

Investigating the Impact of Market Power on Foreign Direct Investment Absorption in Concentrated and Unconcentrated Industries in Iran

Behnaz Heidarzadeh¹, Mohammad Nabi Shahiki Tash²

Abstract

The central purpose of this thesis is investigating the relationship between market structure and absorption of foreign direct investment in Iran manufacturing industries. Four firm concentration ratio and Herfindahl -Hirschman index are used to measure market power. Analysis of these indexes determines the concentrated and monopoly in the market and also provides a good background for understanding the relationship between market structure with FDI. In other words, this research seeks to answer that the 10 industries in ISIC based on two-digit code in Iran industries during 1996 to 2008 have what market structure (concentrated or unconcentrated) and what effect it has on absorption of FDI. Using regression analysis and panel data model, estimation results of model showed that there is a negative relationship between concentrated market structures with absorption of FDI. In Iran industries there is a positive relationship between export and economic scales with FDI.

Keywords: Foreign Direct Investment, Market Power, Market Structure.

1. Introduction

Theoretically, capital accumulation is one of the fundamental prerequisites for economic growth process that can be financed by domestic (savings) and overseas funds. Overseas funding is not only the supplement to domestic saving and fills the saving-investment gap, but also it is a solution to deal with the foreign exchange gap. In developing countries, foreign funds, includes mutual aid from developed countries, financial flows originating from multiple sources such as the World Bank and regional banks, indirect investment (FPI) and foreign direct investment (FDI). Regardless of the outcome of the first two which contributed to the debt crisis and the debt-service problems and Most often carried by government and governmental institutions such as the IMF and the World Bank, two recent cases are taken place by private sector and multinational companies (MNCs) and they are referred to as private capital flows (Barclay 2000 & Thirlwall 1999-2000 & Chan 1995). Foreign portfolio investment which is opposed to foreign direct investment, includes investments by foreign individual and legal entities to purchase securities of companies and financial institutions and during this process, no one can have control over their money in the host country. Absolute returns, high liquidity and being short term investment are particular attractions of foreign indirect investment for investors. The experience of countries in Southeast Asia and South America suggests that the volatility of foreign indirect investment in terms of external financing could not be considered as a support for the host country. In fact among financing options, countries are obliged to assign less weight to this type of investment. In contrast, it seems that foreign direct investment entering the developing country during 1980-2000 has become almost 30 times and from \$ 8263 million has reached to \$ 240167 million, compared with the entire international financial flows emanating from non-private institutions in this period which has only 2-fold increase, this issue requires more thought (UNCTAD 2001). In the course of economic development of countries, industrial development is fundamentally important. Issues such as economic interdependence and balance of payments deficits are found mainly in this section. In connection with the development of mentioned sector, one of the main issues is to attract foreign investment in the industrial sector. Because investors are looking for more market share in developing countries they are seeking suitable and lucrative opportunities to transfer their capital to foreign markets. One of the structural factors related to the market is the market power. This means that investors based on their self-assessment, invest in another country with the aim of gaining more market share and higher profit margin in a particular industry. In this research, we try to answer to this question "whether concentrated structure in industry has impact on FDI inflow?" To explore this question in this research, using data on FDI entry from Iran's Foreign Investment and International Aid Organization and data on Herfindahl -

¹ Department of Business Administration, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran.

² Faculty Member of Sistan and Baluchestan University

Hirschman index and four firm concentration ratios retrieved from the study "Evaluation of nonparametric concentration on Iran's industries. Khdadadkashi & Shahikitash, 2010" we investigate and assess industries on this Issue. Herfindahl -Hirschman index indicates the amount of industry's market share and four firm concentration ratios reflects the contribution of the industry's four top firm in the market. Then we turn to examine monopolistic structure and concentration in industries. The basic calculations are done using Excel software. To test the hypothesis, the research model uses panel data regression analysis as well as diagnostic tests of model and effect. Rest of the paper is organized as follows: Section two deals with foreign direct investment. The third section is devoted to literature review. In the next sections, we analyze the data and model results and finally conclusions are presented.

2. Foreign Direct Investment in Iran's Industry

Foreign direct investment in Iran's economy plays a leading role in the transmission of technology and modern management. Iran having the relative advantage of the abundant investment opportunities in various economic and industrial sectors including favorable climate, strategic location and easy access to regional markets, Also, with oil, gas resources, mining, and agricultural industries..., can grow well in attracting foreign investment in various industries (Saremi, 2003). According to UNCTAD statistics for the year 2010, volume of foreign investment in Iran's industrial sector reached to the total amount of \$ 1,030,320,190 and in this year first, second and third ranked in attracting FDI are respectively the tobacco industry, manufacturing basic metals, food and beverage industry. In 2009 the amount of foreign capital entering the industry, was total amount of \$ 705,396,360 and in this year first place belongs to the chemical, petroleum, rubber and plastic industry which is roughly 93/74% of total FDI in the industrial sector accounted for this industry. Second place belongs to food and beverage industry and tobacco with share of 64/13% and third place belongs to the Manufacture of basic metals industry with 3% of total FDI. Minimum volume of investments owned by pharmaceutical industry, recycling industry, non-metallic minerals except petroleum and coal products and transportation equipment and automotive industry. The following table shows each industry's share of the total FDI in 2008.

Table1: Industry's share of total FDI in 2008

ISIC code	industry	FDI
15	Food and Beverage	% 22
16	Tobacco products-cigarettes	% 3
17	Textile and leather	% 0.38
21	Paper production, publishing, printing and printed media	% 5.47
24	chemical, petroleum, rubber and plastic industry	% 29
26	Non-metallic mineral products	% 0.05
27	Manufacture of basic metals	% 38
28	Fabricated metal products, machinery and equipment	% 1.44
32	Production of communication devices and appliances	% 0.11
34	Production of motor vehicles and trailers and other transportation equipment	% 0.19

3. Literature Review

A review of previous studies indicates that the effect of industry concentration on FDI entry into the host country is a controversial subject. The results of some studies indicate that there is a negative correlation between the concentration of industry and FDI attraction ([Forte&Sarmiento2012](#), [Zhuang&Zuo 2009](#), [Frage 2007](#), [Francois&Wooton 2007](#),[Luo& Tan 1997](#), [Lundin&Sjöholm2007](#),[Sjoholm 1997](#),[Chari &Nandini2006](#)) Whileotherstudiessuggesta positive association between these two variables ([Hao&Lahiri 2009](#), [Campa & Donnenfeld 1998](#)).Also, some researchers have concluded that there are both positive and negative relationship between the degree of market power with FDI attraction ([Barrios&Gorg2005](#)).

Due to the lack of consensus regarding the effect of market power on FDI attraction and lack of similar studies in Iran, we decided to investigate the effect of market power unconcentrated and unconcentrated industries to attract FDI in Iran's industrial sectors. We are trying to obtain empirical evidence on this issue using FDI inflow data based ontwo digitISIC code during1996-2008 and four-firm concentration and Herfindahl indices during this period as well as panel data estimates.

Table 2: summary of literature review

Researcher, (year of publication)	country	Variables	methodology	results
Forte and Sarmiento (2012)	Portugal	Market concentration, FDI, economies of scale, capital, advertising, R & D, market size and growth	Panel data estimates in the manufacturing sector during 2006-2009	FDI has a significant negative impact on industry concentration.
Barrios & Gorg (2005)	Ireland	FDI, number of firms, industry growth rate, competitiveness	Semi-parametric regression techniques on firm-level panel data for the manufacturing sector	At the beginning competitive effect to FDI may prevent domestic firms from entering the market, but the effect is gradually losing market conditions that led to the creation of a positive effect of FDI on industry in host country.
Hao & Lahiri (2009)	U.S.	FDI, industry size, exports, industry Efficiency	Partial equilibrium models	International companies invest in a concentrated market structure which is less active and less competitive. It is preferable to invest in a country that doesn't participate in global markets and has a small industry.
Kadochnikov & Drapkin (2008)	Russia	Market Structure, FDI, backlinks	Cases of imperfect competition in local companies merged with the parent company	Competitive market can't guarantee a positive impact on FDI absorption.
Zhuang & Zuo (2009)	U.S. & China	Market structure, intellectual property rights (IPR), technology, FDI, monopoly power		Monopolistic market will reduce the amount of FDI and technology is transferred through channel of FDI to the host country.
Frage (2007)	U.S.	FDI, exports, Competition	Empirical estimates based on gravity model years 1997-2002 for industries	In Competitive industries, FDI and exports are complementary and in industries which the competition is low, they are alternatives.
Campa & Doornik (1998)	U.S.	Market Structure, FDI, exports, tariffs	Conceptual model and test sample of manufacturing industries	FDI in industries with high concentration is higher. High tariffs reduce foreign direct investment and increase imports.
Luo & Tan (1997)	China	Market Structure, FDI, exports, sales, profitability, growth rate, size of the industry	The combination of the general linear model (GLM) and multivariate regression (MANOVA) industry between 1988-1991	Monopolistic power in market is negatively related to attracting FDI.
Lundin & Sjöholm (2007)	China	FDI, competitiveness, R&D	panel data econometric models industry-level 1998-2004	FDI increases competition, but there is no strong evidence indicating that competition affects investments in research and development.
Maioli & Ferrero (2005)	U.K. & Respective	FDI, international trade,	Econometric models, panel	FDI in host country's greenfield has a negative effect on the profitability

	countries	competition, industry concentration, margin profits	data analysis firm-level 1991-2001	of industrial sites because new manufacturing capacity added to the host country, which increases the competitiveness of local shops and reduces their profit margins.
Sjoholm (1997)	Indonesia	Technology, FDI, Profitability	Indonesia's industrial sector panel data 1991-1980	There are overflows of FDI in highly competitive industries. Also, the technology gap between foreign and domestic firms is larger, the spillovers are higher.
Pant & Mondal (2010)	India	Market power, FDI, natural monopolies, labor, market share, profitability	Panel data relating to industry-level 1990-1988	Firms with a high concentration in industry prevent the entry of FDI. But when foreign investors enter the industry, active firms are experiencing a sharp decline in market share and profits.
Yin (1999)	China	Pricing, profitability, FDI, tax incentives, market structure, technology	Evaluation of tax incentives to attract foreign funds	If host country provides more tax relief for foreign companies, resulted in reducing the overall output and price index increases. More foreign firms will enter the industry while the domestic companies will be forced out of the industry. Thus, depending on the market structure and degree of industry concentration, the host country must have different preferential tax treatment for foreign investors.
Francois & Wooton (2007)	Austria	Competition, market power, international trade, FDI	combination of linear and nonlinear modeling for industry	Links between competitiveness and foreign trade resulted in liberalization of services trade-in cross-country. This freedom would extend to industry and trade of goods and lead to increased FDI which in turn causes an increase in capital of the service sector related to manufacturing in the host country.
Haller (2005)	Italy	FDI, competition	Model in the impact of different ways of market entry of multinational companies to host countries	FDI will increase competition in the market if it does not face with anti-competitive behavior by domestic firms.

4. Variables and model

In this research, the dependent variable is net foreign direct investment to the Iran's industrial sector. Independent variables mentioned in the literature include:

Herfindahl index: an indication of the industry's share of the market which considers share of total square size of firms as share of each firm.

$$HHI = \sum_{i=1}^n S_i^2$$

Profit margin: refers to company's profit with regard to cost of sales or cost of goods sold. In other words, it refers to the level of management efficiency in the utilization of labor resources.

$$pcmg = \frac{\text{price} - \text{marginal cost}}{\text{price}}$$

Economies of scale: One of the criteria for assessing the degree of competitive or monopolistic markets. they are one of the basic barriers to entry to a market. Thus the Economies of scale larger in a market, the entry of new firms into the market more difficult (Modigliani1958).

Government share: represents the government’s share in economic activities in Iran.

Export: sendinggoods outside ofthegeographic boundariesso as for salesand international trade.

The mainhypothesisof this research is:"Does marketpower have an effect ontheentryofFDIin industrial sector of Iran?" To test the hypothesis, we use data of FDI inflow from the organization of Foreign Investment and International Aid in Iran and the Herfindahl index and four firm concentration ratios.Herfindahl -Hirschman index indicates the amount of industry’s market share and four firm concentration ratio reflects the contribution of the industry's four top firm in the market. Then we turn to examine monopolistic structure and concentration in industries. The basic calculation is done using Excel software. To test the hypothesis, the research model uses panel data regression analysis as well as diagnostic tests of model and effect. Testsandmodel estimating are done using econometric EViews7software.The research model is presentedinEquation 1.to identify the type of model, F- Limer and the fixed effectsmodelor random effects,Hausman testwere used.

$$FDI_{it} = \alpha + \beta_1HHI_{it} + \beta_2PCMG_{it} + \beta_3MES_1 + Sngov_{it} + EX_{it} + \varepsilon_{it}$$

In which: FDI: Net foreign direct investment, HHI: Herfindahl- Hyrshmnindex, PCMG: Profit margin, MES: Economies of scale, Sngov: share of Irangovernment in economic activities,EX:Exports.

5. DataAnalysis

To test the hypothesis, the research model uses panel data regression analysis and also diagnostic tests of model and effect. Testsand model estimating are done using econometric EViews7software.to identify the type of model, F- Limer and the fixed effectsmodelor random effects,Hausman testwere used.

Model estimating requires the use of panel data techniques that combine time series data and cross-sectional data which have several benefits including increased number of observations, increasing the degrees of freedom, reduction in the variance anisotropy and reduction in multi-co linearity among the variables. We estimate the model using panel data for 10 industrial sectors in the ISIC two-digit code in Iran during 1996-2008.

At first, we should answer to this question that “Is there any evidence proving that it is possible to Pooling data? Or the model has different cross-sectional units?” It should be investigated whether the heterogeneity between sections or individual differences exist or not? If there is heterogeneity we use panel data approach to estimate, otherwise, the data fusion approach with ordinary least squares (OLS) model is used to estimate. F test is performed for this purpose. In this test the zero hypothesis H_0 is equality of intercept (data fusion) and in contrast, the opposite hypothesis H_1 is different Intercept (using panel data). Results of F test for identifying model are shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Results of model identification

	Statistic	d.f.	Prob.
F	8.751908	(9,90)	0.0000
Chi-square	65.385881	9	0.0000

Result of F test is approximately 8.751908. Since the calculated F value is greater than the F table so H_0 is rejected. There is heterogeneity and individual differences in sections, as a result, panel data techniques are appropriate. After selection of panel data approach by F test, in order to choose between fixed and random effects Hausman test has been used. The Hausman test statistic is calculated for determining fixed or random differences in cross-sectional units and it has Distribution of chi-square and degree of freedom is the number of independent variables.

Table 4: Hausman test summary

	Chi-Sq. Statistic	Chi-Sq. d.f.	Prob.
cross-section random	5.566786	4	0.2339

According to the result of Hausman test and calculated probability given in table 4, H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted in 95% confidence level, which implies the use of fixed effects method. In following table according to the model presented, examination of effects of independent variables on FDI inflow in the industry is presented.

Table 5: Impact of market structure on FDI

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	-2.726738	4.017905	-0.678647	0.4991
SNGOV?	-2.235520	2.350478	-0.951092	0.3441
LEX?	0.366734	0.186143	1.970178	0.0519
HHI?	-0.984236	2.624693	-0.374991	0.7085
LOG(K?)	0.083480	0.140410	0.594547	0.5536

In this research the Herfindahl-Herishm index (HHI) is considered as a proxy for the market structure. Results show there is a negative relationship between market structure and FDI attraction in studied industries. It means higher monopolistic industries have not been successful in attracting FDI, and more competitive industries have been more successful in attracting FDI. Based on results of the regression model is expected that in increasing one degree in competition of industrial markets, there would be 92/0 per cent increase in FDI attraction (By contrast, increasing the degree of monopoly decreases 92/0 per cent of FDI). Results also show a negative relationship between ownership structure (public or private) and attracting FDI. Furthermore, the results suggest a positive relationship between exports (Participation of enterprises in world markets) and FDI.

6. Conclusions

In this research, results of the econometric models show that if the market structure is concentrated in an industry and competitive conditions are not dominant, the industry will not be successful in attracting FDI and there is a negative relationship between FDI with concentrated market structure. There is also a negative relationship in industries that government ownership is dominant and government owns most of the market and plays a major role in industry. Based on results of this research, industries that have more capital, and have active participation in world markets by their exports, have been successful in attracting foreign direct investment so they have imported greater FDI flows to the industry. Thus, the export and capital have a positive relationship with FDI absorption and also MNCs tend to invest in such industries. Other factors related to the characteristics of industries that have had an effect on attracting FDI are economies of scale (the optimal level of production) that in this research the relationship between economies of scale with foreign direct investment is evaluated positive.

References:

- Adelman, M. (1951). The Measurement of Industrial Concentration. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 33: 296-305.
- Agiomirganakis, G. & Asterio, D. & Papatoma, 2006, "The Determinants of Foreign Direct Investment : A Panel Data Study for the OECD Countries", Department of Economics, City University London, No. 03/06.
- Agarwal, J.P. (1980). Determinants of foreign direct investment: a survey. *Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv*, 106, 739-77. [Online] Available: <http://ideas.repec.org/a/spr/weltar/v116y1980i4p739-773.html>.
- Aloya, M., 2004, "Do South Countries of the Mediterranean Basin Really Benefit from Foreign Direct Investment?" G.E.F. University Of Montesquieu – Bordeaux IV.
- Alfaro, I., & Chanda, A., & Özcan, S., & Sayek, S., 2003, "Foreign Direct Investment Spillovers, Financial Markets and Economic Development." IMF Working Paper WP/03/86.
- Alfaro, I., & Chanda, A., & Özcan, S., & Sayek, S., 2006, "How Dose Foreign Direct Investment Promote Economic Growth? Exploring the Effect of Financial Markets on Linkage", NEOUDC. Macroeconomic Meeting and University of Oregon for Useful Comments and Suggestions.
- Alfaro, I., & Chanda, A., & Özcan, S., & Sayek, S., 2002, "FDI and Economic Growth: the Role of Local Financial markets", The views expressed in this paper are those of the authors and not necessarily represent those of the IMF. April.

- Azzam, A.M. 1997, "Measuring Market Power and Cost-Efficiency Effect of Industrial Concentration", *The journal of industrial economics*. 45(4), 377-386.
- Bain, J. S. (1951). *Relation of Profit Rate to Industry Concentration: American Manufacturing, 1936-40*, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 65: 293-324.
- Baltagi, B., (2005). *Econometric Analysis of Panel Data*, John Wiley & Sons Ltd, Third Edition.
- Besancenot, D. & Vranceanu, R., 2001, "Manager Honesty and Foreign Investment in development countries", *Research in Economics* (2006) 56.
- Bikker, J., Haaf, K., 2002. Competition, concentration and their relationship: An empirical analysis of the banking industry. *Journal of Banking and Finance* 26, 2191-2214.
- Blomstrom, M., & Kokke, A., & Zeng, M., 2003, "Host country Competition and Technology transfer by multinationals" *Welt Wirtschafts Archiv*, Band 130.
- Borenztein, E., 1989, "The Effect of External Debt on Investment", *Finance and Development*, Sep.
- Busse, M. & Griozard, J., 2008, "FDI, Regulations and Growth", Homburg Institute of International Economic. (HWWA), *never Jungfernsige* 21,20347 Homburg Germany.
- Carison, M., & Hernandez, I., 2002, "Determinant and Repercussion of the Composition of Capital Inflows", IMF, WP0/2/86.
- Casson M. 1979, "Alternatives to Multinational Enterprise", London Macmillan Press, XIII.
- Caves R. 1974, "Multinational Corporations, Competitors and productivity in Host Country Markets", *Economical Journal*, Vol. 41.
- Chan B. & schahidur R. 1997, "Effect of Inward Foreign Direct Investment on the Singapore Economy", *East-Asia Economic Issues*, Vol. III, W.W.ac.NBER.
- Chow Y. & Zeng J. 2001, "Foreign Capital in a Neoclassical model of Growth", *Applied economics letters*, Vol. 8.
- Clarke, R., S.W.Davies (1972), *Market structure and price-cost Margin*, *Economica*.
- Davies, S. W. (1980). *Measuring Industrial Concentration: An Alternative Approach*. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 62: 306-309.
- Dehejia H. & weichenrieder J. 2001, "Tariff Jumping Foreign Investment and Capital Taxation", *Journal of International Economics*, Vol. 51.
- Diewert, W.E., 1974, "Duality Approches to Microeconomic Theory", in *Handbook of Mathematical Economics*, ED.K.J. Arrow and M.D. Intriligator. Amsterdam: North Holland, Vol. 2.
- Donsimoni, Mari- Paule, Paul Geroski, Alexis Jacquemin, "Concentration Indices and Market Power: Two Views", *The Journal of Industrial Economic*, No.4, (June 1984), p.419.
- Egger P. & Pfaffermayr M. 2002, "A Note on Labour Productivity and Foreign Direct Investment" *Austrian Institute of Economic Research*.
- Elo K. 2007, "The Effect of Capital on Foreign Direct Investment Decision Under Country Risk With Intangible Assets", IMF. Working Paper /07/79.
- Ermisch . & Heinz A. 2000, "The Impact of Political Instability on FDI : an Econometric study of Direct Investment from united Kingdom and united states in Canada across Industries and over time", IMF. Working Paper/21/132.
- Estalon S. 2006, "Impact of Financial Markets on FDI", Working Paper of EstiPank, No. 28.
- Aethi A. 2007, "Technological Progress FDI and Investment Climate the case study of Tunisian industry", Working Paper of EL Manar University.
- Fontage L. 1999, "Exchange Rate Strategies in Competition Attracting FDI", SSRN WP/99/60.
- Gastanga M. & Nougent J. & Pashamova B. 1998, "Host Country Reform and FDI Inflows : How much difference do they make?", *World Development Report* Vol. 5, No. 7, 199-1314.

- Gerda D. & Holger G. & Cotia M., 2003, "Should I Stay or Should I Go? A Note on Employment Protection, Domestic Anchorage, and FDI", Discussion Paper No.848 (IZADP No. 848).
- Goldberg I. 2004, "Financial- sector Foreign Direct Investment and Host Countries : New and Old Lessons", Federal Reserve Bank of New York Staff Reports, Vol. 183.
- Good Speed T. & Vazquez J. & Zhang L. 2006, "Are Other Government Policies more Important than Taxation in Attracting FDI?", Georgia state University.
- Hall, M. and N. Tideman (1976), Measures of Concentration, Journal of American Statistic, Vol 92, PP. 162-68.
- Hause, J.S. 1977, "The measurement of concentrated industrial structure and the size distribution of firms", Annual of economic and social measurement 6, 73-107.
- Herfindahl, O. C. (1950). Concentration in the US Steel Industry. Ph. D. Thesis, Columbia University.
- Hirshman, A. O. (1964). The Paternity of an Index. American Economic Review, 54: 761-762.
- Honnah, L. and J. A. Kay (1977), Concentration in modern industry, Macmillian, London.
- Harrison E. & Macmillan M. 2003, "Dose Direct Foreign Investment affect Domestic Credit Constraints?", Journal of international Economic Vol. 61.
- Hausman, J., (1978). Specification Test in Econometrics, Econometrica 46(6), 1251-1271.
- Hurat, P.E.(1971), Entropy and other measures of concentration, Journal of The Royal Statistics Society, series A.
- Jen ins R. 1991, "Transnational Corporations and Uneven Development", Routledge Publication, London.
- Jun J. 1989, "Tax plié and International Direct Investment", Cambridge National Economic Research WP/No.3048.
- Kathuria, V. & Das, S., 2005, "Impact of FDI on R & D Strategies Firms in the past –1991 Era", IMF Conference.
- Kwaka, J. 1985, "The Herfindahl Index in theory and Practice", Antitrust Bulletin 30, 915-947.
- Lallis S. 2004, "FDI and Development : Policy and Research Issues in Emerging Context" Working Paper of Oxford University, No. 43.
- Lerner A. P. (1934), The Concept of Monopoly and the Measurement of Monopoly Power, R. Econ. Stud. Vol. 1, PP. 157-75.
- Lihong Y. 2006, "Determination of Export Intensity and FDI presence Case of Manufacturing of Guangdong Province", the People Republic of China, logistics and Management, Vol. 2, No.3.
- Loungani P. & Razin A. 2001, "How beneficial is Foreign Direct Investment for Development Countries", Finance and Development Journal Vol. 38, Issue 2.
- Lyer K. & Rambaldi A. & Tang K. 2004, "Measuring spill Overs from Alternative Forms of Foreign Investment School Of Economics", University of Queensland, St Lucia, QLD. 4072, Australia.
- Marfels, C. 1971, " Absolute and Relative measures of concentration reconsidered", Kyklos 24. 753-766.
- Menil G. 2005, "Why should the Portfolios of Mandatory private Pension be Found Capital? (The foreign Investment Question)", Journal of Banking and Finance, Vol. 29.
- Modigliani, F. 1958, "The Cost of Capital, Corporation Finance and the Theory of Investment," American Economic Review, 48, 3 (June 1958), pp. 261–97, with Merton Miller
- Ongena, S., and D.C. Smith (2001): "The duration of bank relationships", Journal of Financial Economics, 61: 449-475.
- Polache S. seiglie C. & Xing J. 2005, "Globalization and International conflict : Can FDI Increase Peace?", Rutgers University Newark, Working Paper, No. 004.
- Ramos A. 2001, "Foreign Direct Investment as Catalyst For Human Capital Accumulation", Submitted in Fulfillment of the MALD Thesis Requirement, Fletcher School, Tufts University, Boston.
- Reder, Melvin W. "Chicago economics: Permanence and Change", Journal of Economic Literature, 20(1), (March 1982), pp.1-38.
- Richard, "Using the H.Index of concentration with Published Data Review of Economics and Statistics", Vol. 59, No.2, (May 1977), p.1.

- Rosenbluth, G. 1955, "Measures of concentration in business concentration and price policy", National bureau committee for economic research, Princeton, 57-99.
- Scherer, F.M. 1979, "The causes and consequences of rising industrial concentration", journal of law and economics. 22. April, P.191-201.
- Solow R. 1957, "Technical change and the Aggregate Production Function", Review of Economics and Statistics, Vol. 39.
- Stigler ,G.J (1968), The organization of industry, Homework, Illinois.
- Stiglitz, J.E. 1993, Economics, Norton.
- Taylor L. 1994, "Gap Models Journal of Development", Economics Vol. 45.
- Ulrich, 2005, "Anti Unfair Competition Law and Antitrust Law. EIU.Law. P,915.
- UNCTAD 2001, "World Investment Reports", Promoting Lin age United Nations, New York.
- UNCTAD 2005, "The Impact of FDI on Development: Globalization of R & D by Transnational Corporations an Implications for Developing Countries", New York.
- UNCTAD, 2008, "World Investment Report".
- UNCTAD, 2011, "World Investment Report".
- Urata S. 1998, "Japanese Foreign Direct Investment in Asia Its Impact on Export Expansion and Technolog Acquisition of the Host Economics", Waseda University and Japan Center for Economic Research, PP. 14-164.
- Vahter P. &Masso J. 2005, "Home Versus Host Country Effects of FDI: searching for New Evidence of Productivity Spillovers Working Paper of FastiPank, No. 13.
- White, A.P. 1982, "A note on market structure measures and the characteristics of the market that they measure", Southern economic journal, 542-549.
- William d. 1999, "Foreign Manufacturing Firms in UK: Effects on Employments output and Supplier Linkages", European Business Reviewing, Vol. 99.
- Yergin Daniel A. and Joseph Stanislaw, Battle for the World Economy, Paperback, TheChicago School, Excerpt from Commanding Heights, 1998, pp. 2-3.