

RIGHTS OF SMES IN BANKRUPTCY PROTECTION: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF LEGAL SYSTEMS IN CHINA AND THAILAND

Pichet Tookjitra^{1*}, Lei Gao², Haijun Wang³, Jun Fang⁴, Jia Tang⁵

¹²³⁴⁵Innovation College, North-Chiang Mai University

* **Corresponding Author, E-mail:** Pichet @northcm.ac.th

Abstract: Small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) are crucial to the economic landscapes of China and Thailand, significantly contributing to job creation, innovation, and economic growth. However, SMEs are particularly vulnerable to financial distress and bankruptcy. This study provides a comparative analysis of the bankruptcy laws in China and Thailand, examining their legal frameworks and practical applications in protecting SMEs. The analysis highlights the differences and similarities in the legal traditions, influenced by civil and common law principles, which shape the design and implementation of these laws. The study draws on primary and secondary data sources, including legal texts, case law, and empirical data, to assess the effectiveness of SME protection mechanisms. The findings reveal significant strengths and weaknesses in both systems, offering valuable insights for policymakers, legal practitioners, and business owners. Recommendations for reform are provided to enhance the resilience and sustainability of SMEs, promoting economic stability and growth.

Keywords: SMEs, Bankruptcy Laws, Financial Distress

Introduction

Small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) are the backbone of the economic landscape in both China and Thailand. They play a crucial role in job creation, innovation, and overall economic growth. In China, SMEs contribute over 60% to the country's GDP and account for 80% of urban employment (National Bureau of Statistics of China, 2022). Similarly, in Thailand, SMEs represent more than 99% of enterprises and employ over 70% of the workforce (Office of Small and Medium Enterprises Promotion [OSMEP], 2021). Despite their significant contributions, SMEs are particularly vulnerable to financial distress and bankruptcy, which can lead to severe economic consequences.

Bankruptcy laws are essential for providing a legal framework that facilitates the orderly exit of failing businesses and offers mechanisms for the reorganization and survival of distressed firms. However, the effectiveness of these laws in protecting SMEs varies significantly between different legal systems. China and Thailand, with their distinct legal traditions and economic contexts, offer a unique comparative perspective on this issue. China's legal system is influenced by the civil law tradition,

particularly the Germanic-Roman law, while Thailand's system reflects a hybrid of civil and common law influences (Chen, 2010; Harding, 2001). These differences impact the design and implementation of bankruptcy laws, affecting how SMEs are protected during insolvency procedures.

This research contributes to the academic literature on bankruptcy law and SME protection by providing a comparative analysis of the legal systems in China and Thailand. The findings have practical implications for improving legal frameworks and practices, offering valuable insights for policymakers, legal practitioners, and business owners. Enhancing the protection of SMEs during bankruptcy can promote economic stability and resilience, fostering sustainable economic development.

This study seeks to answer the following research questions:

What are the key legal provisions for SME protection in the bankruptcy laws of China and Thailand?

How are these laws implemented in practice, and what challenges exist?

What are the strengths and weaknesses of each system in terms of SME protection?

How can the legal frameworks be improved to better protect SMEs during bankruptcy?

Literature Review

China: The historical development of China's bankruptcy law has been marked by significant reforms, particularly since the late 20th century. The transition from a centrally planned economy to a market-oriented economy necessitated comprehensive legal reforms to support economic growth and stability (Chen, 2010). The enactment of the Enterprise Bankruptcy Law in 2006 was a milestone, providing a unified legal framework for addressing insolvency issues across the country (Wang, 2020). This law introduced provisions for both reorganization and liquidation, aiming to balance the interests of creditors and debtors while improving the efficiency of the bankruptcy process (Wang, 2020). Subsequent amendments have aimed to better address the complexities of modern economic activities and provide more robust protections for SMEs (Zhang, 2015).

Thailand: Thailand's bankruptcy law has a longer history, dating back to the Bankruptcy Act B.E. 2483 (1940). This Act has undergone several amendments to address the changing economic landscape and improve the effectiveness of bankruptcy procedures (Chotithamaporn, 2019). Significant reforms in recent years have focused on enhancing the protection of SMEs and streamlining the reorganization process to support business continuity and economic stability (Chotithamaporn, 2019). The hybrid legal system in Thailand, which combines elements of civil and common law traditions, has contributed to a more flexible and adaptive bankruptcy framework (Harding, 2001).

China: The key principles underlying China's bankruptcy law reflect its civil law tradition, influenced by the Germanic-Roman legal system (Chen, 2010). The Enterprise Bankruptcy Law

emphasizes the fair treatment of creditors, protection of debtor rights, and promotion of economic efficiency through reorganization and liquidation processes (Wang, 2020). Specific provisions aimed at protecting SMEs include simplified procedures for small business bankruptcies and measures to facilitate debt restructuring and reorganization (Enterprise Bankruptcy Law of the People's Republic of China, 2006). These provisions are designed to expedite the bankruptcy process and reduce the administrative burden on SMEs, allowing them to recover and continue operations more efficiently (Wang, 2020).

Thailand: Thailand's bankruptcy law, influenced by both civil and common law traditions, incorporates principles of fairness, creditor protection, and economic efficiency (Harding, 2001). The Bankruptcy Act B.E. 2483 (1940) provides a legal framework for both liquidation and reorganization, with recent amendments focusing on improving the protection of SMEs and enhancing the efficiency of bankruptcy procedures (Chotithamaporn, 2019). Key provisions include special procedures for SME bankruptcies, mechanisms for debt restructuring, and protections against unfair treatment of small business owners (Bankruptcy Act B.E. 2483, 1940). These measures are intended to provide a balanced approach that safeguards the interests of both creditors and debtors while promoting economic stability (Liew, 2018).

Several comparative studies have examined the differences and similarities in bankruptcy laws between China and other jurisdictions, highlighting the unique challenges and opportunities in each legal system. For instance, Ho (2020) compares the bankruptcy frameworks of China and the United States, emphasizing the distinct approaches to debtor protection and creditor rights. The study reveals that while the U.S. bankruptcy system offers more robust protections for debtors, China's system is more creditor-friendly, reflecting different legal and cultural contexts.

Similarly, Liew (2018) provides a comparative analysis of bankruptcy laws in China and Japan, focusing on procedural efficiencies and protection mechanisms for SMEs. The study finds that Japan's bankruptcy law is more streamlined and effective in terms of SME protection, largely due to its well-established legal infrastructure and experienced judiciary. In contrast, China's system, while comprehensive, faces challenges related to inconsistent application and regional disparities (Liew, 2018).

Comparative studies between China and Thailand are relatively sparse, but existing research suggests that both countries face similar challenges in protecting SMEs during bankruptcy. For example, Xu and Wu (2022) highlight the importance of effective reorganization mechanisms and the need for legal reforms to enhance SME protection in both jurisdictions. Their study underscores the role of cultural and institutional factors in shaping legal frameworks and suggests that a comparative approach can offer valuable insights for policymakers and legal practitioners.

Despite the extensive literature on bankruptcy laws and SME protection, there are notable gaps

that warrant further research. Specifically, there is limited comparative analysis focusing on the protection mechanisms for SMEs in China and Thailand. Existing studies often concentrate on broader comparisons or specific aspects of bankruptcy law, leaving a gap in understanding how these mechanisms function in practice and their effectiveness in protecting SMEs (Davydenko & Franks, 2008; Fisher & Martel, 2004).

Another gap in the literature is the lack of empirical studies examining the real-world experiences of SMEs undergoing bankruptcy proceedings in these countries. Such studies could provide valuable insights into the practical challenges faced by SMEs and the effectiveness of existing legal protections (Morrison, 2007). Additionally, research exploring the socio-economic impacts of bankruptcy laws on SMEs, particularly in terms of job retention and economic stability, would be beneficial (Fan & White, 2003).

Methodology

The methodology ensures a comprehensive, systematic, and rigorous examination of the relevant legal frameworks and practices in both countries. The key components of the methodology include research design, data sources, the analytical framework, and comparative metrics.

The research adopts a comparative legal analysis and qualitative case study approach to investigate the bankruptcy protection mechanisms for SMEs in China and Thailand. Comparative legal analysis allows for a detailed examination of the similarities and differences between the two legal systems, providing insights into their respective strengths and weaknesses (Kamba, 1974). The qualitative case study approach is employed to analyze selected cases, offering a deeper understanding of how bankruptcy laws are applied in practice (Yin, 2014).

To ensure comprehensive and accurate information on the bankruptcy laws and SME protection mechanisms in China and Thailand, the research draws on both primary and secondary data sources. Primary sources include legal texts and statutes such as the Enterprise Bankruptcy Law of the People's Republic of China (2006) and the Bankruptcy Act B.E. 2483 (1940) of Thailand and its subsequent amendments. Additionally, relevant judicial decisions and case reports from Chinese and Thai courts that illustrate the application of bankruptcy laws to SMEs are examined. Government and regulatory documents, including reports and publications from the National Bureau of Statistics of China and the Office of Small and Medium Enterprises Promotion (OSMEP) in Thailand, are also utilized. Secondary data sources encompass a wide range of academic journals and articles, including scholarly articles and comparative studies on bankruptcy law and SME protection, as well as legal commentaries and analyses published in reputable law journals. Comprehensive texts on Chinese and Thai legal systems, focusing on bankruptcy law and SME protection, are also reviewed. Reports from international organizations, such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF), provide additional insights into

the efficacy of bankruptcy laws and SME protection in the two countries.

The analytical framework for this comparative study is structured around key legal and procedural aspects of bankruptcy protection for SMEs. This includes an examination of the statutory provisions and legal principles underpinning bankruptcy laws in China and Thailand, identifying specific legal measures designed to protect SMEs, such as simplified procedures, debt restructuring mechanisms, and reorganization processes (Enterprise Bankruptcy Law of the People's Republic of China, 2006; Bankruptcy Act B.E. 2483, 1940). The analysis also considers how bankruptcy laws are applied in practice, focusing on the treatment of SMEs in bankruptcy proceedings and includes case studies illustrating the real-world application of bankruptcy protection mechanisms for SMEs in both countries (Chen, 2010; Harding, 2001). Comparative metrics involve the comparison of key metrics such as the time required for bankruptcy resolution, recovery rates for SMEs, and the costs associated with bankruptcy procedures. This assessment evaluates the effectiveness of SME protection measures based on outcomes observed in judicial decisions and practical implementations (Xu & Wu, 2022; Liew, 2018).

The comparative analysis involves a systematic comparison of the bankruptcy laws and SME protection mechanisms in China and Thailand using the analytical framework described above. The analysis is conducted in three main stages. First, a statutory comparison is performed, detailing the statutory provisions in the Enterprise Bankruptcy Law of China and the Bankruptcy Act of Thailand, and identifying similarities and differences in the legal frameworks and specific measures aimed at protecting SMEs. Second, case law analysis examines selected case studies from both countries to understand how courts interpret and apply bankruptcy laws to SMEs, analyzing the outcomes of these cases to evaluate the effectiveness of the legal protections available to SMEs (Wang, 2020; Liew, 2018). Finally, practical implementation is reviewed through empirical data and reports on the practical implementation of bankruptcy laws in China and Thailand, evaluating the efficiency, accessibility, and impact of bankruptcy protection mechanisms on SMEs in both countries (Xu & Wu, 2022; Davydenko & Franks, 2008).

While this study aims to provide a comprehensive comparative analysis, it acknowledges certain limitations. These include limited availability of detailed case law and practical implementation data in some regions, particularly for recent reforms and their impacts on SMEs (Morrison, 2007). Additionally, cultural and institutional differences influence the application and effectiveness of bankruptcy laws, which may not be fully captured in the comparative analysis (Harding, 2001; Pistor, 2000). The focus on SME protection mechanisms may also exclude other relevant aspects of bankruptcy law that could influence the overall insolvency framework in both countries (Lerner & Schoar, 2005).

The methodology outlined above ensures a rigorous and comprehensive approach to comparing the bankruptcy laws and SME protection mechanisms in China and Thailand. By integrating primary

and secondary data sources, applying a structured analytical framework, and conducting detailed comparative analysis, this study aims to provide valuable insights for policymakers, legal practitioners, and scholars interested in the field of bankruptcy law and SME protection.

Comparative Analysis

The analysis focuses on the statutory provisions, case law, and practical implementation of these laws, highlighting the similarities and differences in how SMEs are protected during bankruptcy proceedings in both countries.

The statutory provisions in the bankruptcy laws of China and Thailand reveal both commonalities and distinctions in their approaches to protecting SMEs.

China: The Enterprise Bankruptcy Law of the People's Republic of China (2006) provides a comprehensive framework for handling insolvency issues. This law includes specific provisions aimed at protecting SMEs, such as simplified bankruptcy procedures for small businesses and mechanisms to facilitate debt restructuring and reorganization (Enterprise Bankruptcy Law of the People's Republic of China, 2006). These provisions are designed to expedite the bankruptcy process and reduce the administrative burden on SMEs, allowing them to recover and continue operations more efficiently (Wang, 2020).

Thailand: The Bankruptcy Act B.E. 2483 (1940) and its subsequent amendments provide the legal foundation for bankruptcy proceedings in Thailand. Similar to China, Thailand's bankruptcy law includes provisions to support SMEs, such as special procedures for SME bankruptcies and measures to facilitate debt restructuring (Chotithamaporn, 2019). Recent amendments to the Bankruptcy Act have introduced more streamlined processes for SME reorganization, reflecting the government's recognition of the critical role SMEs play in the economy (Bankruptcy Act B.E. 2483, 1940).

Both countries' laws emphasize the need for efficient reorganization processes and the protection of debtor rights, but they differ in their legal traditions and specific procedural details. China's approach is influenced by the civil law tradition, particularly the Germanic-Roman legal system, while Thailand's system reflects a hybrid of civil and common law influences (Chen, 2010; Harding, 2001).

Case law analysis provides insights into how the statutory provisions are applied in practice and the effectiveness of these laws in protecting SMEs.

China: Judicial decisions in China have demonstrated a commitment to applying the Enterprise Bankruptcy Law's provisions to protect SMEs. For instance, cases have shown that Chinese courts often expedite bankruptcy proceedings for SMEs to minimize disruption to their operations (Wang, 2020). The courts also actively facilitate debt restructuring processes, allowing SMEs to reorganize their debts and continue their business activities. However, the effectiveness of these protections can vary depending on the local implementation and the specific circumstances of each case (Chen, 2010).

Thailand: Thai courts have similarly shown a proactive approach in applying the Bankruptcy

Act's provisions to protect SMEs. Recent case studies indicate that Thai courts prioritize the reorganization of SMEs over liquidation, reflecting a broader policy objective of sustaining SME operations and preserving employment (Chotithamaporn, 2019). The courts also play a crucial role in overseeing the fair treatment of SME creditors and ensuring that debt restructuring agreements are equitable and feasible (Harding, 2001).

Despite these positive trends, both countries face challenges in ensuring consistent and effective application of their bankruptcy laws. Issues such as regional disparities in judicial capacity and varying levels of legal expertise can impact the outcomes of bankruptcy proceedings for SMEs (Liew, 2018).

The practical implementation of bankruptcy laws and the protection mechanisms for SMEs involves examining empirical data and reports on the efficiency, accessibility, and impact of these laws.

China: The practical implementation of the Enterprise Bankruptcy Law in China has shown mixed results. While the law provides robust mechanisms for SME protection, its effectiveness is often hindered by bureaucratic inefficiencies and regional disparities in enforcement (Wang, 2020). For example, the time required for bankruptcy resolution can vary significantly between different regions, impacting the overall recovery rates for SMEs. Additionally, the costs associated with bankruptcy procedures can be burdensome for smaller enterprises, despite the simplified procedures in place (Xu & Wu, 2022).

Thailand: In Thailand, the implementation of the Bankruptcy Act has generally been more streamlined, particularly with recent reforms aimed at enhancing SME protection. Empirical data suggests that the time required for bankruptcy resolution and the recovery rates for SMEs are relatively favorable compared to China (Chotithamaporn, 2019). However, challenges remain in ensuring that all SMEs have equal access to bankruptcy protection mechanisms, particularly in rural areas where legal resources may be limited (Office of Small and Medium Enterprises Promotion [OSMEP], 2021).

Both countries have made significant strides in improving their bankruptcy frameworks to better support SMEs, but ongoing reforms and targeted policy interventions are needed to address the remaining gaps and enhance the overall effectiveness of these laws.

China: Strengths: China's comprehensive legal framework includes specific provisions for SME protection, such as simplified bankruptcy procedures and robust reorganization mechanisms. The legal system's emphasis on balancing creditor and debtor interests promotes fair treatment in bankruptcy proceedings. **Weaknesses:** The effectiveness of China's bankruptcy law is often compromised by bureaucratic inefficiencies and regional disparities. High costs and prolonged proceedings are significant barriers for SMEs, particularly in rural areas (Xu & Wu, 2022).

Thailand: Strengths: Thailand's hybrid legal system and recent reforms have created a more streamlined and adaptive bankruptcy framework. The proactive judicial approach and simplified processes for SME bankruptcies contribute to more favorable outcomes for SMEs. **Weaknesses:** Access

to legal resources and consistent application of bankruptcy laws remain challenges, particularly in rural areas. Further reforms are needed to ensure that SMEs across all regions receive adequate protection during bankruptcy proceedings (OSMEP, 2021).

To evaluate the effectiveness of SME protection measures, this study compares key metrics such as the time required for bankruptcy resolution, recovery rates for SMEs, and the costs associated with bankruptcy procedures.

Results

The comparative analysis of the bankruptcy laws and SME protection mechanisms in China and Thailand has yielded several significant findings. These findings highlight the strengths and weaknesses of each country's legal framework and its practical application in protecting SMEs during bankruptcy proceedings.

Legal Frameworks

China: The Enterprise Bankruptcy Law of China provides a comprehensive legal framework aimed at balancing the interests of creditors and debtors. It includes specific provisions designed to facilitate the reorganization and liquidation of SMEs, such as simplified procedures and mechanisms for debt restructuring. However, the effectiveness of these provisions is often undermined by bureaucratic inefficiencies and regional disparities in enforcement (Wang, 2020). The influence of the civil law tradition, particularly the Germanic-Roman legal system, is evident in the structure and principles of the Chinese bankruptcy law (Chen, 2010).

Thailand: Thailand's Bankruptcy Act B.E. 2483 (1940) has evolved to include provisions that specifically address the needs of SMEs. Recent amendments have introduced streamlined processes for SME bankruptcies and enhanced mechanisms for debt restructuring and reorganization (Chotithamaporn, 2019). The hybrid legal system in Thailand, which combines elements of civil and common law traditions, has contributed to a more flexible and adaptive bankruptcy framework (Harding, 2001).

Case Law Applications

China: Judicial decisions in China reflect a strong commitment to protecting SMEs, with courts often prioritizing expedited bankruptcy proceedings and effective debt restructuring processes (Wang, 2020). However, the variability in judicial capacity and expertise across different regions can lead to inconsistent application of the law, affecting the overall protection afforded to SMEs (Chen, 2010). Case studies have shown that while some courts are proactive in facilitating SME reorganization, others may lack the resources or expertise to effectively implement these protections.

Thailand: Thai courts have demonstrated a proactive approach in applying the Bankruptcy Act's provisions to protect SMEs, with a clear preference for reorganization over liquidation

(Chotithamaporn, 2019). The judiciary's role in overseeing fair treatment of SME creditors and ensuring equitable debt restructuring agreements is crucial in maintaining the effectiveness of bankruptcy protection mechanisms (Harding, 2001). Despite these positive trends, challenges remain in ensuring consistent application of the law, particularly in rural areas.

Practical Implementation

China: The practical implementation of bankruptcy laws in China is characterized by significant regional disparities. While major urban centers may benefit from more efficient judicial processes and greater access to legal resources, SMEs in rural areas often face prolonged bankruptcy proceedings and higher associated costs (Xu & Wu, 2022). The time required for bankruptcy resolution and the recovery rates for SMEs can vary widely, reflecting the uneven application of the law (Wang, 2020).

Thailand: Thailand has generally achieved more consistent implementation of its bankruptcy laws, particularly following recent reforms aimed at improving SME protection (Chotithamaporn, 2019). The time required for bankruptcy resolution and recovery rates for SMEs are relatively favorable compared to China. However, access to bankruptcy protection mechanisms remains a challenge for SMEs in remote areas, where legal resources and judicial capacity may be limited (OSMEP, 2021).

Strengths and Weaknesses

China:

Strengths: Comprehensive legal framework with specific provisions for SME protection; commitment to balancing creditor and debtor interests; robust reorganization mechanisms.

Weaknesses: Bureaucratic inefficiencies; regional disparities in enforcement and judicial capacity; high costs and prolonged proceedings for SMEs in rural areas (Xu & Wu, 2022).

Thailand:

Strengths: Streamlined bankruptcy processes; flexible and adaptive legal framework; proactive judicial approach to SME protection.

Weaknesses: Inconsistent access to legal resources in rural areas; ongoing need for reforms to ensure equal protection across all regions (OSMEP, 2021).

Comparative Metrics

Time Required for Bankruptcy Resolution:

China: The time required for bankruptcy resolution in China can vary significantly between different regions due to bureaucratic inefficiencies and varying levels of judicial capacity (Wang, 2020).

Thailand: Thailand has generally achieved more consistent and quicker bankruptcy resolutions, particularly following recent reforms aimed at streamlining procedures for SMEs (Chotithamaporn, 2019).

Recovery Rates for SMEs

China: The recovery rates for SMEs in China are often impacted by regional disparities in the

application of bankruptcy laws. In more developed regions with better judicial capacity, recovery rates tend to be higher (Xu & Wu, 2022).

Thailand: Empirical data suggests that recovery rates for SMEs in Thailand are relatively favorable compared to China, reflecting the effectiveness of recent legal reforms (OSMEP, 2021).

Costs Associated with Bankruptcy Procedures

China: The costs associated with bankruptcy procedures in China can be burdensome for smaller enterprises, despite the existence of simplified procedures (Wang, 2020).

Thailand: Thailand has made efforts to reduce the costs associated with bankruptcy proceedings for SMEs, contributing to more accessible and efficient processes (Chotithamaporn, 2019).

Policy Implications

The findings of this comparative analysis have several important implications for policymakers, legal practitioners, and business owners in both countries. In China, addressing bureaucratic inefficiencies and regional disparities in the application of bankruptcy laws could enhance the overall protection of SMEs. This could involve targeted reforms to streamline procedures and improve judicial capacity in less-developed regions. In Thailand, further efforts to ensure consistent access to bankruptcy protection mechanisms across all regions, particularly in rural areas, are necessary. Policymakers might consider additional reforms to strengthen the legal framework and enhance the judiciary's capacity to handle SME bankruptcies effectively.

Overall, both China and Thailand have made significant strides in developing legal frameworks that support SMEs during bankruptcy proceedings. However, continuous legal reforms and targeted policy interventions are essential to address remaining gaps and ensure that SMEs receive the protection they need to survive and thrive in times of financial distress.

Discussion

This study provides a comprehensive comparative analysis of SME protection mechanisms in the bankruptcy laws of China and Thailand, highlighting both the strengths and weaknesses of each legal system. The analysis focuses on statutory provisions, case law applications, and practical implementations, offering valuable insights for policymakers, legal practitioners, and business owners.

Summary of Findings

Legal Frameworks: China's Enterprise Bankruptcy Law and Thailand's Bankruptcy Act both provide comprehensive legal frameworks aimed at protecting SMEs during bankruptcy proceedings. While China's system is influenced by the civil law tradition, Thailand's hybrid system incorporates elements of both civil and common law traditions. Each framework includes specific provisions to facilitate SME reorganization and debt restructuring, although the effectiveness of these provisions varies.

Case Law Applications: Judicial decisions in both countries demonstrate a commitment to protecting SMEs, with courts in China and Thailand prioritizing expedited bankruptcy proceedings and effective debt restructuring processes. However, the variability in judicial capacity and expertise across different regions can lead to inconsistent application of the law, affecting the overall protection afforded to SMEs.

Practical Implementation: The practical implementation of bankruptcy laws in China and Thailand reveals significant regional disparities. In China, SMEs in rural areas often face prolonged bankruptcy proceedings and higher associated costs, while major urban centers benefit from more efficient judicial processes. Thailand has generally achieved more consistent implementation, particularly following recent reforms, but access to legal resources remains a challenge in remote areas.

Policy Implications

The findings of this study have several important implications for policymakers, legal practitioners, and business owners in both countries. Addressing bureaucratic inefficiencies, enhancing judicial capacity, and reducing the costs associated with bankruptcy procedures are crucial steps to improve the overall protection of SMEs. Policymakers in China should focus on streamlining procedures and improving judicial capacity, while Thailand should continue efforts to extend legal resources and simplify the reorganization process.

Recommendations for Reform

China:

Streamline Bankruptcy Procedures: Implement reforms to reduce bureaucratic inefficiencies and expedite bankruptcy proceedings.

Enhance Judicial Capacity: Provide standardized training programs for judges and legal practitioners, and increase resources for under-resourced courts.

Reduce Costs: Lower the costs associated with bankruptcy procedures to make them more accessible to SMEs.

Improve Transparency: Adopt technology to improve the transparency and efficiency of bankruptcy proceedings.

Thailand:

Extend Legal Resources: Increase funding for local legal aid services and consider mobile court systems to improve access in rural areas.

Simplify Reorganization Process: Further simplify the reorganization process for SMEs to make it more efficient.

Strengthen Implementation: Ensure consistent implementation of bankruptcy laws across all regions and educate SMEs about their rights and available resources.

Reduce Costs: Continue efforts to lower the costs associated with bankruptcy proceedings to

enhance accessibility for SMEs.

Areas for Further Research

Future research should explore the long-term impacts of recent legal reforms in both countries on SME survival and growth. Comparative studies involving additional jurisdictions with similar economic and legal contexts could provide broader insights into effective bankruptcy protection mechanisms for SMEs. Empirical studies examining the experiences of SMEs in bankruptcy proceedings would highlight practical challenges and inform more targeted policy interventions. Additionally, research exploring the socio-economic impacts of these legal frameworks on SMEs, particularly in terms of job retention and economic stability, would be beneficial.

Final Thoughts

This study underscores the importance of continuous legal reforms and targeted policy interventions to enhance the protection of SMEs during bankruptcy proceedings. By addressing the identified weaknesses and building on the strengths of their respective legal systems, China and Thailand can improve the resilience and sustainability of their SME sectors. Ensuring that SMEs receive the protection they need during times of financial distress is crucial for promoting economic stability and fostering long-term growth.

Conclusions

This study provides a comprehensive comparative analysis of SME protection mechanisms in the bankruptcy laws of China and Thailand, highlighting both the strengths and weaknesses of each legal system. The analysis focuses on statutory provisions, case law applications, and practical implementations, offering valuable insights for policymakers, legal practitioners, and business owners.

Summary of Findings

Legal Frameworks: China's Enterprise Bankruptcy Law and Thailand's Bankruptcy Act both provide comprehensive legal frameworks aimed at protecting SMEs during bankruptcy proceedings. While China's system is influenced by the civil law tradition, Thailand's hybrid system incorporates elements of both civil and common law traditions. Each framework includes specific provisions to facilitate SME reorganization and debt restructuring, although the effectiveness of these provisions varies.

Case Law Applications: Judicial decisions in both countries demonstrate a commitment to protecting SMEs, with courts in China and Thailand prioritizing expedited bankruptcy proceedings and effective debt restructuring processes. However, the variability in judicial capacity and expertise across different regions can lead to inconsistent application of the law, affecting the overall protection afforded to SMEs.

Practical Implementation: The practical implementation of bankruptcy laws in China and

Thailand reveals significant regional disparities. In China, SMEs in rural areas often face prolonged bankruptcy proceedings and higher associated costs, while major urban centers benefit from more efficient judicial processes. Thailand has generally achieved more consistent implementation, particularly following recent reforms, but access to legal resources remains a challenge in remote areas.

Policy Implications

The findings of this study have several important implications for policymakers, legal practitioners, and business owners in both countries. Addressing bureaucratic inefficiencies, enhancing judicial capacity, and reducing the costs associated with bankruptcy procedures are crucial steps to improve the overall protection of SMEs. Policymakers in China should focus on streamlining procedures and improving judicial capacity, while Thailand should continue efforts to extend legal resources and simplify the reorganization process.

Recommendations for Reform

China:

Streamline Bankruptcy Procedures: Implement reforms to reduce bureaucratic inefficiencies and expedite bankruptcy proceedings.

Enhance Judicial Capacity: Provide standardized training programs for judges and legal practitioners, and increase resources for under-resourced courts.

Reduce Costs: Lower the costs associated with bankruptcy procedures to make them more accessible to SMEs.

Improve Transparency: Adopt technology to improve the transparency and efficiency of bankruptcy proceedings.

Thailand:

Extend Legal Resources: Increase funding for local legal aid services and consider mobile court systems to improve access in rural areas.

Simplify Reorganization Process: Further simplify the reorganization process for SMEs to make it more efficient.

Strengthen Implementation: Ensure consistent implementation of bankruptcy laws across all regions and educate SMEs about their rights and available resources.

Reduce Costs: Continue efforts to lower the costs associated with bankruptcy proceedings to enhance accessibility for SMEs.

Future research should explore the long-term impacts of recent legal reforms in both countries on SME survival and growth. Comparative studies involving additional jurisdictions with similar economic and legal contexts could provide broader insights into effective bankruptcy protection mechanisms for SMEs. Empirical studies examining the experiences of SMEs in bankruptcy proceedings would highlight practical challenges and inform more targeted policy interventions.

Additionally, research exploring the socio-economic impacts of these legal frameworks on SMEs, particularly in terms of job retention and economic stability, would be beneficial.

This study underscores the importance of continuous legal reforms and targeted policy interventions to enhance the protection of SMEs during bankruptcy proceedings. By addressing the identified weaknesses and building on the strengths of their respective legal systems, China and Thailand can improve the resilience and sustainability of their SME sectors. Ensuring that SMEs receive the protection they need during times of financial distress is crucial for promoting economic stability and fostering long-term growth.

References

- Chen, J. (2010). Evolution of Chinese bankruptcy law. *Journal of Chinese Law*, 24(2), 123-156.
- Chotithamaporn, C. (2019). Reforms in Thailand's bankruptcy law: Focus on SMEs. *Southeast Asian Law Review*, 32(1), 78-102.
- Davydenko, S. A., & Franks, J. R. (2008). Do bankruptcy codes matter? A study of defaults in France, Germany, and the UK. *Journal of Finance*, 63(2), 565-608.
- Jintao, H. (2009). Enterprise Bankruptcy Law of the People's Republic of China (2006). *Chinese Law and Government*, 42(1), 56-80.
- Fan, W., & White, M. J. (2003). Personal bankruptcy and the level of entrepreneurial activity. *Journal of Law and Economics*, 46(2), 543-567.
- Fisher, J., & Martel, R. (2004). The impact of bankruptcy law on small businesses. *Small Business Economics*, 23(5), 415-426.
- Harding, A. (2001). Comparative legal traditions in Southeast Asia. *Asian Journal of Comparative Law*, 6(3), 215-240.
- Ho, D. (2020). Comparing bankruptcy frameworks: China and the United States. *International Journal of Law and Management*, 62(4), 321-339.
- Kamba, W. J. (1974). Comparative law: A theoretical framework. *International and Comparative Law Quarterly*, 23(3), 485-519.
- Liew, Y. K. (2018). Bankruptcy law in China and Japan: A comparative study. *Asian Law Review*, 14(1), 89-112.
- Morrison, E. R. (2007). Bankruptcy decision making: An empirical study of continuation bias in small-business bankruptcies. *Journal of Law and Economics*, 50(1), 381-419.
- National Bureau of Statistics of China. (2022). *Annual report on the performance of small and medium-sized enterprises*.
- Office of Small and Medium Enterprises Promotion [OSMEP]. (2021). *Thailand SME annual report*.
- Pistor, K. (2000). The standardization of law and its effect on developing economies. *American*

Journal of Comparative Law, 48(1), 97-130.

Wang, X. (2020). Recent developments in China's bankruptcy law. *China Legal Science*, 35(4), 145-167.

Xu, L., & Wu, Y. (2022). Enhancing SME protection in bankruptcy: A comparative approach. *Journal of International Business Law*, 19(2), 253-275.

Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research: Design and methods* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.

Zhang, L. (2015). Legal reforms in China's bankruptcy law. *Chinese Journal of Law*, 28(2), 174-195.