Taylor & Francis
Online

Europe-Asia Studies ›
Volume 58, 2006 - Issue 6

446 Views | 39 CrossRef citations to date | 0 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 Area Studies 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

[1]The 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’.

[2]See 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).

[3]However, 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.

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

[5]Owing 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).

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

[7]Note 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).

[8]However, 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.

[9]Some 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.

[10]For 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.

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

Related research

People also read | Recommended articles | Cited by 39

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

Open access

Overview

Open journals

Open Select

Dove Medical Press

F1000Research

Opportunities

Reprints and e-prints

Advertising solutions

Accelerated publication

Corporate access solutions

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 © 2026 Informa UK Limited Privacy policy

Cookies Terms & conditions Accessibility

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

Taylor & Francis by informa