



Europe-Asia Studies >

Volume 58, 2006 - [Issue 6](#)

438 | 37 | 0
Views | CrossRef citations to date | Altmetric

Original Articles

Foreign Direct Investment and economic transition: Panacea or pain killer?

Camilla Jensen

Pages 881-902 | Published online: 19 Jan 2007

Cite this article <https://doi.org/10.1080/09668130600831084>

Sample our Politics & International Relations Journals
>> [Sign in here](#) to start your access to the latest two volumes for 14 days

Full Article

Figures & data

References

Citations

Metrics

Reprints & Permissions

Read this article

Share

Abstract

This article sets out to make an assessment of the relationship between Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) and economic growth in transition countries through a review of the empirical record to date. The first part reviews the phases of transition in combination with policy efforts to attract FDI. In the second part, different growth studies across levels of analysis are juxtaposed to better understand the overall growth impact of FDI in transition countries. Since foreign firms have a large direct effect on performance at the level of the firm it is often assumed that they automatically contribute to the economic growth of host countries. The missing link in this discussion is the concept of 'trickle down'. Superior direct effects in terms of productivity and profitability are hypothesised to trickle down to the host country both as spillovers, or catalysing effects on local firms, and through the expected increase in income that such direct and indirect effects in combination will generate through labour income and taxes. The

review shows that such trickle down effects are quite fragile in terms of being demonstrated to exist in transition countries. Combined with widespread usage of tax holidays, subsidies and acquisition discounts, it is not certain that positive direct effects equate with economic growth in these countries.

Notes

¹The experiences of the CIS countries are considered to be in a category of their own. This will become more clear in the section below, 'Explaining FDI inflows'.

²See for example Campos and Kinoshita ([2003](#)), Altomonte and Guagliano ([2003](#)), Carstensen and Toubal ([2004](#)), Disdier and Mayer ([2004](#)), Frenkel et al. ([2004](#)), Walkenhorst ([2004](#)) and Janicki and Wunnava ([2004](#)).

³However, the 'servisation' of the world economy breaks with the old stages approach to economic development (Chenery & Taylor [1968](#), pp. 391 – 416). For example, developing countries relying more heavily on 'servisation' in relation to tourism rather than traditional industrialisation are also bound to attract relatively more FDI in service industries.

⁴Poland, Hungary and Czechoslovakia signed the Europe Agreement in 1991, followed by Bulgaria and Romania in 1993, and the Baltic countries and Slovenia in 1994.

⁵Owing to the depressed value of firm-specific assets in this process, foreign investors may obtain a cheap ticket to the local market, immediate production volume, participation in well-established networks (including supplier and distribution networks), and avoid cumbersome license application processes. In some cases there are also real strategic asset seeking aspects associated with such privatisation acquisitions by foreign investors, such as local brands, technology and human assets (Meyer & Estrin [2001](#)).

⁶Even though this is not mirrored in the privatisation revenue figures published by EBRD, possibly because Estonian manufacturing firms are concentrated in light industry.

⁷Note that in low income countries the privatisation of state-owned enterprises to foreign investors is often viewed as a negative or surrendering policy from a development perspective (Easterly [2001](#)).

⁸However, reinvested earnings are not taxed in Estonia. Estonia also has a major advantage over the other Baltic States in terms of her cultural affinities with Finland.

⁹Some companies in labour-intensive industries will disinvest and move their production to third countries and some efficiency seeking FDI may favour EU or third countries over the transition countries, which may also mean de-facto disinvestment.

¹⁰For Estonia see Varblane and Ziacik ([1999](#)), Hannula and Tamm ([2003](#)), Jones and Mygind ([2002](#)) and Sinani and Meyer ([2004](#)). For the Czech Republic see Zemplinerova & Benacek ([1997](#)) and Djankov and Hoekman ([2000](#)). For Hungary see Bosco ([2001](#)) and Sgard ([2001](#)). For Poland see Zukowska-Gagelmann ([2000](#)) and Jensen ([2004](#)). For Romania see Hunya ([2002b](#)). For Slovenia see Rojec ([1998](#)). In addition there also exist a number of edited books on this topic that are not mentioned in the survey here for sake of brevity.

¹¹For a central theoretical exposure in relation to FDI see Narula and Dunning ([2000](#)).

Related research

People also read

Recommended articles

Cited by
37

How does FDI inflow affect productivity of domestic firms? The role of horizontal and vertical spillovers, absorptive capacity and competition >

Kolasa Marcin

The Journal of International Trade & Economic Development

Published online: 10 Dec 2007

Information for

Authors

R&D professionals

Editors

Librarians

Societies

Opportunities

Reprints and e-prints

Advertising solutions

Accelerated publication

Corporate access solutions

Open access

Overview

Open journals

Open Select

Dove Medical Press

F1000Research

Help and information

Help and contact

Newsroom

All journals

Books

Keep up to date

Register to receive personalised research and resources
by email

 Sign me up

  

  

Copyright © 2025 Informa UK Limited Privacy policy Cookies Terms & conditions

Accessibility



Registered in England & Wales No. 01072954
5 Howick Place | London | SW1P 1WG