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National industrial policy is important, but can have unforeseen consequences – lessons from South Korea

Manufacturing led growth and employment is coming to an end – and automation will hit the workforce of developing countries also in services.

SMEs need to define their own growth strategy – driving own R&D, combining global network with local insights, and leveraging digital channels can be powerful.
Among similar nations, Korea’s growth rate has been stunning and is only surpassed by China

Countries with highest GDP growth (excluding China)

Real GDP

Source: Prof. Jaehoon Hahn, Yonsei University, *Introduction to the Korean economy and society* (lecture).
Korea used interventionist/protectionist strategy to drive manufactured goods exports by subsidizing target industries and related chaebols

**Korean growth and industrial policy**

**Guided capitalism model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Main policy direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1950s</strong></td>
<td>• Import substitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Price stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1962-1971</strong></td>
<td>• Policy shift to export promotion (EP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Expanding SOC³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1972-1981</strong></td>
<td>• Heavy and Chemical Industrialization under EP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Administered credit allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Import substitution of parts and components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1982-1991</strong></td>
<td>• Industrial rationalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Initial liberalization and opening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Shift to private sector initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1993-1998</strong></td>
<td>• Deregulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Globalization (capital and foreign exchange liberalization)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fairness and transparency in industrial and trade policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Technology based industrial policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chaebols’ assets as a share of top 200 corporate assets (1987-2012)**

1. Includes LG, GS, LS and their affiliates; 2. Includes Samsung, Shinsegae, CJ and Hansol; 3. Social overhead capital such as roads, schools and hospitals.

Source: ERRI, 재벌 및 대기업으로의 경제력집중과 동태적 변화분석; Ahn, The outward-looking trade policy and the industrial development of South Korea.
Korea pursued substitution, while Malaysia, Taiwan and Vietnam pursued complementary strategy – the choice had effects on SMEs

Comparison on national growth models
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Unlike Japan, Taiwan and Singapore, Korean model required large outside financing (debt and other funding).

Note: MNC = multinational company, SME = small and medium sized enterprise, GLC = government linked company, SWF = sovereign wealth fund, SOE = 100% state owned enterprise, Guangxiqiye = local business groups; China applies a modified substitution strategy, leveraging JVs to expedite tech transfer process.

Source: Shin, Chang, *Restructuring Korea Inc.*, pp. 11-22; Ha Thanh, Nguyen & Klaus Meyer (2004); Van Chung, Vu (2015); Reddal analysis.
Yet a burning issue of Korean economy is that the SME sector is extremely inefficient and employs a large share of the population.

**SMEs contribution to overall economy by country**

SMEs share of total employment\(^2\) in 2012**

*Used 2013 number of labor forces and 2016 GDP for Iran and 2014 data for Korea and the U.S.; **Used 2013 data for Korea.

Productivity gap between Korean SME and conglomerates continues to be a major issue

Productivity index: SME vs. large corporations

SME productivity has been lower than large enterprises consistently and has been growing at lower rate

Note: 1SME includes companies with 10 – 300 employees; 2 Total productivity index, including labor and capital; 3Compounded annual growth rate

Korean SMEs are often locked in vicious cycle, as SMEs are complacent with their role as supplier – transition to virtuous cycles requires internationalization.

SME vicious vs. virtuous cycle

Vicious cycle of OEM trap (focus on serving local conglomerates)

- Price squeeze
- Bargaining power falls
- Operations centered around conglomerates
- Profit falls
- Inability to invest in development and attract new talent, morale falls
- Loss of competitiveness

Virtuous cycle (focus on internationally competitive technology and products, and expansion abroad)

- Acquire new customers, expand further
- Optimized resource allocation
- Increased product/service differentiation
- Bargaining power increases
- Better competitive advantage, market position, ability to invest and attract talent

"Price squeeze is inevitable and comes by direct price-cut request"
- Head of gov. agency

"Working with chaebols often provides SMEs with solid skills"
- Manager of consulting firm

"As local market is limited, diversifying the customer base globally is key for growth"
- CEO of local IT SME

Moving to virtuous cycle can be realized by providing SMEs with global-minded management capability, competitive talents pool, and network and insights in international market.

Source: Interviews
National industrial policy is important, but can have unforeseen consequences – lessons from South Korea

Manufacturing led growth and employment is coming to an end – and automation will hit the workforce of developing countries also in services

SMEs need to define their own growth strategy – driving own R&D, combining global network with local insights, and leveraging digital channels can be powerful
Avoiding OEM trap is even more critical for SMEs in developing nations – advantage in manufacturing, arising out of cheap labor will diminish

**Peak manufacturing employment share and GDP per capita when it peaked**

Percent, constant 2005 USD

- **Observations**
  - Trade has induced productivity gaps to close faster than gap in income as manufacturers must follow similar international standards.
  - Manufacturing is becoming less labor-intensive also in developing economies; thus peaked share of manufacturing employment has declined.
  - Automation coupled with additive manufacturing making OEMs from developing economies risk becoming redundant.

**Peak share of manufacturing employment below 20% for many emerging economies**

Source: GGDC-10 Sector database, World Bank Development Indicators, Citi Research in “Technology at work v2.0: The future is not what it used to be.”
Manufacturing share of GDP is declining worldwide – manufacturing export led growth will not be the panacea it used to be

### Manufacturing share of GDP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regions</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Asia and Pacific</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe and Central Asia</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America and Caribbean</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asia</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low income</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower middle income</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper middle income</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High income</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implications**

- Share of manufacturing in GDP is declining everywhere in the world
- Stiglitz argues that this is the result of manufacturing productivity exceeding the rate of increase in demand
- 20th century national growth model characterized by export-led growth will not work in the future to the extent it did for East Asian countries
- Developing nations today need to define new national growth strategy that balances industry, services and other parts of the economy

Reaching prosperity is getting harder for developing countries – their workforce is more susceptible to automation overall

Impact of automation on workforce

The workforce in these "high risk" economies risk become redundant in the global value chain without local companies with internationally competitive products/services.

Source: World Bank Development Indicators, Citi Research in “Technology at work v2.0: The future is not what it used to be.”
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Manufacturing led growth and employment is coming to an end – and automation will hit the workforce of developing countries also in services

**SMEs need to define their own growth strategy** – driving own R&D, combining global network with local insights, and leveraging digital channels can be powerful
SMEs in developing nations require a unique path creation strategy, where internationalization is an integral part of success.

Path creation strategy for SMEs: from OEM to OBM*

**SME supplier to conglomerate**
- Condition: late entry and resource poor
- Learning and building technology via external sources and in-house R&D
- Needs local conglomerates to supply to

**Developing own design/brand**
- Early strength in production skills acquired in supplier position
- Upgrade into higher-value-added products in the same industry
- Key challenges in weak brands, lack of marketing experience and incumbent litigations

**Success as global company**
- Consolidate global system that allows flexibility in cost management and customized marketing
- Risk of new entrants with lower cost advantage persists
- To sustain position, firm-specific and proprietary knowledge in narrow field must be developed

---

*OEM = original equipment manufacturer, OBM = original brand manufacturer; concepts can be also extended to services

Source: Lee, *Economic catchup and technological leapfrogging*
Past Korean cases show that while OEM experience can expedite the tech transfer, investment in in-house R&D is even more critical.

In-house R&D essential for hi-tech SMEs in internationalization – Korean cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm</th>
<th>Products</th>
<th>Incumbent competitors</th>
<th>Tech acquisition sources</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SunStar</td>
<td>Embroidery machinery</td>
<td>• Tajima (Japan)</td>
<td>• In-house R&amp;D</td>
<td>Largest market share in the world market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HJC</td>
<td>Helmets</td>
<td>• Shoei (Japan)</td>
<td>• OEM</td>
<td>20% of world market share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jusung</td>
<td>Production equipment for semiconductor and flat panels</td>
<td>• Bieffe (Italy)</td>
<td>• In-house R&amp;D</td>
<td>33% world market share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• AKT (U.S.)</td>
<td>• Collaboration with universities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations
- HJC leveraged the learnings from their previous position as OEM parts supplier to further develop their own product and brand
- SunStar and Jusung leveraged other channels to expedite the technology acquisition process: licensing and collaboration with academia
- These cases suggest that tech transfer alone is not enough and in-house R&D must be an integral part to develop competitiveness

Source: Lee, *Economic catchup and technological leapfrogging*
Misfit combined local capabilities across multiple countries in a unique way to fuel its growth

Leveraging international connections for acceleration: Misfit Wearables

About Misfit (now part of Fossil Group)
- Founded in 2011 by Sony Vu (CEO and President), Sridhar Lyengar and former Apple CEO John Sculley
- Offering: health tracker wearables
- Available in 20 countries (US, Canada Mexico, Brazil, UK, Germany, Italy, France, Switzerland, Spain, Sweden, Russia, Australia, China, Hong Kong, Japan, Singapore, Taiwan, South Korea and India)
- Acquired by Fossil Group at 260MUSD in November 2015

On organizing international operations in Vietnam*

Q: What prompted the decision to have so many employees here [in Vietnam], aside from your background?
Vu: “So we have to get the best talent at the best price. So what we’ve done is optimized our hiring to be in places where we have an unfair competitive advantage”

Vu: “If you just come here with a mentality, I’m going to get cheap outsourced labor, then that’s exactly what you’re going to get…So we really give them [the Vietnamese staff] a lot of authority…And people rise up to the challenge”

*Interview with Sonny Vu conducted by CNET in 2015
Source: Company website, press articles

Leverage the best of each world to gain competitive advantages and scale internal capabilities development fast

* Logistics and supply chain, operations, finance
* Customer service
* Data science and algorithm development
* Firmware engineering
* Graphic design
* Commercial product development

Product design • Funding • Marketing and sales • Manufacturing

© Reddal Inc. This material is Reddal proprietary.
Uber struggles to scale in China, Russia and SEA illustrate that global success of digital services still require local know-how

Lessons learnt from some of Uber internationalization journey

Uber expansion timeline in selected markets

- Feb 2013 – Uber launched in Singapore, starting its expansion in South East Asia (SEA)
- Jul 2014 – Uber officially launched in China. Also in Russia
- August 2016 – Uber China merged into Didi Chuxing. Uber China would own 20% of the new entity. Didi to own $1bn share in Uber global
- July 2017 – Uber merged its operations in Russia, Azerbaijan, Belarus and Kazakhstan with Yandex. Uber would own 36.6% of the new entity
- March 2018 – Uber sold its operations in SEA for 27.5% stakes in Grab – a Singapore based competitor

Uber Slayer: How China’s Didi Beat the Ride-Hailing Superpower

“We felt like the People’s Liberation Army, with basic rifles, and we were bombed by airplanes and missiles.”
- Brad Stone and Luoluo Hua
- October 6, 2016
- Photographs by Ka Hing
- From Bloomberg Businessweek

Uber stages retreat in Russia as it merges with rival Yandex

Ride-hailing company makes second embarrassing climbdown after selling its Chinese operations last year

Grab Vanquishes Uber With Local Strategy, Billions From SoftBank

March 26, 2018, 10:00 PM GMT+3

Uber’s defeat in Southeast Asia calls into question its “barge in” expansion strategy worldwide
# Grab focused on building ”segmented, localized and tailored service” to foster customer experience and loyalty

## Grab localization strategy to succeed in regional expansion

### South East Asia special characteristics

- Traffic congestion make motorbike a more convenient and faster choice
- Cash payments are still prevalent in many South East Asian cities
- SEA is a fragmented region with different languages; many still do not speak English
- Durian is a special and popular local fruit in many parts of SEA

### How Grab cater to local needs and tastes

- GrabBike was launched in 2014, two years ahead of Uber Motor
- Grab has traditionally accepted cash payments, long before Uber began to pilot it, first in India in 2015
- Grab launched GrabChat in 2016 with template messages and auto translation for quick communication between drivers and riders
- Grab organized special campaigns/redeem offer for special treats of high-quality durian

Source: Press clippings

© Reddal Inc. This material is Reddal proprietary.
Without a dedicated entry strategy, many young companies fell to the pitfalls of relying on the “sales” approach only for short-term gain.

**Entry strategy approach versus “sales” approach to international markets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&quot;Sales&quot; approach</th>
<th>Entry strategy approach (go-to-market system)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time horizons</strong></td>
<td>Short-run</td>
<td>Long-run (say, 3 to 5 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target markets</strong></td>
<td>No systematic selection</td>
<td>Selection based on analysis of markets/sales potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dominant objectives</strong></td>
<td>Immediate sales</td>
<td>Build permanet market position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resource commitment</strong></td>
<td>Only enough to get immediate sales</td>
<td>What is necessary to gain permanet market position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entry mode</strong></td>
<td>No systematic choice</td>
<td>Systematic choice of most appropriate mode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New product development</strong></td>
<td>Exclusively for home market</td>
<td>For both home and foreign markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product adoption</strong></td>
<td>Only mandator adaption (to meet legal/technical requirements) of domestic products</td>
<td>Adaption of domestic products to foreign buyers' preferences, incomes, and use conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Channels</strong></td>
<td>No effort to control</td>
<td>Effort to control to drive market objectives/goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Price</strong></td>
<td>Determined by domestic full cost with some ad hoc adjustments to specific sales situations</td>
<td>Determined by demand, competition, objectives, and other marketing policies, as well as cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promotion</strong></td>
<td>Mainly confined to personal selling or left to middlemen</td>
<td>Advertising, sales promotion, and personal selling mix to achieve market objectives/goals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Without a go-to-market system with entry strategy for a product/target market, a company only has a “sales” approach.

Young technology companies need to build internal R&D capabilities and leverage digital technologies and service platforms to drive growth

Tips on internationalization for technology SMEs

- Avoid the OEM trap – being complacent in playing the role of part manufacturers in the global value chain
- Over-rely on low-cost advantages without realizing other value-adding advantages from local resources
- Overly ambitious expansion plan, risk stretching themselves too thin over mass expansion without a clear go-to-market strategy/strategies

- Invest in internal R&D to develop internationally competitive technology and products, and expansion abroad
- Digital technologies make cross-border collaboration more easily, which young companies can leverage to build optimal teams
- Digital and service platforms make scaled internationalization more feasible for young companies with local resources – but local know-how essential for success
Working together for successful growth!
Services can be more easily inserted into global economy, bypassing steps manufacturing went through in sequential internationalization

**Internationalization model: manufacturing vs. service**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maunfacturing SME</th>
<th>Product based division of labor</th>
<th>Value chain based division of labor</th>
<th>Market based division of labor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company establishes manufacturing subsidiary in low wage country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only low-value-added product manufacturing is relocated to the foreign subsidiary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low wage country is not yet the market for the product</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-value-added product and R&amp;D still remains in the home country headquarter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home country loses competitiveness in manufacturing even in the high-value-added products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidiary undertakes the production of entire product line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The low wage country is not yet the market for locally produced products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent firm mainly handles R&amp;D and marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low wage country market grows to have large enough in terms of purchasing power for product sales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidiary now handles not only the production but also conducts domestic marketing activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D for improving low-value-added or local-market-oriented products are conducted by the subsidiary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service SME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Market based division of labor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When entering the new market, service firms usually focus on attractiveness of the target country in terms of purchasing power for sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While some localization effort for sourcing may be needed, usual focus is on localizing the marketing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Lee, *Economic catchup and technological leapfrogging*