

Liberalisation, Foreign Direct Investment Flows and Development

Indian Experience in the 1990s

Most developing countries now offer a welcoming attitude to FDI. After following a somewhat restrictive policy towards FDI, India has liberalised her policy regime considerably since 1991. This liberalisation has been accompanied by increasing inflows and also by changes in the sectoral composition, sources and entry modes of FDI. The increasing recognition of India's locational advantages in knowledge-based industries among MNEs has led to increasing investments in software development and global R&D centres set up in India to exploit these advantages. This paper reviews the Indian experience with FDI since 1991 in a comparative east Asian perspective.

NAGESH KUMAR

I Introduction

Foreign direct investment (FDI) is now widely perceived as an important resource for expediting the industrial development of developing countries in view of the fact that it flows as a bundle of capital, technology, skills and some times even market access. Most of the developing countries, therefore, offer a welcoming attitude to multinational enterprises (MNEs) that are usually associated with FDI. India's case is a typical in this context. After following a somewhat restrictive policy towards FDI, India liberalised her FDI policy regime considerably since 1991. This liberalisation has been accompanied by increasing inflows. The liberalisation has also been accompanied by changes in the sectoral composition, sources and entry modes of FDI. The increasing recognition of India's locational advantages in knowledge-based industries among MNEs has also led to increasing investments by them in software development and in global R&D centres set up in India to exploit these advantages.

This paper reviews the Indian experience with FDI and its quality¹ since the 1991 in a comparative east Asian perspective. The structure of the paper is as follows: Section II summarises the evolution of Indian government's policy towards FDI. Section III examines the trends and patterns in FDI inflows in the 1990s. It also comments on the determinants of FDI inflows in India. Section IV examines the impact of FDI in terms of various parameters of development. Section V discusses the emerging trends in the MNE activities in knowledge-based industries in India, viz, IT software and global R&D activities. Section VI concludes the paper with some remarks on policy lessons.

II Evolution of Governments Policy Towards FDI, 1948-2004


Indian government policy towards FDI has evolved over time in tune with the requirements of the process of development in different phases.² Soon after independence, India embarked on

a strategy of import substituting industrialisation in the framework of development planning with a focus on encouraging and improving the local capability in heavy industries including the machinery-manufacturing sector. As the domestic base of 'created' assets, viz, technology, skills, entrepreneurship was quite limited, the attitude towards FDI was increasingly receptive. FDI was sought on mutually advantageous terms though the majority local ownership was preferred. The government adopted a more restrictive attitude towards FDI in the late 1960s as the local base of machinery manufacturing capability and local entrepreneurship developed and as the outflow on account of remittances of dividends, profits, royalties, and technical fees, etc, abroad on account of servicing of FDI and technology imports grew sharply. Restrictions were put on proposals of foreign direct investments unaccompanied by technology transfer and those seeking more than 40 per cent foreign ownership. From 1973 onwards the further activities of foreign companies (along with those of local large industrial houses) were restricted to a select group of core or high priority industries. The Foreign Exchange Regulation Act, (FERA) of 1973 required all foreign companies operating in India to register under Indian corporate legislation with up to 40 per cent foreign equity. Exceptions from the general limit of 40 per cent were made only for companies operating in high priority or high technology sectors, tea plantations, or those producing predominantly for exports.

In the 1980s the attitude towards FDI began to change as a part of the strategy of modernisation of industry with liberalised imports of capital goods and technology, exposing the Indian industry to foreign competition, and assigning a greater role to MNEs in the promotion of manufactured exports. The policy changes adopted in the 1980s covered liberalisation of industrial licensing (approval) rules, a host of incentives, and exemption from foreign equity restrictions under FERA to 100 per cent export-oriented units and a degree of flexibility concerning foreign ownership.

After pursuing a restrictive policy towards FDI over the four decades with a varying degree of selectivity, India changed tracks in 1990s and embarked on a broader process of reforms designed

Figure 1: India's FDI Inflows, 1991-2003



Source: UNCTAD (2004).


to increase her integration with the global economy. Among the reform measures implemented included a departure from the restrictive policy towards FDI, a much more liberal trade policy besides reforms of capital market and exchange controls. The New Industrial Policy (NIP) announced on July 24, 1991 marked a major departure with respect to FDI policy with the abolition of industrial licensing system except where it is required for strategic or environmental grounds, creation of a system of automatic clearance of FDI proposals fulfilling the conditions laid down, such as the ownership levels of 50 per cent, 51 per cent, 74 per cent and 100 per cent foreign equity and opening of new sectors such as mining, banking, insurance, telecommunications, construction and management of ports, harbours, roads and highways, airlines, and defence equipment, to foreign-owned companies subject to sectoral caps. Foreign ownership up to 100 per cent is permitted in most manufacturing sectors – in some sectors even on automatic basis – except for defence equipment where it is limited to 26 per cent and for items reserved for production by small-scale industries where it is limited to 24 per cent. The dividend balancing and the related export obligation conditions on foreign investors, which applied to 22 consumer goods industries, were withdrawn in 2000.

III Liberalisation and Trends and Patterns in FDI Inflows

The economic reforms in general and liberalisation of FDI policy in particular have affected the magnitude and pattern of FDI inflows received by India. During the 1990s, they showed a marked increase until 1997, when they peaked at US\$3.6 billion. However, after stagnating for a few subsequent years at around US\$2.5 billion they rose again to a level of about \$3.4 billion and to \$4.3 billion in 2003 (Figure 1). The magnitude of FDI inflows received by India would appear too small, especially if compared with inflows received by other countries in the region such as China (around \$50 billion in recent years). However, the difference in the FDI to GDP ratio narrows if account is taken of underestimation of FDI in India and overestimation of FDI in China due to round tripping of Chinese capital as is commented later.

In an analysis of the role of liberalisation in explaining the rising inflows of FDI till 1997, Kumar (1998b) found that only a part of the increase in FDI inflows could be attributed to liberalisation, and a part of the rise was explained in terms of

Figure 2: Industrial Growth (left scale) and FDI Inflows (right scale) in India, 1991-2003



Source: the author based on UNCTAD and Government of India data.

a sharp expansion in the global scale of FDI outflows during the 1990s. Secondly, the decline in inflows since 1997 despite continued liberalisation suggested that policy liberalisation is not an adequate explanation of FDI inflows. Macroeconomic fundamentals of the host economies that emerge as the most powerful explanatory variables in the inter-country analysis of FDI inflows also explain the year-to-year fluctuations in FDI, although with a lag. This becomes clear from Figure 2 which plots FDI inflows during the 1990s against the fluctuations in the annual rates of growth of industrial output. One finds a good correspondence between industrial growth rate in a year and the FDI inflows in the following year. The industrial growth seems to signal to the foreign investors about the prospects of the economy. Therefore, it appears that policy liberalisation may be a necessary but not a sufficient condition for FDI inflows.

The implication of the above discussion is that recovery of industrial growth rate in 2003-04 is likely to increase FDI inflows in the subsequent year. Some indications of this trend are already available from the India emerging as the third most attractive FDI destination after China and the US (compared to sixth in 2003) in terms of FDI Confidence Index developed by AT Kearney on the basis of survey of 1000 global corporations.³

Liberalisation and Changing Sectoral Composition of FDI

The sectoral composition of FDI in India has undergone significant change in the 1990s. Table 1 presents sectoral distribution of FDI stock in India at three points of time, viz, 1980, 1990 and 1997 (that is the latest available year for the stock data). Three characteristics of FDI stock in India can be noted. First, the share of mining and petroleum along with plantation sector in FDI stock it has fallen markedly from 9 per cent in 1980 to only 2 per cent in 1997. Second, as the bulk of FDI inflows in the pre-liberalisation era were directed to manufacturing sector, it accounted for the bulk of FDI stock with nearly 87 per cent share in 1980 that declined marginally to 85 per cent in 1990. However, with the liberalisation of FDI policy regime in the 1990s, FDI inflows have been received by services and infrastructural sectors. This has brought the share of manufacturing down to 48 per cent by 1997. During the 1990s, services clearly emerged as a major sector receiving FDI. Power generation among other infrastructure sectors (included in Others) have also attracted substantial FDI during the 1990s bringing the share of others up to nearly 35 per cent from marginal in 1980 and in 1990.

Among the manufacturing subsectors, FDI stock in 1997 is also more evenly distributed between food and beverages, transport equipment, metals and metal products, electricals and electronics, chemicals and allied products, and miscellaneous manufacturing unlike a very heavy concentration in relatively technology intensive sectors, viz, machinery, chemicals, electricals, and transport equipment up to 1990. The infrastructural sectors which have commanded nearly half of total approved investments in the 1990s had not been open to FDI inflows before and hence, could be attributed to the policy liberalisation.

It may be useful to look at the distribution of inward FDI within the services sector given its increasing importance in the FDI inflows during the 1990s. A look at the sub-sector break up of cumulative approvals of FDI during the 1991-2000 period, suggests that about 61 per cent of approved service sector FDI during 1991-2000 has gone to the telecommunications sector. The financial and banking sector stood as the second most important service sector host to FDI nearly claiming about 14 per cent of total amount approved. Other important branches are hotel and tourism, and air and sea transport.

Liberalisation and Changing Sources of FDI in India

European countries had been major sources of FDI inflows to India until 1990. However, their relative importance has steadily declined in the post-liberalisation period with the share of major European source countries (which include the UK, Germany, France, Switzerland, Sweden, Italy and Netherlands) coming down from 69 and 66 per cent of FDI stock in 1980 and 1990 to just 31 per cent by 1997. The decline in the relative importance of European countries as sources of FDI to India has been made more prominent by diversification of sources of FDI by the country over the 1990s.

The US has emerged as the most important source of FDI over this period with a share of nearly 19 per cent of stock in 1992. In 1997 the share of the US at 13.75 per cent is, however, deceptive as a large proportion of the US FDI is believed to be routed through Mauritius making the island-nation appear as the largest source of investments in India with Rs 65.46 billion or nearly 18 per cent of total FDI stock in the economy in 1997 (Table 2). The emergence of Mauritius as the largest source of FDI can be explained by the Double Taxation Avoidance Agreement signed between Mauritius and India during the 1990s that enables foreign investors to minimise their tax liability given the tax haven status of Mauritius. Hence, foreign investors from other countries, principally the US, route their investments through Mauritius to take advantage of the tax treaty.

Liberalisation and Mode of Entry: Greenfield vs M&As

An important feature of FDI inflows into India during 1990s is the emergence of mergers and acquisition as an important channel of FDI inflow. During the period 1997-1999, for instance, nearly 39 per cent of FDI inflows into India have taken the form of M&As by foreign companies of existing Indian enterprises, whereas in the pre-reform period, FDI entry was invariably in the nature of greenfield investments (Table 3). This trend may have implications for the impact of FDI given limited potential of acquisitions compared to greenfield entry to add to the stock of productive capital, generate favourable knowledge-spillovers and competitive effects.

FDI Inflows in India in a Comparative East Asian Perspective

Although FDI inflows into Indian economy have increased considerably during the 1990s following the reforms, India's share would appear too small, especially if it is compared with that of other countries in the region such as China. In 2001, India's reported inflows of about \$ 3.4 billion represent a mere 1.7 per cent

Table 1: Industrial Distribution of India's Inward FDI Stock 1989-97
(Rs million)

Industry Group	End March					
	1980		1990		1997	
	Value	Per Cent	Value	Per Cent	Value	Per Cent
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I Plantations	385	4.13	2560	9.46	4310	1.18
II Mining	78	0.84	80	0.30	410	0.11
III Petroleum	368	3.94	30	0.11	3330	0.91
III Manufacturing	8116	86.97	22980	84.95	175230	48.00
1 Food and beverages	391	4.19	1620	5.99	24310	6.66
2 Textiles products	320	3.43	920	3.40	10390	2.85
3 Transport equipment	515	5.52	2820	10.43	24570	6.73
4 Machinery and machine tools	710	7.61	3540	13.09	19310	5.29
5 Metal and metal products	1187	12.72	1410	5.21	7600	2.08
6 Electrical goods and machinery	975	10.45	2950	10.91	29400	8.31
7 Chemicals and allied products	3018	32.34	7690	28.43	32530	8.91
8 Others	1000	10.72	2030	7.50	27120	7.43
V Services	320	3.43	890	3.29	54650	14.97
VI Others	65	0.70	510	1.89	127170	34.83
Total	9332	100.00	27050	100.00	365100	100.00

Source: RBI Bulletin (April 1985, August 1993, October 2000).

Table 2: Sourcewise Distribution of India's Inward FDI Stock 1989-97
(Rs crore = 10 million)

Country	1992		1997	
	Value	Per Cent	Value	Per Cent
Mauritius	..		6,546	17.93
US	713	18.57	5,019	13.75
UK	1,545	40.23	4,379	11.99
Germany	476	12.40	2,078	5.69
Japan	213	5.55	1,958	5.36
Netherlands	164	4.27	1,175	3.22
Switzerland	185	4.82	785	2.15
Singapore	..		449	1.23
Canada	108	2.81	367	1.01
Hong Kong	..		346	0.95
France	19	0.49	329	0.90
Sweden	93	2.42	328	0.90
Belgium	..		257	0.70
Iran	..		140	0.38
West Indies	..		78	0.21
Others	324	8.44	12,276	33.62
Total	3,840	100	36,510	100

Source: RBI Bulletin, October 2000.

Table 3: Share of M&As in FDI Inflows in India

Year	FDI Inflows (\$ Million)	M&A Funds (\$ Million)	Share of M&A (Per Cent)
1997	3200	1300	40.6
1998	2900	1000	34.5
1999 (January-March)	1400	500	35.7
Total	7100	2800	39.4

Source: Kumar (2000b).

of total inflows attracted by developing countries. In contrast, China received an estimated \$ 46.8 billion of inflows in the same year representing nearly 23 per cent total developing country FDI inflows. There are also other differences in the sectoral patterns and the acquisition modes among other characteristics. In what follows we take a brief look at the key differences and some possible explanations.

Magnitudes of FDI Inflows

The comparison of about US\$3.4 billion in annual inflows of FDI by India with US\$45 billion of FDI inflows by China is often made. It has been pointed out however, that the figures of FDI inflows in India and China are not comparable because of several differences.⁴ Firstly, the Indian figures of inflows do not follow the IMF's *BOP Manual* that is followed internationally. The principle difference is that Indian figures only count the fresh inflows of equity and do not take into consideration the reinvested earnings by foreign affiliates in the country nor the inter-corporate debt flows that are generally included while computing the FDI figures as per the IMF Guidelines. Therefore, the Indian figures tend to underreport the inflows. Secondly, FDI inflows in China are believed to be overestimating the real FDI inflows in view of round-tripping of Chinese capital to take advantage of more favourable tax treatment of FDI. Therefore, the figures of India and China are not strictly comparable and tend to overplay the difference between the intensity of inflows between the two countries. Finally, the size of the Chinese economy is much larger than the Indian economy and hence the figures should be normalised.

Table 4 puts the FDI inflows in India and China in a comparative perspective. The reported figure of FDI inflow in China in 2000 as a proportion of GDP is 3.6 per cent compared to 0.5 per cent in the case of India. However, when the Indian figures are revised by taking into account the reinvested earnings and inter-corporate debt and Chinese figures are moderated on account of possible round tripping of FDI inflows (using the estimates provided by the IFC), the gap in the FDI/GDP ratios narrows to 1.7 to 2.0 for India and China respectively.

The Indian government has taken steps to revise the definition of FDI flows in the country. A committee set up by the Reserve Bank of India in its report submitted in October 2002 had recommended the Indian definition brought on par with the global practice. In June 2003, the government of India announced that adoption of international norms led to near doubling of FDI inflow figures from US\$ 2,342 million to \$4,029 million in 2000-01 and from \$3,906 million in 2001-02 to \$6131 million.⁵

Even after taking into account the measurement problems, FDI inflows in India are low compared to other economies in the region. Studies of determinants of FDI inflows conducted in the framework of an extended model of location of foreign production [Kumar 2000a, 2002, for details], have found that a country's attractiveness to FDI is affected by structural factors such as market size (income levels and population), extent of urbanisation, quality of infrastructure, geographical and cultural proximity with major sources of capital, and policy factors, viz, tax rates, investment incentives, performance requirements. In terms of these, while India's large population base is an advantage, her low income levels, low levels of urbanisation and relatively poor quality of infrastructure are disadvantages. Furthermore, the relative geographical and cultural proximity of her east Asian

counterparts with major sources of capital such as Japan and Korea (also the US) for instance, may have put her at a disadvantage compared to them. Furthermore, unlike China and some other countries India has not employed fiscal incentives like tax concessions to attract FDI. India is also behind China by at least 12 years in terms of launching reforms. Finally the ability of China in attracting FDI inflows to quite a large extent owes to the large special economic zones which provided foreign enterprises better and specialised infrastructure and flexibility from the domestic regulations such as labour laws.

Quality of FDI Inflows in Indian and China: Sectoral Composition and Other Differences

India's post-reform experience suggests that a substantial proportion of FDI has gone to services, infrastructure and relatively low technology intensive consumer goods manufacturing industries compared to high concentration in technology intensive manufacturing industries in the pre-reform period. In China and other south-east Asian countries, the bulk of FDI is concentrated in manufacturing. In the pre-reform period, FDI was consciously channelled into technology intensive manufacturing through a selective policy. In the post-reform period, however, opening up of new industries such as services and infrastructure to FDI has led to a lot of FDI going to them thus bringing down the share of manufacturing. Within the manufacturing too, now that there is no policy to direct the FDI to certain branches, consumer goods industries that did not have so much exposure to FDI have risen in importance. On the other hand while following in general a liberal policy towards FDI, China and other south-east Asian countries have directed FDI to manufacturing with export-obligations and other incentives such pioneer industry programmes. Hence, FDI also accounts for a relatively very high share of manufactured exports in these countries, as observed later. It suggests while according it a liberal treatment, a broad direction needs to be given to improve quality of FDI and make it contribute more to the industrialisation and building export capability. Specific promotion of export-oriented FDI may also be fruitful.

IV Impact of FDI Inflows: Some Issues

Given their intangible assets, MNE affiliates can contribute to their host country's development with generation of output, employment, balanced regional development, technological capability and export-expansion, among other parameters. The lack of data on the economic activity of enterprises operating in India classified by nationality of ownership has constrained

Table 4: FDI Inflows in China and India: A Comparative Perspective, 2000

	India		China	
	Reported FDI*	Adjusted FDI#	Reported FDI	Adjusted FDI#
FDI net inflows (BoP, current US\$Bn)	2.3	8.0	39.0	20.0
FDI net inflows (per cent of GDP)	0.5	1.7	3.6	2.0

Notes: * Figures published by official sources.
Based on IFC's *World Business Environment Survey*, 2002. see Pfefferman 2002.

Source: Srivastava (2003) based on World Bank, *World Development Indicators*, 2002 and IFC, *World Business Environment Survey: Economic Prospects for Developing Countries*, March 2002.

a fuller appreciation of the role played by FDI in the country's economic development. In what follows findings of existing studies and some observations based on comparisons of samples of enterprises are made to gather some idea of the impact of FDI.

Place of FDI in India: Shares in Sales, Capital Formation and GDP

An idea of the relative importance of FDI in India can be had from the share of output or sales of foreign affiliates in output or sales of the industrial sector. A few attempts have been made in that direction. Kumar (1990a) had estimated that foreign controlled firms accounted for nearly 25 per cent of output of larger private corporate sector and 31 per cent in manufacturing sector in 1980-81. Arthreye and Kapur (1999) in an attempt to update Kumar's estimates following the same methodology found that foreign firms in 1990-91 accounted for about 26 per cent of sales in manufacturing down from 31 per cent in 1980-81. The declining trend of the share of foreign controlled enterprises over the 1980-1990 period has to do with the restrictive attitude followed by the government with respect to FDI during the period. Similar estimates for the post liberalisation period are not available.

To examine the trends in share of foreign enterprises during the 1990s in Indian manufacturing we have computed share of foreign firms in total value added and total sales in a sample of large private sector companies that are quoted at Indian stock exchanges and included in the RIS Database of compiled by extracting information of relevant companies from the Prowess (online) Database of the Centre for Monitoring Indian Economy (CMIE). The shares computed on the basis of the sample such as this are useful only to observe trends overtime as information is not available on the representative nature of the sample. Table 5 summarises these shares and data are plotted in Figure 3. The shares of foreign enterprises in both value added and sales reveal an increasing trend in the 1990s particularly in the late 1990s. Therefore, liberalisation of policy seems to have led to a rise in the place of foreign enterprises in the Indian industry.

The growing importance of FDI inflows in the Indian economy can also be judged from the rising ratios of FDI inflows as a proportion of gross fixed capital formation from 0.3 per cent in 1990 to 4 per cent and of inward FDI stock as a percentage of GDP rising from 0.5 to 5.4 per cent over the same period (Table 6).

FDI, Growth and Domestic Investment

FDI inflows could contribute to growth rate of the host economy by augmenting the capital stock as well as with infusion of new technology. However, high growth rates may also lead to more FDI inflows by enhancing the investment climate in the country. Therefore, the FDI-growth relationship is subject to causality bias given the possibility of two-way relationship. What is the nature of the relationship in India? A recent study has examined the direction of causation between FDI and growth empirically for a sample of 107 countries for the 1980-1999 period. In the case of India, the study finds a Granger neutral relationship as the direction of causation was not pronounced [see Kumar and Pradhan 2002, for more details of the methodology and results].

Furthermore, it has been shown that some times FDI projects may actually crowd-out or substitute domestic investments from the product or capital markets with the market power of their well-known brand names and other resources and may thus be

immiserising [Fry 1992, Agosin and Myer 2000, for evidence]. Therefore, it is important to examine the impact of FDI on domestic investment to evaluate the impact of FDI on growth and welfare in host economy. Our study to examine the effect of FDI on domestic investment in a dynamic setting, however, did not find a statistically significant effect of FDI on domestic investment in the case of India [Kumar and Pradhan 2002 for details]. It appears, therefore, that FDI inflows received by India have been of mixed type combining some inflows crowding-in domestic investments while others crowding them out, with no predominant pattern emerging in the case of India.

The empirical studies on the nature of relationship between FDI and domestic investments suggest that the effect of FDI on domestic investment depends on host government policies. Governments have extensively employed selective policies, imposed various performance requirements such as local content requirements (LCRs) to deepen the commitment of MNEs with the host economy. The Indian government has imposed condition of phased manufacturing programmes (or local content requirements) in the auto industry to promote vertical inter-firm linkages and encourage development of auto component industry (and crowding-in of domestic investments). A case study of the auto industry where such policy was followed shows that these policies (in combination with other performance requirements, viz, foreign exchange neutrality), have succeeded in building an internationally competitive vertically integrated auto sector in the country [Kumar 2003a]. The Indian experience in this industry, therefore, is in tune with the experiences of Thailand, Brazil and Mexico as documented by Moran (1998).

Exports and Balance of Payments

A number of developing countries have used FDI to exploit the resources of MNEs such as globally recognised brand names, best practice technology or by getting integrated with their global production networks, among others, for expanding their manufactured exports.

Table 5: Shares of Foreign Firms in Indian Manufacturing during 1990s

Year	No of Sample Firms			Share (Per Cent) of Foreign Firms in	
	Total	Foreign Firms	Domestic Firms	Total Value Added	Total Sales
1990	1378	126	1252	9.50	11.26
1991	1754	149	1605	9.77	11.77
1992	1991	158	1833	9.61	11.69
1993	2381	171	2210	9.77	11.88
1994	2987	178	2809	9.91	11.67
1995	3500	190	3310	9.25	11.03
1996	3649	195	3454	9.65	11.67
1997	3695	208	3487	10.77	12.64
1998	3695	216	3479	11.20	12.85
1999	3716	225	3491	12.12	13.66
2000	3726	224	3502	12.76	14.05
2001	2959	193	2766	12.63	13.77

Source: RIS Database.

Table 6: Rising Importance of FDI in Indian Economy

Indicator	1990	1995	2000	2003
FDI inflows as a percentage of gross fixed capital formation	0.3	2.4	2.3	4.0
Inward FDI stocks as a percentage of GDP	0.5	1.6	4.1	5.4

Source: UNCTAD.

The early studies analysing the export performance of Indian enterprises in the pre-liberalisation phase had reported no statistically significant difference between the export performance of foreign and local firms [Kumar 1990a; Kumar and Siddharthan 1994]. Sharma (2000) in a study using a simultaneous equation model examining the factors explaining export growth in India over 1970-98 period found FDI to have no significant effect on export performance although its coefficient had a positive sign. Obviously in a highly protected setting, both local and foreign firms found it more profitable to concentrate on the domestic market. For the post-reform period, Agarwal (2001) found a weak support for the hypothesis that foreign firms have performed better than local firms in India in the post-reform period 1996-2000 although the estimates were not robust across various technology groupings and the foreign ownership dummy turned out to be significant at 10 per cent level only in the case of medium-high-technology industries. Controlling for several firm-specific factors, fiscal incentives, and industry characteristics, Kumar and Pradhan (2003) in a recent study analysing the export orientation of over 4,000 Indian enterprises in manufacturing for the 1988-2001 period find Indian affiliates of MNEs appear to be performing better than their local counterparts in terms of export-orientation overall although with some variation across industries. In light of the findings of earlier studies relating to pre-liberalisation period of no significant difference in the export-orientation of foreign and local enterprises, it would appear that reforms have prompted foreign MNEs to begin to explore the potential of India as an export-platform production in a modest manner.

The studies analysing the determinants of the patterns of export-orientation of MNE affiliates across 74 countries in seven branches of industry over three points of time have shown trade liberalisation to be an important factor in explaining export-orientation of foreign affiliates. Furthermore, in host countries with large domestic markets, the export-obligations have been found to be effective for promoting export-orientation of foreign affiliates to third countries [Kumar 1998c]. From that perspective the liberalisation of trade regime during the 1990s in India may have facilitated the export-orientation of foreign affiliates as borne out from the above.

Export-obligations have also been employed fruitfully by many countries to prompt MNE affiliates to exploit the host country's potential for export platform production. For instance in China which has succeeded in expanding manufactured exports with help of MNE affiliates, regulations stipulate that wholly owned foreign enterprises must undertake to export more than 50 per cent of their output [Rosen 1999:63-71]. As a result of these policies, the proportion of foreign enterprises in manufactured exports has steadily increased over the 1990s to 44 per cent. MNE affiliates account for over 80 per cent of China's high technology exports [UNCTAD 2002:154, 163]. India has not imposed export obligations on MNE affiliates except for those entering the products reserved for SMEs. However, indirect export obligations in the form of dividend balancing have been imposed for enterprises producing primarily consumer goods (since phased out in 2000). Under these policies, a foreign enterprise is obliged to earn the foreign exchange that it wishes to remit abroad as dividend so that there is no adverse impact on host country's bop. Some times a condition of foreign exchange neutrality has been imposed where the enterprise is required to earn foreign exchange enough to even cover the outgo on account of imports. Therefore, these regulations have acted as indirect export obligations

prompting foreign enterprises to export to earn the foreign exchange required by them. The evidence that is available suggests that such regulations have prompted foreign enterprises in undertaking exports. In the case of the auto industry in order to comply with their export commitments to comply with foreign exchange neutrality condition, foreign auto majors have undertaken export of auto components from India which have not only opened new opportunities for Indian component manufacturers but also in that process found profitable opportunities for business. Hence, exports of auto components from India are now growing at rapid rate exceeding the obligations several times over. These regulations have acted to remove the information asymmetry existing in the minds of auto majors about the poor quality of Indian components. In that respect India's experience is very similar to that of Thailand that has emerged as the major auto hub of south-east Asia (as documented by Moran 1998 and Kumar 2003a).

It has been shown that even the indirect export obligations such as foreign exchange neutrality and dividend balancing could be effective in prompting MNEs to exploit opportunities for export-oriented manufacture. In order to comply with performance requirements imposed at the time of entry, Pepsi developed a model of contract farming in Punjab with new technology brought in for growing horticulture products of requisite quality and specifications in the country. This way the indirect export obligations have helped the country benefit from not only export earnings but also from transfer and diffusion of new technology among farmers [Kumar and Singh 2002 for details].

R&D, Local Technological Capability and Diffusion

For the overall sample of manufacturing, foreign firms appear to be spending more on R&D activity in India than local firms although gap between their R&D intensities has tended to narrow down vanishing by 2001 (Table 7). A study analysing the R&D activity of Indian manufacturing enterprises in the context of liberalisation has found that after controlling for extraneous factors, MNE affiliates reveal a lower R&D intensity compared to local firms, presumably on account of their captive access to the laboratories of their parents and associated companies. The study also observed differences in the nature or motivation of R&D activity of foreign and local firms. Local firms seem to be directing their R&D activity towards absorption of imported knowledge and to provide a backup to their outward expansion. MNE affiliates, on the other hand, either focus on customisation of their parents' technology for the local market [Kumar and Agarwal 2000].

Table 7: R&D Intensity of Indian Manufacturing Enterprises Based on Ownership, 1990-2001

Year	R&D Intensity (Per Cent)		
	All Firms	Foreign Firms	Domestic Firms
1990	0.053	0.114	0.046
1991	0.082	0.086	0.082
1992	0.148	0.213	0.139
1993	0.201	0.365	0.178
1994	0.217	0.378	0.196
1995	0.272	0.377	0.259
1996	0.312	0.376	0.303
1997	0.413	0.447	0.409
1998	0.341	0.559	0.309
1999	0.352	0.477	0.332
2000	0.311	0.386	0.298
2001	0.343	0.320	0.346

Source: RIS Database.

With respect to contribution of FDI to local technological capability and technology diffusion, the studies find a mixed evidence. Fikkert (1994)'s study covering 305 Indian private sector firms showed that firms having foreign equity participation have an insignificant direct effect on R&D but they tend to depend significantly more on foreign technology purchases which in turn tend to reduce R&D. In view of these findings, Fikkert concludes that "India's closed technology policies with respect to foreign direct investment and technology licensing had the desired effect of promoting indigenous R&D, the usual measure of technological self-reliance".

On the knowledge spillovers from foreign to domestic enterprises, the evidence suggests that they are positive when the technology gap between foreign and local enterprises is not wide. When the technology gap is wide, the entry of foreign enterprises may affect the productivity of domestic enterprise adversely, i.e., there could be negative spillovers.

Some governments have imposed technology transfer requirements on foreign enterprises, e.g., Malaysia. However, such performance requirements, however, do not appear to have been very successful in achieving their objectives [UNCTAD 2003]. Instead other performance requirements such as local content requirements or domestic equity requirements may be more effective in transfer of technology. As observed above local content requirements and export performance requirements have prompted foreign enterprises to transfer and diffuse some knowledge to domestic enterprises in order to comply with their obligations. Similarly the domestic equity requirements may facilitate the quick absorption of the knowledge brought in by foreign enterprises which is an important prerequisite of the local technological capability, as is evident from case studies of Indian two-wheelers industry where Indian joint ventures with foreign firms were able to absorb knowledge brought in by the foreign partner and eventually become self-reliant not only to continue production but even to develop their own world class models for domestic market and exports on their own [Kumar and Singh 2002]. Some have expressed the view that domestic equity requirements may adversely affect the extent or quality of technology transfer [Moran 2001]. However, it has been shown that MNEs may not transfer key technologies even to their wholly owned subsidiaries abroad fearing the risk of dissipation or diffusion through mobility of employees. Furthermore, even if the content and quality of technology transfer is superior in the case of a sole venture than in the case of a joint venture, from the host country point of view, the latter may have more desirable externalities in terms of local learning and diffusion of the knowledge transferred [Kumar and Singh 2002].

A recent trend in FDI is that of globalisation of R&D activity including other knowledge based activities such as development of custom software, business process outsourcing. After the potential of India as a competitive location for software development was established by the mid-1990s, MNEs began to enter for setting up their dedicated software development centres in the country. It is discussed later.

Firm Size, Profitability and Efficiency

Foreign affiliates have generally been larger than their local counterparts. This is to do with their strategy to employ non-price rivalry such as product differentiation that have substantial economies of scale [Kumar 1991]. As Table 8 shows even with

our sample based on the Prowess database, the average size of foreign firms is larger than that of domestic firms.

The early studies of profitability in Indian industry suggested that foreign affiliates had higher profit margins on sales than their local counterparts in most branches of Indian manufacturing [Kumar 1990a]. A further analysis of the determinants of profit margins of foreign and local firms suggested that the higher profitability of foreign firms was more due to their preference to focus on the less price elastic upper ends of the market with product differentiation and leaving more price competitive lower ends of the market for local firms. The study did not find any evidence of their higher profitability to be due to their better efficiency of resource utilisation [Kumar 1990b]. The trend of higher profit margins of foreign firms is also corroborated by the sample of larger firms that is used for this study even in the post-liberalisation period summarised in Table 8. Table 8 also suggests that foreign affiliates have not only enjoyed consistently higher profit margins, their profit margins have been more stable compared that of local firms.

V

FDI and the Knowledge-Based Economy in India: Software and Global R&D Hub

FDI and Indian Software Industry: Role and the Distribution of Gains

The rise of the IT software and services industry (henceforth software industry) over the 1990s represents one of the most spectacular achievements for the Indian economy.⁶ The industry has grown at an incredible rate of 50 per cent per annum over the past few years, is highly export-oriented, has established India as an exporter of knowledge intensive services in the world, and has brought in a number of other spillover benefits such as of creating employment and new pool of entrepreneurship. The Indian software industry has grown at a phenomenal compound annual rate of over 50 per cent over the 1990s from a modest export revenue of US \$ 100 million in 1989-90 to evolve into over \$ 12 billion export earnings by 2003-04 and has set itself a target of \$ 50 billion of exports by 2008.

The Indian export success in the software industry is primarily driven by local enterprise, resources and talent. The role played by MNEs in software development in India is quite limited. Although all the major software companies have established development bases in India, their overall share in India's exports

Table 8: Average Firm Size in Indian Manufacturing, 1990-2001

Year	Average Sales (Rs Crore)			Profit to Sales Ratio (Per Cent)		
	All Firms	Foreign Firms	Domestic Firms	All Firms	Foreign Firms	Domestic Firms
1990	97.3	119.8	95.1	3.8	6.2	3.5
1991	90.3	125.1	87.0	3.7	7.0	3.3
1992	95.9	141.3	92.0	3.6	6.5	3.2
1993	92.8	153.4	88.1	3.4	6.0	3.1
1994	88.2	172.7	82.8	5.1	7.4	4.8
1995	94.3	191.6	88.7	6.7	9.0	6.4
1996	113.3	247.3	105.7	6.3	8.0	6.0
1997	119.8	269.0	110.9	4.6	7.8	4.1
1998	130.0	285.8	120.3	3.2	8.0	2.5
1999	134.9	304.3	124.0	1.6	7.6	0.7
2000	149.3	348.9	136.5	1.6	8.0	0.6
2001	187.5	395.6	172.9	1.4	7.9	0.3

Source: RIS Database.

of software is rather small at 19 per cent. MNEs do not figure among the top seven software companies in India, ranked either on the basis of overall sales or the exports. Among the top 20 software companies too, no more than six are MNE affiliates or joint ventures. Seventy-nine of the 572 member companies of Nasscom are reported as foreign subsidiaries. Some of these are actually subsidiaries of companies promoted by non-resident Indians in the US while some others were Indian companies to begin with but have been subsequently taken over by foreign companies. The foreign subsidiaries include software development centres of software MNEs and also subsidiaries of other MNEs that develop software for their parents' applications, e.g. subsidiaries of financial services companies such as Citicorp, Deutsche Bank, or telecommunication MNEs such as Hughes, Motorola, among others. In addition MNEs have set up 16 joint ventures with local enterprises such as British Aerospace with Hindustan Aeronautics. In all, 95 companies have controlling foreign participation. The bulk of the entries took place since 1994 by which time India's potential as a base for software development was already established and not the other way round.

What is the distribution of gains of from the activity of MNE subsidiaries in software industry between home and host countries? Apparently some of the MNE subsidiaries in software development are doing pioneering work for their parents, e.g. Oracle Software Development Centre located in Bangalore has been responsible for designing the 'network computer' introduced by Oracle entirely. SAP of Germany has recently launched its internet-enabled distributor reseller management (DRM) solutions for high-tech industry developed entirely at SAP Labs, India, a Bangalore-based subsidiary of SAP. Many other design centres of MNEs in India are doing highly valuable development work for them. However, the Indian subsidiaries of these MNEs do not share the revenue streams generated by their developments worldwide. MNEs tend to invoice the exports of their subsidiaries to them at cost plus 10-15 per cent. Therefore, the distribution of gains is grossly in favour of the home country of MNEs and against the host country, that is India in this case.

Most of the export-oriented software companies operate as 'export enclaves' with little linkages with the domestic economy, if at all. MNE subsidiaries in software development, in particular, derive almost all of their income from exports to their parents. Hence, hardly any vertical linkages are developed with the domestic software market or the rest of the economy. The enclave nature of operation generates very few knowledge spillovers for the domestic economy. The bulk of the work done is also of highly customised nature having little applications elsewhere. Given the high salaries and perks of foreign travel, the movement of personnel from these companies to domestic firms also does not take place. The employees of export-oriented firms are generally lured by foreign companies. However, there is considerable movement of personnel from domestic market-oriented firms to export-oriented firms or foreign subsidiaries. A survey of the software industry suggested that 45.6 per cent of the professionals were recruited by software firms from other companies. The domestic market also supports the exports of products that are first tried locally and are improved on the basis of feedback data generated before being exported. In terms of technological complexity and sophistication, some projects in the domestic market are more advanced and challenging than export projects.

Although the R&D activity of domestic market-oriented MNE affiliates is not high compared to their local counterparts as observed above, MNEs are increasingly looking to India because of her relatively well developed scientific and technological infrastructure and resources for setting up global and regional R&D centres that provide solutions to specific R&D problems for their global operations, besides research collaborations with Indian enterprises having complementary capabilities. This trend has been encouraged by the development of international communication and information technologies (ICT) that allow efficient communication between research groups based in different places across the continents through dedicated networks. This enables MNEs to fragment R&D projects into smaller subprojects some of which could be subcontracted to units located in developing countries having particular skills in that particular branch of knowledge. The internationalisation of R&D conducted in this manner involves little risk of dissipation or diffusion of technology to competitors because of high specificity of the subproject.

A quantitative analysis of the factors explaining the locational pattern of overseas R&D by US and Japanese MNEs suggests that countries that are characterised by a larger scale of technological activity and abundant cheap but qualified R&D manpower are most likely to play host to MNEs' overseas R&D activity [Kumar 2001b]. As observed earlier the Indian government has invested cumulatively in building centres of excellence in different branches of science and technology. These centres coupled with the relative abundance of the country in qualified but cheap R&D manpower has begun attract MNEs to it for setting up global or home-base augmenting R&D centres. Over the past five years, nearly 100 MNEs have set up R&D centres in India. These include GE's \$80 million technology centre at Bangalore that is the largest outside the US and employs 1,600 people. The list of MNEs that have set up global R&D centres in India includes Akzo Nobel, AVL, Bell Labs, Colgate Palmolive, Cummins, Dupont, Daimler-Chrysler, Eli Lilly, GM, HP, Honeywell, Intel, McDonald's, Monsanto, Pfizer, Texas Instruments, Unilever, among many others.

According to some reports the Indian R&D centres of the US MNEs have begun to generate substantial intellectual property for their parents and have filed more than 1,000 patent applications with the US Patent and Trademark Office mostly during the past two years, viz, 2002 and 2003. The Indian centres of multinational technology companies expect to double the number of their employees from 40,000 in 2003. The Indian R&D centres of MNEs have begun to play an important role in knowledge generation for their parents. For instance, 30 per cent of all software for Motorola's latest phones is written in India.⁷

A look at the illustrative cases of global R&D centres, R&D joint ventures and contracts set up by MNEs in India suggests that most of the R&D centres have been motivated primarily by the abundance of highly talented R&D personnel in India at much lower cost than prevailing in the western world [Kumar 1999, for more details]. An Indian engineer, for instance, costs \$ 2,300 per year compared to one with a similar profile in the US for \$ 60,000 pa.

Second, existence of a few internationally renowned public funded centres of excellence, e.g. Indian Institute of Science (IISc), National Chemical Laboratory (NCL), and Indian Institute of Chemical Technology (IICT) have helped India to attract R&D

investments from MNEs. Actually, the Indian research centres of Astra AB and Daimler-Benz were specifically attracted to Bangalore by the prospects of collaboration with IISc. Astra has actually endowed a Chair at IISc to cement its relationship with it and Benz research centre has contracted a project in avionics to IISc. Encouraged by its research contracts with IICT and NCL, Du Pont has set up a separate India Technology Office at its headquarters to systematically target India for its technology search activity. Another feature of these investments is that these are all concentrated in a few Indian cities such as Bangalore or Hyderabad because of high concentration of innovative activities in these areas. Bangalore has also been chosen by a number of ICT MNEs as their base for software development and is widely referred to as India's Silicon Valley.

To sum up, the foregoing discussion on FDI's role in software industry and R&D activity suggests that India's success owes largely to the cumulative investments made by the government over the past five decades in building what is now termed as national innovation systems. These include resources in development of a system of higher education in engineering and technical disciplines, creation of an institutional infrastructure for S&T policy-making and implementation, building centres of excellence and numerous other institutions for technology development, among other initiatives. The Indian government recognised the potential of the country in computer software way back in the early 1970s and started building necessary infrastructure for its fruition, in particular, for training of manpower. The government also facilitated technological capability building with investments in public funded R&D institutions and supporting their projects, by creating computing facilities, and developing infrastructure for data transfer and networking. The patterns of clustering of the software development activity and in particular the case study of Bangalore provides a further evidence to the contention that public funded technological infrastructure has crowded in the investments from private sector in skill intensive activities such as software development. It would appear from this that investments made by governments in national innovation systems have substantial positive externalities.

VI

Concluding Remarks and Policy Lessons

This paper has overviewed the evolution of Indian government's attitude towards FDI, examined the trends and patterns in FDI inflows during the 1990s and has considered its impact on a few parameters of development in a comparative east Asian perspective. The changing policy framework has affected the trends and patterns of FDI inflows received by the country. Although the magnitude of FDI inflows has increased, in the absence of policy direction the bulk of them have gone into services and soft technology consumer goods industries bringing the share of manufacturing and technology intensive among them down in sharp contrast to the east Asian countries. Although the importance of FDI as a source of capital and output generation has risen, its impact on direct investment and growth is mixed as some FDI inflows possibly crowd-in domestic investments while some others crowd it out. Policies like local content regulation where pursued (as phased manufacturing programmes in auto industry) have yielded desirable results. India's experience with respect to fostering export-oriented industrialisation with the help

of FDI has also been much poorer than that of east Asian economies. However, recent analysis suggests that MNEs are beginning to take a serious look at the India's potential as base for export-oriented manufacture. As in the case of the east Asian countries, the performance requirements such as export-obligations wherever imposed (as indirect export-obligations such as dividend-balancing on consumer goods industries) have helped in promoting MNEs to consider using India as a sourcing base thus helping solve information asymmetry or the perception gap on the country's potential.

In terms of technology and R&D, the manufacturing affiliates of MNEs in India seem to be spending a relatively smaller proportion of their turn-over on R&D activity after controlling for extraneous influences. It also appears that R&D activity of MNE affiliates is geared for customisation of their technology for local markets or to work on assignments by their parents in contrast with the focus of the R&D activity of local enterprises on technology absorption and external competitiveness. The case study evidence suggests that joint venture requirements and vertical inter-firm linkages may facilitate diffusion of knowledge-brought in by MNEs.

India is also attracting increasing attention from MNEs as a base for their knowledge-based activities such as software development and global R&D activity. A case study of the MNEs involvement in knowledge-based activities suggests that India's success owes largely to the cumulative investments made by the government over the past five decades in building what is now termed as national innovation systems including resources in development of a system of higher education in engineering and technical disciplines, creation of an institutional infrastructure for S&T policy-making and implementation, building centres of excellence and numerous other institutions for technology development, among other initiatives.

MNE affiliates in India generally enjoy much better and stable profit margins compared to local enterprises largely due to their ability to exploit economies of scale with larger scales of operations and their strategy to focus on less price sensitive upper segments of markets than because of greater efficiency per se.

Policy Lessons

In general, the above analysis brings out the role of government policy in attracting and benefiting from FDI inflows for development. In light of this discussion we may now draw a few policy lessons for India and other similarly placed developing countries.

First of all, liberalisation of FDI policy may be necessary but not sufficient for expanding FDI inflows. The overall macroeconomic performance continues to exercise a major influence on the magnitude of FDI inflows by acting as a signalling device for foreign investors about the growth prospects for the potential host economy. Hence, paying attention to macroeconomic performance indicators such as growth rates of industry through public investments in socio-economic infrastructure and other supportive policies and creating a stable and enabling environment would crowd-in FDI inflows. Studies have shown that policies that facilitate domestic investments also pull in FDI inflows. While investment incentives may not be efficient, active promotion of FDI by developing certain viable projects and getting key MNEs interested in them could be useful in attracting investments in desirable directions.

The evidence presented in the paper and elsewhere suggests that the government policies play an important role in determining the quality or developmental impact of FDI and in facilitating the exploitation of its potential benefits by host country's development. The approval policy followed till 1990 has channelled FDI into the areas where capabilities needed to be built. The various performance requirements such as phased manufacturing programmes, export performance requirements and domestic ownership requirements have also been employed by the government to achieve her developmental policy objectives. Even with liberalised policy some policy direction to FDI is desirable as has been demonstrated by the case of east Asian countries.

One way to maximise the contribution of FDI to the host development is to improve chances of FDI crowding-in domestic investments and minimise the possibilities of it crowd-out domestic investments. In this context, the experiences of south-east Asian countries such as Malaysia, Korea, China, Thailand in channelling FDI into export-oriented manufacturing through selective policies and export performance requirements imposed at the time of entry deserve careful consideration [Kumar 2003a for evidence]. The export-oriented FDI minimises the possibilities of crowding-out of domestic investments and generates favourable spillovers for domestic investments by creating demand for intermediate goods. Another policy that can help in maximising the contribution of FDI inflows is to push them to newer areas where local capabilities do not exist as that minimises the chances of conflict with domestic investments. Some governments such as Malaysia have employed pioneer industry programmes to attract FDI in industries that have the potential to generate more favourable externalities for domestic investment [UNCTAD 1999, 2001, for examples]. Similarly because MNE entry through acquisition of domestic enterprises is likely to generate less favourable externalities for domestic investment than greenfield investments, some governments discourage acquisitions by foreign enterprises [Agosin and Mayor 2000, for examples].

Another sphere where governmental intervention may be required to maximise gains from globalisation is in diffusion of knowledge brought in by foreign enterprises. An important channel of diffusion of knowledge brought in by MNEs in the host economy is vertical inter-firm linkages with domestic enterprises. Many governments – in developed as well as developing countries alike – have imposed local content requirements on MNEs to intensify generation of local linkages and transfer of technology [Kumar *ibid* for evidence]. The host governments could also consider employing proactive measures that encourage foreign and local firms to deepen their local content as a number of countries, e.g., Singapore, Taiwan, Korea and Ireland have done so successfully [Battat et al 1996]. The knowledge diffusion could also be accomplished by creating sub-national or sub-regional clusters of inter-related activities which facilitate the spillovers of knowledge through informal and social contacts among the employees besides traditional buyer-seller links. UNCTAD (2001) also highlights the policy measures employed by different governments in promoting linkages.

Investments made by governments in building local capabilities for higher education and training in technical disciplines, centres of excellence and in other aspects of national innovation systems have substantial favourable externalities as is demonstrated by the case study of FDI in India's knowledge-based industries.

Finally, in light of the above, it is clear that it is of critical importance for the host governments to preserve the policy

flexibility to pursue selective policy or impose performance requirements on FDI, if necessary. Some of the performance requirements have already been outlawed by the WTO's TRIMs Agreement. Attempts have been made by developed countries to expand the scope of international trade rules beyond what is covered under TRIMs and GATS and further limit the policy flexibility available to developing countries by creating a WTO's multilateral framework on investment⁸. However, due to developing country resistance to start WTO negotiations at the Cancun Ministerial Conference of WTO, negotiations on the subject have been dropped from the agenda of Doha Round as per the July package agreed at the General Council Meeting held in Geneva at the end of July 2004. [EW](#)

Email: nkumar@ris.org.in

Notes

[An earlier version of the paper was presented at the Workshop on Foreign Direct Investment and Economic Development organised by the World Bank Institute in Fukuoka, Japan on June 18-19, 2003. It has benefited from many useful comments of participants, in particular of Shujiro Urata, Yu Yongding and Chia Siow Yue and a discussion with K J Joseph. Jayaprakash Pradhan assisted with extracting a number of tables from RIS database. However, the views expressed are author's and should not be attributed to either WBI or RIS.]

- 1 Quality of FDI has been defined in terms of developmental impact in recent literature. See Kumar (2002) for details.
- 2 See Kumar (1998b) for more details.
- 3 http://www.atkearney.com/shared_res/pdf/FDICIOct_2004_S.pdf
- 4 It was first noted by IFC, Washington in 2002; see Pfefferman (2002).
- 5 See government of India Press Note dated June 30, 2003, DIPP, ministry of commerce and industry.
- 6 This discussion draws upon Kumar 2001a.
- 7 As reported in *The Hindu*, December 16, 2003 citing a *New York Times* source.
- 8 see Kumar (2003b) for a more detailed discussion on this.

References

- Agarwal, A (2001): 'Liberalisation, Multinational Enterprises and Export Performance: Evidence from Indian Manufacturing', ICRIER Working Paper, No 69, New Delhi.
- Agosin, M R and Ricardo Mayer (2000): 'Foreign Investment in Developing Countries: Does it Crowd in Domestic Investment?' UNCTAD Discussion Paper, No 146, UNCTAD, Geneva.
- Arthreya, Suma and Sandeep Kapur (1999): 'Foreign-Controlled Manufacturing Firms in India: Long-Term Trends', *Economic and Political Weekly*, November 27, pp M149-51.
- Battat, Joseph, Isiah Frank and Xiaofang Shen (1996): 'Suppliers to Multinationals: Linkage Programmes to Strengthen Local Capability in Developing Countries', FIAs, Washington, DC.
- Fikkert, Brian (1994): 'An Open or Closed Technology Policy? The Effects of Technology Licensing', Foreign Direct Investment, and Technology Spillovers on R&D in Indian Industrial Sector Firms, PhD Dissertation, Yale University, New Haven, CT.
- Fry, Maxwell J (1992): 'Foreign Direct Investment in a Macroeconomic Framework: Finance, Efficiency, Incentives and Distortions', PRE Working Paper, The World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Kumar, Nagesh (1990a): *Multinational Enterprises in India: Industrial Distribution, Characteristics and Performance*, Routledge, London and New York.
- (1990b): 'Mobility Barriers and Profitability of Multinational and Local Enterprises in Indian Manufacturing', *The Journal of Industrial Economics*, 38, 449-61.
- (1991): 'Mode of Rivalry and Comparative Behaviour of Multinational and Local Enterprises: The Case of Indian Manufacturing', *Journal of Development Economics*, 35:381-92.
- (1998b): 'Liberalisation and Changing Patterns of Foreign Direct Investments: Has India's Relative Attractiveness as a Host of FDI Improved?' *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol XXXIII, No 22, May 30.

- (1998c): 'Emerging Outward Foreign Direct Investments from Asian Developing Countries: Prospects and Implications', Nagesh Kumar et al, *Globalisation, Foreign Direct Investment and Technology Transfers: Impacts on and Prospects for Developing Countries*, pp 177-94, Routledge, London and New York.
- (1999): 'Trends, Patterns and Determinants of Overseas R&D Activity of Multinational Enterprises: Evidence from US and Japanese MNEs', *Development Engineering* (Tokyo), Vol 5:21-36.
- (2000a): 'Explaining the Geography and Depth of International Production: The Case of US and Japanese Multinational Enterprises', *Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv*, 136(3): 442-76.
- (2000b): 'Mergers and Acquisitions by MNEs: Patterns and Implications', *Economic and Political Weekly*, August 5, pp 2851-58.
- (2001a): 'Indian Software Industry Development: International and National Perspective', *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol 36, No 45, November 10, pp 4278-90.
- (2001b): 'Determinants of Location of Overseas R&D Activity of Multinational Enterprises: The Case of US and Japanese Corporations', *Research Policy*, Vol 30, pp 159-74.
- (2002): *Globalisation and the Quality of Foreign Direct Investment*, Oxford University Press, Delhi.
- (2003a): Performance Requirements as Tools of Development Policy: Lessons from Experiences of Developed and Developing Countries, RIS Discussion Paper # 52.
- (2003b): 'Investment on the WTO Agenda: A Developing Country Perspective and the Way Forward for the Cancun Ministerial Conference', *Economic and Political Weekly*, 38(30), July 26, 3177-88.
- Kumar, Nagesh and N S Siddharthan (1994): 'Technology, Firm Size and Export Behaviour in Developing Countries: The Case of Indian Enterprises', *Journal of Development Studies*, 31(2): 289-309.
- Kumar, Nagesh and Aradhna Agarwal (2000): 'Liberalisation, Outward Orientation and In-house R&D Activity of Multinational and Local Firms: A Quantitative Exploration for Indian Manufacturing', RIS Discussion paper #07/2002.
- Kumar, Nagesh and Neelam Singh (2002): 'The Use and Effectiveness of Performance Requirements: The Case of India', RIS, New Delhi.
- Kumar, Nagesh and Jaya Prakash Pradhan (2002): 'Foreign Direct Investment, Externalities and Economic Growth in Developing Countries: Some Empirical Explorations and Implications for WTO Negotiations on Investment', RIS Discussion Paper #27/2002
- (2003): 'Export Competitiveness in Knowledge-based Industries: A Firm-Level Analysis of Indian Manufacturing', RIS Discussion Paper (RIS-DP): #43/2003, New Delhi.
- Moran, Theodore H (1998): *Foreign Direct Investment and Development*, Institute for International Economics, Washington, DC.
- (2001): *Parental Supervision: The New Paradigm for Foreign Direct Investment and Development*, Washington, DC.
- Pfeffermann, G (2002): 'Business Environment and Surveys, Paradoxes: China vs India' presentation made at 2002 PSD Forum Session on 'Investment Climate Assessment Methodology: The Investment Climate in India and China - Which Is Better?', <http://rru.worldbank.org/psdforum/forum2002/documents/Pfeffermann.ppt>.
- Rosen, D (1999): *Behind the Open Door: Foreign Enterprise Establishment in China*, Institute for International Economics, Washington, DC.
- Sharma, Kishor (2000): 'Export Growth in India: Has FDI Played a Role?' Centre Discussion Paper No 816, Economic Growth Centre, Yale University, New Haven, CT.
- Srivastava, Sadhana (2003): 'What Is the True Level of FDI Flows to India?', *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol XXXVIII, No 7, February, pp 608-10.
- UNCTAD (1999): *World Investment Report 1999*, United Nations, New York.
- (2002): *World Investment Report 2002*, United Nations, New York.
- (2003): *Use and Effectiveness of Performance Requirements: Select Case Studies*, United Nations, New York.
- (2004): *World Investment Report 2004*, United Nations, New York.