_i is the index for each factor?

$\bar{s_i}$ is the means for each factor

σ is the standards deviation for each factor

Under this measurement, the index locates at 50 for center, and there are three standards deviations for either the index up 50 or below 50. Thus, we use the index for calculation from 0 to 100. It will be the positive index if the measurement uses 50 plus standards deviation. In the other hand, the negative index will use 50 minus standards deviations. The index will be the positive index if those variables can help competition of national economy. In contrast to the positive index, it will be the negative index if those variables discard with the national competition for human resources.

$$AI = \sum_{i=1}^{N} W_i \times I_i \quad (5\text{-}2)$$

Where AI is aggregate index
W_i is weight for each index

The index of human capital competition will calculate from the weight with their means in each dimension's factor. The index is then established by the following five major steps: (1) selection of the appropriate relevant statistics for each category (2) data collection, (3) conversion of all the relevant statistics into index, (4) determination of appropriate weight for each category and (5) calculate the weight sum to obtain the aggregated labor quality index. Under the method of indexation, we measure the competition for human resources. We try to find the rank for national competition in these ten states, providing the information of business investment.

6. Results

There are three parts in this section. We conclude the results of weight in first section, then aggregate index in next section, it also explain what's difference in the

result of Singapore. Finally, the last section will describe the results for each dimension.

6.1 Weight

Table 2 shows that the weight for each dimension and the calculation of weight will depend on survey for each nation. We find that the cost of wages and employee benefits are the higher weight for both Liao and Thailand. But the manpower utilization is the highest weight for other eight nations. We know questionnaire answers in most nations will focus on the manpower utilization, but both Liao and Thailand will more focus on the cost of wages and employee benefits. Most nations believe that their enriched labor quantity and quality will benefit their national competition. In the other side, the other two states questionnaire answers will believe that their competition for human resources mainly from lower wages.

For more details of sub-dimension of weight in each nation, the results will show in the table 3. We find the benefit level have the highest weight for all ten states. It implies that the benefit level can improve the labor performance. In the other hand, union effect, the strikes and lockouts, and working days lost have the lowest weight for all ten states. Those people answer the survey; believe that labor disputes have less impact to national competition for human resources.

6.2 Results of Aggregate Index

For general manpower of each nation, Liao and Thailand have higher rank than other states. Since the aggregate index for general level of human resources, both Liao and Thailand have extremely advantage for cost of wage and employee benefits. Cambodia and Singapore are evaluated for lower number of aggregate index that have lower competition for developing the industries, which needs general or unskilled manpower. The aggregate index in this paper come more close to Liu (1996) finding, Thailand and Malaysia have better evaluation for general human resources. But it do not correspond the result of Tseng et. al. (2002), which Singapore has the best rank.

We might explain this difference by flowing two reasons. First one is the weight definition, the value of weight are defined by each nation's. Since the weight will different from questionnaire answers in each nation, it is based on the personal view of each nation's answers. The weight might not reflect the really number for aggregate index of human resource in their nation.

10

Second, the index is based on the general human resources. For Singapore, the nation have higher quality for skilled labor, the index might not reflect the actually rank for overall manpower including skilled and unskilled. The other reason may come from the soft data are based on Singapore; questionnaire answers in other nation have bias for the soft data.

6.3 Results for each dimension

For manpower utilization in table 5, Myanmar and Singapore have higher rank of index, which have higher rank for labor quality and quantity, but Liao and Cambodia have lower rank. For the single index in table 4, Thailand has the higher labor quantity than other nations, including both labor force participation and working hours. For the labor quality, Thailand has the highest variable for Literacy, but Brunei has the higher index for all three-education measurement (Primary, Secondary, and Tertiary).

Liao and Thailand have higher index of wages and employee benefits, which have the low cost, but Singapore and Brunei have lower rank for those cost. For more details, Myanmar has the highest variable for average working hours and benefits, Liao have the highest variable for real wage inflation.

For the turnover cost, Indonesia and Liao have higher index than other nations, which have low turnover cost. It correspond the Liu (1996) study that Indonesia has the first rank for labor cost. In the other hand, Myanmar and Singapore have lower index than other states that have high labor turnover costs. For the single item, Vietnam has the highest variable for recruitment cost, training cost, and severance payment.

For labor disputes or industrial disputes and union power, Indonesia and Vietnam have higher index than other states that have lower disputes as well as union power, because their military control labor union to lower labor standards. In the other hand, Liao and Myanmar have lower index than other states, which have higher disputes and union power. In the details, Singapore has the highest union effect than other nation. Brunei, Singapore, Liao, and Vietnam have the highest number for the strikes and lockout. Vietnam has the highest degree for labor legislation enforcement and coverage. Cambodia has the highest variable for the labor existing power on foreign power.

7. Conclusion

11

For the general level for human resources, we find the Liao and Thailand have higher index. It implies that these two states have higher potential for national competition in human resources. Under the reason of human resources, the firms can invest their business for labor-intensive industry. The national competition of human resource of Liao mainly comes from cost of wage and employee benefit and turnover. In the other hand, the national competition of human resources for Thailand comes from lower dispute rate for labor or industry as well as union effect.

In the other side, Cambodia and Singapore have lower index for general level of human resources. It implies that these two states have lowest competition for human resources. The result will not encourage firm to invest their labor-intensive industry. For the country of Singapore, we know it is the only developed state that has higher wages rather than other nation. Therefore, Singapore has lower national competition for human resources. But the low index for Cambodia mainly comes from the lower usage of manpower utilization. It will also encourage the government of Cambodia to improve their quantity as well as quality of manpower.

Figure 1 The Index Item for Human Resource

Manpower Utilization
- ● Labor force participation rate, LFPR (Positive Index)
- ● Weekly working hours (Positive Index)
- ● Illiteracy ratio   (Positive Index)
- ● Elementary Education Index (Positive Index)
- ● Secondary Education Index (Positive Index)
- ● Tertiary Education Index   (Positive Index)

Cost of Wages and Employee Benefit
- ● Average wage rates (Negative Index)
- ● Average wage inflation (Negative Index)
- ○ The benefit level of employee (Negative Index)

Turnover
- ○ The level of recruitment cost (Negative Index)
- ○ The level of training cost (Negative Index)
- ○ The level of severance payment (Negative Ind.)

Labor Disputes or Industrial Disputes and Union Power
- ● Number of strikes and lockout (Negative Index)
- ● Working days lost (Negative Index)
- ○ The enforcement degree of labor legislation (Negative Index)
- ○ The coverage degree of labor legislation (Negative Index)
- ○ The union effect on wage rates (Negative Index)
- ○ The labor existing power on foreign companies (Negative Index)

Note: "●" and "○" indicate the measured (hard) data and the survey (soft) data, respectively.

13

Table 1 Dimensions of Human Resource for each study

Author	BERI (1995)	Liu(1996)	San et. al. (1997)	Tseng et. al. (2002)
Dimension	(1)Workforce Performance	(1) Labor Supply	(1) Labor Productivity	(1) Labor Supply
	(2)Workforce Characteristics	(2a) Labor Quality (2b) Labor Cost	(2aa) Education (2ab)Training	(2a) Labor Quality (2b) Labor Cost
	(3)Workforce Organization & Practice	(3a) Labor-capital Relationship (3b)Culture in the Society	(3a) Labor-capital Relationship (3c) Labor Safety and Health (3d) Labor Structure Change (3e) Worker's Living Quality	(3a) Labor-capital Relationship (3b)Culture in the Society

Sources: CEPD(1995),Liu(1996), San et. al, (1997), Tseng et. al. (2002)
Note: In San et. al. (1997) paper, the dimension of education and training should belong to labor quality in other papers. For the (3c) Labor Safety and Health, (3d) Labor structure change, (3e) Worker's living quality do not belong to the (3b) culture in the society in other papers, therefore, we rearrange the number 3c, 3d,3e.

Table 2 The Weight of Each Dimension

	Malaysia	Brunei	Singapore	Cambodia	Indonesia	Philippine	Liao	Vietnam	Thailand	Myanmar
Total MU	28.97	30.448	31.632	29.498	30.594	27.816	27.109	36.168	27.748	50
Total COWAEB	25.769	26.929	29.656	25.180	20.893	26.073	34.153	28.649	29.727	25
Total Turnover	23.862	23.58	18.879	22.800	25.797	22.692	24.645	15.258	21.888	15
Total LDOIDAUP	21.392	18.929	19.822	22.518	22.702	23.408	14.090	19.908	20.635	10

Inside the parthesis is the rank

Table 3 The Means of Each Factor

	Malaysia	Brunei	Singapore	Cambodia	Indonesia	Philippine	Liao	Vietnam	Thailand	Myanmar
Labor Force Participation Rate	34.426 (9)	35.812 (8)	38.999 (6)	34.287 (10)	45.761 (5)	37.474 (7)	77.243 (1)	60.726 (4)	71.770 (2)	63.497 (3)
Working Hours	67.810 (3)	48.752	62.982	67.810	45.321	44.051	37.317	20.050	69.729	36.173
Literacy	52.389 (6)	58.506	59.916	22.618	51.492	64.019	17.664	60.311	64.834	48.246
Primary Education Index	60.071 (3)	85.164	47.273	25.313	61.476	39.068	46.676	45.198	55.063	34.693
Secondary Education Index	56.849 (3)	84.495	66.064	30.280	55.270	41.137	37.089	43.790	52.320	32.701
Tertiary Education Index	53.509 (4)	68.362	85.872	34.490	49.751	54.092	34.304	37.250	45.762	36.602
Average Hourly Wage	53.935 (8)	13.505	24.294	59.138	58.400	57.573	58.992	58.700	56.245	59.213
Real Wage Inflation	46.069 (5)	41.507	38.265	39.865	53.275	48.449	93.673	36.905	44.746	57.241
Benefit	53.285 (6)	52.220	34.182	57.245	54.674	57.134	56.840	52.529	53.146	59.821
Recruitment Cost	53.735 (7)	53.282	37.027	55.974	54.490	54.288	56.632	60.218	57.021	51.278
Training Cost	53.618	54.092	49.851	57.122	58.412	56.417	58.338	60.238	45.136	52.482
Severance Payment	51.866	52.772	41.889	55.415	59.162	54.627	55.196	59.882	56.004	51.868
Union Effect	50.911	57.976	82.297	49.652	59.423	53.396	55.929	64.760	55.023	48.243
Strikes	53.760	60.441	60.441	12.909	60.441	26.462	60.441	60.441	52.042	52.615
Working Days Lost	56.017	56.164	56.164	2.853	56.164	50.507	56.164	56.164	53.728	56.072
Labor Legislation Enforcement	53.994	55.184	43.387	54.559	59.058	53.144	55.095	61.784	54.698	48.916
Labor Legislation Coverage	53.531	55.054	43.259	56.135	58.208	53.896	55.460	61.191	53.370	49.791
Labor Existing Power on Foreign Power	53.922	55.085	68.106	52.646	56.189	54.227	55.694	64.947	52.576	50.886

Table 4 Total Index of Human Resources for each Nation

	Malaysia	Brunei	Singapore	Cambodia	Indonesia	Philippine	Liao	Vietnam	Thailand	Myanmar
Total MU	15.474 (6)	17.724 (3)	18.312 (2)	11.685 (10)	15.305 (7)	12.566 (8)	12.362 (9)	15.738 (5)	17.375(4)	21.974 (1)
Total COWAEB	13.308 (4)	10.735 (9)	9.706 (10)	13.439 (7)	11.546 (8)	14.360 (6)	22.740 (1)	14.372 (5)	15.404(2)	14.756 (3)
Total Turnover	12.665 (4)	12.587 (5)	8.104 (9)	12.806 (3)	14.797 (1)	12.507 (6)	13.979 (2)	9.173 (8)	11.539(7)	7.781 (10)
Total LDOIDAUP	11.498 (5)	10.625 (7)	11.743(4)	9.742 (8)	13.129 (1)	11.797(3)	7.911 (9)	12.401(2)	11.018 (6)	5.083 (10)
Total	52.943 (4)	51.670 (6)	47.863 (9)	47.673 (10)	54.772 (3)	51.227 (7)	56.993 (1)	51.683(5)	55.336 (2)	49.595 (8)

Inside the parthesis is the rank

Reference

1. Arthur J.B. (1994) "Effects of Human Resources Management Systems on Manufacturing Performance and Turnover", Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 37, No.3, pp 670-687.

2. Barney J. (1991) "Firm Resources and Sustained Competitive Advantage", Journal of Management, Vol. 17, pp91-120.

3. Barro R. J. (1991) "Economic Growth in Cross Section of Countries, Quarterly Journal of Economics 106, pp407-443.

4. Benhabib. J. and Speigel M. (1992), The Role of Human Capital in Economic Development: Evidence from Aggregate Cross-country and regional U.S. data, Working paper , pp 92-146 Sept. (New York University, New York, NY)

5. Berman M.E., West P.J., and Wang X. (1999) "Using Performance Measurement in Human Resource Management", Review of Public Personnel Administration, Vol. 19, No. 2, 1999, pp5-31.

6. Bird C.P. and Bleechler D.W. (1995) "Links Between Business Strategy and Human Resource Management Strategy in U.S. –Based Japanese Subsidiaries: An Empirical Investigation", Journal of International Business Studies, Vol. 26, No. 1, pp23-26.

7. Campell B. and Yeo Ellen (1994) "Perceptions of Appropriate Leadership Style: Participation versus Consultation Across Two Culture", Asia Pacific Journal of Management, Vol. 10, No.1, pp1-19.

8. Council of Economic Planning and Development (1995) Quality of Workforce: Manufacturing and Services, Business Environment Risk Intelligence S.A., Council of Economic Planning and Development, Taipei, June 1995.

9. Dyer L. and Reeves T. (1995)"Human Resources Strategies and Firm Performance: What Do We Know and Where Do We Need to Go?", International Journal of Human Resource Management, Vol. 6, No.3, pp 656-670.

10. Garavan T. N. (1991) "Strategies Human Resource Development" International Journal of Manpower; Vol. 12, No. 6, pp 21-34.

11. Maddison, A. (1987) "Growth and Slowdown in Advanced Capitalist Economies: Techniques of Quantitative Assessment, Journal of Economic Literature 25, pp649-698.

12. Pencavel, J. (1991) "Higher Education, Productivity, and Earnings: A review, Journal of Economic Education 22, pp331-359.

13. Keiman L.S. (1997) Human Resource Management- A Tool for Competitive Advantage, South-Western Book Inc.

14. Wright P.M. (1992) "Theoretical Perspectives for Strategic Human Resource Management", Journal of Management, Vol. 18, pp. 295-320.

15. San G., Huang T.C. Huang L.H. (1997) "Compiling a Labor Quality Index for Taiwan Labor Force in the Manufacturing Industry", Socioeconomic Law and Institution Review (Taiwan), No. 20, pp. 1-28.

16. Tseng Y. F. et. al. (2002) "Human Resource Evaluation for Ten East Asia Nations from Taiwan Business" Journal of Management, Vol. 19, No. 2 pp 389-414 (Taiwan).

17. Liu (1996), The Evaluation of Human Resources for Overseas Investment- The Case of Southeast Asia Nations, The unpublished Master thesis, National Cheng Kung University, Tainan, Taiwan.