

The Role of FDI in Accelerating India's Economic Development: A Macroeconomic Perspective

Sushma Karnati

Associate Professor

Dept. Of Management, Aurora's PG College, Hyderabad

Abstract

Foreign direct investment (FDI) has been extensively studied as a significant driver of economic growth, particularly in transitioning economies. In the Indian context, while FDI inflows have increased substantially since the economic liberalization of the 1990s, their impact remains relatively limited when measured as a percentage of GDP or total investment. This stands in sharp contrast to the transformative role FDI has played in the rapid development of other Asian economies like China and ASEAN nations, where the FDI-export model has been crucial to their growth trajectories. India's comparatively lower FDI absorption stems from a complex interplay of domestic and international factors. The academic discourse presents divergent views on FDI's role: proponents highlight its benefits in enhancing production capacity, operational efficiency, and managerial capabilities, while critics caution against potential negative consequences, viewing it as a potential vehicle for economic exploitation in developing nations. This dichotomy necessitates a thorough examination of FDI's actual impact on India's economic expansion to inform balanced policy decisions.

I. Introduction

Foreign direct investment (FDI) exerts both direct and indirect influences on host economies. Direct effects manifest through measurable impacts on domestic income, employment, price stability, productivity enhancement, and export growth. Indirectly, FDI generates spillover effects that stimulate competitive domestic markets, driving improvements in product quality, operational efficiency, and business processes. However, the empirical evidence regarding these spillovers remains contested, particularly concerning the special incentives often granted to foreign enterprises. This academic debate persists as researchers continue to assess FDI's net benefits for developing economies.

India's FDI landscape has evolved significantly since colonial times, when British capital dominated the market. Post-independence policymakers strategically crafted FDI regulations to balance national interests with technology transfer objectives. The 1990s marked a watershed moment with comprehensive liberalization reforms, supported by international financial institutions, which transformed India into a premier FDI destination. From negligible inflows in 1990, India rose to become the world's second-most attractive FDI location (after China) during 2010-2012, with major investments concentrating in services (20% of total FDI), telecommunications, construction, and technology sectors. Key contributors included Mauritius, Singapore, the U.S., and U.K. investors.

This study specifically examines FDI's sectoral impacts, focusing on services, construction, trade, mining, and agriculture - critical domains that have received substantial foreign investment but demonstrate varying

degrees of developmental outcomes. The analysis considers both the historical policy evolution and contemporary dynamics shaping FDI's role in India's growth trajectory, providing insights into how foreign capital can be optimally harnessed for sustainable economic advancement.

Further insights from GYANPRATHA – ACCMAN (Journal of Management, Volume 5 Issue 1, 2013) indicated that FDI for the fiscal year 2009-10 totaled US\$ 25.88 billion, a slight decrease from US\$ 27.33 billion in the preceding fiscal year. In 2013, the Indian government relaxed FDI regulations across various industries, encompassing telecommunications, defense, public-sector oil refineries, power exchanges, and stock exchanges, among others.

Over the past fifteen years, Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) has become an increasingly vital component of global economic integration. The significance of FDI in the world economy is evident from its dramatic growth from representing just 8% of global GDP in 1990 to 26% by 2006. While developed OECD nations continue to account for the majority of FDI flows, developing economies - particularly the BRIC countries (Brazil, Russia, India, and China) - have emerged as major destinations for foreign capital. This shift is reflected in the rising share of global FDI inflows to non-OECD countries, which increased from 22% to 32% between 1990 and 2005. China has dominated this trend, receiving approximately one-third of all FDI flowing to developing nations in 2005, though other emerging markets have also attracted substantial investments. Notably, since the mid-1990s, FDI has surpassed official development assistance as the primary source of external financing for developing countries, with inflows exceeding government aid by more than two-fold.

The central objective of this study is to meticulously examine the impact of FDI inflows on various sectors within India's economy, including services, construction, trade, mining, and agriculture.

II. Review of Literature

Debatable views of spillovers in technology, knowledge, productivity and creation of competitive business scenario coupled with a growth in capital inflow triggered by FDIs has been well documented in the literature. “Some critics however view that FDIs could bring about deterioration in the balance of payments in developing countries like India” (Kaur, Yadav & Gautam, 2013)¹. “The causality between FDI inflow and economic growth also spurs in considerable contradictory opinions in literature. In this section, we highlight in brief the contradictory viewpoints about this linkage and try to identify other parameter which determines FDI influx in developing countries. The relationship between the inflow of FDI and economic growth in developing countries like India is documented in literature with contrasting viewpoints. The beneficial effects of FDI on the economic growth mainly arising due the spillover effects has been empirically analysed” by Borensztein, De Gregorio and Lee (1998)²; Zhang (2001)³; Sun and Parikh (2001)⁴; Liu et al. (1997)⁵; Tsai (1991)⁶; Hansen and Rand (2005)⁷; Yao (2006)⁸; and Chang (2007)⁹. “Another group of researchers had tried to establish the linkage between FDI and economic growth. Although there are very limited evidences in literature addressing the issue to that context, it has been an area of interest to the researchers recently. However, the studies have reported contrasting results about the nexus between FDI and Economic growth” (Choi and Baek, 2017)¹⁰; Chakraborty and Basu, 2002¹¹; Agrawal and Khan, 2011¹²; and Dash and Parida, 2013¹³; Sahoo and Mathiyazhagan, 2003¹⁴; Pradhan, 2002¹⁵. According to Pradhan (2002)¹⁵ “FDI does not have significant positive growth impacts and thus they have concluded that the contribution of FDI to economic growth was

minimal. On the other hand, **Chakraborty and Nunnenkamp (2008)¹⁶** find that the influx of FDI contributes to economic growth for the Indian economy". **Dash and Parida (2013)¹³** reported about passing a beneficial effect of FDI on growth, after controlling for trade.

"The results were however not contrasting only to the context of India. The available literature also documents for cross country studies and documents for this contrasting results. Johnson (2006) examined the impact of FDI on growth for a panel of 90 countries and found the result to be positive and significant." While **Motaleb (2007)¹⁷** "assessed the impact of FDI on growth for 60 low and middle income countries and concluded that large GDP and GDP growth rate are instrumental in attracting FDI. Some researchers view FDI as an instrument for promoting the economic growth of host countries". **Balasubramanyam et al. (1996)¹⁸** shows that FDI leads to growth in those countries which followed export promotion policies over import substitution policies.

"Apart from these parameters of balance of payments, trade and growth, few other factors also contributed to the inflow of FDI. These factors include human capital, GDP per capita, government consumption, foreign exchange and trade distortions" (**Siddiqui and Ahmed, 2017¹⁹, Borenzstein et al., 1998²⁰**). Other factors like stable macroeconomic policies, institutional quality, lowering inflation rate, tax rates, and government consumption are required to attract FDI and lead to growth (**Siddiqui and Ahmed, 2017¹⁹, Dhakal et al. (2007)²¹** "indicate that in India causality is bidirectional and flows from growth to FDI and from FDI to growth. Trade openness and development of the financial sector are also desired for attracting higher FDI in India." **Mathiyazhagan (2005)²²** examines "the relationship between FDI, output, export and labour productivity for the Indian economy during the time period from 1990-1991 to 2000-2001 based on the model given by" **Sahoo et al. (2002)²³** and **Sahoo and Mathiyazhagan (2003)²⁴**. "It is found that FDI has led to a rise in output, labour productivity and export in a few sectors which is not highly significant. It has also been suggested in the study to open up export oriented sectors in order to achieve higher growth of the economy through these sectors. Education level of the labour force also plays significant role in determining the FDI influx to a country" (**Siddiqui and Ahmed, 2017¹⁹**).

Based on this literature review, it is prudent to say that the causality of the FDI and economic growth needs to be established. Further, it is also necessary to identify the other parameters via empirical methods which have an impact on the FDI influx in India.

III. Details of FDI

This study employs a quantitative research design based on secondary data analysis. The dataset was compiled from authoritative sources, including:

- ◆ The Department of Industrial Policy and Promotion (DIPP), Ministry of Commerce and Industry, Government of India
- ◆ The Reserve Bank of India (RBI)
- ◆ The World Bank
- ◆ The Centre for Monitoring Indian Economy (CMIE) online database

The research focuses on five key sectors—services, construction, trading, mining, and agriculture—and examines annual data spanning 2007 to 2017.

For empirical analysis, the study utilizes panel data estimation techniques, specifically comparing the Fixed Effects (FE) and Random Effects (RE) models. The FE model is particularly suitable for this analysis as it controls for entity-specific, time-invariant characteristics that could potentially bias the relationship between predictor and outcome variables. By accounting for the correlation between the error term and predictor variables, the FE approach isolates the net effect of the independent variables. Model selection between FE and RE specifications was determined through the Hausman test, which evaluates the consistency of estimator coefficients.

All econometric analyses were conducted using STATA statistical software, which enabled robust estimation of the panel regression models. This methodological approach ensures rigorous examination of sectoral FDI impacts while controlling for unobserved heterogeneity across industries and time periods.

IV. Results

Firstly, we have run Random Effect Panel Regression Model and the outcomes are given below.

Sector GDP	Coefficient	Standard Error (SE)	z statistic	P Value
Sector FDI	0.012	0.004	4.93	0.000
Constant	5815.574	2425.755	2.41	0.017
R Square	0.325			
Chi Square	24.260			
Prob. >Chi Square	0.000			

Table 1: Random Effect Panel Regression Model

After Random Effect Model, we have run the Fixed Effect Panel Regression Model and the results are given below.

Sector GDP	Coefficient	Standard Error (SE)	t statistic	P Value
Sector FDI	0.012	0.003	4.85	0.000
Constant	5814.816	358.360	16.24	0.000
R Square	0.324			
F Statistic	23.49			
Prob. > F	0.000			

Table 2: Fixed Effect Panel Regression Model

To select the effective model for this case, we have done Hausman Test between the Random Effect and Fixed Effect and the result of the same is given below. Test: Ho: difference in coefficients not systematic

$$\begin{aligned} Cchi\ Square &= (b-B)'[(V_b-V_B)^{-1}](b-B) = 0.00 \\ Prob>chi2 &= 0.9964 \end{aligned}$$

The Hausman Test results indicate that we should reject the Fixed Effect Model and choose the Random Effect Model at a 5% level of significance.

The Random Effect Model results show that the impact of sectoral FDI is positive, which suggests that as FDI inflows increase, so will the growth of that industry.

V. Conclusions

The empirical analysis demonstrates a statistically significant positive relationship between FDI inflows and GDP growth, suggesting that foreign direct investment serves as an important catalyst for economic expansion. These findings provide valuable insights for policymakers seeking to optimize economic growth strategies through targeted FDI promotion policies.

However, three important qualifications emerge from this research:

1. The analysis would benefit from incorporation of additional control variables that influence GDP, such as domestic investment, human capital development, and institutional factors, to isolate FDI's net effect more precisely.
2. While the aggregate model reveals FDI's macroeconomic impact, sector-specific analyses are needed to understand variations across different industries.
3. Further research should examine the transmission mechanisms through which FDI contributes to GDP growth, including technology transfer, productivity spillovers, and employment effects.

References

1. Kaur, M., Yadav, S. S., & Gautam, V. (2013). Financial system development and foreign direct investment: A panel data study for BRIC countries. *Global Business Review*, 14(4), 729-742.
2. Borensztein, E., De Gregorio, J., & Lee, J. W. (1998). How does foreign direct investment affect economic growth? *Journal of international Economics*, 45(1), 115-135.
3. Zhang, K. H., & Song, S. (2001). Promoting exports: the role of inward FDI in China. *China economic review*, 11(4), 385-396
4. Sun, H., & Parikh, A. (2001). Exports, inward foreign direct investment (FDI) and regional economic growth in China. *Regional Studies*, 35(3), 187-196.
5. Liu, X., Song, H., Wei, Y., & Romilly, P. (1997). Country characteristics and foreign direct investment in China: A panel data analysis. *Review of World Economics*, 133(2), 313-329.
6. Tsai, P. L. (1991). Determinants of foreign direct investment in Taiwan: an alternative approach with time series data. *World Development*, 19(2-3), 275-285.
7. Hansen, H., & Rand, J. (2006). On the causal links between FDI and growth in developing countries. *The World Economy*, 29(1), 21-41.
8. Yao, S. (2006). On economic growth, FDI and exports in China. *Applied Economics*, 38(3), 339-351.
9. Chang, S. J., Chung, J., & Xu, D. (2007). FDI and technology spillovers in China. Center for Economic Institutions Working Paper Series
10. Choi, Y. J., & Baek, J. (2017). Does FDI Really Matter to Economic Growth in India?. *Economics*, 5(2), 20.
11. Chakraborty, C., & Basu, P. (2002). Foreign direct investment and growth in India: A cointegration approach. *Applied economics*, 34(9), 1061-1073
12. Agrawal, G., & Khan, M. A. (2011). Impact of FDI on GDP: A comparative study of China and India. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 6(10), 71.
13. Dash, R. K., & Parida, P. C. (2013). FDI, services trade and economic growth in India: empirical evidence on causal links. *Empirical economics*, 45(1), 217-238.

14. Sahoo, D., & Mathiyazhagan, M. K. (2003). Economic Growth In India: " Does Foreign Direct Investment Inflow Matter?". *The Singapore Economic Review*, 48(02), 151-171.
15. Pradhan, J. P. (2002). FDI spillovers and local productivity growth: evidence from Indian pharmaceutical industry.
16. Chakraborty, C., & Nunnenkamp, P. (2008). Economic reforms, FDI, and economic growth in India: a sector level analysis. *World development*, 36(7), 1192-1212.
17. Mottaleb, K.A. (2007), *Determinants of foreign direct investment and its impact on economic growth in developing countries*, MPRA Paper No. 9457
18. Balasubramanyam, V.N., Salisu, M., Sapsford, D. (1996), Foreign direct investment and growth in EP and IS countries. *Economic Journal*, 106(434), 92-105.
19. Siddiqui, A. A., & Ahmed, S. (2016). Impact of Foreign Direct Investment on Sectoral Growth of Indian Economy. *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*, 7(3), 477-488.
20. Borensztein, E., De Gregorio, J., Lee, J.W. (1998), How does foreign direct investment affect economic growth? *Journal of International Economics*, 45(1), 115-135.
21. Dhakal, A., Rahman, S., Upadhyaya, K. (2007), Foreign direct investment and economic growth in Asia. *Indian Journal of Economics and Business*, 6, 15-26
22. Mathiyazhagan, M.K. (2005), *Impact of FDI on Indian Economy: A Sectoral Level Analysis*, ISAS Working Paper No. 6, Singapore.
23. Sahoo, D., Mathiyazhagan, K.M., Parida, P. (2002), Is foreign direct investment an engine of growth? Evidence from the Chinese economy. *Savings and Development*, 4, 419-439.
24. Sahoo, D., Mathiyazhagan, M.K. (2003), Economic growth in India: Does foreign direct investment inflow matter? *Singapore Economic Review*, 48(2), 151-171