▪ Global Social Sciences Review (GSSR) ▪ Vol. VII, No. I (Winter 2022) ▪ Pages: 202 – 211
▪ DOI: 10.31703/gssr.2022(VII-I).20 ▪ URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2022(VII-I).20
▪ L- ISSN: 2520-0348 ▪ p- ISSN: 2520-0348 ▪ e-ISSN: 2616-793X
▪ Citation: Ali, N., & Khan, K. I. (2022). Intellectual Property Rights, Non-Market Considerations and Foreign R&D Investments. *Global Social Sciences Review, VII*(I), 202–211. https://doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2022(VII-I).20

Intellectual Property Rights, Non-Market Considerations and Foreign R&D Investments

Naheeda Ali [*] Kanwal Iqbal Khan [†]

Contents:

Abstract: *This study focuses on how businesses can depend upon non-market elements, gain privileged handling from hosting governmental bodies, and safeguard the intellectual property in other states. This study interrogates different non-market elements; one is at the national level, while the other is at the corporate level, i.e., to influence where businesses focus their innovative efforts. It uses the qualitative method to analyse statutes, local and international laws, protocols, conventions, etc. The findings highlight the importance of intellectual property, which is the creation of the mind, innovation or innovative activities. Internationally these are fully protected by law under Intellectual property rights. Previous studies also consider other relevant factors like the political or governmental role in protecting overseas R&D investments by Intellectual property rights (IPR) regulations. Further, it concluded that the laws related to IPR and non-market factors safeguard company invention from piracy and make states more appealing for innovation-based activity.*

Key Words: Intellectual Property Rights, Innovation, Piracy, R&D Investments, Political Proficiencies, Non-Market Considerations

Introduction

Previous studies observed that companies employ multiple organisational structures to secure research and development (hear in after called, R&D) expenditures against theft worries in other states (Porter & Heppelmann, 2015). However, know-how corporations could depend upon non-market qualities to get privileged dealing from hosting governmental agencies, therefore protecting intellectual property in a foreign country (Rizopoulos & Sergakis, 2010). In this study, work on two non-market changes that affect where businesses locate their revolution actions, one at the state level and the other at the company level: hosting state disposition to corporation's native state and corporation's political skills, respectively. Consequently, consider Intellectual property rights (hear in after called, IPR). Legal policies and non-market changes protect commercial inventions from theft and make states more appealing for

[*] Assistant Professor, Department of Law, The University of the Punjab, Gujranwala Campus, Gujranwala, Punjab, Pakistan.
[†] Assistant Professor, Institute of Business and Management, University of Engineering and Technology Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan. Email: kanwal.khan@uet.edu.pk *(Corresponding Author)*

innovation-related activities (Mahmood et al., 2017).

Previous research shows that specific organisations are considered suitable compared to others in states without intellectual property laws just because of securing intellectual property rights, particularly utilising multiple organisational strategies (Ali & Khan, 2021). Aside from these tactics, non-market characteristics may impact how confidently a company may expect to use intellectual property, irrespective of the level of protection provided by the state's IPR laws (Albino-Pimentel et al., 2022). Now differentiate between analysing non-market variables at national & corporate strata (De Salvo & Signorello, 2015). We extend and expand on this line of research by concentrating on overseas R&D investment site selections and examining IPR regulations and non-market changes interrelate to protect corporation inventions from theft to make states striking for activity dealing with innovation.

Often, intangible assets become a reason for competitive advantages; their preservation becomes a critical concern, mainly when companies invest in R&D overseas (Gruber, 2017). Theft of intangible assets, like R&D inputs and outputs, is not visible compared to the open seizure of corporeal resources (Vaughan, 1995). Even though IPR limits are severe, infringements are more challenging to identify and understand. As a result, while deciding whether to invest in R&D in a specific state, corporations will probably evaluate whether IPR will be safeguarded, independent of the language of the legislation in that state. IPR regulations are deeply embedded in state laws and regulations, an imposition that is the prerogative of administrative and political establishments, and non-market elements make a significant contribution (Howse, 2002). Optimistic corporations are those whose IPR will be appropriately secured within the hosting state (Parkinson, 2003). Non-market issues of this magnitude may impact specific groups of corporations or be unique to a single organisation (Khan & Mushtaq, 2020).

At the state level, authorities in the hosting state may be more or less inclined to regard corporations from a given native state auspiciously (Butler & Broockman, 2011). This predisposition may change depending on the hosting state's overall attitude toward the house. Diplomatic ties, political affinities, and economic interdependence between the two states might all have a role. We believe that when companies contemplate investing in R&D in a state with an optimistic hosting state attitude, they will feel more secure that their intellectual property will be safeguarded, irrespective of the power of the state's official IPR regulations (Betts, 2015). Believe if the IPR framework in such states is weak, businesses will be less hesitant to engage in R&D. Few organisations may anticipate their political abilities, which have been described as "quid pro quo and quasi empowering corporations start managing the public policy efficiency and enhance preferable legislative, executive, organisational and adjudicative policy consequences," notwithstanding formal IPR regulations (Guthrie, 1990). Privileged dealing by hosting administration. Argue companies' political skills enable them to influence hosting governments indirectly, obvious by provoking native administration engagement or tacitly having professed potential to do so (Grare, 2013).

As a result, regardless of the severity of IPR regulation, we expect corporations with more vital political skills to likely compare to others who invest in R&D within the hosting state. This study adds to the corpus of information on non-market methods, overseas R&D investment & innovations regulations. To begin elaborating in previous research, political economics impact corporate strategical decision making, particularly at that time, it's emanating outsourcing innovations. Further precisely, extend earlier research protagonist non-market characteristics in foreign direct investment (hear in after called FDI) site selection to the location for overseas R&D investment secondly, how non-market changes interact at the national and business levels to affect corporate innovation strategies. Third, we contribute to a deeper understanding of how non-market variables interact with public policy, enticing R&D investment, which is a crucial purpose of innovation regulations.

Theories behind its Working/ Theory of Existing-working Mindset

Businesses' fundamental source of competitive advantage is commonly recognised as innovation (Khan et al., 2020). Multiple corporations outsource selective innovative activities to increase their competitive advantage. According to existing research, organisations that engage in innovation outsourcing might benefit both the demand and supply sides (Anttonen et al., 2013). Demand-side advantages emerge from a corporation's present technology being exploited and modified to local market needs and specificities (Pietrobelli et al., 2018). They add new knowledge from the local market to a corporation's existing portfolio of inventions resulting in supply-side profits. Furthermore, foreign investment-driven innovation might benefit from valuable but less expensive inputs such as highly trained labour and a more diversified range of backgrounds (Guthrie, 1990).

On the other hand, investing in foreign nations for innovation is risky. The central research zone in worldwide corporations is how companies deal with the unique problems they come across while investing in another state (Bell et al., 2012). This study engrossed mainly in the likelihood of the corporation's human and financial investments being expropriated for specific hosting states. Intangible assets, however, make for a significant amount of a company's innovation capabilities (Donate et al., 2016). Intangible asset misappropriation is more challenging to identify and comprehend than the brief seizure of physical or financial assets.

Furthermore, the confiscation of corporeal and financial investments necessitates a cautious act of hosting governmental bodies. In contrast, the misuse of incorporeal resources might necessitate hosting governmental bodies turning unheard into heard for intellectual property rights infringers (De Salvo & Signorello, 2015). Misuse of incorporeal properties, particularly those utilised in contributions and productions in R&D, have far-reaching effects beyond the hosting state (Kulkarni, 2015). This form of theft might avert the corporation from securing the outcome of its operations' invention. Whereas overseas investment in corporeal properties is only focused on expropriation in the hosting state, funds in innovative overseas activity might depict the corporation's broader information, adding information developed or placed other than the hosting state (Rao & Srirekha, 2018). When corporations invest in R&D protection, such incorporeal properties are very critical.

IPR regulations vary significantly between states, as do the hazards accompanied by international R&D investment. IPR regulations in hosting states with organised institutes, having the rule of law, competent organisational establishments, and autonomous law lords are premeditated to deliver adequate legal fortification to all corporations, including foreign corporations, against the risks of misappropriation without discrimination (Baudenbacher et al., 2019). As a result, it's no surprise that corporations contemplate an essential aspect during issuing foreign R&D expenditures the strength of intellectual property regulation (Porter & Heppelmann, 2015). Notwithstanding preceding hazards, numerous corporations outsource their creative efforts to states that lack strong intellectual property protection laws. Because the benefits of establishing innovation efforts in specific states are projected to be large, some of these corporations may be ready to accept the risk. For example, China has gained huge R&D investment by MNEs keen to capitalise on the state's developing marketplaces with affordable humanoid capital despite being viewed as a speculative place for a creative activity for an extended period.

Indeed, some companies appear to be better equipped to deal with poor IPR circumstances than others. Previous studies depict that organisations could use specific knowledge fortification procedural regulations to reduce the risk of misuse (Sarkar, 2010). Knowledge fortification actions improve the opacity of creative procedure, preventing knowledge wastage and external parties' capability to copy. Like, foreign companies secure their intellectual property, keep its innovations procedures secret, limit information handovers to already approved beneficiaries, and constrain knowledge-based actions to defined organisational components such as highly protected labs (Rizopoulos & Sergakis, 2010). Corporations can select a briefer innovation cycle and lead competing reproductions to get in the market too late.

Furthermore, international corporations might organise their innovation progressions to realise the worth of a single discovery after it is paired with harmonising knowledge with capital held by the company elsewhere. However, most research on such information protection approaches is based on the assumption that defective IPR laws are an intrinsic part of the departmental atmosphere and would implement equally by every business, jeopardising a worth that may extract from its discoveries. This perspective ignores that certain businesses have an advantage over others when securing protection from IPR limitations in a specific jurisdiction. IPR laws are entrenched in nationwide legislation, often entrusted to political and administrative authorities to administer and enforce (Wu & Liu, 2012). Furthermore, as previously noted, infringements of an intangible asset and property rights are difficult to detect and usually ambiguous, boosting the discretion granted to political and organisational establishments.

As a result, non-market characteristics performance significantly influences assured businesses. Its IPR will be adequately protected within the hosting state, independent from the language of legislation, during considering whether to do R&D there or not (Grare, 2013). Defective IPR policies would deter foreign businesses less if they expect local government to help them. The strategical international business indicates that when businesses can obtain privileged dealing from underperforming institutions, they are less reliant on the formal institutional environment's overall quality. Non-market components can affect certain businesses, exclusively particular companies (Poisson-de Haro & Bitektine, 2015). While considering international ventures, companies from the native state-managed analogous sets of non-market components during investment in a particular hosting state. Furthermore, a specific non-market component may have varying effects on different businesses. Thus, speculation of two machines, first at the nation and second at a company level, affects business assumptions of auspicious dealing. Would collect from local establishments in other states related to IPR fortification.

Stimulus of Hosting State Proclivity

Individuals of every state have extensive impressions regarding another state. Physical immediacy, similar social background, common languages and religious beliefs, universal principles and ethics that exceed physical boundaries can all contribute to these broad concepts. They might also result from historical events such as colonisation, immigration, or armed conflict (Connaghan et al., 2021). They can deliberately be refined with time by organised diplomatic relationships (e.g., armed coalitions and trade treaties) to enhance political, cultural, and economic ties. Believe that most individuals in the nation hold these beliefs, which we call the hosting state tendency. Individuals in a given hosting nation's view of corporations in their native state, invention, and facilities are highly impacted by this host state predisposition.

Examining how cross-national attitudes, opinions, and affinities affect international company operations suggests that lower acquisition premia are connected with political empathy between a corporation's native state and the state where the business is making an acquisition (Chams & García-Blandón, 2019). Corporations' native state is professed by hosting governmental bodies like a friend, not an adversary; acquirers predict less hosting government pushback to their offer and, as a result, not much required to pay a considerable premium. Furthermore, the auspicious impacts of political empathy last with time; post-acquisition presentations are better when native-hosting government ties are good due to political stakeholders' worries about legality being reduced throughout the post-acquisition integration phase. A company's choice of foreign investment site and size is influenced by political affinity, which gauges the strength of a state's diplomatic relations (Betts, 2015).

It's worth emphasising that all of these bases their estimates of how friendly nations' connections are on voting patterns in the United Nations General Assembly, which reflects political affinity at upper standards. IPR conflicts have frequently been tackled by bureaucrats and administrative authorities of hosting states in response to technical issues, other than higher government officials (who are in charge of diplomacy and UN voting). As a result, broader attitudes and perceptions, such as hosting state proclivity, stimulate consequences of clashes than government-to-government affinities, and foreign corporations with a positive attitude toward the hosting state probably benefit by great local authorities are lenient and sympathetic with corporations and individuals from states with they have an optimistic attitude, to gain sustenance regarding IPR matters (Howse, 2002).

The highest levels of government are likely to share the hosting state's attitude, influencing policy decisions in favour of businesses originating in states with a suspicious attitude (Kennedy, 2007).. These repercussions are more evident in weaker IPR regimes because higher administrators and low-rank bureaucrats have a higher latitude in determining and implementing IPR policies. Managers of corporations from native states that benefit from a more auspicious hosting state attitude may underestimate hazards accompanying R&D investment if the state's IPR system is deficient since they assume a more auspicious treatment of IPR concerns (Porter & Heppelmann, 2015). When the hosting state's attitude is overwhelmingly unauspicious, most administrators should share optimism for IPR relating to the enforcement of current IPR legislation; defective IPR states are inadequate to provide effective fortification (Kulkarni, 2015). As a result, the strength of the local IPR system will impact a company's decision to invest in R&D in overseas states with not as much auspicious hosting state trend. As a consequence, we recommend the following:

Influence of IPR on R&D Investment

The smaller the deterrent effect of IPR dimness on a corporation's R&D investment site decision, the auspicious hosting state's orientation toward a corporation's native state is.

Influence of Corporation Political Capabilities

As previously said, enterprises with a more positive hosting state disposition assume good handling of any intellectual property fortification concerns that arise in that state and minimise IPR deficiencies when evaluating R&D investment (Rizopoulos & Sergakis, 2010). It also suggests that, regardless of formal IPR restrictions, the political capacities of a corporation are an additional mechanism through which it might extract privileged dealing from the hosting government. Political trades may assist organisations in various ways, according to existing research on non-market strategy. They can provide businesses privileged admittance to state-administered sources like subsidies and government procurement contracts, obstruct the passage of adverse rules, and protect businesses from market rivalry by keeping entrance fences high. Corporations with higher political capacities are likely to invest in R&D in hosting states with scrawny IPR laws (Naseem et al., 2010).

First, corporations with more substantial political clout can use diplomatic backdoors, where the native government acts as a go-between to get auspicious treatment from the hosting state. Indeed, businesses routinely push their native governments to gain economic advantages in other states; such initiatives usually translate into diplomatic nudges from native governments to hosting nations. When necessary, such native government engagement may be used to address IPR infringement against a specific company. However, domestic government officials must be careful in their concerns and aggressively pursue compromises. Corporations having more substantial political clout might raise the apparent importance of IPR concerned issues in front of domestic government officials than other companies (Grare, 2013). When domestic government assistance is limited, corporations with higher political capacities are more likely to outcompete other enterprises (Howse, 2002).

Second, political talents can give businesses direct access to hosting government officials.

Politically capable companies, in particular, revealed the thought of generating public policies, exchanged, and executed. This understanding is efficient in converting into a more profound comprehension of regulatory issues like IPR fortification, better needed to recognise and eloquent priorities of hosting governmental bodies supervise the implementation of these regulatory requirements and an increased probability of being conceived as capable by hosting governmental bodies (Kennedy, 2007). On the other hand, corporations without political qualities are often less effective in communicating and persuading government officials; hence not as receive privileged handling from hosting governmental bodies, particularly in terms of IPR protection.

Effects of Defective IPR Regulations

We expand on the premise that companies are apprehensive of dangers to their intellectual property posed by defective IPR regulations in potential hosting states when undertaking R&D investments overseas (Rao & Srirekha, 2018). Non-market factors can help corporations reduce appropriability worries connected with investing in states with defective IPR laws. First, we looked at the non-market environment at the state level. We discovered a detrimental impression of defective IPR regulations in a corporation's desire to spend on R&D mitigated by much auspicious hosting state tendency on the way to the corporation's native state. Secondly, look at the non-market context in which businesses operate and discover that political competencies attenuate the adverse effects of defective IPR regimes, implying that such qualities might assist corporations in minimising hazards accompanying innovation under defective IPR restrictions (Ali & Khan, 2021).

Non-market variables impact enterprises' opinions about how to rely on defective IPR laws to safeguard ideas from theft in other states (De Salvo & Signorello, 2015). It has ramifications for a business policy as well as governmental innovation policies. Corporations that would ordinarily be hesitant to invest in specific nations owing to defective IPR legislation may be more willing to do so if the hosting state's propensity is strong enough or if the corporation has significant political capabilities. Businesses might profit from input and output paybacks to the investment made for innovation in states where other corporations are hesitant to do likewise, resulting in lower competition and preserving the value of their intellectual property (Rizopoulos & Sergakis, 2010). Our research demonstrates that, regardless of the extent of legal IPR protection provided by governments, states might be capable of enticing investment overseas in R&D (Porter & Heppelmann, 2015). However, the sub-standards of IPR fortification may (unintentionally) confine inbound investments to specific nations and enterprises, such as those with solid political capacities, to which they have an auspicious bias. There might be a financial or political cost to it. Limiting inner R&D expenditures to enterprises by a specific group of nations, hosting states can unintentionally stifle the growth of particular technical disciplines, reducing spillovers, distorting human capital allocation, and, eventually, harming economic expansion (Chaudhry, & Zimmerman, 2009). Although unwittingly, analogously boosting investments through enterprises with political capacities may improve a state's political and diplomatic power. From the standpoint of the native state, our findings imply that boosting hosting state propensity, mainly through soft diplomacy efforts, may benefit local businesses and potentially the native state economy as a whole.

Investments in Innovation

when determining where to put innovational activities, corporations used variant lucidity. When determining somewhere position other overseas outflows (Mahmood et al., 2017). To reduce the hazard of confiscating their local assets, companies often depend upon the inclusive quality of local departmental situations when deciding where to deploy foreign investments. Misuse is hard to identify and explain because investment in innovation is linked to incorporeal assets. The complexity of local IPR legislation and the overall quality of the local institutional framework is so critical. Comparing advanced and outdated-tech investments (Ali & Khan, 2021). The institutional environment's general quality is significant for both tech investment, and the robustness of IPR rules sounds more relevant for advanced technological investment. Such investments have the highest risk of being misused while still delivering a significant competitive advantage.

Conclusion

One key finding of how interstate ties and political activity impact corporation international site decision is that this stimulus might differ based on specific native state characteristics. Favourable native-hosting connections have been identified as a condition for stimulating a corporation's political capacities in many studies concentrating on investments by Chinese enterprises. This viewpoint holds that a corporation's political talents will provide value in hosting nations with whom the corporation's native state has good connections. We, on the other hand, advocate for a distinct perspective. Interstate interactions and political capacities assist as substitute channels for corporations to mitigate the hazards of operating in states with worse organisational environments. In other words, political competencies enable businesses to invest in specific hosting nations though relations between the native and hosting states are strained.

These divergent perspectives and empirical findings are seen as dazzling essential variances in corporation-governmental interactions across native nations. On the other hand, corporations in states where political ambitions trump financial benefits, or the government is very monocratic may become instruments of their native state's foreign policy, aligning their investment designs with it. It's in line with the finding that politically affianced businesses from these states prefer to invest in host countries with a larger political affinity for their home country. Corporations from states with more policy checks and balances, on the other hand, use their political clout to a group for efficaciously acquire native state support under less desirable native and hosting states relations or circumvent native government totally to acquire special privileges effectively from hosting governmental bodies.

We believe these findings are not much amenable to understanding which enterprises are employed as foreign policy tools because of their empirical context, corporations from OECD nations. Large corporations from Western nations have even been accused of influencing international policy to benefit their interests. Nations with defective IPR regulations entice investment from companies domiciled in welcoming states, companies with political links to the native state, or companies with political capacities originating in welcoming states. A future study might focus on separating the roles of foreign policies and corporate political capacities to driving foreign investment designs, particularly in the R&D. range to which foreign policies influence corporation stratagem and corporation benefits influence foreign policies are crucial to understanding corporation international planning, governmental policies, and interactions.

Our work adds innovation outsourcing, a non-market approach and R&D regulations in general. To begin, our data suggest that corporations may employ non-market features to minimise the risks of foreign R&D spending rather than formal institutions like a robust IPR regulatory system. Such as cautious strategy of inner innovation measures and procedures demonstrates that non-market characteristics at national and business levels are especially suited governing nature of IPR regulatory policymaking and implementation. While enterprises may have minimal control over a hosting state's IPR legislation, they might be competent to improve appropriability worries by depending on auspicious dealing from hosting state establishments formed by non-market variables, including hosting state disposition and political skills. Second, the different conceptualisation of reaching hazard extenuation, in which the efficiency of corporation explicit stratagems and competences, as well as the multinational atmosphere in which they are implemented, is dependent on the effectiveness of a given IPR regime.

Interaction between government policy and corporate actions. Underappreciated mechanism: non-market components may minimise appropriability hazards associated with foreign innovation efforts. Second, we contribute to an emerging organisation of research signifying that non-market components, including corporations' political capabilities, might influence policy-makers in other states, despite non-market stratagem literature's major focus on the interaction between a corporation's political capabilities and national policies makers. IPR regulations constraints limit not just the amount of money a corporation may invest in innovation but also the amount of money it can generate. In conclusion, we demonstrate that defective IPR laws constraints restrict the volume of innovation related to the foreign investment state obtains and distort its flow. Corporations from countries with a good reputation in hosting states or corporations with political power will be overrepresented in investors, though others may be underrepresented. It might raise apprehensions concerning the hosting state's industrial or technical R&D spending allocations.

References

Albino-Pimentel, J., Dussauge, P., & El Nayal, O. (2022). Intellectual property rights, non-market considerations and foreign R&D investments. *Research Policy*, *51*(2), 104-442.

Ali, N., & Khan, K. I. (2021). Legal framework for compulsory licensing: a solution to the conflict of intellectual property rights and intellectual monopoly. *International Journal of Public Law and Policy*, *7*(2), 122-133. https://doi.org/10.1504/ijplap.2021.115930

Anttonen, M., Halme, M., Houtbeckers, E., & Nurkka, J. (2013). The other side of sustainable innovation: is there a demand for innovative services?. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *45*, 89-103.

Baudenbacher, C., Baudenbacher, C., & Seyfried. (2019). *Judicial Independence*. Springer International Publishing.

Bell, R. G., Filatotchev, I., & Rasheed, A. A. (2012). The liability of foreignness in capital markets: Sources and remedies. *Journal of International Business Studies*, *43*(2), 107-122.

Betts, A. (2015). The normative terrain of the global refugee regime. *Ethics & International Affairs*, *29*(4), 363-375.

Butler, D. M., & Broockman, D. E. (2011). Do politicians racially discriminate against constituents? A field experiment on state legislators. *American Journal of Political Science*, *55*(3), 463-477.

Chaudhry, P. E., & Zimmerman, A. (2009). *The economics of counterfeit trade: Governments, consumers, pirates and intellectual property rights*. Springer Science & Business Media.

Chams, N., & García-Blandón, J. (2019). Sustainable or not sustainable? The role of the board of directors. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *226*, 1067-1081.

Connaghan, K. P., Wertheim, C., Laures-Gore, J. S., Russell, S., & Patel, R. (2021). An exploratory study of student, speech–language pathologist and emergency worker impressions of speakers with dysarthria. *International Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, *23*(3), 265-274.

De Salvo, M., & Signorello, G. (2015). Non-market valuation of recreational services in Italy: A meta-analysis. *Ecosystem Services*, *16*, 47-62.

Donate, M. J., Pena, I., & Sanchez de Pablo, J. D. (2016). HRM practices for human and social capital development: effects on innovation capabilities. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *27*(9), 928-953.

Guthrie, J. W. (1990). The evolution of educational management: Eroding myths and emerging models. *Teachers College Record*, *91*(6), 210-231.

Grare, F. (2013). Pakistan's foreign and security policies after the 2013 general election: the judge, the politician and the military. *International Affairs*, *89*(4), 987-1001.

Gruber, H. (2017). Innovation, skills and investment: A digital industrial policy for Europe. *Economia e Politica Industriale*, *44*(3), 327-343.

Howse, R. (2002). From politics to technocracy—and back again: the fate of the multilateral trading regime. *American Journal of International Law*, *96*(1), 94-117.

Kennedy, S. (2007). Transnational political alliances: An exploration with evidence from China. *Business & Society*, *46*(2), 174-200.

Khan, K. I., & Mushtaq, A. (2020). Corporate social responsibility and firms credibility: A comparative study of family and non-family firms; Evidence from Pakistan stock exchange, *Review of Socio-Economic Perspectives, 5(2),* 59-86.

Khan, K. I., Naqvi, S. M., Ghafoor, M. M., & Nayab, G. (2020). Effect of reward system on innovative work behaviour through temporary organizational commitment and proficiency: Moderating role of multiculturalism, *International Journal of Management Research and Emerging Sciences, 10(2),* 96-108.

Kulkarni, S. R. (2015). Intellectual Property Rights-Protection and Regulation.

In *Advances in Bioprocess Technology* (pp. 475-519). Springer, Cham.

Mahmood, S., Sheeraz, M., Aslam, S., Tanweer, M., & Khan, K. I. (2017). Intellectual capital and market performance: Testing the mediating mechanism of organizational learning. *Journal of Managerial Sciences, 11(2),* 303-322.

Naseem, A., Spielman, D. J., & Omamo, S. W. (2010). Private-sector investment in R&D: a review of policy options to promote its growth in developing-country agriculture. *Agribusiness*, *26*(1), 143-173.

Parkinson, J. (2003). Disclosure and corporate social and environmental performance: competitiveness and enterprise in a broader social frame. *Journal of Corporate Law Studies*, *3*(1), 3-39.

Pietrobelli, C., Marin, A., & Olivari, J. (2018). Innovation in mining value chains: New evidence from Latin America. *Resources Policy*, *58*, 1-10.

Poisson-de Haro, S., & Bitektine, A. (2015). Global sustainability pressures and strategic choice: The role of firms' structures and non-market capabilities in selection and implementation of sustainability initiatives. *Journal of World Business*, *50*(2), 326-341.

Porter, M. E., & Heppelmann, J. E. (2015). How smart, connected products are transforming companies. *Harvard Business Review*, *93*(10), 96-114.

Rao, Y. V., & Srirekha, G. (2018). Intellectual property rights in business organizations. *International Journal of Engineering and Management Research (IJEMR)*, *8*(1), 118-124.

Rizopoulos, Y. A., & Sergakis, D. E. (2010). MNEs and policy networks: Institutional embeddedness and strategic choice. *Journal of World Business*, *45*(3), 250-256.

Sarkar, K. R. (2010). Assessing insider threats to information security using technical, behavioural and organisational measures. I*nformation Security Technical Report*, *15*(3), 112-133.

Vaughan, R. E. (1995). Defining Terms in the Intellectual Property Protection Debate: Are the North and South Arguing Past Each Other When We Say Property-A Lockean, Confucian, and Islamic Comparison. *ILSA Journal of International & Comparative Law, 2*, 307.

Wu, C., & Liu, Z. (2012). A tiger without teeth? Regulation of administrative monopoly under China's Anti-Monopoly Law. *Review of Industrial Organization*, *41*(1), 133-155.