The Indian Economic Journal
JOURNAL OF THE INDIAN ECONOMIC ASSOCIATION
Volume - 4 • Special Issue • December 2025

GLOBAL TRADE AND GEOPOLITICAL CHALLENGES

The Economic Impact of Counterfeiting in IT Hardware: A Micro & Macro Welfare Analysis

Paul Abraham J E*
G. Rajini**

Abstract

This paper has attempted to develop a quantitative framework through a formula the total economic impact of counterfeiting in the IT hardware sector using an integrated micro and macro welfare framework. Counterfeiting in IT hardware generates multi-layered economic losses affecting producers who are also the manufacturers or brand owners, distributors aka the channel partners, consumers which include both individual but largely B2B consumers, governments, and the broader economy through macroeconomic spillovers. Computer hardware market represents Computer Peripheral Equipment, Computer Storage Devices and Servers, Computers. The computer hardware market size has grown strongly in recent years. It is currently valued at $740.54 billion in 2025 and will grow at a compound annual growth rate (CAGR) of 5.0%. The growth in the historic period can be attributed to increasing personal computing revolution, globalization of supply chains, rise of the internet, data center expansion, and operating system developments. However, Counterfeiting of IT hardware products is a significant problem that is challenging not only producers or brand owners but also distribution channel parties, government regulators and end users, both individual and commercial alike. It is estimated that the counterfeiting could be anywhere between 3% - 5% according to research reports. This is very less compared to other products like footwear and clothing which are 22% and 16% respectively. For a highly close-knit business-like IT hardware this is a cause of concern for brand owners. The effects of counterfeiting are impacted beyond annual financial reports and tax collections.

Direct negative effects are loss of employment which is felt by the people directly employed in this sector and this is considered disruptive to the economy. Using a demand model, the study aims to propose a formula that calculates the total welfare loss into producer revenue and profit erosion, brand depreciation, distributor margin losses, consumer surplus reductions, fiscal revenue leakage, enforcement expenditures, and second-round macroeconomic effects. The first proposed equation is a micro economic loss equation which brings together the Producer, consumer, distribution and government loss and incorporates that loss into a macroeconomic multiplier effect using a Keynesian demand contraction. The results when calculated will indicate that annual welfare losses to the total market turnover under conservative parameter assumptions.

Economic loss analysis confirms that counterfeiting creates large and persistent negative externalities not limited to only within the sector but also far beyond it. The findings provide strong justification for enhanced cross-border enforcement, supply-chain traceability, and coordinated trade policy interventions not only by the producers and brand owners but also by regulators and sector level associations.

Keywords: Counterfeiting, IT Hardware, Fake, Welfare Economics, Economic Loss, Brand Depreciation, Consumer Surplus, Global Trade

*Research Scholar, School of Management Studies, VISTAS, Chennai, India
**Professor- MBA & Director- MoUs, School of Management Studies, VISTAS, Chennai, India

1. Introduction

Computer hardware is the physical component required for a computer system to function. These hardware components are tangible, and they work together to process, store, input, and output data and information in a computer system. The main types of computer hardware are computer peripheral equipment, computer storage devices and servers and computers.

By Computer Peripheral Equipment we mean Keyboards and Mice, Monitors, Printers and Scanners, Speakers and Headsets. Computer Storage Devices and Servers include Hard Disk Drives (HDD), Solid State Drives (SSD), Network Attached Storage (NAS), Servers (Rack-Mounted, Blade Servers) and finally Computers are defined in this paper as Desktops, Laptops, Workstations, All-In-One PCs. The various distribution channels include online and offline. The various end-users are household and commercial users.

The computer hardware market size has grown strongly in recent years. It is currently at $740.54 billion in 2025 growing at a compound annual growth rate (CAGR) of 5.0%. The growth in the historic period can be attributed to increasing personal computing revolution, globalization of supply chains, rise of the internet, data center expansion, and operating system developments.

Counterfeiting of IT hardware represents a significant distortion in global markets. These counterfeit products are made in exact imitation of branded originals with the intent to deceive consumers and defraud firms. The IT hardware sector is particularly vulnerable due to complex global supply chains, high product standardization, and rapid technological turnover. The economic consequences of counterfeiting extend far beyond direct revenue losses to manufacturers. They include erosion of brand equity, reduction in consumer welfare due to product failures and lack of after-sales support, displacement of legitimate distributors, loss of employment, and tax revenue leakage for governments.

Counterfeits are products that are produced illegally and do not have any legitimate commercial value. They violate trademark, copyright, patent or other intellectual property rights (IPRs) (Qian, 2014b). Any commercial business or trade using counterfeit products can cause damages to manufacturers or brand owners, slow the economic growth of businesses and countries and alter the competition landscape within a market (Grossman and Shapiro, 1988a, 1988b; Staake et al., 2009; Li and Yi, 2017; Bosworth, 2006). It also poses significant threats to the safety and quality of users, thanks to this form of products not conforming to any prescribed safety controls and regulations (Staake et al., 2009; Li and Yi, 2017; Bosworth, 2006; Peitz and Waelbroeck, 2006).

Mapping the dynamics of counterfeit products in the economy is a significantly complex task for theoretical and methodological purposes, but the proofs available shows consistency in the growth trend of business and trade using counterfeited products worldwide (Choate, 2005; OECD-EUIPO, 2015). According to the latest estimates available to us via industry level research the counterfeit products market within the IT hardware space amounts to approximately 3% - 5% of total market size. Recent reports further show that counterfeiting is expanding beyond the traditionally targeted sectors such as luxury goods, watches, notes & coins, information and apparel, increasingly occurring for high-tech products, such as memory sticks, solid state drives, (OECD, 2017) and related products (BSA, 2016). If we go by the estimates defined above, we can calculate in 2025, the worldwide trade in counterfeit IT hardware products to be worth USD 22 bn to 37bn, which is almost equivalent to the size of IT hardware market of India.

Most existing studies focus on descriptive estimates of counterfeit volumes or firm-level losses. This paper contributes to the literature by developing a rigorous, theoretically grounded micro–macro welfare model to quantify the total economic cost of counterfeiting in IT hardware, with specific relevance to economic loss.

2. Conceptual Framework

Counterfeiting affects the economy through five major channels:

1. **Producers:** Lost sales, reduced profits, lower innovation incentives, and brand depreciation.

2. **Distributors and Retailers:** Displacement of legitimate sales and margin compression.

3. **Consumers:** Lower consumer surplus due to product failure, safety risks, and absence of warranties.

4. **Government:** Loss of GST/VAT, customs duties, corporate income tax, and additional enforcement expenditure.

5. **Macroeconomy:** Reduced industrial output, employment losses, lower investment, and negative multiplier effects.

These effects are interconnected and propagate through the economy via general equilibrium and trade linkages, particularly in cross-border counterfeiting networks.

3. Microeconomic Welfare Loss Model (Core Formula used in this Paper)

Total microeconomic welfare loss due to counterfeiting in the IT hardware market is defined as:

$$W = P + D + C + G$$

Where: W = microeconomic welfare loss; P = potential Loss incurred to the producer; D = potential Loss incurred to the distribution channel; C = potential Loss incurred to the users including both individuals and businesses; G = potential Loss incurred to government.

Let us now break down each loss using a detailed equation which will now consider the demand. Product demand is the quantity of a product or service that consumers are both willing and able to buy at a specific price and at a time. It is a fundamental economic concept that drives a company's revenue and helps businesses make strategic decisions about pricing, production, and marketing. What explains consumer demand for counterfeits? (Nan Chen 2025) Certain demands are labelled illicit when society deems them socially harmful. Yet these markets exist, and many thrive online. Because these activities are hidden, evidence is sparse. As a result, the forces that sustain or restrain illicit demand remain poorly understood. Illicit demand differs from legal demand in two key respects. Counterfeits offer a leading case of illicit demand. The above paper answers the question as to why there exists a demand for counterfeit products. First, the socioeconomic profile of buyers: demand is highest at both low and high incomes and lowest in the middle. Second, behavior-based measures of consumer trustworthiness show that communities with lower trustworthiness purchase more counterfeits. Third, causal evidence shows that when seller information disclosure is constrained by regulation, buyer-to-buyer information sharing through reviews emerges as a substitute and sustains the market. Taken together, these contributions provide an empirical basis for policy design and deepen our understanding of illicit demand.

3.1 Producer Welfare Loss

$P = (Pr - Co)\, Qc + Bd * Bv$

Where: Pr = Price of branded product; Co = Marginal cost of production; Qc = Quantity of demand diverted to counterfeits; Bd = Brand depreciation coefficient; B = Brand value

Bv is Annual branded operating profit / cost of capital

Bd is Brand sales before counterfeit surge / Permanent sales loss after controlling for price and income effects

A large body of research documents that counterfeiting erodes firm profitability not only through lost sales but also through brand dilution. Brand equity operates as an intangible capital stock that is built through sustained investment in quality and innovation. The circulation of low-quality imitations increases the probability of consumer dissatisfaction that is incorrectly attributed to the original brand, leading to persistent downward shifts in demand. Dynamic models of reputation show that even small counterfeit penetration rates can generate large, long-run profit losses through repeated negative signals.

From electronics, automotive components, and pharmaceuticals counterfeiting we learn that counterfeit exposure reduces market share growth, weakens pricing power, and increases customer acquisition costs. These effects are particularly pronounced in emerging markets where brand verification mechanisms are weaker, and enforcement intensity is heterogeneous.

3.2 Distributor Welfare Loss

$D = Dm * Dq$

Where: Dm = Average distributor margin per unit; Dq = Diverted quantity

Formal distribution networks incur losses not only through reduced transaction volumes but also through margin compression as counterfeit products undercut genuine prices. Because authorized distributors operate under compliance costs related to taxation, warranty obligations, and quality assurance, they are structurally disadvantaged relative to informal counterfeit networks. This creates an uneven competitive environment in which legitimate distributors suffer systematic revenue erosion. Authorized distributors also bear additional operational costs due to counterfeiting, including increased product authentication expenses, higher return and dispute resolution rates, inventory screening, and customer support for counterfeit-related complaints. These costs represent real resource diversion away from productive investment. In emerging markets, where informal retail and e-commerce intermediation are widespread, these distribution-level welfare losses are particularly acute due to weak verification infrastructure and inconsistent enforcement.

3.3 Consumer Welfare Loss

$L = \frac{1}{2} (Pr - Pc)\, Qc * Pfp$

Where: Pr = Price of branded product; Pc = price of Counterfeit product; Qc = Quantity of counterfeit purchases; Pfp = Product failure probability

This formula adjusts surplus loss by expected damage probability. From the consumer perspective, counterfeiting generates ambiguous short-term price benefits but significant long-term welfare losses. The literature distinguishes three channels of harm:

(i) expected product failure and safety risk,
(ii) denial of warranty and after-sales service, and
(iii) misallocation of consumer expenditure due to deceptive information.

Structural demand models show that when consumers misperceive counterfeit quality, measured consumer surplus is overstated in simple price-based comparisons. Once quality-adjusted utility is incorporated, counterfeit purchases often yield negative expected surplus.

In IT hardware markets, these effects are magnified due to system compatibility risks, cybersecurity vulnerabilities, and cascading device failures. Consequently, consumer welfare losses in electronics are substantially larger than in symbolic or non-functional counterfeit goods such as apparel accessories.

3.4 Government Fiscal Loss

$$G = Tr * Pr * Dq + Cr * Pr * CIq * PE$$

Where: Pr = Price of branded product; Dq = Diverted quantity; Tr = Sales tax/GST rate; Cr = Customs duty rate; CIq = Counterfeit import volume; E = Public enforcement expenditure

Counterfeiting reduces public revenue through multiple fiscal channels: evasion of value-added taxes, corporate income taxes, customs duties, and employment-related social security contributions. In addition to these direct fiscal losses, general equilibrium models show that suppressed legitimate output reduces aggregate demand, employment, and investment through multiplier effects. Input–output analyses consistently find that manufacturing sectors exhibit above-average output and employment multipliers; therefore, counterfeit-induced output contraction in IT hardware propagates widely across upstream and downstream industries.

For developing economies such as India, where electronics manufacturing and imports play a critical role in industrial policy and employment generation, these macroeconomic effects are particularly relevant for long-term growth and fiscal sustainability.

4. Macroeconomic Multiplier Effect

Total economic loss including second-round macro effects is given by:

$$\mathbf{TEL = W * (1 / 1 - Mp (1 - T) + IM)}$$

Where: W = micro economic loss calculated above; Mp = Marginal propensity to consume; T = Effective tax rate; IM = Import leakage ratio

This formula above captures how the earlier private and fiscal losses reduce national income through Keynesian demand contraction. The core of Keynesian economics is that aggregate demand determines the level of economic activity in the short run. A demand contraction is represented by a decrease in the components of the aggregate demand (AD) equation, often amplified by the Keynesian multiplier.

The fundamental Keynesian equation for aggregate demand in a closed economy (ignoring net exports for simplicity) is given by $Y = C + I + G$ where Y = Total output/income (Gross Domestic Product); C = Consumption expenditure; I = Investment expenditure; G = Government spending. A demand contraction occurs when one or more of these components decrease. For example, a fall in business confidence might reduce investment (I).

5. Interpretation of Economic Losses

- **Producers** suffer persistent profit erosion and reduced innovation incentives.
- **Distributors** face market displacement, reducing investment in formal retail networks.
- **Consumers** suffer welfare losses due to early equipment failure and safety risks.
- **Governments** lose tax revenue while bearing higher enforcement costs.
- **Macroeconomy** experiences output contraction, employment losses, and reduced capital formation.

6. Relevance to Global Trade and Geopolitics

Counterfeiting in IT hardware is fundamentally a cross-border illegal trade phenomenon involving Transnational supply chains, Weak customs enforcement corridors, E-commerce enabled distribution and Jurisdictional enforcement gaps. It distorts legitimate trade flows, undermines tariff regimes, and creates diplomatic and trade-policy frictions—directly placing this study within the Global Trade and Geopolitical Challenges track.

7. Policy Implications

The empirical and theoretical results of this study demonstrate that counterfeiting in IT hardware generates systemic welfare losses across producers, distributors, consumers, and the government. Effective policy intervention therefore requires a coordinated mix of technological, legal, fiscal, and institutional responses that operate across national borders and digital marketplaces.

Strengthening customs risk profiling using AI and blockchain traceability can significantly improve real-time detection of counterfeit shipments and reduce inspection leakage in high-volume trade corridors.

Harmonization of cross-border intellectual property enforcement mechanisms is essential to close jurisdictional gaps that currently allow counterfeit networks to arbitrage regulatory weak points across countries.

Platform liability regulations for online marketplaces can internalize the external costs of counterfeit trade by making digital intermediaries accountable for proactive screening and seller verification.

Tax-linked product authentication systems can simultaneously deter counterfeit circulation and improve indirect tax compliance through verifiable digital product identities.

Public–private cooperation with original equipment manufacturers (OEMs) enables information sharing, joint enforcement operations, and scalable authentication technologies that enhance overall supply-chain integrity.

8. Gaps Addressed by the Present Study

While the existing literature provides rich insights into isolated components of counterfeit harm, three major gaps remain:

1. Most studies examine either **firm-level profit loss** or **consumer welfare loss**, but not in a unified framework.

2. Very few studies incorporate **dynamic brand depreciation** using causal identification strategies.

3. There is limited integration of **micro-level losses with macro-level multiplier effects** in emerging market contexts.

This paper addresses these gaps by constructing a unified welfare accounting framework that integrates all major economic agents and explicitly models both static and dynamic losses within a single empirical system.

9. Limitations and Future Research

The shadow nature of counterfeit trade limits precise volume estimation. Future studies should Apply dynamic general equilibrium (DGE) modeling, Use blockchain-verified supply chain data, and examine cyber-counterfeiting in embedded hardware and firmware.

10. Conclusion

IT hardware counterfeiting imposes large, persistent, and economy-wide costs extending far beyond firm-level revenue losses. By integrating welfare economics with macroeconomic multiplier theory, this paper demonstrates that counterfeiting acts as a systemic drag on industrial growth, fiscal stability, and international trade credibility. Effective anti-counterfeiting policy must be viewed not merely as intellectual property protection, but as a core economic policy instrument for growth and trade stability in emerging markets.

11. References

International Chamber of Commerce | The Economic Impacts of Counterfeiting and Piracy – Report prepared for BASCAP and INTA | February 2017 – *https://iccwbo.org/news-publications/policies-reports/economic-impacts-counterfeiting-piracy-report-prepared-bascap-inta/*

The Business Research Company | Computer Hardware Global Market Report 2025 | January 2025 – *https://www.thebusinessresearchcompany.com/report/computer-hardware-global-market-report*

Statista | Industries, Technology & Telecommunication, Hardware | January 2025 – *https://www.statista.com/markets/418/topic/482/hardware/?srsltid=AfmBOopjvx1jyt5lEFEb4l_CHc6s22tGbc6zrmXZ0Lgp1lzZon7vBBJM#overview*

Nano Matrix | The True Cost of Counterfeiting: Impact on Businesses | *https://www.nanomatrixsecure.com/the-true-cost-of-counterfeiting-impact-on-businesses/*

VCQRU | The Economic Impact of Counterfeit Products | April 2024 | *https://www.vcqru.com/blog/the-economic-impact-of-counterfeit-products*

AlpVision | The Economic Impact of Counterfeiting: How It Affects Brands and How to Fight Back | July 2025 | *https://alpvision.com/the-economic-impact-of-counterfeiting/*

RedPoints | What are the economic effects of counterfeit goods? | January 2025 | *https://www.redpoints.com/blog/what-are-the-economic-effects-of-counterfeit-goods/*

Counterfeiting in digital technologies: An empirical analysis of the economic performance and innovative activities of affected companies | Science Direct | Vincenzo Butticè | June 2020 |
https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0048733320300391

The Impact of Counterfeit Goods in Global Commerce | Ocean Tomo | David Fraser, Matthew Brown and James E | June 2025 | *https://oceantomo.com/insights/the-impact-of-counterfeit-goods-in-global-commerce/*

The demand for counterfeiting on the criminological research agenda | IDEAS | Jo Large | 2019 |
https://ideas.repec.org/h/elg/eechap/17736_8.html

The Demand for Counterfeits | SSRN | Nan Chen & Mengqi Xiang | April 2025 |
https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=5198625