


ISSN 0003 - 6846 VOLUME 45 NUMBERS 1-3 JAN 2013

APPLIED ECONOMICS

EDITOR MARK TAYLOR
CO-EDITOR DAVID A. PEEL

 **Routledge**
Taylor & Francis Group



Applied Economics


Country	United Kingdom
Subject Area and Category	Economics, Econometrics and Finance Economics and Econometrics
Publisher	Routledge
Publication type	Journals
ISSN	00036846
Coverage	1977-ongoing

62

H Index

Scope Applied Economics is a peer-reviewed journal encouraging the application of economic analysis to specific problems in both the public and private sectors. It particularly fosters quantitative studies, the results of which are of use in the practical field, and thus helps to bring economic theory nearer to reality. Contributions which make use of the methods of mathematics, statistics and operations research will be welcomed, provided the conclusions are factual and properly explained. ([source](#))

Quartiles










SJR



Citations per document





← Show this widget in your own website

Just copy the code below and paste within your html code:

```
<a href="http://www.scimagc
```

Developed by:



Powered by:



Follow us on Twitter

Scimago Lab, Copyright 2007-2017. Data Source: Scopus®

EST MODUS IN REBUS
Horatio (Satire 1.1.106)

APPLIED ECONOMICS

VOLUME 45 NUMBERS 1-3 ISSN 0003-6846

Contents

B. Lucke		F. Bilgel and K. C. Tran	
Testing the technology interpretation of news shocks	1	The determinants of Canadian provincial health expenditures: evidence from a dynamic panel	201
E. Fatás, N. Georgantzis, J. A. Máñez and G. Sabater		S. Hammoudeh, M. Nandha and Y. Yuan	
Experimental duopolies under price guarantees	15	Dynamics of CDS spread indexes of US financial sectors	213
J. H. Park and D. L. MacLachlan		H.-C. Chou, R. Zaabar and D. Wang	
Estimating willingness to pay by risk adjustment mechanism	37	Measuring and testing the long-term impact of terrorist attacks on the US futures market	225
C. P. Barros, A. G. de Menezes and J. C. Vieira		V. Carrieri and M. Bilger	
Measurement of hospital efficiency, using a latent class stochastic frontier model	47	Preventive care: underused even when free. Is there something else at work?	239
C. I. Tra		V. Tuesta	
Nonlinear income effects in random utility models: revisiting the accuracy of the representative consumer approximation	55	The consumption-real exchange rate anomaly: nontraded goods and distribution services	255
H. J. Faría, H. M. Montesinos-Yufa, D. R. Morales, C. G. Aviles B. and O. Brito-Bigott			
Does corruption cause encumbered business regulations? An IV approach	65	D. Kim, J. I. Kim and T. Sung	
K. Fukuda		Stock market liberalization and price response: gradualism versus cold turkey	273
Decomposition of new venture growth into firm age, survey period and vintage effects	85	J. M. Santos	
N. G. Vaillant and F.-C. Wolff		Trading grain now and then: the relative performance of early grain-futures markets	287
Understanding how experts rate cigars: a 'havanometric' analysis	99	C. Grund and A. Schmitt	
M. P. Olivero and R. Madak		Works councils, wages and job satisfaction	299
Financial integration within Europe and the international transmission of business cycles among industrialized countries	111	I. Martínez-Zarzoso	
N. Winchester and R. T. Stefani		The log of gravity revisited	311
An innovative approach to National Football League standings using bonus points	123	J. Klomp and J. De Haan	
C. H. Hsieh and F. Lin		Do political budget cycles really exist?	329
Applying digital analysis to detect fraud: an empirical analysis of US marine industry	135	A. Direr	
		Are betting markets efficient? Evidence from European Football Championships	343
B. Tadesse and E. K. Shukralla		P. H. van der Meer and R. Wielers	
The impact of foreign direct investment on horizontal export diversification: empirical evidence	141	What makes workers happy?	357
C. Martínez-Sola, P. J. García-Teruel and P. Martínez-Solano		T. Ng, T. Tai-Leung Chong, M.-T. Siu and B. Everard	
Corporate cash holding and firm value	161	What determines the price of a racing horse?	369
V. A. Dang		Suyanto and R. Salim	
Testing capital structure theories using error correction models: evidence from the UK, France and Germany	171	Foreign direct investment spillovers and technical efficiency in the Indonesian pharmaceutical sector: firm level evidence	383
H.-C. (River) Huang and C.-C. Yeh		J. E. Askildsen and T. H. Holmås	
Okun's law in panels of countries and states	191	Wages and work conditions as determinants for physicians' work decisions	397

Applied Economics is published three times a month by Routledge, an imprint of Taylor & Francis, 4 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon OX14 4RN, UK. This journal is subject to a peer-review process. A full listing of Taylor & Francis publications is available at <http://www.tandfonline.com>

Subscription rates

In 2013 a subscription to Volume 45 of *Applied Economics* will consist of 36 issues of *Applied Economics*, 18 issues of *Applied Economics Letters* and 24 issues of *Applied Financial Economics*. It is also possible to subscribe to a combination of *Applied Economics* and *Applied Financial Economics*, details of which are available on request.

The 2013 subscription rates of Volume 45 (36 issues) are: US\$11765; £7128; €9411. Online only: US\$10294; £6237; €8235 (plus tax where applicable). Prices include Internet access to the journal.

All subscription enquiries should be addressed to:

UK/Europe/Rest of the World – Routledge Journals, T&F Customer Services, T&F Informa UK Ltd, Sheepen Place, Colchester, Essex, CO3 3LP, UK. Tel: +44 (0) 20 7017 5544. Fax: +44 (0) 20 7017 5198.

USA/Canada – Routledge Journals, Taylor & Francis Inc., Journals Department, 325 Chestnut Street, 8th Floor, Philadelphia, PA 19106, USA. Tel: +1 (215) 269 0400. Fax: +1 (215) 269 0363.

Japan – Routledge Journals, Kinokuniya Co. Ltd, Journals Department, PO Box 55, Chitose, Tokyo 156, Japan.

India – Routledge Journals, Universal Subscriptions Agency Pvt Ltd, 877 Phase V, Udyog Vihar, Gurgaon, 122001, India.

Journals are sent second-class in the UK and by air speeded post or air freight to most other countries.

Applied Economics (USPS permit number 020 956) is published three times a month. Printed copies of *Applied Economics* are produced 12 times a year in January, February, March, April, May, June, July, August, September, October, November and December, each containing 3 issues. The 2013 US institutional subscription price is \$11765. Periodicals postage paid at Jamaica, NY by US Mailing Agent Air Business Ltd, c/o Worldnet Shipping USA Inc., 149-35 177th Street, Jamaica, New York, NY 11434.

US Postmaster: Send address changes to RAEC, c/o Air Business Ltd, 155-11 146th, Street, Jamaica, New York, NY 11434. Subscription records are maintained at Taylor & Francis Group, 4 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, OX14 4RN, UK.

Back Issues:

Taylor & Francis retains a three year back issue stock of journals. Older volumes are held by our official stockists: Periodicals Service Company <<http://www.periodicals.com/tandf.html>>, 11 Main Street, Germantown, NY 12526, USA to whom all orders and enquiries should be addressed. Telephone: +1 518 537 4700; Fax: +1 518 537 5899; E-mail: psc@periodicals.com

Sample copy and back issue requests should be addressed to the Basingstoke address above.

Advertising enquiries to:

USA/Canada – the Advertising Manager, Advertising Department, Taylor & Francis, 325 Chestnut Street, 8th Floor, Philadelphia, PA 19106, USA. Tel: +1 (215) 625 8900. Fax: +1 (215) 625 2240.

EU/RoW – the Advertising Manager, Routledge Journals, Taylor & Francis, 4 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon OX14 4RN, UK. Tel: +44 (0) 1235 828 600. Fax: +44 (0) 1235 829 000.

Editorial enquiries to: Publishing Editor, *Applied Economics*, Routledge Journals, Taylor & Francis, 4 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon OX14 4RN, UK. Tel: +44 (0) 207 017 6000. Fax: +44 (0) 207 017 6336. Submission status enquiries to: Anita Philips, Warwick Business School, Warwick University, Coventry CV4 7AL, UK.

Applied Economics is Abstracted/Indexed in: *Current Contents: Social and Behavioral Sciences*; *Risk Abstracts*; *PAIS International ISI: Social Sciences Citation Index*; *Research Alert*; *Wilson Business Abstracts*; *CAB Abstracts and Academic Search*; *Business Periodicals Index*; *GEO Abstracts*; *ABI Inform*; *Current Index to Statistics*; *Social SciSearch*; *PwC Executive Digest*; *International Bibliography of the Social Sciences (IBSS)*; *Emerald Reviews*; *IBZ International Bibliography of Periodical Literature*; *Journal of Economic Literature* and (*JEL-online*).

© 2013 Taylor & Francis. All rights reserved.


Typeset by Glyph International, and printed and bound by Hobbs the Printers Ltd, UK.

This article was downloaded by: [Curtin University of Technology]

On: 25 September 2011, At: 19:15

Publisher: Routledge

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK



Applied Economics

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/raec20>

Foreign direct investment spillovers and technical efficiency in the Indonesian pharmaceutical sector: firm level evidence

Suyanto^a & Ruhul Salim^b

^a Faculty of Economics, University of Surabaya, East Java, Indonesia

^b School of Economics and Finance, Curtin University, Perth, Australia

Available online: 23 Sep 2011

To cite this article: Suyanto & Ruhul Salim (2013): Foreign direct investment spillovers and technical efficiency in the Indonesian pharmaceutical sector: firm level evidence, *Applied Economics*, 45:3, 383-395

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00036846.2011.605554>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Full terms and conditions of use: <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

This article may be used for research, teaching and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, re-distribution, re-selling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

The publisher does not give any warranty express or implied or make any representation that the contents will be complete or accurate or up to date. The accuracy of any instructions, formulae and drug doses should be independently verified with primary sources. The publisher shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of this material.

Foreign direct investment spillovers and technical efficiency in the Indonesian pharmaceutical sector: firm level evidence†

Suyanto^a and Ruhul Salim^{b,*}

^aFaculty of Economics, University of Surabaya, East Java, Indonesia

^bSchool of Economics and Finance, Curtin University, Perth, Australia

The spillovers of Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) on domestic firms' performances have been highly debated for many years. This article contributes to this debate by analysing spillovers effects on technical efficiency of Indonesian pharmaceutical sector using a unique unbalanced panel of highly disaggregated (at five-digit International Standard Industrial Classification (ISIC)) 210 firms over the period 1990–1995 (1001 observations). The Stochastic Production Frontier (SPF) and the Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA) based on *Malmquist* Productivity Indices (MPI) have been used to test the spillovers effects of FDI on technical efficiency. The empirical results from the SPF show that foreign firms are more efficient than domestic competitors, and the presence of the former increases the inefficiency of the latter. Similarly the results from the MPI demonstrate that FDI has a negative and significant impact on technical efficiency changes in domestic competitors, but generate positive spillovers to domestic suppliers.

Keywords: FDI spillovers; technical efficiency; stochastic frontier; *Malmquist* productivity index

JEL Classification: D24; D29; F23

I. Introduction

Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) is considered, in most developing countries, to be a driving force of economic growth, and policies are accordingly designed to attract more FDI. Host countries offer a wide range of fiscal and financial incentives to foreign firms. These incentives are justified on a common argument that FDI provides not only capital and

additional employment but also new knowledge to recipient economies. The new transferred knowledge from Multinational Companies (MNCs) to their subsidiaries may spillover entire recipient economies and increase the economic performance of domestic firms (Blomstrom and Kokko, 1998). This knowledge spillover has recently been regarded as an important source of productivity growth for developing countries (Suyanto *et al.*, 2009).

*Corresponding author. E-mail: Ruhul.Salim@cbs.curtin.edu.au

†The earlier version of this article was presented in the International Conference of Business and Information 2009, 6–8 July, in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

Several studies investigate FDI spillovers in recipient countries for the past decades; however, the findings are mixed at best. Cross-sectional intra-industry studies show fairly consistent evidence of positive FDI spillovers (for example, Caves, 1974; Globerman, 1979; Driffield, 2001; Dimelis and Lauri, 2002). In contrast, panel-data firm-level studies provide ambiguous results, particularly from developing countries. A number of panel-data studies confirm that FDI generates positive spillovers (for example, Chuang and Hsu, 2004; Javorcik, 2004; Gorg and Strobl, 2005; Kugler, 2006; Liang, 2007), but some studies provide no evidence (Haddad and Harrison, 1993; Kathuria, 2000; Konings, 2001) or even negative evidence (Aitken and Harrison, 1999; Djankov and Hoekman, 2000; Thangavelu and Pattanayak, 2006; Wang and Yu, 2007). Although cross-sectional studies provide more conclusive evidence, these studies tend to overstate the positive spillover effects. An observation on one point in time in cross-sectional studies provides only 'snap shot' evidence and is unable to control for unobservable industries' or firms' heterogeneity (Gorg and Strobl, 2001). In contrast, panel-data studies that focus on a disaggregate industry reduce bias due to the persistent heterogeneity and, therefore, provide a unique picture of spillover effects in a specific industry (Bartelsman and Doms, 2000).

Although the empirical literature shows mixed evidence of FDI spillovers, the policy makers in developing countries, including Indonesia, continue competing for FDI inflows. As noted by Harding and Javorcik (2007), there was a significant increase in the number of national investment promotion agencies between 1990 and 2005, and these agencies provided a variety of incentives for foreign investors. The contrast between the mixed evidence from empirical studies and the actions of policy makers has lead researchers to question whether the existing studies have simply failed to uncover spillover effects that indeed exist or the huge range of incentives provided by government is not warranted. To contribute to this debate, the present study utilizes a firm-level survey data from the Indonesian central board of statistics to examine FDI horizontal and backward spillovers and their impact on firm-specific technical efficiency. It focuses on a highly disaggregated industrial sector (at five-digit International Standard Industrial Classification (ISIC)), namely the pharmaceutical industry (ISIC 35222). As argued by Bartelsman

and Doms (2000), disaggregated sectors are preferable for analysing firms' efficiency (or productivity), particularly if related to FDI spillover effects. Since high-technological firms, such as pharmaceuticals, tend to have a different capability to absorb FDI spillovers compared to low-technological firms, such as bakeries, pooling them together tends to understate the spillover effects that might exist.¹

This article contributes to the literature in several ways. So far, firm-level studies on FDI spillovers in Indonesia and elsewhere generally pool all manufacturing firms together. This is one of the first attempts to examine disaggregated industries using the five-digit firm-level panel data. Second, it employs two rigorous productivity analysis methods, namely Stochastic Production Frontier (SPF) and Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA), instead of using the commonly used production function. The authors know no study on FDI spillovers in Indonesia uses both parametric (SPF) and nonparametric (DEA) approaches. These two approaches may shed light on the continuing debate related to spillover effects from FDI.

The rest of this article is structured as follows. Section II provides a literature review, followed by model and estimation strategy in Section III. Section IV presents data sources and measurement of variables followed by estimation and analysis of empirical results in Section V. The conclusion, policy implications and focuses for further studies are presented in the last section.

II. Review of Earlier Literature

FDI and spillover effects

FDI provides direct and indirect benefits for recipient economies. The direct benefits are often in the form of additional capital and employment, while the indirect benefits arise from the externalities resulting from the foreign presence (Hymer, 1960). The argument for the indirect benefits is that the presence of Multinational Corporations (MNCs) due to FDI may generate nonmarket impacts on domestic firms, as the latter may experience increasing efficiency or productivity (i.e. efficiency or productivity spillovers), rising ability to gain profits (pecuniary spillovers), and gaining knowledge to enter international markets (market-access spillovers) (Blomstrom and Kokko,

¹The *Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development* (OECD) classifies industries based on their technology-intensity into three categories: high, middle and low industries. The pharmaceutical industry is classified as high-technology industry, while bakeries are grouped as a low-technology industry. A detailed discussion of this classification can be found in Hatzichronoglou (1997).

1998; Lipsey and Sjöholm, 2005). Of these three spillover effects, the efficiency (or productivity) spillover has been of major concern for researchers in the last two decades. This attention is not surprising because efficiency of manufacturing firms is an important aspect of production functions which throws light on the efficiency of the production environment and assesses whether the existing resources are being used efficiently in the post-FDI regime.

Theoretical literature on FDI has identified three channels of intra-industry spillovers. The first channel is demonstration effects, when the presence of foreign firms in domestic markets encourages domestic firms to imitate directly the new knowledge or to develop their-own innovations, raising their efficiency or productivity (Das, 1987). The second channel is labour mobility, which happens when the workers trained by MNCs move to domestic firms or establish their own business and bring with them the knowledge (Glass and Saggi, 2002). The third channel is competition, when the entry of foreign firms increases competition in product markets and forces domestic firms to utilize their resources in a more efficient way (Wang and Blomstrom, 1992).

Several empirical studies have been conducted to test the presence of spillovers through these three channels. Cross-sectional studies mostly confirm an unambiguously positive relationship between the presence of FDI and efficiency (or productivity). However, more recent studies using panel data analysis show mixed evidences. Thus, the linkage between FDI presence and firms' efficiency (or productivity) still remains an unsettled issue. Lipsey and Sjöholm (2005) rightly point out that an effort to find universal evidence of spillover effects may be ineffectual. The evidence of spillovers tends to vary across countries and across industries within countries. Therefore, a focus on a specific disaggregated sector might reveal the uniqueness of the sector in response to the entry of foreign firms. An empirical assessment on a highly disaggregated industry, as in this study, might provide an interesting contribution to the existing literature.

FDI spillovers and the role of vertical linkages

Some researchers argue that negative spillovers of FDI on domestic competitors are not surprising. Aitken and Harrison (1999), for example, note that the net spillover effects of FDI may be negative in the short run, because foreign firms can steal market share. Foreign firms with a lower marginal cost have an incentive to increase production relative to their domestic competitors. The efficiency of domestic

firms might fall because these firms have to spread a fixed cost over a smaller amount of output. In a highly capital-intensive industry, where the fixed costs are significant, the negative spillover effects on domestic competitors would be more severe.

These negative spillovers occur mostly to domestic firms in the same sector (i.e., horizontal spillovers) since they are potential competitors for foreign firms (Javorcik, 2004). In contrast, positive spillovers are more likely to occur to domestic firms those supply inputs for foreign firms (i.e. backward spillovers). The positive spillovers on domestic suppliers might happen through a requirement for high quality inputs and technical training provided by foreign firms to domestic firms' employees. A high-quality input requirement forces domestic firms to utilize resources in a more efficient way, leading to efficiency improvement (Rodriguez-Clare, 1996). Similarly, the training from foreign buyers updates the knowledge of domestic suppliers, which in turn raises the efficiency and productivity of domestic suppliers (Javorcik, 2004).

The positive backward spillovers have been identified in a number of empirical studies. Kugler (2006) examines Colombian manufacturing and finds that positive FDI spillovers occurred mainly between industries and negative spillovers within industries. According to Kugler, foreign firms tend to be rivals of domestic firms in the same industry but become channels of knowledge diffusion for domestic firms in upstream industries. In a similar vein, Liang (2007) tests the spillover hypothesis for Chinese manufacturing industries and discovers that positive productivity spillovers take place only from foreign firms to local suppliers, but there is no spillover to domestic firms in the same industries. In a study on Indonesian manufacturing firms, Blalock and Gertler (2008) also find that there are positive productivity spillovers to local suppliers, but negative productivity spillovers exists on firms in the same sectors. Blalock and Gertler's study focuses on all manufacturing firms and three selected two-digit industries. This present study extends Blalock and Gertler's (2008) study by examining a more detailed five-digit industry, namely pharmaceuticals.

Foreign firms and technical efficiency

In the early literature on FDI, productivity spillovers are often regarded synonymously as technology spillovers. The use of a standard production function, which assumes full efficiency production, makes the impact of FDI on domestic firms' productivity appear solely as a shift in the production curve. Positive productivity spillovers are represented by an

upward shift of the production curve while the negative spillovers are reflected in a downward shift.

The recent literature focuses on both technology and technical efficiency. In this literature, the assumption of full efficiency is relaxed, and therefore, the externalities of FDI appear both as technological advancement (i.e. a shift in the production curve) and technical efficiency improvement (i.e. movement to the most efficient level given a set of inputs). Although FDI spillovers on technical efficiency are a relatively new issue, there is growing concern about this field. In a study on 4056 Greek firms in 1997, Dimelis and Lauri (2002) identify positive FDI spillovers on domestic firms' efficiencies. A similar finding is made by Ghali and Rezgui (2008) when they analyse the Tunisian manufacturing sector. Dimelis and Lauri (2004) extend their previous study and find that efficiency spillovers stem from foreign firms with minority holdings.

III. Estimation Methods and Empirical Models

Focusing on FDI spillovers that appear through technical efficiency, this study adopts two productivity methods: a SPF with inefficiency effects and a DEA based *Malmquist* Productivity Index (MPI). In the SPF, FDI productivity spillovers are estimated through the relationship between the FDI-spillover and technical inefficiency. FDI-spillover variables are included in the technical inefficiency effect as contributing factors, together with other firms' specific variables. If the estimate of FDI-spillovers shows a negative sign and is statistically significant, it is argued that FDI generates positive technical efficiency spillovers. In the MPI, the technical efficiency change is calculated using the DEA approach and panel analysis is employed to estimate the spillover effects.

The stochastic production frontier model

The frontier analysis suggests numerous estimation models. Each model has its own merits and limitations, and the debate over which model is superior continues (see, for example, Kumbhakar and Lovell (2000) and Coelli *et al.* (2005) for excellent discussions on advantages and disadvantages of each model). This study adopts Battese and Coelli's

(1995) model because it is applicable to unbalanced panel data and uses a single-stage estimation approach.²

The Battese and Coelli's model can be written in a functional form as

$$Y_{it} = f(\mathbf{X}_{it}; \beta) \cdot \exp(v_{it} - u_{it}) \quad (1)$$

$$u_{it} = \mathbf{z}_{it}\delta + \omega_{it} \quad (2)$$

where Y_{it} denotes the scalar output of firm i ($i=1, 2, \dots, N$) at time t ($t=1, 2, \dots, T$), \mathbf{X}_{it} is a $(1 \times k)$ vector of inputs used by firm i at time t , β is a $(k \times 1)$ vector of unknown parameters to be estimated; the v_{it} is a random error; u_{it} is the technical inefficiency effect; \mathbf{z}_{it} is a $(1 \times m)$ vector of observable nonstochastic explanatory variables affecting technical inefficiency for firm i at time t , δ denotes a $(m \times 1)$ vector of unknown parameters of the inefficiency effect to be estimated; ω is an unobservable random error.

Equation 1 shows the stochastic production frontier in terms of the original production value, and Equation 2 represents the technical inefficiency effects. The parameters of both equations are estimated simultaneously by the maximum-likelihood method. The variance parameters of the likelihood function are estimated in terms of $\sigma_s^2 \equiv \sigma_v^2 + \sigma_u^2$ and $\gamma \equiv \sigma_u^2 / \sigma_s^2$ (see Battese and Coelli (1993) for a detailed explanation of the log-likelihood functions and the variance parameters).

Assuming that the production frontier takes the form of a Cobb–Douglas technology with two inputs, labour (L) and capital (K), the empirical model for the production frontier can be expressed in a natural logarithm (ln) as follows:

$$\ln Y_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \ln L_{it} + \beta_2 \ln K_{it} + v_{it} - u_{it} \quad (3)$$

To test a hypothesis of FDI spillovers on technical efficiency, FDI variables are incorporated in the inefficiency function. Hence, the exogenous variables affecting inefficiency in this study are separated into two groups: FDI variables and other exogenous variables. The inefficiency function can be rewritten as

$$u_{it} = \mathbf{FDI}_{it}\tau + \mathbf{g}_{it}\delta + \omega_{it} \quad (4)$$

where \mathbf{FDI} is a $(1 \times j)$ vector of FDI variables of firm i at time t , τ is a $(j \times 1)$ vector of intercepts, \mathbf{g} is a $(1 \times p)$ vector of other exogenous variables of firm i at time t , and δ is a $(p \times 1)$ vector of intercepts for other exogenous variable.

² A stream of SPF with inefficiency effects can be divided into two groups based on the stage of estimation: the earlier two-stage approach and the more recent one-stage approach. The one-stage approach was introduced when researchers discovered that there were problems with the two-stage approach, which can lead to bias in estimations (Kumbhakar *et al.*, 1991; Wang and Schmidt, 2002).

The estimation procedure for the chosen stochastic frontier model is as follows:

- (1) All variables are converted into logarithm natural (ln).
- (2) The stochastic frontier production function and the inefficiency function are estimated simultaneously using a single-stage method introduced by Battese and Coelli (1995). FRONTIER4.1 computer software is used to conduct the estimation.³
- (3) The estimated parameters of the SPF, which represent the elasticity of inputs to output, are used to set a frontier, and the most efficient firm is assumed to be on the frontier.
- (4) The sign of estimated parameters for FDI variables in the inefficiency function indicate the spillover effects on technical efficiency. If the sign is negative and statistically significant, it is taken as evidence of positive FDI spillovers on domestic firms' efficiency.⁴ Likewise, if the sign is positive and statistically significant, it might suggest negative FDI spillovers on efficiency. In contrast, if the estimated parameter of a FDI-spillover is insignificant, it indicates no FDI spillovers.

The MPI

The MPI has recently gained increasing popularity in efficiency and productivity analysis. This method is adopted in this study for decomposing Total Factor Productivity (TFP) growth into Technical Efficiency Change (TEC) and Technological Change (TC). The calculated TEC indices are then used to examine the FDI spillovers on Efficiency Change (EC) using a panel data analysis.⁵

The MPI is defined using the Shepard's (1970) distance function.⁶ The distance functions can be generalized from either an input-oriented or an output-oriented objective. From the input orientation, the distance function is defined as the minimum feasible contraction of the input vector with the output vector held fixed (i.e. the input minimization objective). Likewise, the output distance function is

defined as the maximum feasible expansion of the output vector given a fixed input vector (i.e. the output maximization objective). In this study, the output-oriented Shepard's distance function is adopted since the focus is on output productivity.

Consider a panel of i ($i=1, \dots, N$) producers observed in t ($t=1, \dots, T$) periods, transforming input vectors $x_i^t = (x_{1i}^t, \dots, x_{ni}^t) \in \mathfrak{R}_+^n$ into output vectors $y_i^t = (y_{1i}^t, \dots, y_{mi}^t) \in \mathfrak{R}_+^m$. Given this information, technology can be represented by the production possibility set of feasible input-output combinations

$$S^t = \{(x^t, y^t); x^t \in \mathfrak{R}_+^n \text{ can produce } y^t \in \mathfrak{R}_+^m\}, \\ t = 1, \dots, T \quad (5)$$

which are assumed to satisfy the usual regularity axioms of production theory (Fare and Primont, 1995). Within this framework, a valid representation of the technology from the i -th firm perspective using the output oriented Shephard's (1970) distance function $D_O^t(x_i^t, y_i^t) : \mathfrak{R}_+^n \times \mathfrak{R}_+^m \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}_+^1 \cup \{\infty\}$ which is defined as⁷

$$D_O^t(x_i^t, y_i^t) \equiv \inf_{\theta} \{\theta > 0 : (x_i^t, y_i^t/\theta) \in S^t\} \quad (6)$$

The technology in Equation 6 is assumed linearly homogenous of degree +1 in y and nonincreasing in x . For any period of time t , a complete characterization of the technology of firm i , is expressed as

$$D_O^t(x_i^t, y_i^t) \leq 1 \Leftrightarrow y_i^t \in S^t \quad (7)$$

Equation 7 serves as a criterion for measuring the relative distance from the frontier of the technology set to any point of input-output combination inside the set. Following an output distance function of Shepard (1970), the maximum feasible expansion of the output vector with the input vector held fixed is $D_O^t(x_i^t, y_i^t) = 1$. In this condition, the evaluated firm is said to be efficient belonging to the best practice technology, which is represented by the subset isoquant $S^t(x, y) = \{(x, y) : D_O^t(x_i^t, y_i^t) = 1\}$. In contrast, if $D_O^t(x_i^t, y_i^t) < 1$, a radial expansion of the output vector y_i^t is feasible within the production technology for the observed input level x_i^t and the evaluated firm is said to be inefficient.

³ FRONTIER4.1 was developed by Tim Coelli in the Department of Econometrics, University of New England. The program, written in Shazam, can be run on an IBM-PC. In this program, the execution of a stochastic frontier model can be done either by modifying the available instruction file or writing a program language. This program is available online on the Centre for Efficiency and Productivity Analysis website (<http://www.uq.edu.au/economics/cepa/frontier.htm>). A detailed procedure for running FRONTIER4.1 is discussed in Coelli (1996).

⁴ Note that the FDI-spillover variables are regressed on the inefficiency indexes. The negative and significant of FDI-spillover estimates imply a reduction in inefficiency (or increasing inefficiency), which indicate positive FDI spillovers on efficiency.

⁵ This method involves a two-stage estimation procedure. The first stage is to decompose the TFP into EC and technological progress. The second stage is to estimate the spillover effects of FDI to EC.

⁶ For a comprehensive survey on the development of MPI, please see Zofio (2007).

⁷ The symbol 'inf' denotes 'infimum' or 'the greatest lower bound'.

The MPI measures TFP growth for two adjacent time periods by calculating the ratio of the distance of each data point relative to a common technology. Following Färe *et al.* (1994), the output-oriented MPI between period t and period $t+1$ is defined as

$$M_o(x_i^{t+1}, y_i^{t+1}, x_i^t, y_i^t) = \left[\left(\frac{D_o^t(x_i^{t+1}, y_i^{t+1})}{D_o^t(x_i^t, y_i^t)} \right) \times \left(\frac{D_o^{t+1}(x_i^{t+1}, y_i^{t+1})}{D_o^{t+1}(x_i^t, y_i^t)} \right) \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (8)$$

where $M_o(x_i^{t+1}, y_i^{t+1}, x_i^t, y_i^t)$ is a MPI for period t to $t+1$, $D_o^t(x_i^{t+1}, y_i^{t+1})$ represents a distance function that compares the $t+1$ period firms to the t period technology, $D_o^t(x_i^t, y_i^t)$ is a distance function for firm i at the t period technology, $D_o^{t+1}(x_i^{t+1}, y_i^{t+1})$ denotes a distance function for firm i at the $t+1$ period technology, and $D_o^{t+1}(x_i^t, y_i^t)$ is a distance function that compares the t period firms to the $t+1$ period technology.

An equivalent way to express Equation 8 is

$$M_o(x_i^{t+1}, y_i^{t+1}, x_i^t, y_i^t) = \left(\frac{D_o^{t+1}(x_i^{t+1}, y_i^{t+1})}{D_o^t(x_i^t, y_i^t)} \right) \times x \left[\left(\frac{D_o^t(x_i^{t+1}, y_i^{t+1})}{D_o^{t+1}(x_i^{t+1}, y_i^{t+1})} \right) \times \left(\frac{D_o^t(x_i^t, y_i^t)}{D_o^{t+1}(x_i^t, y_i^t)} \right) \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (9)$$

where the first part of the right-hand side of the equation measures the change in the output-oriented measure of Farrell (1957) technical efficiency between period t and $t+1$, and the second part measures the geometric mean of the TC between two periods, evaluated at x_{t+1} and x_t . Hence, the MPI is the product of the change in relative efficiency (TEC) that occurred between period t and $t+1$, and the change in technology (TC) that occurred in the same periods, which can be written as

$$M_o(x_i^{t+1}, y_i^{t+1}, x_i^t, y_i^t) = TEC_i^{t,t+1} \times TC_i^{t,t+1} \quad (10)$$

Where

$$TEC_i^{t,t+1} = \frac{D_o^{t+1}(x_i^{t+1}, y_i^{t+1})}{D_o^t(x_i^t, y_i^t)} \quad (11)$$

And

$$TC_i^{t,t+1} = \left[\left(\frac{D_o^t(x_i^{t+1}, y_i^{t+1})}{D_o^{t+1}(x_i^{t+1}, y_i^{t+1})} \right) \left(\frac{D_o^t(x_i^t, y_i^t)}{D_o^{t+1}(x_i^t, y_i^t)} \right) \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (12)$$

The MPI, TEC and TC indexes are calculated using DEA. The TEC obtained from Equation 11 is used as a dependent variable in a model for estimating the FDI spillovers on technical efficiency change. The empirical model can be written as

$$TEC_i^{t,t+1} = \text{FDI}_{i,t} \alpha + \mathbf{g}_{i,t} \beta + \zeta_{it} \quad (13)$$

where α and β denote parameter to be estimated, ζ is random error, and other variables are defined as previous.

IV. Data Sources and Measurement of Variables

Data sources

The main source of data for this study is the annual survey of Indonesian Medium and Large Manufacturing Industries (*Statistik Industri* or SI hereafter) conducted by the Indonesian Board of Statistics (*Badan Pusat Statistik* or hereafter BPS). The survey covers the basic information of each establishment, such as specific identification code, industrial classification, year of starting production and location. It also covers the ownership information (domestic and foreign ownerships), production information (gross output, value-added, number of labour in production and nonproduction, value of fixed capital and investment, material, and energy consumption), and other information (share of production exported, value of material imported, and expenditure on research and development). As supplements to the SI data, this study also utilizes the other sources available in Indonesia. The average Wholesale Price Index (WPI) and the WPI for machinery are used as deflators for monetary values of output and capital, respectively.

The samples cover an unbalanced panel of 210 pharmaceutical firms operating in the period of 1990 to 1995 (with 1001 observations). The year of 1990 is chosen as a starting year because it is the first year when the foreign-owned pharmaceutical firms were surveyed. The year of 1995 is used as the last year in order to exclude the period of crisis. From the original data set, this study conducts two adjustments with the intention of obtaining a consistent panel data set. The first adjustment is on the capital data. There are 194 out of 1001 observations (19.28%) reported missing values of capital. This study predicts the missing values using the Vial (2006) methodology, which is explained in more detail in the Appendix.

Measurement of variables

Value-added is used as an output variable in this study. Total number of employees (production and nonproduction staffs) is taken as a measurement for labour. As a proxy for capital, this study uses the replacement values of fixed asset. Output values are deflated using the average WPI at a constant price, while capital values are deflated using WPI for machinery.

The key variables in this study are *FDI*, *FDIHorizontal* and *FDIBackward*. The first variable (*FDI*) is a dummy variable of foreign firms. This variable is assigned one if the share of foreign ownership in a firm is greater than 0% and it is assigned zero if otherwise. The horizontal spillover (*FDIHorizontal*) variable is to measure the impact of foreign presence on domestic firms in the same market. Following Javorcik (2004) and Blalock and Gertler (2008) the horizontal spillover variable is defined as

$$FDIHorizontal_{jt} = \frac{\sum_{i \in j} FDI_{it} * Y_{it}}{\sum_{i \in j} Y_{it}} \quad (14)$$

where Y is gross output, i denotes the i -th firm, j denotes the j -th industry, and $i \in j$ indicates a firm in a given industry. Since there is only one industry (i.e. ISIC 35222) examined in this study, the j is set to one. Thus, the value of the *FDIHorizontal* increases with the output of foreign firms in the industry.

The backward spillover (*FDIBackward*) variable is intended to capture the extent of potential contact between domestic suppliers and multinational companies. This variable is defined following Thangavelu and Pattnayak (2006) as

$$FDIBackward_{jt} = \frac{LRAWM_{it}}{\sum_i FRAWM_{it}} * \frac{output_{it}}{\sum_i output_{it}} \quad (15)$$

where $LRAWM_{it}$ denotes expenditure incurred in local material by local firms i at time t , and $\sum_j FRAWM_{it}$ denotes total raw material expenditure of all foreign firms. The *FDIBackward* variable indicates the degree of spillovers and linkages that exist from the procurement activities undertaken by the foreign firms to domestic suppliers.

This study includes also age of firm (*Age*) as a variable contributing to inefficiency. The *Age* variable is measured by the time period between the year of survey and the year of starting production. The summary statistics of the panel data set for the relevant variables is presented in Table 1. The mean

Table 1. Summary statistics of relevant variables

Variable	Mean	SD	Min	Max
$\ln Y$	18.344	1.847	13.292	24.118
$\ln L$	4.802	0.965	2.996	7.542
$\ln K$	16.599	2.631	7.601	26.553
<i>FDI</i>	0.210	0.407	0	1
<i>FDIHorizontal</i>	0.396	0.052	0.336	0.492
<i>FDIBackward</i>	0.003	0.009	0	0.097
<i>Age</i>	18.692	14.915	0	93
Number of observations	1001			

Notes: Author's calculation from the unbalance panel data set using STATA10. The zero value in the minimum value of *Age* reflects that some firms are just started their operation in the observed year. For example, there are two firms that just started their production in 1990. Therefore, the value of *Age* variable for these two firms is zero in year 1990.

value of *FDIHorizontal* shows that, on average, the percentage of foreign assets in the observed firms is 39.6%. *FDIBackward* has a mean value of 0.003, suggesting that 0.3% of the expenditure in raw material is local content. The zero value of the 'Age' in the MIN column of the table suggests that some firms included in this study are just starting at the first year of observation (i.e. 1990). Thus, in 1990 these firms are recorded as having zero value for *Age* variable.

V. Estimation and Analysis of Results

The estimates of stochastic frontier with inefficiency effect

Using the stochastic frontier specified in Equations 3 and 4 this study begins the estimation of FDI spillovers with samples of all pharmaceutical firms. The estimates are presented in Table 2. The upper part of the table shows the estimates of production frontier and the second part presents the estimates of inefficiency function. From the production frontier estimates, the coefficients of labour and capital are positive and statistically significant at the 1% level, suggesting that these two input variables contribute positively and significantly to output. The output elasticity of labour is 0.982 and the output elasticity of capital is 0.211.⁸ As the frontier estimated using

⁸ A relatively low output elasticity of capital should be treated with caution, as capital is a key factor in pharmaceutical firms. However, this finding is somehow unsurprising as the share of capital in total industry outputs is relatively low in the Indonesian pharmaceuticals, where the environment is a more labour intensive if compared to pharmaceutical firms in other more developed countries, such as Japan. As argued by Wacker *et al.* (2006), high elasticity of capital is usually observed in advanced technology industries in developed countries.

Table 2. Estimates of stochastic production frontiers with inefficiency effect

Variable (1)	All pharmaceutical firms			Domestic pharmaceutical firms		
	Coefficient (2)	SE (3)	<i>t</i> -ratio (4)	Coefficient (5)	SE (6)	<i>t</i> -ratio (7)
<i>Production frontier (dependent variable: lnY)</i>						
Constant	11.590***	0.573	20.24	10.088***	0.208	48.48
ln <i>L</i>	0.982***	0.044	22.12	0.950***	0.047	22.27
ln <i>K</i>	0.211***	0.016	13.03	0.219***	0.016	13.37
<i>Inefficiency effect (dependent variable: u)</i>						
Constant	1.093	0.699	1.56	-2.046**	0.952	2.15
<i>FDI</i>	-0.113***	0.032	-3.49	-	-	-
<i>FDIHorizontal</i>	0.139	0.101	1.36	0.218**	0.107	2.03
<i>FDIBackward</i>	-0.151*	0.087	-1.74	-0.167*	0.096	-1.73
<i>Age</i>	-0.004	0.003	-1.21	-0.001**	0.0005	-2.36
Sigma-squared	1.230***	0.124	9.96	0.915***	0.311	2.94
Gamma	0.524***	0.128	4.08	0.918***	0.030	30.99
Number of observations	1001			791		

Notes: Author's estimations on Equations 3 and 4 using FRONTIER4.1. ***, ** and * denote significance at the 1, 5 and 10% levels, respectively.

the Cobb–Douglas production function, the sum of the output elasticity of labour and the output elasticity of capital resulted on the return to scale, which is larger than one, showing the increasing return to scale of the pharmaceutical firms.

In the inefficiency function, the negative sign and the highly significant *FDI* estimate indicates that foreign-owned firms are, on average, less inefficient than domestic firms, keeping other variables constant. This finding supports the mainstream argument that foreign firms generally possess more updated knowledge and have more experience in serving the market, so that they are more efficient than domestic firms (Caves, 1974; Dunning, 1988; Kathuria, 2001; Wang, 2010). In previous research using a different methodology, Narjoko and Hill (2007) found foreign ownership to have a positive effect on efficiency. The coefficient of *FDIHorizontal* is positive and statistically insignificant, indicating no significant spillover effects from foreign firms to domestic firms in the same market. This might be because a little learning of domestic competitors from the foreign firms' presence. Thus, this result validates the hypothesis given by Aitken and Harrison (1999) and is consistent with the findings of Blalock and Gertler (2008). For *FDIBackward*, the negative and marginally significant of the coefficient suggests the existence of positive spillovers from foreign firms to domestic suppliers. This finding confirms the arguments in Rodriguez-Clare (1996) and the finding of Javorcik (2004), that foreign firms tend to provide new knowledge for their suppliers in relation to a demand for high quality inputs. Furthermore, the coefficient of *Age* is negative and insignificant,

indicating no significant difference in technical inefficiency between older and younger firms. As has been long debated in literature, the effect of age on technical efficiency is ambiguous. Arrow (1962) and Malerba (1992) argue for positive relationship between age and efficiency, while Teece (1977) and Winter (1987) state an opposing argument that younger firms tend to have updated knowledge, which make them are more technically efficient than older firms. The evidence of negative relationship between age and technical efficiency is found in Chen and Tang (1987) and Balcombe *et al.* (2008), while the positive relationship is observed in Pitt and Lee (1981) and Salim (2009). Nevertheless, some previous empirical studies have recorded no significant effect of age in Indonesia (Jacob, 2006) and other countries (e.g. Kathuria, 2001).

There is an argument in the literature that the inclusion of foreign firms in an estimation of *FDI* spillovers tends to understate the spillover effects that might exist. Considering the argument, this study estimates the samples of only domestic firms in order to examine further *FDI* spillovers. In this estimation, the foreign firms are excluded, but the spillover variables (*FDIHorizontal* and *FDIBackward*) are calculated from the original samples. The estimation results are presented in column (5) to (7) of Table 2. Similar to the results for all firms, the coefficients of labour and capital are positive and significant at the 1% level, indicating positive elasticity of labour and capital on output. For the inefficiency function, the coefficient of *FDIHorizontal* is positive, but it turns out to be significantly affecting the technical inefficiency. The exclusion of foreign firms in this

estimation provides evidence of negative horizontal spillovers. As Aitken and Harrison (1999) argue, the competitive effects from a new foreign firm might overshadow the demonstration effects, so that the net spillover effects to domestic firms might be negative. For *FDIBackward*, the estimated parameter provides the same conclusion as in the sample of all firms. The negative sign and statistically significant *FDIBackward* estimate suggests positive spillovers from foreign firms to domestic suppliers. Excluding foreign firms in the estimation provides a negative and statistically significant coefficient of *Age*, which indicates that older domestic firms have lower inefficiencies than younger ones. This finding supports the argument that firms accumulate their learning experience and might improve their efficiency through the learning process (Arrow, 1962; Malerba, 1992) and is consistent with findings in Hill and Kalirajan (1993) for the garment industry.

As discussed in the literature review, though there have been a number of studies estimating FDI spillovers on technical efficiency level, they are not directly comparable as they differ not only in the data but also in the methodology. A study that is closer to the present research (Kathuria (2001) for India) also adopts a SPF. However, the stochastic frontier used in testing the spillover hypothesis of Kathuria's study is a two-stage approach, which has been widely known having limitations that may lead to bias in estimations (Kumbhakar *et al.*, 1991; Wang and Schmidt, 2002). In this study, a one-stage approach, as discussed in the estimation methods, is adopted. The one-stage approach overcomes the possible limitations and provides estimates that are efficient and unbiased. Thus, our results differ from those of Kathuria (2001). Kathuria (2001) shows no evidence of horizontal spillovers for the whole manufacturing firms and positive horizontal spillovers for R&D firms, while this study finds negative horizontal spillovers. Another notable difference of this present study to that of Kathuria's is that this study estimates backward spillovers, which enable estimating FDI spillover effects on domestic suppliers.

The MPIs and estimates for FDI spillovers

The above estimations focus on FDI spillovers on technical efficiency levels. In this section, the spillover effects are evaluated in relation to changes in technical efficiency. Using the DEA based MPI, as discussed in Section III, the TFP growth is decomposed into TEC and TC. The calculated TEC is then used as a dependent variable in the estimation of FDI spillovers. This study uses the DEAP2.1 computer software for running the MPI decomposition.

Table 3. Average TFP growth, TEC and TC of Indonesian pharmaceutical firms

Year	Average TFP growth	Average TEC	Average TC
1990	1.000	1.000	1.000
1991	0.963	1.028	0.990
1992	0.951	1.057	1.005
1993	1.027	1.073	0.957
1994	0.916	1.037	0.885
1995	0.994	1.101	0.904
Average	0.970	1.059	0.948

Note: Author's calculation from the unbalance panel data set using DEAP2.1.

This software requires balanced panel data for the decomposition. Therefore, the balanced panel set is constructed from the unbalanced panel used in the above estimation. The constructed balanced panel consists of 127 firms (with 762 observations). The average TFP growth and its components (TEC and TC) are given in Table 3 and the estimates of panel data for FDI spillovers are presented in Table 4.

In this section, two panel data models are estimated. These are Fixed-Effect (FE) and Random-Effect (RE) models. Estimates of these two models provide similar conclusions regarding the effects of FDI spillovers and age on technical efficiency change. There is a changing sign of the *FDI* estimate between FE and RE models. However, in both models, the estimate is statistically insignificant. In order to test which model appropriately represents the data set, a *Hausman* test is conducted. The results show that the null hypothesis (of difference in coefficients not systematic) cannot be rejected. It suggests that the RE model appropriately represent the data. Hence, the analysis in this section is based on the RE model.

The results of FDI spillovers on technical efficiency change are consistent to those of FDI spillovers on technical efficiency levels, with a minor difference in the significance of FDI coefficient. The conclusions regarding spillover effects are similar. The positive and insignificant *FDI* coefficient indicates no difference in technical efficiency change between foreign and domestic firms. The coefficient of *FDIHorizontal* is negative, suggesting that the presence of foreign firms in year *t* generates positive spillovers on technical efficiency change (between year *t* and *t+1*) of firms in the same market. As noted in the previous section, the negative horizontal spillovers might be because the competitive effects of foreign firms are large enough to reduce the efficiency of domestic firms through the market stealing phenomenon (Aitken and Harrison, 1999). In other words, the

Table 4. Estimates of FDI spillovers on the change in technical efficiency (dependent variable: $TEC_{t,t+1}$)

Variable (1)	FE model			RE model		
	Coefficient (2)	SE (3)	<i>t</i> -ratio (4)	Coefficient (5)	SE (6)	<i>t</i> -ratio (7)
Constant	1.1895***	0.080	14.80	1.2071***	0.072	16.65
<i>FDI</i>	-0.0016	0.022	-0.07	0.0080	0.010	0.78
<i>FDIHorizontal_t</i>	-0.4461**	0.189	-2.36	-0.4741***	0.172	-2.75
<i>FDIBackward_t</i>	3.6453***	1.064	3.43	2.7794***	0.751	3.70
<i>Age</i>	0.0006	0.005	1.22	0.0003	0.0003	0.97
Hausman test	Prob>chi ² = 0.6683 (RE)					
Number of observations	762					

Notes: Author's estimations on Equation 14 using STATA10.

*** and ** denote significance at the 1 and 5% levels, respectively.

presence of foreign firms in a domestic market reduces the market share of domestic firms, which in turn reduces their efficiency. This finding is in contrast with Ghali and Rezegui (2008) for Tunisia, though the method adopted is the same. A reason for the difference in findings could be a difference in data. As shown by Gorg and Strobl (2001), different data sets and different industrial focus can lead to mixed findings of FDI spillovers. The same argument also presented in Lipsey and Sjöholm (2005).

The positive and significant of the *FDIBackward* coefficient indicates spillover effects of foreign firms to the technical efficiency change of domestic suppliers, a finding in keeping with Javorcik (2004) and Blalock and Gertler (2008). This finding indicates the linkages of foreign firms to upstream industries. Thus, the presence of foreign firms in the Indonesian pharmaceutical industry generate higher technical efficiency change for domestic suppliers as these foreign firms tend to demand high quality inputs from and provide knowledge trainings to domestic suppliers.

The *Age* variable proves to have a positive but insignificant coefficient, suggesting no significant difference in technical efficiency change between older and younger firms. Similar to the estimate on technical efficiency level, the insignificant estimate of age on technical efficiency change is unsurprising since the relationship between these two factors is still unsettled. Nevertheless, some previous studies that use different method of analysis have shown an insignificant effect of age on technical efficiency change (e.g. Berghall, 2006).

VI. Conclusions and Policy Implications

This article aims to estimate FDI spillovers on technical efficiency levels and technical efficiency

changes of the Indonesian pharmaceutical sector. The SPF and the DEA based MPI are used to the plant-level survey data over the period 1990–1995. The empirical results from the stochastic frontier method show that foreign firms are less inefficient than domestic firms and there are positive spillover effects of FDI on technical efficiencies of domestic suppliers. Therefore, these results support the conventional wisdom of the advanced knowledge of foreign firms. Similarly, the results from the MPI show that FDI generates negative spillovers to domestic competitors, but provides positive spillovers to domestic suppliers.

The policy implications of these findings might not provide straightforward support for policies promoting FDI in the Indonesian pharmaceutical sector. From the outcomes obtained in the estimations, policy makers might at least need to consider whether the incoming FDI is intended to serve the domestic demands or to benefit from being near to local suppliers. In cases where there is potential for multinationals to 'steal' market from domestic firms, policy makers should at least, at the minimum, to ensure that the negative FDI spillovers on domestic firms do not overweight the overall benefits of the FDI. In contrast, when there is potential for multinational companies to source inputs from local suppliers, policy makers should provide incentives to encourage FDI. Furthermore, institutional reforms including political system, economic management and government administration and trade policies are needed in order to develop a more competitive environment in the whole manufacturing sector.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank the participants for useful comments. Comments and suggestions from

anonymous reviewers and editor are also highly appreciated. The remaining errors and confusion are the responsibility of the authors.

References

- Aitken, B. J. and Harrison, A. E. (1999) Do domestic firms benefit from direct foreign investment? Evidence from Venezuela, *American Economic Review*, **89**, 605–18.
- Arrow, K. J. (1962) The economic implications of learning by doing, *The Review of Economic Studies*, **29**, 155–73.
- Balcombe, K., Fraser, I., Latruffe, L., Rahman, M. and Smith, L. (2008) An application of the DEA double bootstrap to examine sources of efficiency in Bangladesh rice farming, *Applied Economics*, **40**, 1919–25.
- Baltagi, B. H. (2008) *Econometric Analysis of Panel Data*, 4th edn, John Wiley & Sons, West Sussex.
- Bartelsman, E. J. and Doms, M. (2000) Understanding productivity: lessons from longitudinal microdata, *Journal of Economic Literature*, **38**, 569–94.
- Battese, G. E. and Coelli, T. J. (1993) A stochastic frontier production function incorporating a model for technical inefficiency effects, Working Paper in Econometrics and Applied Statistics, Department of Economics University of New England.
- Battese, G. E. and Coelli, T. J. (1995) A model for technical inefficiency effects in a stochastic frontier production function for panel data, *Empirical Economics*, **20**, 325–32.
- Berghall, E. (2006) Technical change, efficiency, firm size and age in R&D intensive sector, GIER Working Paper No. 390, Government Institute for Economic Research.
- Blalock, G. and Gertler, P. J. (2008) Welfare gain from foreign direct investment through technology transfer to local suppliers, *Journal of International Economics*, **74**, 402–21.
- Blomstrom, M. and Kokko, A. (1998) Multinational corporation and spillovers, *Journal of Economic Surveys*, **12**, 247–77.
- Caves, R. E. (1974) Multinational firms, competition and productivity in host country markets, *Economica*, **41**, 176–93.
- Chen, T. J. and Tang, D. P. (1987) Comparing technical efficiency between import-substitution-oriented and export-oriented foreign firms in a developing economy, *Journal of Development Economics*, **26**, 277–89.
- Chuang, Y. C. and Hsu, P. F. (2004) FDI, trade, and spillover efficiency: evidence from China's manufacturing sector, *Applied Economics*, **36**, 1103–15.
- Coelli, T. J. (1996) A guide to frontier version 4.1: a computer program for stochastic frontier production and cost function estimation, CEPA Working Paper No. 07/96, University of New England.
- Coelli, T. J., Rao, D. S. P., O'Donnell, C. J. and Battese, G. E. (2005) *An Introduction to Efficiency and Productivity Analysis*, 2nd edn, Springer, New York.
- Das, S. (1987) Externalities and technology transfer through multinational corporations, *Journal of International Economics*, **22**, 171–82.
- Dimelis, S. and Lauri, H. (2002) Foreign direct investment and efficiency benefits: a conditional quartile analysis, *Oxford Economic Papers*, **54**, 449–69.
- Dimelis, S. and Lauri, H. (2004) Foreign direct investment and technology spillovers: which firms really benefit?, *Review of World Economics*, **140**, 230–53.
- Djankov, S. and Hoekman, B. (2000) Foreign investment and productivity growth in Czech enterprises, *World Bank Economic Review*, **14**, 49–64.
- Driffield, N. (2001) The impact on domestic productivity of inward investment in the UK, *The Manchester School*, **69**, 103–19.
- Dunning, J. (1988) *Multinational, Technology and Competitiveness*, Allen & Unwin, London.
- Färe, R., Grosskopf, S., Norris, M. and Zhang, Z. (1994) Productivity growth, technical progress, and efficiency change in industrialized countries, *American Economic Review*, **84**, 66–83.
- Fare, R. and Primont, D. (1995) *Multi-output Production and Duality: Theory and Applications*, Kluwer Academic, Boston and Dordrecht.
- Farrell, M. J. (1957) The measurement of productive efficiency, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, **120**, 253–90.
- Ghali, S. and Rezgui, S. (2008) FDI contribution to technical efficiency in the Tunisian manufacturing sector, ERF Working Paper Series No. 421.
- Glass, A. and Saggi, K. (2002) Multinational firms and technology transfer, *Scandinavian Journal of Economics*, **104**, 495–514.
- Globerman, S. (1979) Foreign direct investment and 'spillover' efficiency benefits in Canadian manufacturing industries, *The Canadian Journal of Economics*, **12**, 42–56.
- Gorg, H. and Strobl, E. (2001) Multinational companies and productivity spillovers: a meta-analysis, *Economic Journal*, **111**, F723–39.
- Gorg, H. and Strobl, E. (2005) Spillovers from foreign firms through worker mobility: an empirical investigation, *Scandinavian Journal of Economics*, **107**, 693–739.
- Greene, W. H. (2008) *Econometric Analysis*, 6th edn, Pearson International Publisher, New Jersey.
- Haddad, M. and Harrison, A. E. (1993) Are there positive spillovers from foreign direct investment? Evidence from panel data for Morocco, *Journal of Development Economics*, **42**, 51–74.
- Harding, T. and Javorcik, B. S. (2007) Developing economies and international investors: do investment promotion agencies bring them together?, Policy Research Working Paper No. 4339, World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Hatzichronoglou, T. (1997) Revision of the high-technology sector and product classification, STI Working Paper, OECD, Paris.
- Hill, H. and Kalirajan, K. (1993) Small enterprises and firm-level technical efficiency in the Indonesian garment industry, *Applied Economics*, **25**, 1137–44.
- Hymer, S. H. (1960) The international operations of national firms: a study of direct foreign investment, PhD Dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, MA (Published by MIT Press in 1976).
- Ikhsan, M. (2007) Total factor productivity growth in Indonesian manufacturing: a stochastic frontier approach, *Global Economic Review*, **36**, 321–42.
- Jacob, J. (2006) International technology spillovers and manufacturing performance in Indonesia, PhD

- Dissertation, Technische Universiteit Eindhoven. Available at www.alexandria.tue.nl/extra2/200610843.pdf (accessed 6 September 2007).
- Javorcik, B. S. (2004) Does foreign direct investment increase the productivity of domestic firms? In search of spillovers through backward linkages, *American Economic Review*, **94**, 605–27.
- Kathuria, V. (2000) Productivity spillovers from technology transfer to Indian manufacturing firms, *Journal of International Development*, **12**, 343–69.
- Kathuria, V. (2001) Foreign firms, technology transfer and knowledge spillovers to Indian manufacturing firms: a stochastic frontier analysis, *Applied Economics*, **33**, 625–42.
- Konings, J. (2001) The effects of foreign direct investment on domestic firms, *Economics of Transition*, **9**, 619–33.
- Kugler, M. (2006) Spillovers from foreign direct investment: within or between industries?, *Journal of Development Economics*, **80**, 444–77.
- Kumbhakar, S. C., Ghosh, S. and McGuckin, J. T. (1991) A generalized production frontier approach for estimating determinants of inefficiency in US dairy farms, *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*, **9**, 279–86.
- Kumbhakar, S. C. and Lovell, C. A. K. (2000) *Stochastic Frontier Analysis*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Liang, F. H. (2007) Does foreign direct investment improve the productivities of domestic firms? Technology spillovers within and between industries, Haas Berkeley Working Paper. Available at <http://faculty.haas.berkeley.edu/fenliang/research/spillover/FDIspillover.pdf> (accessed 20 July 2007).
- Lipse, R. E. and Sjöholm, F. (2005) The impact of inward FDI on host countries: why such different answers?, in *Does Foreign Direct Investment Promote Development?* (Eds) T. H. Moran, E. Graham and M. Blomstrom, Institute for International Economics and Center for Global Development, Washington, DC, pp. 23–43.
- Malerba, F. (1992) Learning by firms and incremental technical change, *Economic Journal*, **102**, 845–59.
- Narjoko, D. A. and Hill, H. (2007) Winners and losers during a deep economic crisis: firm level evidence for Indonesian manufacturing, *Asian Economic Journal*, **21**, 343–68.
- Pitt, M. M. and Lee, L.-F. (1981) The measurement and sources of technical inefficiency in the Indonesian weaving industry, *Journal of Development Economics*, **9**, 43–64.
- Rodriguez-Clare, A. (1996) Multinationals, linkages, and economic development, *American Economic Review*, **86**, 852–72.
- Salim, R. A. (2009) Differentials at firm level productive capacity realization in Bangladesh food manufacturing: an empirical analysis, *Applied Economics*, **40**, 3111–26.
- Shepard, R. W. (1970) *Theory of Cost and Production Function*, Princeton University Press, New Jersey.
- Suyanto, Salim, R. A. and Bloch, H. (2009) Does foreign direct investment lead to productivity spillovers? Firm level evidence from Indonesia, *World Development*, **37**, 1861–76.
- Teece, D. J. (1977) Technology transfer by multinational firms: the resource cost of transferring technological know-how, *Economic Journal*, **87**, 242–61.
- Thangavelu, S. M. and Pattayak, S. S. (2006) Linkages and spillovers from foreign ownership in the Indian pharmaceutical firms, SCAPE Working Paper Series No. 2006/05.
- Vial, V. (2006) New estimates of total factor productivity growth in Indonesian manufacturing, *Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies*, **42**, 357–69.
- Wacker, J. G., Yang, C.-L. and Sheu, C. (2006) Productivity of production labor, non-production labor, and capital: an international study, *International Journal of Production Economics*, **103**, 863–72.
- Wang, M. (2010) Foreign direct investment and domestic investment in the host country: evidence from panel study, *Applied Economics*, **42**, 3711–21.
- Wang, J. W. and Blomstrom, M. (1992) Foreign investment and technology transfer: a simple model, *European Economic Review*, **36**, 137–55.
- Wang, H. J. and Schmidt, P. (2002) One-step and two-step estimation of the effects of exogenous variables on technical efficiency level, *Journal of Productivity Analysis*, **18**, 129–44.
- Wang, C. and Yu, L. (2007) Do spillover benefits grow with rising foreign direct investment? An empirical examination of the case of China, *Applied Economics*, **39**, 397–405.
- Winter, S. (1987) Knowledge and competence as strategic assets, in *The Competitive Challenge* (Ed.) D. Teece, Ballinger, Cambridge, pp. 159–84.
- Zofio, J. L. (2007) Malmquist productivity index decompositions: a unifying framework, *Applied Economics*, **39**, 2371–87.

Appendix

Back-casting the missing values of capital

Following Vial (2006) and Ikhsan (2007), the missing values of establishment capital are back-casting using the following regression for the observed period 1988–1995:

$$\ln k_{it} = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 \ln y_{it-1} + \mu_{it} + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (\text{A1})$$

where k_{it} represents the fixed assets of establishment i at time t , y_{it-1} represents the gross-output of establishments i at time $t-1$, γ_0 and γ_1 denote parameters to be estimated, μ_{it} is the establishment-specific effect, and ε_{it} is the remainder disturbance. The reason for choosing a 1-year lag of gross-output as an independent variable is to control for a potential endogeneity problems that could arise if using the

gross-output at time t . In other words, as the predicted fixed assets from Equation A1 will be used as the capital variable in the SPFs, the use of gross-output at time t as an independent variable may cause an endogeneity bias in estimations.

The Equation A1 is estimated using RE Generalized Least Squared (GLS) estimation. There are two basic reasons for choosing RE model instead of FE model. First, a RE model avoids an enormous loss in degree of freedom, as would have happened under the FE model (Greene, 2008). Second, as

indicated by Baltagi (2008), an RE is to be preferred for a panel set with a larger number of establishments if compared to the time period, because the prediction in a RE model is unconditional of the number of establishments. The RE-GLS estimation is carried out under STATA10 computer software, and the estimates are then used to calculate the missing value of capital. By doing so, all missing values of capital are filled and the consistent panel set is constructed.

Foreign direct investment spillovers and technical efficiency in the Indonesian pharmaceutical sector: firm level evidence

.. Suyanto and SALIM, RUHUL (2013) *Foreign direct investment spillovers and technical efficiency in the Indonesian pharmaceutical sector: firm level evidence*. Applied Economics., 45 (3). pp. 383-395. ISSN ISSN 0003-6846 print/ISSN 1466-4283 online



PDF

Suyanto_Salim_Foreign Direct_Abstract_2013.pdf - Published Version

[Download \(72Kb\)](#) | [Preview](#)



PDF

Suyanto_Salim_Foreign Direct_References_2013.pdf - Published Version

[Download \(78Kb\)](#) | [Preview](#)

Official URL: <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/0003684...>

Abstract

The spillovers of Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) on domestic firms' performances have been highly debated for many years. This article contributes to this debate by analysing spillovers effects on technical efficiency of Indonesian pharmaceutical sector using a unique unbalanced panel of highly disaggregated (at five-digit International Standard Industrial Classification (ISIC)) 210 firms over the period 1990-1995 (1001 observations). The Stochastic Production Frontier (SPF) and the Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA) based on Malmquist Productivity Indices (MPI) have been used to test the spillovers effects of FDI on technical efficiency. The empirical results from the SPF show that foreign firms are more efficient than domestic competitors, and the presence of the former increases the inefficiency of the latter. Similarly the results from the MPI demonstrate that FDI has a negative and significant impact on technical efficiency changes in domestic competitors, but generate positive spillovers to domestic suppliers.

Item Type: Article

Uncontrolled Keywords: FDI spillovers; technical efficiency; stochastic frontier; Malmquist productivity index

Subjects: [H Social Sciences](#) > [HB Economic Theory](#)

Depositing User: Eko Setiawan 194014

Date Deposited: 08 Feb 2013 02:30

Last Modified: 08 Feb 2013 03:03

URI: <http://repository.ubaya.ac.id/id/eprint/3088>

Actions (login required)



[View Item](#)

**LEMBAR
HASIL PENILAIAN SEJAWAT SEBIDANG ATAU PEER REVIEW
KARYA ILMIAH : JURNAL ILMIAH**

Judul Karya Ilmiah(artikel) : Foreign Direct Investment Spillovers and Technical Efficiency in the Indonesian Pharmaceutical Sector: Firm Level Evidence

Jumlah Penulis : 2 Orang

Status Pengusul : Penulis Pertama

Identitas Jurnal Ilmiah :

- a. Nama Jurnal : Applied Economics
- b. Nomor ISSN : 0003-6846
- c. Vol, No, Bln, Thn : Vol. 45, Issue 3
- d. Penerbit : Routledge Taylor & Francis Group
- e. DOI Artikel : DOI:10.1080/00036846.2011.605554
- f. Alamat Web Jurnal : <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00036846.2011.605554?journalCode=raec20>
- g. Terindeks di : <http://www.scimagojr.com/journalsearch.php?q=18768&tip=sid&clean=0>

Kategori Publikasi Jurnal Ilmiah : Jurnal Ilmiah Internasional / Internasional Bereputasi Berdampak Faktor
 (beri \checkmark pada kategori yang tepat)

Jurnal Ilmiah Nasional Terakreditasi

Jurnal Ilmiah Nasional / Nasional Terindeks di DOAJ, CABI, COPERNICUS

Hasil Penilaian Peer Review :

No.	Komponen Yang Dinilai	Nilai Maksimal Jurnal Ilmiah			Nilai Akhir Yang Diperoleh ... (2)
		Internasional ... (1)	Nasional Terakreditasi	Nasional	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
1.	Kelengkapan unsur isi jurnal (10%)	4	---	---	0,6 x 4 = 2,4
2.	Ruang lingkup dan kedalaman pembahasan (30%)	12	---	---	0,6 x 11 = 6,6
3.	Kecukupan dan kemutakhiran data/informasi dan metodologi (30%)	12	---	---	0,6 x 12 = 7,2
4.	Kelengkapan unsur dan kualitas penerbit (30%)	12	---	---	0,6 x 12 = 7,2
Total = (100%)		40	---	---	23,4
Nilai Pengusul=					

Catatan Penilaian Artikel oleh Reviewer:
 Scopus Coverage Years: 1969 – on going. CiteScore 0,86 and SJR 0,464. The journal rank #247/533 in Economics and Econometrics journal. Similarity check sudah dilakukan dengan Turnitin. Tulisan baik karena memperlihatkan originalitas dalam hal analisis spillover effects mencakup pengaruh tidak hanya pada perusahaan di industri sejenis (horisontal), tetapi juga pengaruh pada perusahaan di industri hulu (backward) dan industri hilir (forward) sehingga terdeteksi pengaruh pada perusahaan suppliers dan perusahaan buyers. Notable genuine adalah pada tipe spillover effect yang mencakup horisontal, backward dan forward.

Surabaya, 13 Mei 2016

Reviewer 1



Prof. Dr. R. Wilopo, Ak., CA, CFE

NIP / NPK ... (3) : 36940141

Unit Kerja ... (4) : STIE PERBANAS Surabaya

LEMBAR
HASIL PENILAIAN SEJAWAT SEBIDANG ATAU PEER REVIEW
KARYA ILMIAH : JURNAL ILMIAH

Judul Karya Ilmiah(artikel) : Foreign Direct Investment Spillovers and Technical Efficiency in the Indonesian Pharmaceutical Sector: Firm Level Evidence

Jumlah Penulis : 2 Orang

Status Pengusul : Penulis Pertama

Identitas Jurnal Ilmiah :

- a. Nama Jurnal : Applied Economics
- b. Nomor ISSN : 0003-6846
- c. Vol, No, Bln, Thn : Vol. 45, Issue 3
- d. Penerbit : Routledge Taylor & Francis Group
- e. DOI Artikel : DOI:10.1080/00036846.2011.605554
- f. Alamat Web Jurnal : <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00036846.2011.605554?journalCode=raec20>
- g. Terindeks di : <http://www.scimagojr.com/journalsearch.php?q=18768&tip=sid&clean=0>

Kategori Publikasi Jurnal Ilmiah : Jurnal Ilmiah ~~Internasional~~ / Internasional Bereputasi Berdampak Faktor
 (beri \checkmark pada kategori yang tepat) Jurnal Ilmiah Nasional Terakreditasi
 Jurnal Ilmiah Nasional / Nasional Terindeks di DOAJ, CABI, COPENICUS

Hasil Penilaian Peer Review :

No.	Komponen Yang Dinilai	Nilai Maksimal Jurnal Ilmiah			Nilai Akhir Yang Diperoleh ... (2)
		Internasional ... (1)	Nasional Terakreditasi	Nasional	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
1.	Kelengkapan unsur isi jurnal (10%)	4	---	---	0,6 x 4 = 2,4
2.	Ruang lingkup dan kedalaman pembahasan (30%)	12	---	---	0,6 x 11,5 = 6,9
3.	Kecukupan dan kemutakhiran data/infromasi dan metodologi (30%)	12	---	---	0,6 x 11,5 = 6,9
4.	Kelengkapan unsur dan kualitas penerbit (30%)	12	---	---	0,6 x 11,5 = 6,9
Total = (100%)		40	---	---	23,1
Nilai Pengusul=					

Catatan Penilaian Artikel oleh Reviewer:
 Cek web Scopus: coverage years 1969 –nsekarang, Cite Score 2016 sebesar 0.86 dan SJR 0.464. Penerbit Routledge berlokasi di New York, USA. Sudah similarity check. Kualitas tulisan baik. Dari rekam jejak penelitian terlihat tulisan merupakan kelanjutan tulisan di Journal of Development Studies (2012) dengan menambahkan dua ukuran spillover effects, yaitu efek terhadap industri hulu (backward linkage) dan efek terhadap industri hilir (forward linkage). Kontribusi terletak pada menggunakan 3 ukuran spillover effects dan penggunaan industri padat modal Farmasi. Referensi cukup mutakhir.

Surabaya, 14 Juni 2016
Reviewer 2

Prof. Dr. Munawar Ismail, SE, DEA

NIP / NPK ... (3) : 19570212198401003

Unit Kerja ... (4) : FEB Universitas Brawijaya

Foreign Direct Investment Spillovers and Technical Efficiency in the Indonesian Pharmaceutical Sector: Firm Level Evidence

by 3 Suyanto

Submission date: 27-Mar-2018 04:57PM (UTC+0700)

Submission ID: 936923105

File name: Ill.1.C.1.4_asli.pdf (167.96K)

Word count: 9319


Character count: 51144

This article was downloaded by: [Curtin University of Technology]

On: 25 September 2011, At: 19:15

Publisher: Routledge

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK



Applied Economics

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/raec20>

67

Foreign direct investment spillovers and technical efficiency in the Indonesian pharmaceutical sector: firm level evidence

Suyanto^a & Ruhul Salim^b

^a Faculty of Economics, University of Surabaya, East Java, Indonesia

^b School of Economics and Finance, Curtin University, Perth, Australia

Available online: 23 Sep 2011

To cite this article: Suyanto & Ruhul Salim (2013): Foreign direct investment spillovers and technical efficiency in the Indonesian pharmaceutical sector: firm level evidence, *Applied Economics*, 45:3, 383-395

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00036846.2011.605554>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Full terms and conditions of use: <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

This article may be used for research, teaching and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, re-distribution, re-selling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

The publisher does not give any warranty express or implied or make any representation that the contents will be complete or accurate or up to date. The accuracy of any instructions, formulae and drug doses should be independently verified with primary sources. The publisher shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of this material.

73 Foreign direct investment spillovers and technical efficiency in the Indonesian pharmaceutical sector: firm level evidence†

Suyanto^a and Ruhul Salim^{b,*}

¹⁵^a*Faculty of Economics, University of Surabaya, East Java, Indonesia*

¹⁵^b*School of Economics and Finance, Curtin University, Perth, Australia*

³The spillovers of Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) on domestic firms' performances have been highly debated for many years. This article contributes to this debate by analysing spillovers effects on technical efficiency of Indonesian pharmaceutical sector using a unique unbalanced panel of highly disaggregated (at five-digit International Standard Industrial Classification (ISIC)) 210 firms over the period 1990–1995 (1001 observations). The Stochastic Production Frontier (SPF) and the Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA) based on *Malmquist* Productivity Indices (MPI) have been used to test the spillovers effects of FDI on technical efficiency. The empirical results from the SPF show that foreign firms are more efficient than domestic competitors, and the presence of the former increases the inefficiency of the latter. Similarly the results from the MPI demonstrate that FDI has a negative and significant impact on technical efficiency changes in domestic competitors, but generate positive spillovers to domestic suppliers.

¹⁶**Keywords:** FDI spillovers; technical efficiency; stochastic frontier; *Malmquist* productivity index

JEL Classification: D24; D29; F23

I. Introduction

³⁷Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) is considered, in most developing countries, to be a driving force of economic growth, and policies are accordingly designed to attract more FDI. Host countries offer a wide range of fiscal and financial incentives to foreign firms. These incentives are justified on a common argument that FDI provides not only capital and

additional employment but also new knowledge to recipient economies. The new transferred knowledge from Multinational Companies (MNCs) to their subsidiaries may spillover entire recipient economies and increase the economic performance of domestic firms (Blomstrom and Kokko, 1998). This knowledge spillover has recently been regarded as an important source of productivity growth for developing countries (Suyanto *et al.*, 2009).

⁶²*Corresponding author. E-mail: Ruhul.Salim@cbs.curtin.edu.au

†The earlier version of this article was presented in the International Conference of Business and Information 2009, 6–8 July, in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

Several studies investigate FDI spillovers in recipient countries for the past decades; however, the findings are mixed at best. Cross-sectional intra-industry studies show fairly consistent evidence of positive FDI spillovers (for example, Caves, 1974; Globerman, 1979; Driffield, 2001; Dimelis and Lauri, 2002). In contrast, panel-data firm-level studies provide ambiguous results, particularly from developing countries. A number of panel-data studies confirm that FDI generates positive spillovers (for example, Chuang and Hsu, 2004; Javorcik, 2004; Gorg and Strobl, 2005; Kugler, 2006; Liang, 2007), but some studies provide no evidence (Haddad and Harrison, 1993; Kathuria, 2000; Konings, 2001) or even negative evidence (Aitken and Harrison, 1999; Djankov and Hoekman, 2000; Thangavelu and Pattanayak, 2006; Wang and Yu, 2007). Although cross-sectional studies provide more conclusive evidence, these studies tend to overstate the positive spillover effects. An observation on one point in time in cross-sectional studies provides only 'snap shot' evidence and is unable to control for unobservable industries' or firms' heterogeneity (Gorg and Strobl, 2001). In contrast, panel-data studies that focus on a disaggregate industry reduce bias due to the persistent heterogeneity and, therefore, provide a unique picture of spillover effects in a specific industry (Bartelsman and Doms, 2000).

Although the empirical literature shows mixed evidence of FDI spillovers, the policy makers in developing countries, including Indonesia, continue competing for FDI inflows. As noted by Harding and Javorcik (2007), there was a significant increase in the number of national investment promotion agencies between 1990 and 2005, and these agencies provided a variety of incentives for foreign investors. The contrast between the mixed evidence from empirical studies and the actions of policy makers has lead researchers to question whether the existing studies have simply failed to uncover spillover effects that indeed exist or the huge range of incentives provided by government is not warranted. To contribute to this debate, the present study utilizes a firm-level survey data from the Indonesian central board of statistics to examine FDI horizontal and backward spillovers and their impact on firm-specific technical efficiency. It focuses on a highly disaggregated industrial sector (at five-digit International Standard Industrial Classification (ISIC)), namely the pharmaceutical industry (ISIC 35222). As argued by Bartelsman

and Doms (2000), disaggregated sectors are preferable for analysing firms' efficiency (or productivity), particularly if related to FDI spillover effects. Since high-technological firms, such as pharmaceuticals, tend to have a different capability to absorb FDI spillovers compared to low-technological firms, such as bakeries, pooling them together tends to understate the spillover effects that might exist.¹

This article contributes to the literature in several ways. So far, firm-level studies on FDI spillovers in Indonesia and elsewhere generally pool all manufacturing firms together. This is one of the first attempts to examine disaggregated industries using the five-digit firm-level panel data. Second, it employs two rigorous productivity analysis methods, namely Stochastic Production Frontier (SPF) and Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA), instead of using the commonly used production function. The authors know no study on FDI spillovers in Indonesia uses both parametric (SPF) and nonparametric (DEA) approaches. These two approaches may shed light on the continuing debate related to spillover effects from FDI.

The rest of this article is structured as follows. Section II provides a literature review, followed by model and estimation strategy in Section III. Section IV presents data sources and measurement of variables followed by estimation and analysis of empirical results in Section V. The conclusion, policy implications and focuses for further studies are presented in the last section.

II. Review of Earlier Literature

FDI and spillover effects

FDI provides direct and indirect benefits for recipient economies. The direct benefits are often in the form of additional capital and employment, while the indirect benefits arise from the externalities resulting from the foreign presence (Hymer, 1960). The argument for the indirect benefits is that the presence of Multinational Corporations (MNCs) due to FDI may generate nonmarket impacts on domestic firms, as the latter may experience increasing efficiency or productivity (i.e. efficiency or productivity spillovers), rising ability to gain profits (pecuniary spillovers), and gaining knowledge to enter international markets (market-access spillovers) (Blomstrom and Kokko,

¹ The *Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development* (OECD) classifies industries based on their technology-intensity into three categories: high, middle and low industries. The pharmaceutical industry is classified as high-technology industry, while bakeries are grouped as a low-technology industry. A detailed discussion of this classification can be found in Hatzichronoglou (1997).

1998; Lipsey and Sjöholm, 2005). Of these three spillover effects, the efficiency (or productivity) spillover has been of major concern for researchers in the last two decades. This attention is not surprising because efficiency of manufacturing firms is an important aspect of production functions which throws light on the efficiency of the production environment and assesses whether the existing resources are being used efficiently in the post-FDI regime.

Theoretical literature on FDI has identified three channels of intra-industry spillovers. The first channel is demonstration effects, when the presence of foreign firms in domestic markets encourages domestic firms to imitate directly the new knowledge or to develop their own innovations, raising their efficiency or productivity (Das, 1987). The second channel is labour mobility, which happens when the workers trained by MNCs move to domestic firms or establish their own business and bring with them the knowledge (Glass and Saggi, 2002). The third channel is competition, when the entry of foreign firms increases competition in product markets and forces domestic firms to utilize their resources in a more efficient way (Wang and Blomstrom, 1992).

Several empirical studies have been conducted to test the presence of spillovers through these three channels. Cross-sectional studies mostly confirm an unambiguously positive relationship between the presence of FDI and efficiency (or productivity). However, more recent studies using panel data analysis show mixed evidences. Thus, the linkage between FDI presence and firms' efficiency (or productivity) still remains an unsettled issue. Lipsey and Sjöholm (2005) rightly point out that an effort to find universal evidence of spillover effects may be ineffectual. The evidence of spillovers tends to vary across countries and across industries within countries. Therefore, a focus on a specific disaggregated sector might reveal the uniqueness of the sector in response to the entry of foreign firms. An empirical assessment on a highly disaggregated industry, as in this study, might provide an interesting contribution to the existing literature.

FDI spillovers and the role of vertical linkages

Some researchers argue that negative spillovers of FDI on domestic competitors are not surprising. Aitken and Harrison (1999), for example, note that the net spillover effects of FDI may be negative in the short run, because foreign firms can steal market share. Foreign firms with a lower marginal cost have an incentive to increase production relative to their domestic competitors. The efficiency of domestic

firms might fall because these firms have to spread a fixed cost over a smaller amount of output. In a highly capital-intensive industry, where the fixed costs are significant, the negative spillover effects on domestic competitors would be more severe.

These negative spillovers occur mostly to domestic firms in the same sector (i.e., horizontal spillovers) since they are potential competitors for foreign firms (Javorcik, 2004). In contrast, positive spillovers are more likely to occur to domestic firms those supply inputs for foreign firms (i.e. backward spillovers). The positive spillovers on domestic suppliers might happen through a requirement for high quality inputs and technical training provided by foreign firms to domestic firms' employees. A high-quality input requirement forces domestic firms to utilize resources in a more efficient way, leading to efficiency improvement (Rodriguez-Clare, 1996). Similarly, the training from foreign buyers updates the knowledge of domestic suppliers, which in turn raises the efficiency and productivity of domestic suppliers (Javorcik, 2004).

The positive backward spillovers have been identified in a number of empirical studies. Kugler (2006) examines Colombian manufacturing and finds that positive FDI spillovers occurred mainly between industries and negative spillovers within industries. According to Kugler, foreign firms tend to be rivals of domestic firms in the same industry but become channels of knowledge diffusion for domestic firms in upstream industries. In a similar vein, Liang (2007) tests the spillover hypothesis for Chinese manufacturing industries and discovers that positive productivity spillovers take place only from foreign firms to local suppliers, but there is no spillover to domestic firms in the same industries. In a study on Indonesian manufacturing firms, Blalock and Gertler (2008) also find that there are positive productivity spillovers to local suppliers, but negative productivity spillovers exists on firms in the same sectors. Blalock and Gertler's study focuses on all manufacturing firms and three selected two-digit industries. This present study extends Blalock and Gertler's (2008) study by examining a more detailed five-digit industry, namely pharmaceuticals.

Foreign firms and technical efficiency

In the early literature on FDI, productivity spillovers are often regarded synonymously as technology spillovers. The use of a standard production function, which assumes full efficiency production, makes the impact of FDI on domestic firms' productivity appear solely as a shift in the production curve. Positive productivity spillovers are represented by an

upward shift of the production curve while the negative spillovers are reflected in a downward shift.

The recent literature focuses on both technology and technical efficiency. In this literature, the assumption of full efficiency is relaxed, and therefore, the externalities of FDI appear both as technological advancement (i.e. a shift in the production curve) and technical efficiency improvement (i.e. movement to the most efficient level given a set of inputs). Although FDI spillovers on technical efficiency are a relatively new issue, there is growing concern about this field. In a study on 4056 Greek firms in 1997, Dimelis and Lauri (2002) identify positive FDI spillovers on domestic firms' efficiencies. A similar finding is made by Ghali and Rezgui (2008) when they analyse the Tunisian manufacturing sector. Dimelis and Lauri (2004) extend their previous study and find that efficiency spillovers stem from foreign firms with minority holdings.

III. Estimation Methods and Empirical Models

Focusing on FDI spillovers that appear through technical efficiency, this study adopts two productivity methods: a SPF with inefficiency effects and a DEA based *Malmquist* Productivity Index (MPI). In the SPF, FDI productivity spillovers are estimated through the relationship between the FDI-spillover and technical inefficiency. FDI-spillover variables are included in the technical inefficiency effect as contributing factors, together with other firms' specific variables. If the estimate of FDI-spillovers shows a negative sign and is statistically significant, it is argued that FDI generates positive technical efficiency spillovers. In the MPI, the technical efficiency change is calculated using the DEA approach and panel analysis is employed to estimate the spillover effects.

The stochastic production frontier model

The frontier analysis suggests numerous estimation models. Each model has its own merits and limitations, and the debate over which model is superior continues (see, for example, Kumbhakar and Lovell (2000) and Coelli *et al.* (2005) for excellent discussions on advantages and disadvantages of each model). This study adopts Battese and Coelli's

(1995) model because it is applicable to unbalanced panel data and uses a single-stage estimation approach.²

The Battese and Coelli's model can be written in a functional form as

$$Y_{it} = f(\mathbf{X}_{it}; \beta) \cdot \exp(v_{it} - u_{it}) \quad (1)$$

$$u_{it} = \mathbf{z}_{it}\delta + \omega_{it} \quad (2)$$

where Y_{it} denotes the scalar output of firm i ($i=1, 2, \dots, N$) at time t ($t=1, 2, \dots, T$), \mathbf{X}_{it} is a $(1 \times k)$ vector of inputs used by firm i at time t , β is a $(k \times 1)$ vector of unknown parameters to be estimated; the v_{it} is a random error; u_{it} is the technical inefficiency effect; \mathbf{z}_{it} is a $(1 \times m)$ vector of observable nonstochastic explanatory variables affecting technical inefficiency for firm i at time t , δ denotes a $(m \times 1)$ vector of unknown parameters of the inefficiency effect to be estimated; ω is an unobservable random error.

Equation 1 shows the stochastic production frontier in terms of the original production value, and Equation 2 represents the technical inefficiency effects. The parameters of both equations are estimated simultaneously by the maximum-likelihood method. The variance parameters of the likelihood function are estimated in terms of $\sigma_v^2 \equiv \sigma_v^2 + \sigma_u^2$ and $\gamma \equiv \sigma_u^2 / \sigma_v^2$ (see Battese and Coelli (1993) for a detailed explanation of the log-likelihood functions and the variance parameters).

Assuming that the production frontier takes the form of a Cobb–Douglas technology with two inputs, labour (L) and capital (K), the empirical model for the production frontier can be expressed in a natural logarithm (ln) as follows:

$$\ln Y_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \ln L_{it} + \beta_2 \ln K_{it} + v_{it} - u_{it} \quad (3)$$

To test a hypothesis of FDI spillovers on technical efficiency, FDI variables are incorporated in the inefficiency function. Hence, the exogenous variables affecting inefficiency in this study are separated into two groups: FDI variables and other exogenous variables. The inefficiency function can be rewritten as

$$u_{it} = \mathbf{FDI}_{it}\tau + \mathbf{g}_{it}\delta + \omega_{it} \quad (4)$$

where \mathbf{FDI}_{it} is a $(1 \times j)$ vector of FDI variables of firm i at time t , τ is a $(j \times 1)$ vector of intercepts, \mathbf{g} is a $(1 \times p)$ vector of other exogenous variables of firm i at time t , and δ is a $(p \times 1)$ vector of intercepts for other exogenous variable.

²A stream of SPF with inefficiency effects can be divided into two groups based on the stage of estimation: the earlier two-stage approach and the more recent one-stage approach. The one-stage approach was introduced when researchers discovered that there were problems with the two-stage approach, which can lead to bias in estimations (Kumbhakar *et al.*, 1991; Wang and Schmidt, 2002).

The estimation procedure for the chosen stochastic frontier model is as follows:

- (1) All variables are converted into logarithmic natural (ln).
- (2) The stochastic frontier production function and the inefficiency function are estimated simultaneously using a single-stage method introduced by Battese and Coelli (1995). FRONTIER4.1 computer software is used to conduct the estimation.³
- (3) The estimated parameters of the SPF, which represent the elasticity of inputs to output, are used to set a frontier, and the most efficient firm is assumed to be on the frontier.
- (4) The sign of estimated parameters for FDI variables in the inefficiency function indicate the spillover effects on technical efficiency. If the sign is negative and statistically significant, it is taken as evidence of positive FDI spillovers on domestic firms' efficiency.⁴ Likewise, if the sign is positive and statistically significant, it might suggest negative FDI spillovers on efficiency. In contrast, if the estimated parameter of a FDI-spillover is insignificant, it indicates no FDI spillovers.

The MPI

The MPI has recently gained increasing popularity in efficiency and productivity analysis. This method is adopted in this study for decomposing Total Factor Productivity (TFP) growth into Technical Efficiency Change (TEC) and Technological Change (TC). The calculated TEC indices are then used to examine the FDI spillovers on Efficiency Change (EC) using a panel data analysis.⁵

The MPI is defined using the Shephard's (1970) distance function.⁶ The distance functions can be generalized from either an input-oriented or an output-oriented objective. From the input orientation, the distance function is defined as the minimum feasible contraction of the input vector with the output vector held fixed (i.e. the input minimization objective). Likewise, the output distance function is

defined as the maximum feasible expansion of the output vector given a fixed input vector (i.e. the output maximization objective). In this study, the output-oriented Shephard's distance function is adopted since the focus is on output productivity.

Consider a panel of i ($i=1, \dots, N$) producers observed in t ($t=1, \dots, T$) periods, transforming input vectors $x_i^t = (x_{i1}^t, \dots, x_{im}^t) \in \mathfrak{R}_+^m$ into output vectors $y_i^t = (y_{i1}^t, \dots, y_{im}^t) \in \mathfrak{R}_+^m$. Given this information, technology can be represented by the production possibility set of feasible input-output combinations

$$S^t = \{(x^t, y^t); x^t \in \mathfrak{R}_+^m \text{ can produce } y^t \in \mathfrak{R}_+^m\}, \\ t = 1, \dots, T \quad (5)$$

which are assumed to satisfy the usual regularity axioms of production theory (Fare and Primont, 1995). Within this framework, a valid representation of the technology from the i -th firm perspective using the output oriented Shephard's (1970) distance function $D'_O(x_i^t, y_i^t) : \mathfrak{R}_+^m \times \mathfrak{R}_+^m \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}_+^1 \cup \{\infty\}$ which is defined as⁷

$$D'_O(x_i^t, y_i^t) \equiv \inf_{\theta} \{\theta > 0 : (x_i^t, y_i^t/\theta) \in S^t\} \quad (6)$$

The technology in Equation 6 is assumed linearly homogenous of degree +1 in y and nonincreasing in x . For any period of time t , a complete characterization of the technology of firm i , is expressed as

$$D'_O(x_i^t, y_i^t) \leq 1 \Leftrightarrow y_i^t \in S^t \quad (7)$$

Equation 7 serves as a criterion for measuring the relative distance from the frontier of the technology set to any point of input-output combination inside the set. Following an output distance function of Shepard (1970), the maximum feasible expansion of the output vector with the input vector held fixed is $D'_O(x_i^t, y_i^t) = 1$. In this condition, the evaluated firm is said to be efficient belonging to the best practice technology, which is represented by the subset isoquant $S^t(x, y) = \{(x, y) : D'_O(x_i^t, y_i^t) = 1\}$. In contrast, if $D'_O(x_i^t, y_i^t) < 1$, a radial expansion of the output vector y_i^t is feasible within the production technology for the observed input level x_i^t and the evaluated firm is said to be inefficient.

³ FRONTIER4.1 was developed by Tim Coelli in the Department of Econometrics, University of New England. The program, written in Shazam, can be run on an IBM-PC. In this program, the execution of a stochastic frontier model can be done either by modifying the available instruction file or writing a program language. This program is available online on the Centre for Efficiency and Productivity Analysis website (<http://www.uq.edu.au/economics/cepa/frontier.htm>). A detailed procedure for running FRONTIER4.1 is discussed in Coelli (1996).

⁴ Note that the FDI-spillover variables are regressed on the inefficiency indexes. The negative and significant of FDI-spillover estimates imply a reduction in inefficiency (or increasing inefficiency), which indicate positive FDI spillovers on efficiency.

⁵ This method involves a two-stage estimation procedure. The first stage is to decompose the TFP into EC and technological progress. The second stage is to estimate the spillover effects of FDI to EC.

⁶ For a comprehensive survey on the development of MPI, please see Zofio (2007).

⁷ The symbol 'inf' denotes 'infimum' or 'the greatest lower bound'.

The MPI measures TFP growth for two adjacent time periods by calculating the ratio of the distance of each data point relative to a common technology. Following Färe *et al.* (1994), the output-oriented MPI between period t and period $t+1$ is defined as

$$M_o(x_i^{t+1}, y_i^{t+1}, x_i^t, y_i^t) = \left[\left(\frac{D_o^t(x_i^{t+1}, y_i^{t+1})}{D_o^t(x_i^t, y_i^t)} \right) \times \left(\frac{D_o^{t+1}(x_i^{t+1}, y_i^{t+1})}{D_o^{t+1}(x_i^t, y_i^t)} \right) \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (8)$$

where $M_o(x_i^{t+1}, y_i^{t+1}, x_i^t, y_i^t)$ is a MPI for period t to $t+1$, $D_o^t(x_i^{t+1}, y_i^{t+1})$ represents a distance function that compares the $t+1$ period firms to the t period technology, $D_o^t(x_i^t, y_i^t)$ is a distance function for firm i at the t period technology, $D_o^{t+1}(x_i^{t+1}, y_i^{t+1})$ denotes a distance function for firm i at the $t+1$ period technology, and $D_o^{t+1}(x_i^t, y_i^t)$ is a distance function that compares the t period firms to the $t+1$ period technology.

An equivalent way to express Equation 8 is

$$M_o(x_i^{t+1}, y_i^{t+1}, x_i^t, y_i^t) = \left(\frac{D_o^{t+1}(x_i^{t+1}, y_i^{t+1})}{D_o^t(x_i^t, y_i^t)} \right) \times \left[\left(\frac{D_o^t(x_i^{t+1}, y_i^{t+1})}{D_o^{t+1}(x_i^{t+1}, y_i^{t+1})} \right) \times \left(\frac{D_o^t(x_i^t, y_i^t)}{D_o^{t+1}(x_i^t, y_i^t)} \right) \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (9)$$

where the first part of the right-hand side of the equation measures the change in the output-oriented measure of Farrell (1957) technical efficiency between period t and $t+1$, and the second part measures the geometric mean of the TC between two periods, evaluated at x_{t+1} and x_t . Hence, the MPI is the product of the change in relative efficiency (TEC) that occurred between period t and $t+1$, and the change in technology (TC) that occurred in the same periods, which can be written as

$$M_o(x_i^{t+1}, y_i^{t+1}, x_i^t, y_i^t) = TEC_i^{t,t+1} \times TC_i^{t,t+1} \quad (10)$$

Where

$$TEC_i^{t,t+1} = \frac{D_o^{t+1}(x_i^{t+1}, y_i^{t+1})}{D_o^t(x_i^t, y_i^t)} \quad (11)$$

And

$$TC_i^{t,t+1} = \left[\left(\frac{D_o^t(x_i^{t+1}, y_i^{t+1})}{D_o^{t+1}(x_i^{t+1}, y_i^{t+1})} \right) \left(\frac{D_o^t(x_i^t, y_i^t)}{D_o^{t+1}(x_i^t, y_i^t)} \right) \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (12)$$

The MPI, TEC and TC indexes are calculated using DEA. The TEC obtained from Equation 11 is used as a dependent variable in a model for estimating the FDI spillovers on technical efficiency change. The empirical model can be written as

$$TEC_i^{t,t+1} = \text{FDI}_{i,t} \alpha + \mathbf{g}_{i,t} \beta + \zeta_{it} \quad (13)$$

where α and β denote parameter to be estimated, ζ is random error, and other variables are defined as previous.

IV. Data Sources and Measurement of Variables

Data sources

The main source of data for this study is the annual survey of Indonesian Medium and Large Manufacturing Industries (*Statistik Industri* or SI hereafter) conducted by the Indonesian Board of Statistics (*Badan Pusat Statistik* or hereafter BPS). The survey covers the basic information of each establishment, such as specific identification code, industrial classification, year of starting production and location. It also covers the ownership information (domestic and foreign ownerships), production information (gross output, value-added, number of labour in production and nonproduction, value of fixed capital and investment, material, and energy consumption), and other information (share of production exported, value of material imported, and expenditure on research and development). As supplements to the SI data, this study also utilizes the other sources available in Indonesia. The average Wholesale Price Index (WPI) and the WPI for machinery are used as deflators for monetary values of output and capital, respectively.

The samples cover an unbalanced panel of 210 pharmaceutical firms operating in the period of 1990 to 1995 (with 1001 observations). The year of 1990 is chosen as a starting year because it is the first year when the foreign-owned pharmaceutical firms were surveyed. The year of 1995 is used as the last year in order to exclude the period of crisis. From the original data set, this study conducts two adjustments with the intention of obtaining a consistent panel data set. The first adjustment is on the capital data. There are 194 out of 1001 observations (19.28%) reported missing values of capital. This study predicts the missing values using the Vial (2006) methodology, which is explained in more detail in the Appendix.

Measurement of variables

Value-added is used as an output variable in this study. Total number of employees (production and nonproduction staffs) is taken as a measurement for labour. As a proxy for capital, this study uses the replacement values of fixed asset. Output values are deflated using the average WPI at a constant price, while capital values are deflated using WPI for machinery.

The key variables in this study are *FDI*, *FDIHorizontal* and *FDIBackward*. The first variable (*FDI*) is a dummy variable of foreign firms. This variable is assigned one if the share of foreign ownership in a firm is greater than 0% and it is assigned zero if otherwise. The horizontal spillover (*FDIHorizontal*) variable is to measure the impact of foreign presence on domestic firms in the same market. Following Javorcik (2004) and Blalock and Gertler (2008) the horizontal spillover variable is defined as

$$FDIHorizontal_{jt} = \frac{\sum_{Ni \in j} FDI_{it} * Y_{it}}{\sum_{Ni \in j} Y_{it}} \quad (14)$$

where Y is gross output, i denotes the i -th firm, j denotes the j -th industry, and $Ni \in j$ indicates a firm in a given industry. Since there is only one industry (i.e. ISIC 35222) examined in this study, the j is set to one. Thus, the value of the *FDIHorizontal* increases with the output of foreign firms in the industry.

The backward spillover (*FDIBackward*) variable is intended to capture the extent of potential contact between domestic suppliers and multinational companies. This variable is defined following Thangavelu and Pattnayak (2006) as

$$FDIBackward_{jt} = \frac{LRAWM_{it}}{\sum_i FRAWM_{it}} * \frac{output_{it}}{\sum_i output_{it}} \quad (15)$$

where $LRAWM_{it}$ denotes expenditure incurred in local material by local firms i at time t , and $\sum_j FRAWM_{it}$ denotes total raw material expenditure of all foreign firms. The *FDIBackward* variable indicates the degree of spillovers and linkages that exist from the procurement activities undertaken by the foreign firms to domestic suppliers.

This study includes also age of firm (*Age*) as a variable contributing to inefficiency. The *Age* variable is measured by the time period between the year of survey and the year of starting production. The summary statistics of the panel data set for the relevant variables is presented in Table 1. The mean

Table 1. Summary statistics of relevant variables

Variable	Mean	SD	Min	Max
ln Y	18.344	1.847	13.292	24.118
ln L	4.802	0.965	2.996	7.542
ln K	16.599	2.631	7.601	26.553
<i>FDI</i>	0.210	0.407	0	1
<i>FDIHorizontal</i>	0.396	0.052	0.336	0.492
<i>FDIBackward</i>	0.003	0.009	0	0.097
<i>Age</i>	18.692	14.915	0	93
Number of observations	1001			

Notes: Author's calculation from the unbalance panel data set using STATA10. The zero value in the minimum value of *Age* reflects that some firms are just started their operation in the observed year. For example, there are two firms that just started their production in 1990. Therefore, the value of *Age* variable for these two firms is zero in year 1990.

value of *FDIHorizontal* shows that, on average, the percentage of foreign assets in the observed firms is 39.6%. *FDIBackward* has a mean value of 0.003, suggesting that 0.3% of the expenditure in raw material is local content. The zero value of the 'Age' in the MIN column of the table suggests that some firms included in this study are just starting at the first year of observation (i.e. 1990). Thus, in 1990 these firms are recorded as having zero value for *Age* variable.

V. Estimation and Analysis of Results

The estimates of stochastic frontier with inefficiency effect

Using the stochastic frontier specified in Equations 3 and 4 this study begins the estimation of FDI spillovers with samples of all pharmaceutical firms. The estimates are presented in Table 2. The upper part of the table shows the estimates of production frontier and the second part presents the estimates of inefficiency function. From the production frontier estimates, the coefficients of labour and capital are positive and statistically significant at the 1% level, suggesting that these two input variables contribute positively and significantly to output. The output elasticity of labour is 0.982 and the output elasticity of capital is 0.211.⁸ As the frontier estimated using

⁸ A relatively low output elasticity of capital should be treated with caution, as capital is a key factor in pharmaceutical firms. However, this finding is somehow unsurprising as the share of capital in total industry outputs is relatively low in the Indonesian pharmaceuticals, where the environment is a more labour intensive if compared to pharmaceutical firms in other more developed countries, such as Japan. As argued by Wacker *et al.* (2006), high elasticity of capital is usually observed in advanced technology industries in developed countries.

Table 2. Estimates of stochastic production frontiers with inefficiency effect

Variable (1)	All pharmaceutical firms			Domestic pharmaceutical firms		
	Coefficient (2)	SE (3)	t-ratio (4)	Coefficient (5)	SE (6)	t-ratio (7)
<i>Production frontier (dependent variable: lnY)</i>						
Constant	11.590***	0.573	20.24	10.088***	0.208	48.48
ln L	0.982***	0.044	22.12	0.950***	0.047	22.27
ln K	0.211***	0.016	13.03	0.219***	0.016	13.37
<i>Inefficiency effect (dependent variable: u)</i>						
Constant	1.093	0.699	1.56	-2.046**	0.952	2.15
FDI	-0.113***	0.032	-3.49	-	-	-
FDIHorizontal	0.139	0.101	1.36	0.218**	0.107	2.03
FDIBackward	-0.151*	0.087	-1.74	-0.167*	0.096	-1.73
Age	-0.004	0.003	-1.21	-0.001**	0.0005	-2.36
Sigma-squared	1.230***	0.124	9.96	0.915***	0.311	2.94
Gamma	0.524***	0.128	4.08	0.918***	0.030	30.99
Number of observations	1001			791		

Notes: Author's estimations on Equations 3 and 4 using FRONTIER4.1. ***, ** and * denote significance at the 1, 5 and 10% levels, respectively.

the Cobb–Douglas production function, the sum of the output elasticity of labour and the output elasticity of capital resulted on the return to scale, which is larger than one, showing the increasing return to scale of the pharmaceutical firms.

In the inefficiency function, the negative sign and the highly significant *FDI* estimate indicates that foreign-owned firms are, on average, less inefficient than domestic firms, keeping other variables constant. This finding supports the mainstream argument that foreign firms generally possess more updated knowledge and have more experience in serving the market, so that they are more efficient than domestic firms (Caves, 1974; Dunning, 1988; Kathuria, 2001; Wang, 2010). In previous research using a different methodology, Narjoko and Hill (2007) found foreign ownership to have a positive effect on efficiency. The coefficient of *FDIHorizontal* is positive and statistically insignificant, indicating no significant spillover effects from foreign firms to domestic firms in the same market. This might be because a little learning of domestic competitors from the foreign firms' presence. Thus, this result validates the hypothesis given by Aitken and Harrison (1999) and is consistent with the findings of Blalock and Gertler (2008). For *FDIBackward*, the negative and marginally significant of the coefficient suggests the existence of positive spillovers from foreign firms to domestic suppliers. This finding confirms the arguments in Rodriguez-Clare (1996) and the finding of Javorcik (2004), that foreign firms tend to provide new knowledge for their suppliers in relation to demand for high quality inputs. Furthermore, the coefficient of *Age* is negative and insignificant,

indicating no significant difference in technical inefficiency between older and younger firms. As has been long debated in literature, the effect of age on technical efficiency is ambiguous. Arrow (1962) and Malerba (1992) argue for positive relationship between age and efficiency, while Teece (1977) and Winter (1987) state an opposing argument that younger firms tend to have updated knowledge, which make them are more technically efficient than older firms. The evidence of negative relationship between age and technical efficiency is found in Chen and Tang (1987) and Balcombe *et al.* (2008), while the positive relationship is observed in Pitt and Lee (1981) and Salim (2009). Nevertheless, some previous empirical studies have recorded no significant effect of age in Indonesia (Jacob, 2006) and other countries (e.g. Kathuria, 2001).

There is an argument in the literature that the inclusion of foreign firms in an estimation of FDI spillovers tends to understate the spillover effects that might exist. Considering the argument, this study estimates the samples of only domestic firms in order to examine further FDI spillovers. In this estimation, the foreign firms are excluded, but the spillover variables (*FDIHorizontal* and *FDIBackward*) are calculated from the original samples. The estimation results are presented in column (5) to (7) of Table 2. Similar to the results for all firms, the coefficients of labour and capital are positive and significant at the 1% level, indicating positive elasticity of labour and capital on output. For the inefficiency function, the coefficient of *FDIHorizontal* is positive, but it turns out to be significantly affecting the technical inefficiency. The exclusion of foreign firms in this

estimation provides evidence of negative horizontal spillovers. As Aitken and Harrison (1999) argue, the competitive effects from a new foreign firm might overshadow the demonstration effects, so that the net spillover effects to domestic firms might be negative. For *FDIBackward*, the estimated parameter provides the same conclusion as in the sample of all firms. The negative sign and statistically significant *FDIBackward* estimate suggests positive spillovers from foreign firms to domestic suppliers. Excluding foreign firms in the estimation provides a negative and statistically significant coefficient of *Age*, which indicates that older domestic firms have lower inefficiencies than younger ones. This finding supports the argument that firms accumulate their learning experience and might improve their efficiency through the learning process (Arrow, 1962; Malerba, 1992) and is consistent with findings in Hill and Kalirajan (1993) for the garment industry.

As discussed in the literature review, though there have been a number of studies estimating FDI spillovers on technical efficiency level, they are not directly comparable as they differ not only in the data but also in the methodology. A study that is closer to the present research (Kathuria (2001) for India) also adopts a SPF. However, the stochastic frontier used in testing the spillover hypothesis of Kathuria's study is a two-stage approach, which has been widely known having limitations that may lead to bias in estimations (Kumbhakar *et al.*, 1991; Wang and Schmidt, 2002). In this study, a one-stage approach, as discussed in the estimation methods, is adopted. The one-stage approach overcomes the possible limitations and provides estimates that are efficient and unbiased. Thus, our results differ from those of Kathuria (2001). Kathuria (2001) shows no evidence of horizontal spillovers for the whole manufacturing firms and positive horizontal spillovers for R&D firms, while this study finds negative horizontal spillovers. Another notable difference of this present study to that of Kathuria's is that this study estimates backward spillovers, which enable estimating FDI spillover effects on domestic suppliers.

The MPIs and estimates for FDI spillovers

The above estimations focus on FDI spillovers on technical efficiency levels. In this section, the spillover effects are evaluated in relation to changes in technical efficiency. Using the DEA based MPI, as discussed in Section III, the TFP growth is decomposed into TEC and TC. The calculated TEC is then used as a dependent variable in the estimation of FDI spillovers. This study uses the DEAP2.1 computer software for running the MPI decomposition.

Table 3. Average TFP growth, TEC and TC of Indonesian pharmaceutical firms

Year	Average TFP growth	Average TEC	Average TC
1990	1.000	1.000	1.000
1991	0.963	1.028	0.990
1992	0.951	1.057	1.005
1993	1.027	1.073	0.957
1994	0.916	1.037	0.885
1995	0.994	1.101	0.904
Average	0.970	1.059	0.948

Note: Author's calculation from the unbalance panel data set using DEAP2.1.

This software requires balanced panel data for the decomposition. Therefore, the balanced panel set is constructed from the unbalanced panel used in the above estimation. The constructed balanced panel consists of 127 firms (with 762 observations). The average TFP growth and its components (TEC and TC) are given in Table 3 and the estimates of panel data for FDI spillovers are presented in Table 4.

In this section, two panel data models are estimated. These are Fixed-Effect (FE) and Random-Effect (RE) models. Estimates of these two models provide similar conclusions regarding the effects of FDI spillovers and age on technical efficiency change. There is a changing sign of the *FDI* estimate between FE and RE models. However, in both models, the estimate is statistically insignificant. In order to test which model appropriately represents the data set, a Hausman test is conducted. The results show that the null hypothesis (of difference in coefficients not systematic) cannot be rejected. It suggests that the RE model appropriately represent the data. Hence, the analysis in this section is based on the RE model.

The results of FDI spillovers on technical efficiency change are consistent to those of FDI spillovers on technical efficiency levels, with a minor difference in the significance of FDI coefficient. The conclusions regarding spillover effects are similar. The positive and insignificant *FDI* coefficient indicates no difference in technical efficiency change between foreign and domestic firms. The coefficient of *FDIHorizontal* is negative, suggesting that the presence of foreign firms in year t generates positive spillovers on technical efficiency change (between year t and $t+1$) of firms in the same market. As noted in the previous section, the negative horizontal spillovers might be because the competitive effects of foreign firms are large enough to reduce the efficiency of domestic firms through the market stealing phenomenon (Aitken and Harrison, 1999). In other words, the

Table 4. Estimates of FDI spillovers on the change in technical efficiency (dependent variable: $TEC_{i,t+1}$)

Variable (1)	FE model			RE model		
	Coefficient (2)	SE (3)	t-ratio (4)	Coefficient (5)	SE (6)	t-ratio (7)
Constant	1.1895***	0.080	14.80	1.2071***	0.072	16.65
<i>FDI</i>	-0.0016	0.022	-0.07	0.0080	0.010	0.78
<i>FDIHorizontal_i</i>	-0.4461**	0.189	-2.36	-0.4741***	0.172	-2.75
<i>FDIBackward_i</i>	3.6453***	1.064	3.43	2.7794***	0.751	3.70
<i>Age</i>	0.0006	0.005	1.22	0.0003	0.0003	0.97
Hausman test	Prob>chi ² =0.6683 (RE)					
Number of observations	762					

Notes: Author's estimations on Equation 14 using STATA10.

*** and ** denote significance at the 1 and 5% levels, respectively.

presence of foreign firms in a domestic market reduces the market share of domestic firms, which in turn reduces their efficiency. This finding is in contrast with Ghali and Rezgui (2008) for Tunisia, though the method adopted is the same. A reason for the difference in findings could be a difference in data. As shown by Gorg and Strobl (2001), different data sets and different industrial focus can lead to mixed findings of FDI spillovers. The same argument also presented in Lipsey and Sjöholm (2005).

The positive and significant of the *FDIBackward* coefficient indicates spillover effects of foreign firms to the technical efficiency change of domestic suppliers, a finding in keeping with Javorcik (2004) and Blalock and Gertler (2008). This finding indicates the linkages of foreign firms to upstream industries. Thus, the presence of foreign firms in the Indonesian pharmaceutical industry generate higher technical efficiency change for domestic suppliers as these foreign firms tend to demand high quality inputs from and provide knowledge trainings to domestic suppliers.

The *Age* variable proves to have a positive but insignificant coefficient, suggesting no significant difference in technical efficiency change between older and younger firms. Similar to the estimate on technical efficiency level, the insignificant estimate of age on technical efficiency change is unsurprising since the relationship between these two factors is still unsettled. Nevertheless, some previous studies that use different method of analysis have shown an insignificant effect of age on technical efficiency change (e.g. Berghall, 2006).

VI. Conclusions and Policy Implications

This article aims to estimate FDI spillovers on technical efficiency levels and technical efficiency

changes of the Indonesian pharmaceutical sector. The SPF and the DEA based MPI are used to the plant-level survey data over the period 1990–1995. The empirical results from the stochastic frontier method show that foreign firms are less inefficient than domestic firms and there are positive spillover effects of FDI on technical efficiencies of domestic suppliers. Therefore, these results support the conventional wisdom of the advanced knowledge of foreign firms. Similarly, the results from the MPI show that FDI generates negative spillovers to domestic competitors, but provides positive spillovers to domestic suppliers.

The policy implications of these findings might not provide straightforward support for policies promoting FDI in the Indonesian pharmaceutical sector. From the outcomes obtained in the estimations, policy makers might at least need to consider whether the incoming FDI is intended to serve the domestic demands or to benefit from being near to local suppliers. In cases where there is potential for multinationals to 'steal' market from domestic firms, policy makers should at least, at the minimum, to ensure that the negative FDI spillovers on domestic firms do not outweigh the overall benefits of the FDI. In contrast, when there is potential for multinational companies to source inputs from local suppliers, policy makers should provide incentives to encourage FDI. Furthermore, institutional reforms including political system, economic management and government administration and trade policies are needed in order to develop a more competitive environment in the whole manufacturing sector.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank the participants for useful comments. Comments and suggestions from

anonymous reviewers and editor are also highly appreciated. The remaining errors and confusion are the responsibility of the authors.

References

- Aitken, B. J. and Harrison, A. E. (1999) Do domestic firms benefit from direct foreign investment? Evidence from Venezuela, *American Economic Review*, **89**, 605–18.
- Arrow, K. J. (1962) The economic implications of learning by doing, *The Review of Economic Studies*, **29**, 155–73.
- Balcombe, K., Fraser, I., Latruffe, L., Rahman, M. and Smith, L. (2008) An application of the DEA double bootstrap to examine sources of efficiency in Bangladesh rice farming, *Applied Economics*, **40**, 1919–25.
- Baltagi, B. H. (2008) *Econometric Analysis of Panel Data*, 4th edn, John Wiley & Sons, West Sussex.
- Bartelsman, E. J. and Doms, M. (2000) Understanding productivity: lessons from longitudinal microdata, *Journal of Economic Literature*, **38**, 569–94.
- Battese, G. E. and Coelli, T. J. (1993) A stochastic frontier production function incorporating a model for technical inefficiency effects, Working Paper in Econometrics and Applied Statistics, Department of Economics University of New England.
- Battese, G. E. and Coelli, T. J. (1995) A model for technical inefficiency effects in a stochastic frontier production function for panel data, *Empirical Economics*, **20**, 325–32.
- Berghall, E. (2006) Technical change, efficiency, firm size and age in R&D intensive sector, GIER Working Paper No. 390, Government Institute for Economic Research.
- Blalock, G. and Gertler, P. J. (2008) Welfare gain from foreign direct investment through technology transfer to local suppliers, *Journal of International Economics*, **74**, 402–21.
- Blomstrom, M. and Kokko, A. (1998) Multinational corporation and spillovers, *Journal of Economic Surveys*, **12**, 247–77.
- Caves, R. E. (1974) Multinational firms, competition and productivity in host country markets, *Economica*, **41**, 176–93.
- Chen, T. J. and Tang, D. P. (1987) Comparing technical efficiency between import-substitution-oriented and export-oriented foreign firms in a developing economy, *Journal of Development Economics*, **26**, 277–89.
- Chuang, Y. C. and Hsu, P. F. (2004) FDI, trade, and spillover efficiency: evidence from China's manufacturing sector, *Applied Economics*, **36**, 1103–15.
- Coelli, T. J. (1996) A guide to frontier version 4.1: a computer program for stochastic frontier production and cost function estimation, CEPA Working Paper No. 07/96, University of New England.
- Coelli, T. J., Rao, D. S. P., O'Donnell, C. J. and Battese, G. E. (2005) *An Introduction to Efficiency and Productivity Analysis*, 2nd edn, Springer, New York.
- Das, S. (1987) Externalities and technology transfer through multinational corporations, *Journal of International Economics*, **22**, 171–82.
- Dimelis, S. and Lauri, H. (2002) Foreign direct investment and efficiency benefits: a conditional quartile analysis, *Oxford Economic Papers*, **54**, 449–69.
- Dimelis, S. and Lauri, H. (2004) Foreign direct investment and technology spillovers: which firms really benefit?, *Review of World Economics*, **140**, 230–53.
- Djankov, S. and Hockman, B. (2000) Foreign investment and productivity growth in Czech enterprises, *World Bank Economic Review*, **14**, 49–64.
- Driffield, N. (2001) The impact on domestic productivity of inward investment in the UK, *The Manchester School*, **69**, 103–19.
- Dunning, J. (1988) *Multinational, Technology and Competitiveness*, Allen & Unwin, London.
- Färe, R., Grosskopf, S., Norris, M. and Zhang, Z. (1994) Productivity growth, technical progress, and efficiency change in industrialized countries, *American Economic Review*, **84**, 66–83.
- Färe, R. and Primont, D. (1995) *Multi-output Production and Duality: Theory and Applications*, Kluwer Academic, Boston and Dordrecht.
- Farrell, M. J. (1957) The measurement of productive efficiency, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, **120**, 253–90.
- Ghali, S. and Rezgui, S. (2008) FDI contribution to technical efficiency in the Tunisian manufacturing sector, ERF Working Paper Series No. 421.
- Glass, A. and Saggi, K. (2002) Multinational firms and technology transfer, *Scandinavian Journal of Economics*, **104**, 495–514.
- Globerman, S. (1979) Foreign direct investment and 'spillover' efficiency benefits in Canadian manufacturing industries, *The Canadian Journal of Economics*, **12**, 42–56.
- Gorg, H. and Strobl, E. (2001) Multinational companies and productivity spillovers: a meta-analysis, *Economic Journal*, **111**, F723–39.
- Gorg, H. and Strobl, E. (2005) Spillovers from foreign firms through worker mobility: an empirical investigation, *Scandinavian Journal of Economics*, **107**, 693–739.
- Greene, W. H. (2008) *Econometric Analysis*, 6th edn, Pearson International Publisher, New Jersey.
- Haddad, M. and Harrison, A. E. (1993) Are there positive spillovers from foreign direct investment? Evidence from panel data for Morocco, *Journal of Development Economics*, **42**, 51–74.
- Harding, T. and Javorcik, B. S. (2007) Developing economies and international investors: do investment promotion agencies bring them together?, Policy Research Working Paper No. 4339, World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Hatzichronoglou, T. (1997) Revision of the high-technology sector and product classification, STI Working Paper, OECD, Paris.
- Hill, H. and Kalirajan, K. (1993) Small enterprises and firm-level technical efficiency in the Indonesian garment industry, *Applied Economics*, **25**, 1137–44.
- Hymer, S. H. (1960) The international operations of national firms: a study of direct foreign investment, PhD Dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, MA (Published by MIT Press in 1976).
- Ikhsan, M. (2007) Total factor productivity growth in Indonesian manufacturing: a stochastic frontier approach, *Global Economic Review*, **36**, 321–42.
- Jacob, J. (2006) International technology spillovers and manufacturing performance in Indonesia, PhD

- Dissertation, Technische Universiteit Eindhoven. Available at www.alexandria.tue.nl/extra2/200610843.pdf (accessed 6 September 2007).
- Javorcik, B. S. (2004) Does foreign direct investment increase the productivity of domestic firms? In search of spillovers through backward linkages, *American Economic Review*, **94**, 605–27.
- Kathuria, V. (2000) Productivity spillovers from technology transfer to Indian manufacturing firms, *Journal of International Development*, **12**, 343–69.
- Kathuria, V. (2001) Foreign firms, technology transfer and knowledge spillovers to Indian manufacturing firms: a stochastic frontier analysis, *Applied Economics*, **33**, 625–42.
- Konings, J. (2001) The effects of foreign direct investment on domestic firms, *Economics of Transition*, **9**, 619–33.
- Kugler, M. (2006) Spillovers from foreign direct investment: within or between industries?, *Journal of Development Economics*, **80**, 444–77.
- Kumbhakar, S. C., Ghosh, S. and McGuckin, J. T. (1991) A generalized production frontier approach for estimating determinants of inefficiency in US dairy farms, *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*, **9**, 279–86.
- Kumbhakar, S. C. and Lovell, C. A. K. (2000) *Stochastic Frontier Analysis*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Liang, F. H. (2007) Does foreign direct investment improve the productivities of domestic firms? Technology spillovers within and between industries, Haas Berkeley Working Paper. Available at <http://faculty.haas.berkeley.edu/fenliang/research/spillover/FDIspillover.pdf> (accessed 20 July 2007).
- Lipsey, R. E. and Sjöholm, F. (2005) The impact of inward FDI on host countries: why such different answers?, in *Does Foreign Direct Investment Promote Development?* (Eds) T. H. Moran, E. Graham and M. Blomstrom, Institute for International Economics and Center for Global Development, Washington, DC, pp. 23–43.
- Malerba, F. (1992) Learning by firms and incremental technical change, *Economic Journal*, **102**, 845–59.
- Narjoko, D. A. and Hill, H. (2007) Winners and losers during a deep economic crisis: firm level evidence for Indonesian manufacturing, *Asian Economic Journal*, **21**, 343–68.
- Pitt, M. M. and Lee, L.-F. (1981) The measurement and sources of technical inefficiency in the Indonesian weaving industry, *Journal of Development Economics*, **9**, 43–64.
- Rodriguez-Clare, A. (1996) Multinationals, linkages, and economic development, *American Economic Review*, **86**, 852–72.
- Salim, R. A. (2009) Differentials at firm level productive capacity realization in Bangladesh food manufacturing: an empirical analysis, *Applied Economics*, **40**, 3111–26.
- Shepard, R. W. (1970) *Theory of Cost and Production Function*, Princeton University Press, New Jersey.
- Suyanto, Salim, R. A. and Bloch, H. (2009) Does foreign direct investment lead to productivity spillovers? Firm level evidence from Indonesia, *World Development*, **37**, 1861–76.
- Teece, D. J. (1977) Technology transfer by multinational firms: the resource cost of transferring technological know-how, *Economic Journal*, **87**, 242–61.
- Thangavelu, S. M. and Pattnayak, S. S. (2006) Linkages and spillovers from foreign ownership in the Indian pharmaceutical firms, SCAPE Working Paper Series No. 2006/05.
- Vial, V. (2006) New estimates of total factor productivity growth in Indonesian manufacturing, *Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies*, **42**, 357–69.
- Wacker, J. G., Yang, C.-L. and Sheu, C. (2006) Productivity of production labor, non-production labor, and capital: an international study, *International Journal of Production Economics*, **103**, 863–72.
- Wang, M. (2010) Foreign direct investment and domestic investment in the host country: evidence from panel study, *Applied Economics*, **42**, 3711–21.
- Wang, J. W. and Blomstrom, M. (1992) Foreign investment and technology transfer: a simple model, *European Economic Review*, **36**, 137–55.
- Wang, H. J. and Schmidt, P. (2002) One-step and two-step estimation of the effects of exogenous variables on technical efficiency level, *Journal of Productivity Analysis*, **18**, 129–44.
- Wang, C. and Yu, L. (2007) Do spillover benefits grow with rising foreign direct investment? An empirical examination of the case of China, *Applied Economics*, **39**, 397–405.
- Winter, S. (1987) Knowledge and competence as strategic assets, in *The Competitive Challenge* (Ed.) D. Teece, Ballinger, Cambridge, pp. 159–84.
- Zofio, J. L. (2007) Malmquist productivity index decompositions: a unifying framework, *Applied Economics*, **39**, 2371–87.

Appendix

Back-casting the missing values of capital

Following Vial (2006) and Ikhsan (2007), the missing values of establishment capital are back-casting using the following regression for the observed period 1988–1995:

$$\ln k_{it} = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 \ln y_{it-1} + \mu_{it} + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (\text{A1})$$

where k_{it} represents the fixed assets of establishment i at time t , y_{it-1} represents the gross-output of establishments i at time $t-1$, and γ_1 denote parameters to be estimated, μ_{it} is the establishment-specific effect, and ε_{it} is the remainder disturbance. The reason for choosing a 1-year lag of gross-output as an independent variable is to control for a potential endogeneity problems that could arise if using the

gross-output at time t . In other words, as the predicted fixed assets from Equation A1 will be used as the capital variable in the SPFs, the use of gross-output at time t as an independent variable may cause an endogeneity bias in estimations.

The Equation A1 is estimated using RE Generalized Least Squared (GLS) estimation. There are two basic reasons for choosing RE model instead of FE model. First, a RE model avoids an enormous loss in degree of freedom, as would have happened under the FE model (Greene, 2008). Second, as

indicated by Baltagi (2008), an RE is to be preferred for a panel set with a larger number of establishments if compared to the time period, because the prediction in a RE model is unconditional of the number of establishments. The RE-GLS estimation is carried out under STATA10 computer software, and the estimates are then used to calculate the missing value of capital. By doing so, all missing values of capital are filled and the consistent panel set is constructed.

Foreign Direct Investment Spillovers and Technical Efficiency in the Indonesian Pharmaceutical Sector: Firm Level Evidence

GRADEMARK REPORT

FINAL GRADE

/100

GENERAL COMMENTS

Instructor

PAGE 1

PAGE 2

PAGE 3

PAGE 4

PAGE 5

PAGE 6

PAGE 7

PAGE 8

PAGE 9

PAGE 10

PAGE 11

PAGE 12

PAGE 13

PAGE 14

Foreign Direct Investment Spillovers and Technical Efficiency in the Indonesian Pharmaceutical Sector: Firm Level Evidence

ORIGINALITY REPORT

41%
SIMILARITY INDEX

34%
INTERNET SOURCES

34%
PUBLICATIONS

26%
STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1	repository.usfca.edu Internet Source	3%
2	Submitted to Curtin University of Technology Student Paper	3%
3	www.ijcem.org Internet Source	2%
4	berument.bilkent.edu.tr Internet Source	2%
5	Submitted to Swinburne University of Technology Student Paper	1%
6	Submitted to Lovely Professional University Student Paper	1%
7	Widodo, Wahyu, Ruhul Salim, and Harry Bloch. "Agglomeration Economies and Productivity Growth in Manufacturing Industry: Empirical Evidence from Indonesia", Economic Record, 2014.	1%

- | | | |
|----|--|----|
| 8 | openarchive.cbs.dk
Internet Source | 1% |
| 9 | Francesca Battaglia. "The efficiency of cooperative banks: the impact of environmental economic conditions", Applied Financial Economics, 09/2010
Publication | 1% |
| 10 | Xavier Irz. "Dual Technological Development in Botswana Agriculture: A Stochastic Input Distance Function Approach", Journal of Agricultural Economics, 11/2004
Publication | 1% |
| 11 | Submitted to The University of Manchester
Student Paper | 1% |
| 12 | icfc2014.com
Internet Source | 1% |
| 13 | Submitted to ESLSCA Business School (Cairo)
Student Paper | 1% |
| 14 | www2.gsu.edu
Internet Source | 1% |
| 15 | Beata S. Javorcik. "Tough Love: Do Czech Suppliers Learn from their Relationships with Multinationals?* : Do Czech suppliers learn from their relationships with MNCs?", | 1% |

16

Suyanto, , and Ruhul Salim. "Foreign direct investment spillovers and technical efficiency in the Indonesian pharmaceutical sector: firm level evidence", Applied Economics, 2013.

Publication

1%

17

Jose Zofio. "Malmquist productivity index decompositions: a unifying framework", Applied Economics, 10/2007

Publication

<1%

18

dspace.lboro.ac.uk

Internet Source

<1%

19

www.bankofgreece.gr

Internet Source

<1%

20

Submitted to University of Edinburgh

Student Paper

<1%

21

www-wds.worldbank.org

Internet Source

<1%

22

Submitted to University of Leeds

Student Paper

<1%

23

ageconsearch.umn.edu

Internet Source

<1%

24

econstor.eu

Internet Source

<1%

25	www.academicjournals.org Internet Source	<1%
26	www19.uniovi.es Internet Source	<1%
27	Submitted to 3241 Student Paper	<1%
28	Widodo, Wahyu, Ruhul Salim, and Harry Bloch. "The effects of agglomeration economies on technical efficiency of manufacturing firms: evidence from Indonesia", Applied Economics, 2015. Publication	<1%
29	Yan, Xiaohuan(Institut für Betriebslehre der Agrar- und Ernährungswirtschaft). "Land tenure arrangements, factor market development and agricultural production in China : Evidence from Henan province", Justus-Liebig-Universität Gießen, 2013. Publication	<1%
30	Submitted to University of Limerick Student Paper	<1%
31	takaecon.sixcore.jp Internet Source	<1%
32	www.southernmedreview.org Internet Source	<1%

33	Aldo Bertazzoli, Rino Ghelfi, Isidoro Guzmán, Sergio Rivaroli. "A Dual Approach to Evaluating the Agricultural Productivity of Fruit Farms in Emilia-Romagna", Outlook on Agriculture, 2014 Publication	<1%
34	www.economics.ox.ac.uk Internet Source	<1%
35	www.webmeets.com Internet Source	<1%
36	www.irjet.net Internet Source	<1%
37	Submitted to Florida Atlantic University Student Paper	<1%
38	Submitted to University of Essex Student Paper	<1%
39	citeseerx.ist.psu.edu Internet Source	<1%
40	Submitted to Multimedia University Student Paper	<1%
41	Murugesan Ramasamy, Dominic Dhanapal, Poovendhan Murugesan. "Effects of FDI spillover on regional productivity", International Journal of Emerging Markets, 2017 Publication	<1%

42 Brian J Aitken. "Do Domestic Firms Benefit from Direct Foreign Investment? Evidence from Venezuela", *The American Economic Review*, 06/1999

Publication

<1%

43 www.eiasm.org

Internet Source

<1%

44 Ghose, A., and C. Chakraborti. "The Relative Role of Imports and Exports in Explaining Productivity of Indian Bio-Pharmaceutical Firms: Evidence from Non Parametric Data Envelopment Analysis", *Foreign Trade Review*, 2013.

Publication

<1%

45 Anubhuti Dwivedi. "Effect of FDI and Trade on Productivity in Indian Electronics Firms", *The Indian Economic Journal*, 2017

Publication

<1%

46 www.palgraveconnect.com

Internet Source

<1%

47 Ramstetter, Eric D., and Phan Minh Ngoc. "Productivity, ownership, and producer concentration in transition: Further evidence from Vietnamese manufacturing", *Journal of Asian Economics*, 2013.

Publication

<1%

48	iefsmaryland.org Internet Source	<1%
49	business.marquette.edu Internet Source	<1%
50	DellaVigna, Stefano, and M.Â Daniele Paserman. "Job Search and Impatience", <i>Journal of Labor Economics</i> , 2005. Publication	<1%
51	hal.archives-ouvertes.fr Internet Source	<1%
52	Heru Margono. "Technical efficiency and productivity analysis in Indonesian provincial economies", <i>Applied Economics</i> , 06/11/2009 Publication	<1%
53	128.118.178.162 Internet Source	<1%
54	www.vdqs.net Internet Source	<1%
55	siti.feem.it Internet Source	<1%
56	Submitted to Bridgepoint Education Student Paper	<1%
57	www.aidsdatahub.org Internet Source	<1%

58	www.soton.ac.uk Internet Source	<1%
59	Hal Hill. "Small enterprise and firm-level technical efficiency in the Indonesian garment industry", Applied Economics, 9/1993 Publication	<1%
60	link.springer.com Internet Source	<1%
61	www.sciencpress.com Internet Source	<1%
62	dro.deakin.edu.au Internet Source	<1%
63	doria.fi Internet Source	<1%
64	Submitted to Middlesex University Student Paper	<1%
65	Submitted to Management Development Institute Student Paper	<1%
66	etd.lib.metu.edu.tr Internet Source	<1%
67	authors.repec.org Internet Source	<1%
68	Virginie Vial. "NEW ESTIMATES OF TOTAL	

FACTOR PRODUCTIVITY GROWTH IN
INDONESIAN MANUFACTURING", Bulletin of
Indonesian Economic Studies, 12/1/2006

Publication

<1%

69

www.emeraldinsight.com

Internet Source

<1%

70

ira.le.ac.uk

Internet Source

<1%

71

issuu.com

Internet Source

<1%

72

Submitted to Sunway Education Group

Student Paper

<1%

73

www.tandfonline.com

Internet Source

<1%

74

Wu, Harry X., Esther Y. P. Shea, and Alice Shiu. "Has China's fast industrial growth been efficient? An industry-level investigation with a newly constructed data set", Applied Economics, 2015.

Publication

<1%

75

www.klausmeyer.co.uk

Internet Source

<1%

76

digamo.free.fr

Internet Source

<1%

77

Malik, Sanjaya Kumar. "Conditional technology

spillovers from foreign direct investment: evidence from Indian manufacturing industries", Journal of Productivity Analysis, 2015.

Publication

<1%

78

www.niesr.ac.uk

Internet Source

<1%

79

Submitted to Universiteit van Amsterdam

Student Paper

<1%

80

open.library.ubc.ca

Internet Source

<1%

81

Sung Tai Kim. "The Role of Local Public Sectors in Regional Economic Growth in Korea", Asian Economic Journal, 06/1997

Publication

<1%

82

Submitted to National Institute of Development Administration

Student Paper

<1%

83

www.piscesforum.org

Internet Source

<1%

84

www.boj.or.jp

Internet Source

<1%

85

Emilio Galdeano-Gómez. "Productivity and Environmental Performance in Marketing Cooperatives: An Analysis of the Spanish

<1%

Horticultural Sector", Journal of Agricultural Economics, 9/2006

Publication

86

Submitted to GRIPS National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies

Student Paper

<1%

87

Sørensen, Allan. "Additive versus multiplicative trade costs and the gains from trade liberalizations : Additive versus multiplicative trade costs", Canadian Journal of Economics/Revue canadienne d'économie, 2014.

Publication

<1%

88

Beata Smarzynska Javorcik. "Does Foreign Direct Investment Increase the Productivity of Domestic Firms? In Search of Spillovers Through Backward Linkages", The American Economic Review, 06/2004

Publication

<1%

89

halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr

Internet Source

<1%

90

www.igidr.ac.in

Internet Source

<1%

91

www.soc.uoc.gr

Internet Source

<1%

92

Submitted to University of Pretoria

<1%

93

Submitted to Higher Education Commission
Pakistan

Student Paper

<1%

94

deazone.com

Internet Source

<1%

95

Susan Mason, Kenneth P. Thomas. "Tax
Increment Financing in Missouri: An Analysis of
Determinants, Competitive Dynamics, Equity,
and Path Dependency", Economic
Development Quarterly, 2010

Publication

<1%

96

orbi.ulg.ac.be

Internet Source

<1%

97

eprints.utas.edu.au

Internet Source

<1%

98

Ruhul Salim. "Business expenditures on R&D
and trade performances in Australia: is there a
link?", Applied Economics, 2007

Publication

<1%

99

scholarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu

Internet Source

<1%

100

Sheng-Hung Chen. "What determines bank
productivity? International evidence on the

<1%

impact of banking competition, bank regulation, and the global financial crisis", Emerald, 2013

Publication

101 Po-Shen Lin, Chyi-Tyi Lee, Chin-Tung Cheng, Chih-Hsuan Sung. "Response spectral attenuation relations for shallow crustal earthquakes in Taiwan", Engineering Geology, 2011

Publication

102 Barbara Casu. "An analysis of the relevance of off-balance sheet items in explaining productivity change in European banking", Applied Financial Economics, 10/15/2005

Publication

103 www.druid.dk

Internet Source

104 business.uow.edu.au

Internet Source

105 agriculturejournals.cz

Internet Source

106 Concetta Castiglione. "Technical efficiency and ICT investment in Italian manufacturing firms", Applied Economics, 2011

Publication

107 bibliotecadigital.fgv.br

<1%

108 www.csae.ox.ac.uk
Internet Source

<1%

109 **Sirus Sharifi, Arunima Haldar, S.V.D. Nageswara Rao. "Relationship between operational risk management, size, and ownership of Indian banks", Managerial Finance, 2016**
Publication

<1%

110 www.eurojournals.com
Internet Source

<1%

111 faculty.buffalostate.edu
Internet Source

<1%

112 www.sed.manchester.ac.uk
Internet Source

<1%

113 **International Series in Operations Research & Management Science, 2016.**
Publication

<1%

114 www.isid.ac.in
Internet Source

<1%

115 **Xiaolan Fu. "Exports, Foreign Direct Investment and Economic Development in China", Springer Nature, 2004**
Publication

<1%

116	lse.ac.uk Internet Source	<1%
117	www.diva-portal.org Internet Source	<1%
118	Journal of Asia Business Studies, Volume 3, Issue 2 (2012-08-06) Publication	<1%
119	Yang Yang, Zhenxing Mao. "Learning From "Alien Monks?" The Productivity Spillovers of Foreign-Invested Hotels in China", Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research, 2015 Publication	<1%
120	www.merit.unu.edu Internet Source	<1%
121	www.ln.edu.hk Internet Source	<1%
122	ediss.sub.uni-hamburg.de Internet Source	<1%
123	edepot.wur.nl Internet Source	<1%
124	pick-me.carloalberto.org Internet Source	<1%
125	eprints.port.ac.uk Internet Source	<1%

126	sbaer.uca.edu Internet Source	<1%
127	Lee, In Hyeock, Eunsuk Hong, and Laixiang Sun. "Inward Foreign Direct Investment and Domestic Entrepreneurship: A Regional Analysis of New Firm Creation in Korea", <i>Regional Studies</i> , 2014. Publication	<1%
128	www.manchester-review.org.uk Internet Source	<1%
129	collections.plymouth.ac.uk Internet Source	<1%
130	193.196.11.222 Internet Source	<1%
131	Estrin, Saul Uvalic, Milica. "Foreign direct investment in the Western Balkans: what role has it played during transition?(Origina", <i>Comparative Economic Studies</i> , Sept 2016 Issue Publication	<1%
132	Todsadee, Areerat -, Hiroshi - Kameyama, Kamol Ngamsomsuk, and Koh-en Yamauchi. "Production Efficiency of Broiler Farming in Thailand: A Stochastic Frontier Approach", <i>Journal of Agricultural Science</i> , 2012. Publication	<1%

133	institute.unido.org Internet Source	<1%
134	Elisabetta Ottoz. "The impact of ownership on the cost of bus service provision: an example from Italy", <i>Applied Economics</i> , 2008 Publication	<1%
135	editorialexpress.com Internet Source	<1%
136	www.cete.cl Internet Source	<1%
137	walkerd.people.cofc.edu Internet Source	<1%
138	Mussard, S.. "On multi-decomposition of the aggregate Malmquist productivity index", <i>Economics Letters</i> , 200606 Publication	<1%
139	Mohamad Ikhsan. "Total Factor Productivity Growth in Indonesian Manufacturing: A Stochastic Frontier Approach", <i>Global Economic Review</i> , 12/2007 Publication	<1%
140	Sumon Kumar Bhaumik, Nigel Driffield, Ying Zhou. "Sources of Competitiveness and Multinationality: Emerging Market Firms in the Electronics Industry", <i>Emerald</i> , 2015 Publication	<1%

141	dse.univr.it Internet Source	<1%
142	researchbank.rmit.edu.au Internet Source	<1%
143	www.cggc.duke.edu Internet Source	<1%
144	www.sbs.ox.ac.uk Internet Source	<1%
145	Qiang (Steven) Lu, Chinmay Pattnaik, Mengze Shi. "Spillover effects of marketing expertise on market performance of domestic firms and MNEs in emerging markets", <i>Management Decision</i> , 2016 Publication	<1%
146	www.gep.org.uk Internet Source	<1%
147	repository.umac.mo Internet Source	<1%
148	"FOREIGN DIRECT INVESTMENT IN GREECE: PRODUCTIVITY AND TECHNOLOGY DIFFUSION", <i>Bank of Greece Economic Bulletin/11059729</i> , 20081101 Publication	<1%
149	LUNDVALL, KARL BATTESE, GEORGE E.. "Firm Size, Age and Efficiency: Evidence from	<1%

Kenyan Manufacturing Firms.", Journal of Development Studies, Feb 2000 Issue

Publication

150 Hoang Duong Vu. "Technical efficiency of FDI firms in the Vietnamese manufacturing sector", Review of Economic Perspectives, 2016 <1%

Publication

151 T. Bayarsaihan. "Productivity growth in pre-1990 Mongolian agriculture: spiralling disaster or emerging success?", Agricultural Economics, 2/2003 <1%

Publication

152 Alene, A.D.. "The production efficiency of intercropping annual and perennial crops in southern Ethiopia: A comparison of distance functions and production frontiers", Agricultural Systems, 200611 <1%

Publication

153 Pavlinek, P., and P. i alova. "Linkages and spillovers in global production networks: firm-level analysis of the Czech automotive industry", Journal of Economic Geography, 2014. <1%

Publication

154 Joshua Abor. "Foreign direct investment and firm productivity: evidence from firm-level data", Global Business and Economics Review, <1%

2010

Publication

155 Yanrui Wu. "Technical Efficiency and Firm Attributes in the Chinese Iron and Steel Industry", International Review of Applied Economics, 5/1996 <1%

Publication

156 Kim, Sangho. "Identifying and estimating sources of technical inefficiency in Korean manufacturing industries.", Contemporary Economic Policy, Jan 2003 Issue <1%

Publication

157 I.K.M. Mokhtarul Wadud. "Technical Efficiency in Australian Textile and Clothing Firms: Evidence From the Business Longitudinal Survey", Australian Economic Papers, 9/2004 <1%

Publication

158 Doan, Tinh, David Maré, and Kris Iyer. "Productivity spillovers from foreign direct investment in New Zealand", New Zealand Economic Papers, 2014. <1%

Publication

159 Defung, Felisitas, Ruhul Salim, and Harry Bloch. "Has regulatory reform had any impact on bank efficiency in Indonesia? A two-stage analysis", Applied Economics, 2016. <1%

Publication

Ricardo A. Lopez. "Trade and Growth: Reconciling the Macroeconomic and Microeconomic Evidence", *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 9/2005

Publication

<1%

Exclude quotes Off

Exclude matches Off

Exclude bibliography Off