

Post-Privatization Enterprise Restructuring

By: Morris Bornstein

Working Paper Number 327

July 2000

POST-PRIVATIZATION ENTERPRISE RESTRUCTURING

Morris Bornstein

Department of Economics
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109-1220, U.S.A.
Telephone: (734) 764-2355
Fax: (734) 764-2769
E-mail: morborn@umich.edu

Copyright © Morris Bornstein, 2000

Abstract

Post-privatization restructuring of former state-owned enterprises (FSOEs) encompasses both shorter-run “defensive” actions and longer-run “strategic” measures. Restructuring involves changes in corporate governance, organizational structure, management, labor, capital, technology, output, and sales. Various performance indicators may measure the results of restructuring, but care is required in the selection and interpretation of indicators. In the restructuring of FSOEs foreign strategic investors have many advantages over domestic investors. The study includes examples from experience in the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland.

Journal of Economic Literature Classifications: F23, G34, L33, P31.

Keywords: Privatization, corporate governance, enterprise restructuring, performance indicators, foreign direct investment.

1. INTRODUCTION

This study analyzes the restructuring of former state-owned enterprises (FSOEs) after their “corporatization” into joint-stock companies (JSCs) in which the state initially held all shares and then, by one method or another, transferred a controlling portion of the shares to private hands.¹

Thus, the study does not consider (1) the restructuring of state-owned enterprises (SOEs) without, or before, privatization²; (2) the post-privatization restructuring of SOEs so small that they are privatized as sole proprietorships or partnerships, rather than as JSCs; or (3) the development of startup private firms.³

In this study, “restructuring” refers to the transformation of the individual firm, rather than to the reallocation of resources across sectors of the economy. The conception of enterprise restructuring is broad, including changes in corporate governance, organizational structure, management, inputs, outputs, and sales. Enterprise restructuring thus encompasses both short-run or “defensive” actions and long-run or “strategic” measures (Estrin and others, 1995, pp. xix-xxiii; Grosfeld and Roland, 1996). The former set, addressed to the immediate survival of the enterprise, comprises, for example, reduction of employment, substitution of cheaper material inputs, disposal of unneeded inventories and equipment, and adjustment of the current product mix to increase sales. The latter set, altering the entire business strategy, comprehends, for instance, a different organizational structure, investment for new production processes and product lines, and stronger quality control and marketing.

This study focuses on the restructuring of nonagricultural and nonfinancial firms, chiefly in manufacturing, construction, and trade. Restructuring of former collective and state farms involves special issues of food policy and rural development.⁴ Restructuring of banks is linked to the creation of a multi-tier banking system, the development of the tools of monetary policy, and bankruptcy procedures.⁵

By way of illustration, the study mentions experience of post-privatization enterprise restructuring in the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland. They are leaders in privatization and other components of economic transition among the countries of Central

and Eastern Europe and nations of the former Soviet Union (EBRD, 1999, pp. 210-213, 226-229, and 250-253).⁶

Part 2 of the study analyzes key elements of the restructuring of the firm. Part 3 discusses measurement of the results of restructuring. Part 4 considers restructuring by foreign direct investors. Part 5 presents some general conclusions.

2. ELEMENTS OF RESTRUCTURING

Key elements in post-privatization restructuring include changes in corporate governance, management, labor and capital inputs, and outputs.

Corporate Governance

In this study corporate governance involves control over the firm's major policies about production, investment, and the disposition of profit, as well as the selection, motivation, and monitoring of top managers who are to implement those policies.⁷

Before privatization, governance of an SOE in a socialist centrally planned economy was exercised in principle by the ministry supervising the branch to which the firm belonged. However, governance responsibilities were sometimes shared by others, for example by enterprise managers in Hungary and by employee councils in Poland.

The method of privatization determined the new controllers of the enterprise and, in turn, the likelihood of its extensive restructuring as a result of their desire, knowledge, and resources for its transformation. From the experience of the Czech Republic, Poland, and Hungary, four main cases can be distinguished, in ascending order of the probability of restructuring (Bornstein, 1997; Havrylyshyn and McGettigan, 1999, pp. 15-27).

Management and Employee Buyouts

The shares of the firm (or its assets to form a new company) were sold to the employees in an employee buyout (EBO), to the managers in a management buyout (MBO), or to both groups in a management-employee buyout (MEBO). Managers may have held only about one-fourth of the shares in an MEBO, but their control of the firm was usually not challenged by the workers, who as a group owned a majority of the shares. MBOs and MEBOs were more likely than EBOs to try to control labor costs by reducing

employment and restraining wage increases, but, understandably, they ordinarily avoided major changes in managerial personnel. MEBOs may have wished to expand the capital stock and modernize processes and products, but their ability to do so was limited by the burden of debt incurred to finance the privatization buyout.

Vouchers to Bid for Shares in Operating Companies (OCs)

In the Czech Republic about 40 percent of the book value of property in the Large Enterprise Privatization Program was divested through a mass privatization (MP) program.⁸ For a nominal fee, each adult citizen could buy a book of coupons with “investment points” to bid in auctions of state shares in JSCs formed from SOEs.⁹ Private investment funds (IFs) were not included in the original MP plan of the government, which expected that voucher privatization would lead to dispersed individual ownership of JSC shares divested in these auctions. It was therefore a surprise that some 440 IFs emerged to collect about two-thirds of the investment points.

Initially, an IF was permitted to own a maximum of 20 percent of the shares in an individual OC. Most IFs were passive investors aiming for income and capital gains from holding and trading OC shares, rather than active investors seeking to affect enterprise policies and to supervise managers regarding those policies (Kotrba and others, 1999, pp. 38-40). In some cases, IFs sought to establish control over enterprises, for example by acting jointly with other IFs or with parent banks that sponsored the IFs. More typically, however, with dispersed individual ownership of shares and passive institutional investors, the enterprise was controlled by the incumbent managers, who had a weak commitment and limited resources to restructure the firm (Mertlík, 1997, pp. 77-81).

In 1996 new regulations authorized IFs to be transformed into holding companies that are not subject to the 20-percent rule and thus can more openly seek control of OCs. Some converted IFs acted as speculators aiming to resell their stakes at higher prices, or to generate revenue from asset-stripping,¹⁰ but others intended to pursue the long-term development of the OC. Thus, after initial voucher privatization, “secondary concentration” of ownership by “core” investors can restructure enterprises (Mertlík, 1998).

Vouchers to Obtain Shares in Investment Trusts Controlling OCs

In the Polish MP program, for a nominal fee each adult citizen could get one freely tradable master share certificate (MSC) representing proportional ownership in 15 investment trusts called National Investment Funds (NIFs) (Lewandowski and Szyszko, 1999; Hashi, 2000).¹¹ Subsequently, the MSC could be exchanged for one separate freely tradable share in each of the NIFs. The government included in the MP program 512 large and medium-sized OCs, mostly in manufacturing, with about 10 percent of industrial sector sales. Each SOE was corporatized as a JSC, and 60 percent of the shares was allocated to the NIF scheme, 15 percent was given free to employees, and 25 percent was retained by the state. A controlling 33 percent of the shares in each OC was assigned to a “lead” NIF, and 27 percent was apportioned among the other 14 NIFs. The lead NIF positions were distributed in a 15-round lottery, each with a different sequence in which the various NIFs chose OCs for which they would play the lead role. In the end, each NIF got the lead status in 31-35 OCs.

The NIF is a JSC with elements of a closed-end mutual fund, a holding company, and a venture capitalist. With clear dominant ownership, a lead NIF exercises corporate governance over the OCs it controls, is supposed to restructure them as appropriate, and can sell its shares in an OC and buy other company shares in an effort to increase the value of the NIF’s portfolio. Thus, in contrast to the Czech scheme, the Polish program provided a core shareholder for each OC, made it responsible for restructuring the OC, and enabled the controller’s performance to be evaluated by the sale price of the OC or its stock market quotation.

Each NIF contracted with a fund management company, whose sponsors typically included one or more Polish banks or consulting firms and one or more foreign financial or consulting firms. The foreign organizations were expected to provide experience in enterprise restructuring and banking services, whereas the Polish partners were to contribute restructuring and financial advice as well as specific knowledge of the country’s business environment. Fund managers were remunerated by a combination of three fees: (1) an annual fixed fee; (2) an annual performance fee from the sale of 1 percent of the

NIF's assets; and (3) a "loyalty" fee of 5 percent of the NIF's assets at the end of the 10-year contractual period.

Almost all of the OCs required some restructuring, but their condition varied greatly. At one end of the spectrum, about a fifth of the OCs were strong enough to be considered for early listing on the Warsaw Stock Exchange. At the other end, some OCs needed immediate rescue to avoid bankruptcy.

An NIF commonly assigned a team of its employees to supervise and restructure 5-6 OCs. Measures to transform them included labor-shedding; changes in the organizational structure, management personnel, output mix, and customer mix; and investment in new processes. NIFs often got domestic or foreign loans to alter OCs. In some cases, an NIF sold off all or part of one OC in order to raise cash to restructure another OC.

However, there was a conflict between the shorter-term goal of maximization of the net asset value of the NIF's portfolio and the longer-term goal of restructuring individual OCs, since the two goals competed for the limited advisory and supervisory capabilities of the NIF. The NIFs' managers often favored the former objective, by improving the best OCs and selling off the weak firms instead of attempting to restructure them. The NIFs' supervisory boards, composed of government appointees, had a longer-term horizon with more interest in restructuring OCs. In disagreements, the NIFs' managers' views usually prevailed, because they had extensive information about the OCs, whereas the supervisory boards had no professional staff to argue their position.

Some NIFs have adopted distinct styles concerning this conflict of objectives. Certain NIFs now consider themselves purely financial investment funds, concerned with the purchase and sale of OC shares. Other NIFs deem themselves predominantly venture capitalists that seek to enhance the value of their OCs through restructuring and to acquire new, privately established OCs in order to develop them.

Direct Sales to Strategic Investors

Such direct sales may occur through competitive bidding in open tenders for JSC shares (or SOE assets) or through closed negotiated sales of JSC shares (or SOE assets) to particular buyers. In both cases the usual aim is to transfer a controlling interest to a domestic or foreign investor. The privatization contract often specifies aspects of

restructuring, such as the purchaser's business plan, employment guarantees, and investment commitments.

In Hungary the main method of privatization was case-by-case direct sales of SOEs, preferably to foreign investors, such as multinational corporations (MNCs), paying in convertible currency (Major and others, 1999, pp. 289-296).¹² Foreign investors were more likely than domestic investors to pursue strategic as well as defensive restructuring, changing the firm's organizational structure and management personnel, reducing employment, investing additional capital, altering the product mix, and raising the share of exports in total sales. Domestic investors, typically burdened by heavy debt service undertaken to buy the enterprise, often lacked resources to upgrade the company's technology and product structure. They frequently had a short-term aim of an immediate and regular return on their investment, rather than a longer-term program of technological development and market expansion.

Enterprise Management

Restructuring of enterprise management encompassed both (1) organizational restructuring and (2) replacement, training, and changes in compensation of individual managerial personnel.

Organizational restructuring altered the number, hierarchy, and duties of managerial posts (Brada, 1998; Major and others, 1999, p. 271).

The scope of the firm itself was sometimes changed. Some enterprises shut down or sold individual plants with unfavorable prospects or a poor fit with the new business strategy. Some vertically integrated companies spun off supplier units, and some enterprises outsourced janitorial, repair, or transportation activities. Finally, in some cases firms divested or closed non-production facilities such as housing and health clinics.

In many firms the organization chart was flattened by a reduction in the number of decision-making levels. Many enterprises shifted from a more centralized to a more decentralized structure with a headquarters staff responsible for strategy, investment allocation, and control, and divisions whose managers were in charge of day-to-day operations.¹³ In some companies, certain units were designated as profit centers, and others as service or cost centers, to measure profitability as a guide to top management's future

channeling of investment. Also, organizational restructuring created, or upgraded the status of, units for specific functions, such as marketing, product quality, and finance. New communication systems were established for management information and production control.

Restructuring led to the appointment of new general directors in about a third of the privatized firms in a large EBRD-World Bank survey (EBRD, 1999, pp. 138-139). The probability of replacement of the top manager increased when the enterprise faced harder budget constraints and more product-market competition. About 40 percent of the new general directors came from outside the firm, and 60 percent from promotions within it.¹⁴

Also, restructuring entailed changes in managerial remuneration. First, the base pay of managers engaged in strategic decisions on finance, accounting, and marketing grew relative to that of direct production managers. Second, within the total compensation package, the share of performance-related components, such as bonuses and merit increases, rose.

Labor

Enterprise restructuring affected both employment and compensation of workers.

SOEs often were overstaffed. In some countries, the enterprise's plan assignments stressed output rather than cost or profit. In others, enterprise councils sought to protect workers' jobs. Thus, privatization was expected to lead to dismissals of redundant workers in many firms. Significant cuts in the labor force did occur in some enterprises. But in others the reductions were modest, because of pressure from local government authorities (particularly in a "company town" with a dominant employer) or because of managers' reluctance to fire workers (Brada, 1998). The extent of dismissals was influenced by the level and length of unemployment benefits and the effectiveness of government "active" labor market measures, such as placement and (re)training programs (Boeri, 1997). Also, some firms avoided employment cuts by increasing sales through changes in the product mix, quality, and marketing (Frydman and others, 1999, pp. 1177-1178).

The liberalization of the labor market ended state controls over wages that were intended to limit inequality in incomes. Wage differentials increased significantly to reflect the scarcity of labor services more closely. In privatized firms, relative wages rose in jobs

requiring more education and skills, and incentive compensation was used more widely (Rutkowski, 1996).

Capital

Restructuring the firm's capital stock after privatization often involved both subtractions and additions (Major and others, 1999, pp. 267-281). The former comprised sales of unneeded inventories, equipment, workshops, warehouses, and land; write-off of unfinished investment; and closing of loss-making plants. The additions consisted of new buildings and equipment, often embodying superior technology to modernize production processes and introduce new products. In some cases, the aim was to raise productivity and quality, rather than to increase capacity.

However, the ability of many enterprises to improve or expand the capital stock was severely constrained by the lack of finance from internal or external sources (Chvojka, 1999, pp. 90-102). Little new investment could be financed from internal sources, such as amortization allowances, retained earnings, and proceeds from the disposal of surplus assets. Among the potential external sources, bank credit was limited for several reasons. Government anti-inflationary monetary policies restricted the growth of the money supply and kept interest rates high. Government efforts to harden enterprise budget constraints discouraged automatic rollovers of loans, and indeed pressed bankruptcy programs to clear up companies' bad debts to banks. Also, the banks themselves preferred to provide short-term commercial credit rather than longer-term loans for plant and equipment. Most firms had little possibility of raising funds by initial public offerings or bond issues floated on the domestic or Eurobond markets. Only foreign-controlled enterprises were able to finance their restructuring easily, through funds from the MNC parent or bank loans obtained on favorable terms because of the parent's guarantee.

Output

There were three main types of post-privatization restructuring of output (Brada, 1998).

The first altered the product mix to concentrate on the product lines with the best market potential and to reduce or abandon those with weaker prospects. The net effect in

most firms was to narrow the product range. This result was not surprising in view of the typical pre-privatization SOE's relatively large size; broad product assortment; and high degree of vertical integration, often intended to avoid reliance on outside suppliers deemed unreliable in meeting delivery commitments. Thus some firms increased the output of particular products while cutting total output.

The second adjustment improved product quality in order to compete more successfully on the domestic market against national products and imports, and on foreign markets, especially the demanding Western markets.

Third, firms commonly strengthened their marketing efforts. On the domestic market, many companies, especially those supplying consumer goods, increased and revised advertising, in an effort to differentiate their products and thereby gain some pricing power to bolster sales revenue. On foreign markets, many enterprises redirected their exports from traditional Eastern markets, where GNP and imports had fallen, to Western, particularly West European, customers.

Product-market competition exerted pressure on firms to restructure in the shorter-run by shedding excess labor and other steps, as well as in the longer-run by innovation in processes and products (EBRD, 1999, pp. 135-137). The extent and nature of product-market competition was influenced by government policies in several spheres. Competition by private startups depended on government regulations and practices concerning registration and licensing, use of real estate, financing, employment, and taxation (EBRD, 1999, pp. 150-159). Formal "competition policy" established a set of rules about the formation of cartels among producers, with agreements on prices, output, or market-sharing; mergers or acquisitions that create or enhance market power; and abuse of a dominant market position by an individual firm (EBRD, 1997, pp. 86-89).¹⁵ Competition increased significantly after the liberalization of foreign economic relations, including currency convertibility, elimination of quantitative restrictions on imports, and reduction of barriers to entry of foreign direct investment (FDI) in the privatization of SOEs, the formation of joint ventures (JVs) with domestic firms, and "greenfield" initiation of new foreign-controlled projects.

3. MEASURING RESULTS OF RESTRUCTURING

There are numerous performance indicators to gauge the results of post-privatization enterprise restructuring, though some care is needed in the selection and interpretation of indicators.

By way of illustration, Table 1 shows the principal performance indicators used in selected studies of post-privatization enterprise restructuring in the Czech Republic, Hungary, and/or Poland. They refer to aspects of costs, revenues, productivity, and profitability.

The number of employees is often used in one form or another, either by itself or as the denominator of ratios concerning different gauges of productivity. For measures of efficiency, the number of worker-hours, including part-time and overtime as well as straight-time work, is a better denominator than the number of employees. However, the data sets available to researchers often report employment but not work-hours. Among the revenue indicators, the share of exports in total sales is sometimes regarded as an indicator of competitiveness on foreign markets and thus as a proxy for quality. "Labor productivity" is characterized by sales or value-added per employee or per worker-hour, although sales and value-added depend also on capital inputs and management, for example. Changes in total factor productivity measure changes in the firm's efficiency in using labor, material inputs, and capital to produce a given level of output. This is the broadest measure of productivity, but its calculation is complex and requires many assumptions (Claessens and Djankov, 1998, pp. 11-13). Profitability can be evaluated in relation to sales, shareholders' equity, or total assets -- respectively, profit margin on sales, return on investment, and return on all assets under management's control, regardless of how financed.

Because they are the most comprehensive, profitability indicators may seem superior to "partial" indicators of costs, revenues, and the productivity of factors in generating output and sales. However, the narrower indicators may answer specific questions of interest. For example, the employment indicator reveals the extent of labor-shedding. Sales reflect the effects of changes in the product mix, the customer mix, and

marketing effort. A comparison of employment and sales shows how far the enterprise succeeded in avoiding dismissals through adjustments in output and revenue.

Moreover, the profitability ratios may be unreliable, because of flaws in the figures for profits and assets, especially in the earlier years of the post-communist transition (Frydman and others, 1999, p. 1158). In a period of rapid inflation, profits were exaggerated, since costs were understated relative to sales revenue because of the rise in prices between the date inputs were bought and the later date the output embodying these inputs was sold (Carlin and others, 1999, p. 6). On the other hand, some companies overstated costs and understated profits in order to reduce their tax liabilities (Major and others, 1999, p. 168). In turn, asset values were listed on balance sheets at historical costs expressed in administratively-set nonscarcity prices of the era of socialist central planning. Buildings and equipment were inadequately depreciated according to excessively conservative depreciation schedules. Land was not valued properly, if at all, because it was not traded (Bornstein, 1999, p. 66).

Thus, some performance indicators were more reliable and more relevant at different stages of the restructuring process. In the earlier phase of “defensive” restructuring, focused on labor-shedding and adjustment in output of the initial product mix, employment and sales were pertinent indicators. Profitability indicators became more appropriate during or after “strategic” restructuring, when new accounting systems corresponding to international standards were adopted, the organizational structure and managerial personnel were changed, investment in product and process innovation began to bear fruit, and the effects of greater domestic and foreign competition were felt.¹⁶

4. RESTRUCTURING BY FOREIGN DIRECT INVESTORS

Many studies have concluded that in restructuring FSOEs foreign strategic investors have been more successful than domestic “outside” and “inside” controllers.¹⁷ Likely reasons for this superior performance, and some offsetting considerations, can be analyzed in the framework of the elements of restructuring in Part 2.

In regard to *corporate governance*, MNCs obtained clear control, though not necessarily full ownership, of FSOEs. The foreign investor had a definite plan for the transformation of the enterprise, encompassing both defensive and strategic restructuring,

to accomplish objectives of investment, production, sales, and profitability. Yet the authority and discretion that foreign owners granted local managers varied across FSOEs. The independence of local managers was related more to the overall strategy and style of the MNC, or to the technical characteristics of production, than to the MNC's ability to project its power as owner (Brada and Singh, 1999, pp. 38-39).

With respect to *organizational restructuring*, the foreign strategic investor was guided by its intentions for the FSOE and the post-restructuring fit into the MNC's international structure, as well as by the parent's experience elsewhere in combinations of centralization and decentralization of managerial decision making. But some of the downsizing that reduced the scope of the enterprise occurred earlier as a precondition of privatization. For example, the government separated out units or assets of an SOE – such as obsolete plants and non-production facilities like housing – that were not included in the package sold to the foreign investor. The new owner was thus spared the effort and consequences of restructuring, divesting, or closing these parts of the SOE.

Foreign investors brought FSOEs a body of *management* know-how about such functions as procurement, production, sales, and financial control. However, getting an FSOE's managerial staff to act in the style of the new foreign owner was often more difficult than expected. An MNC found that some managers carried over from the SOE, or newly hired, were reluctant to make decisions, to take responsibility, to delegate authority to subordinates, and to use leadership and teamwork rather than operating hierarchically. Thus, considerable on-the-job learning and formal training were needed (Estrin and others, 1997, p. 221).

Foreign-owned FSOEs usually proceeded cautiously in shedding excess *labor*. In some cases, they were constrained by explicit or implicit employment guarantees in privatization contracts. In others, they were concerned about hostile public opinion concerning foreigners' purchases of SOEs. Foreign-controlled firms were able to recruit easily because they paid above-average wages (though expecting above-average productivity), offered good working conditions, and provided extensive training opportunities. Yet expatriate managers sent by the parent to the FSOE were often disappointed by workers' attitudes, for example about the importance of quality and their responsibility for it (Estrin and others, 1997, pp. 222-223). Sometimes the “corporate

culture” of the MNC clashed with that of the workers and managers of the FSOE. For instance, a study of the U.S. General Electric Company’s acquisition of the Hungarian firm Tungstam found wide differences between the GE culture and the Tungstam culture regarding such characteristics as individualism, self-confidence, codes of conduct, empowerment, response to uncertainty, the ambitiousness of targets, and the importance of time (Marer and Mabert, 1996, pp. 169-175).

Foreign direct investors have strong advantages over domestic outsider and insider owners in modernizing and expanding an FSOE’s *capital* stock and transferring new, up-to-date technology in production processes and products.¹⁸ However, MNCs often demanded preferential investment incentives, such as tax holidays, accelerated depreciation, exemption from VAT and duties on imported equipment, and the possibility to carry losses forward to future tax periods (Mah and Tamulaitis, 2000). Also, technology transfer by an MNC was frequently accompanied by a reduction in the FSOE’s own research and development, because the parent preferred to concentrate this function abroad (Farkas, 1997).

FDI improved the quality of *output*, of both exports and import-substitutes, and provided marketing links abroad, bringing FSOEs into networks of international business (Meyer, 2000). On the other hand, foreign investors acquiring FSOEs producing for the domestic market often wanted to buy established monopolistic positions and to preserve or strengthen them by government protection against imports (Carlin and others, 1995, p. 448).

In addition to these effects concerning specific elements of restructuring, there are more general issues in the assessment of foreign investors’ transformation of FSOEs. First, the state privatization agency and/or foreign investors usually chose for acquisition by foreigners stronger SOEs with better management and technology, fewer restructuring needs, and brighter prospects than the typical firm (Ewa Balcerowicz and others, 1998, pp. 106-108). Foreign investors tended to avoid enterprises in branches requiring extensive restructuring, such as steel, heavy machinery, and chemicals. This selection bias complicates the evaluation of the ownership-corporate governance-performance chain (Carlin and others, 1999, p. 15).

Also, foreign-controlled firms are commonly larger than domestic enterprises, and the size differential can help explain the superiority of the former in restructuring, for example through new investment and the associated technology transfer (Rojec, 2000, p. 144).

Finally, one should consider the spillover effects of FDI on domestic firms (Estrin and others, 1997, pp. 229-236). All types of foreign-controlled companies trained managers and workers who later moved to domestic enterprises. However, spillovers of technology transfer and quality improvement into domestic supplier and customer firms were greater from foreign-controlled enterprises producing for the national market than from export-oriented assembly operations with a high share of intra-firm trade.¹⁹

Despite these qualifications, foreign strategic investors were superior to domestic investors in restructuring FSOEs. FDI contributed to the preparation of Central European economies for entry into the European Union. In turn, EU accession will provide new opportunities for foreign acquisitions of FSOEs (as well as greenfield projects), speeding the integration of these countries into the world economy (Hunya 2000, pp. 18-25; Carlin and others, 1999, p. 9).

5. CONCLUSIONS

Restructuring of FSOEs encompasses both short-run or “defensive” actions and long-run or “strategic” measures.

The main elements of restructuring firms include changes in corporate governance, organizational structure, management personnel and compensation, labor inputs and remuneration, the capital stock, technology, and the composition, quality, and sale of output.

The results of restructuring may be measured by employment, sales, productivity, and profitability, but care is required in the selection and interpretation of performance indicators.

In the restructuring of FSOEs, foreign strategic investors have many advantages over domestic investors. Foreign acquisitions of SOEs, and other types of FDI, play an important role in expanding transition economies’ participation in the globalization of production.

Table 1

Principal Performance Indicators Used in Selected Studies of
 Post-Privatization Enterprise Restructuring in
 The Czech Republic, Hungary, and/or Poland

<u>Performance Indicator</u>	<u>Study No.</u>
<i>Costs</i>	
Employment [number of workers]	3
(Labor + materials costs)/sales	3
<i>Revenues</i>	
Sales	3
Net export sales/total sales	4
<i>Productivity</i>	
Sales per employee	3, 4
Value-added [sales – materials costs] per employee	2, 3, 4
Value-added [sales – materials costs] per worker-hour	5
Total factor productivity	1, 5
<i>Profitability</i>	
Profits/sales	2, 4
Profits/shareholders' equity	4
Profits/total assets	4

Key to study numbers:

1. Claessens and Djankov (1998).
2. Claessens and Djankov (1999).
3. Frydman and others (1999).
4. Major and others (1999).
5. Pohl and others (1997).

Notes

1. Conventionally, an enterprise is considered to be privatized when ownership of more than 50 percent of its shares is nonstate, though the government may retain a significant minority of the shares, perhaps even a “golden” share with veto power over certain decisions such as mergers. However, a privatization agreement may provide that a strategic investor acquiring less than 50 percent of the shares nevertheless shall make key decisions affecting the operation and expansion of the firm (Frydman and others, 1999, p. 1157). In both cases, the government can continue to influence a firm by legislation, taxes and subsidies, and measures affecting foreign economic relations.

2. On pre-privatization restructuring, see Aghion and others (1994), and Carlin and others (1995, pp. 430-442).

3. Private startups are discussed, for instance, by Ewa Balcerowicz and others (1999) and Bratkowski and others (2000).

4. Restructuring in agriculture is examined, for instance, by Turnock (1998) and Wegren (1998).

5. On bank restructuring and related issues, see Anderson and Kegels (1998), Bonin and others (1998), and Hawkins and Turner (1999). On bankruptcy, see Leszek Balcerowicz and others (1998).

6. Post-privatization enterprise restructuring in other countries of Central and Eastern Europe or the former Soviet Union is discussed by Djankov and Pohl (1997), Pankow and others (1999), Aukutsionek and others (1998), and Djankov (1999).

7. This conception of corporate governance is common in the literature on post-privatization enterprise restructuring in transition economies. For example, see Frydman and others (1996) and Brada and Singh (1999). Shleifer and Vishny (1997) present another view from the perspective of corporate finance.

8. Mejstřík (1997) furnishes a comprehensive account of privatization in the Czech Republic, including other methods of privatization.

9. In these auctions, the state set and adjusted the prices (in investment points) and the buyers bid the quantities (of shares) they wanted at those prices – the reverse of the usual auction procedure in which the seller specifies the quantity and the buyer the price.

10. The forms of asset-stripping include the following (Coffee, 1998, p. 113): (1) The controlling shareholder subcontracts to buy part or all of the firm's output at or below cost and then resells it to the firm's former customers at a profit. (2) The controlling shareholder requires the firm to repay the bank loan with which the investor acquired its shares. (3) The firm sells or leases valuable assets to the controlling shareholder (or its affiliates) at low prices.

11. Blaszczyk and others (1999) present a comprehensive review of privatization in Poland, including other methods of privatization.

12. Canning and Hare (1999) provide a broad survey of privatization in Hungary.

13. The company thus moved from a Unitary form to a Multidivisional form in the classification of Oliver E. Williamson (1986, pp. 54-80).

14. A study of Czech firms during 1993-1997 found that the appointment of new general directors in privatized enterprises was associated with improvements in labor productivity and profit margins (Claessens and Djankov, 1999).

15. However, the implementation of competition policy has been weak in some countries (Dutz and Vagliasindi, 2000).

16. Other issues in the choice, calculation, and interpretation of indicators to measure restructuring performance are discussed by Szalavetz (1996, 1997).

17. See, for example, EBRD (1999, pp. 173-174). An exception to this consensus is Frydman and others (1999). Their survey of 506 midsize manufacturing firms in the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland during 1990-1993 found that the restructuring performance of foreign strategic investors was not significantly better than that of domestic "outsider" owners. The authors speculated that the period studied was too short to observe the results of the foreign owners' transfer of managerial know-how and technology (p. 1172).

18. Djankov and Hoekman (1999) found that in the Czech Republic in 1992-1996 the growth of total factor productivity, taken as an indirect measure of technology transfer, was greater in foreign-controlled firms than in JVs or domestic enterprises.

19. Szanyi (2000) discusses other issues concerning FDI (including not only acquisitions of SOEs but also JVs and greenfield projects), such as investor and host country motivations, links to international trade flows, and transfer pricing and profit repatriation.

References

- Aghion, Philippe, Olivier Blanchard, and Robin Burgess. 1994. "The Behavior of State Firms in Eastern Europe, Pre-privatization," *European Economic Review*, Vol. 38, No. 6, June, pp. 1327-1349.
- Anderson, Ronald W., and Chantal Kegels. 1998. *Transition Banking: Financial Development of Central and Eastern Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Aukutsionek, Sergei, Igor Filatochev, Rostislav Kapelyushnikov, and Vladimir Zhukov. 1998. "Dominant Shareholders, Restructuring, and Performance of Privatized Companies in Russia: An Analysis and Some Policy Implications," *Communist Economies and Economic Transformation*, Vol. 10, No. 4, December, pp. 495-517.
- Balcerowicz, Ewa, Leszek Balcerowicz, and Iraj Hashi (eds.). 1999. *Barriers to Entry and Growth of Private Companies in Poland, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Albania, and Lithuania*. Report No. 14. Warsaw: Center for Social and Economic Research.
- , Iraj Hashi, Jan Mládek, Tamás Novak, Alison Sinclair, and Miklós Szanyi. 1998. "Downsizing as an Exit Mechanism: Comparing the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland," in Leszek Balcerowicz and others (eds.), pp. 91-128.
- Balcerowicz, Leszek, Cheryl W. Gray, and Iraj Hashi (eds.). 1998. *Enterprise Exit Processes in Transition Economies: Downsizing, Workouts, and Liquidation*. Budapest: Central European University Press.
- Błaszczak, Barbara, Grazyna Gierszewska, Michael Górzynski, Tytus Kaminski, Wojciech Maliszewski, Richard Woodward, and Aleksander Zolnierski. 1999. "Privatization and Company Restructuring in Poland," in Major (ed.), pp. 303-373.
- Boeri, Tito. 1997. "Labor-Market Reforms in Transition Economies," *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, Vol. 13, No. 2, Summer, pp. 126-140.
- Bonin, John, Kálmán Mizsei, István Székely, and Paul Wachtel. 1998. *Banking in Transition Economies: Developing Market-Oriented Banking Sectors in Eastern Europe*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Bornstein, Morris. 1997. "Non-standard Methods in the Privatization Strategies of the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland," *Economics of Transition*, Vol. 5, No. 2, pp. 323-337.

- , 1999. "Framework Issues in the Privatization Strategies of the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland," *Post-Communist Economies*, Vol. 11, No. 1, March, pp. 47-77.
- Brada, Josef C. 1998. *Management 101: Behavior of Firms in Transition Economies*. Working Paper No. 133. Ann Arbor, MI: William Davidson Institute.
- , and Inderjit Singh. 1999. "Corporate Governance in East Central Europe: Issues and Summary of Case Studies," in Josef C. Brada and Inderjit Singh (eds.), *Corporate Governance in Central Eastern Europe: Case Studies of Firms in Transition*, pp. 3-39. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Bratkowski, Andrzej, Irena Grosfeld, and Jacek Rostowski. 2000. "Investment and Finance in De Novo Private Firms: Empirical Results from the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland," *Economics of Transition*, Vol. 8, No. 1, pp. 101-116.
- Canning, Anna, and Paul Hare. 1999. "Political Economy of Privatization in Hungary: A Progress Report," in Paul Hare, Judy Batt, and Saul Estrin (eds.), *The Political Economy of Microeconomic Transformation*, pp. 99-130. Amsterdam: Harwood Academic Publishers.
- Carlin, Wendy, Saul Estrin, and Mark Schaffer. 1999. *Measuring Progress in Transition and Towards EU Accession: A Comparison of Manufacturing Firms in Poland, Romania, and Spain*. Working Paper No. 40. London: European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.
- , John Van Reenen, and Toby Wolfe. 1995. "Enterprise Restructuring in Early Transition: The Case Study Evidence from Central and Eastern Europe," *Economics of Transition*, Vol. 3, No. 4, pp. 427-458.
- Chvojka, Petr. 1999. "Financing Enterprise Restructuring," in Martin Myant (ed.), *Industrial Competitiveness in East-Central Europe*, pp. 76-105. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Claessens, Stijn, and Simeon Djankov. 1998. *Politicians and Firms in Seven Central and Eastern European Countries*. Policy Research Working Paper No. 1954. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.

- , and ----- . 1999. "Enterprise Performance and Management Turnover in the Czech Republic," *European Economic Review*, Vol. 43, Nos. 4-6, April, pp. 1115-1124.
- Coffee, John C., Jr. 1998. "Inventing a Corporate Monitor for Transitional Economies: The Uncertain Lessons from the Czech and Polish Experiences," in Klaus J. Hopt, Hideki Kanda, Mark J. Roe, Eddy Wymeersch, and Stefan Prigge (eds.), *Comparative Corporate Governance: The State of the Art and Emerging Research*, pp. 67-138. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Djankov, Simeon. 1999. "Ownership Structure and Enterprise Restructuring in Six Newly Independent States," *Comparative Economic Studies*, Vol. 41, No. 1, Spring, pp. 75-95.
- , and Bernard Hoekman. 1999. *Foreign Investment and Productivity Growth in Czech Enterprises*. Policy Research Working Paper No. 2115. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.
- , and Gerhard Pohl. 1997. *The Restructuring of Large Firms in Slovakia*. Policy Research Working Paper No. 1758. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.
- Dutz, Mark A., and Maria Vagliasindi. 2000. "Competition Policy Implementation in Transition Economies: An Empirical Assessment," *European Economic Review*, Vol. 44. Nos. 4-6, May, pp. 762-772.
- Estrin, Saul, Josef C. Brada, Alan Gelb, and Inderjit Singh. 1995. "An Introduction to the Case-Study Project," in Saul Estrin, Josef C. Brada, Alan Gelb, and Inderjit Singh (eds.), *Restructuring and Privatization in Central Eastern Europe: Case Studies of Firms in Transition*, pp. xi-xxxiv. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- , Kirsty Hughes, and Sarah Todd. 1997. *Foreign Direct Investment in Central and Eastern Europe: Multinationals in Transition*. London: Pinter Publishers.
- European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD). 1997. *Transition Report 1997*. London.
- . 1999. *Transition Report 1999*. London.
- Farkas, Peter. 1997. *The Effect of Foreign Direct Investment on Research, Development, and Innovation in Hungary*. Working Paper No. 81. Budapest: Institute for World Economics, Hungarian Academy of Sciences.

- Frydman, Roman, Cheryl W. Gray, Marek Hessel, and Andrzej Rapaczynski. 1999. "When Does Privatization Work? The Impact of Private Ownership on Corporate Performance in the Transition Economies," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 114, No. 4, November, pp. 1153-1191.
- , -----, and Andrzej Rapaczynski (eds.). 1996. *Corporate Governance in Central Europe and Russia*. 2 vols. Budapest: Central European University Press.
- Grosfeld, Irena, and Gérard Roland. 1996. "Defensive and Strategic Restructuring in Central European Enterprises," *Journal of Transforming Economies and Societies*, Vol. 3, No. 4, Autumn, pp. 21-46.
- Hashi, Iraj. 2000. "The Polish National Investment Fund Program: Mass Privatization with a Difference," *Comparative Economic Studies*, Vol. 42, No. 1, Spring, pp. 87-134.
- Havrylyshyn, Oleh, and Donal McGettigan. 1999. *Privatization in Transition Countries: A Sampling of the Literature*. Working Paper No. 99/6. Washington, D.C.: International Monetary Fund.
- Hawkins, John, and Philip Turner. 1999. "Bank Restructuring in Practice: An Overview," in *Bank Restructuring in Practice*, Policy Paper No. 6, pp. 6-105. Basel: Bank for International Settlements.
- Hunya, Gábor. 2000. "Central Europe Catching Up through FDI?" in Hunya (ed.), pp. 8-27.
- (ed.). 2000. *Integration through Foreign Direct Investment: Making Central European Industries Competitive*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Kotrba, Jozef, Evzen Kocenda, and Jan Hanousek. 1999. "The Governance of Privatization Funds in the Czech Republic," in Simoneti and others (eds.), 1999, pp. 7-43.
- Lewandowski, Janusz, and Roman Szyszko. 1999. "The Governance of Privatization Funds in Poland," in Simoneti and others (eds.), 1999, pp. 44-71.
- Mah, Jai S., and Donatas Tamulaitis. 2000. "A Note on Investment Incentives in the WTO and the Transition Economies," *Post-Communist Economies*, Vol. 12, No. 1, March, pp. 119-130.
- Major, Iván (ed.). 1999. *Privatization and Economic Performance in Central and Eastern Europe: Lessons to be Learnt from Western Europe*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

- , Cristiano Vezzoni, and Andrea Szalavetz. 1999. "Company Restructuring after Privatization in Hungary between 1998 and 1997," in Major (ed.), pp. 155-302.
- Marer, Paul, and Vincent Mabert. 1996. "GE Acquires and Restructures Tungstam: The First Six Years (1990-1995)," in Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, *Trends and Policies in Privatization*, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 149-185. Paris.
- Mejstřík, Michal (ed.). 1997. *The Privatization Process in East-Central Europe: Evolutionary Process of Czech Privatization*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Mertlík, Pavel. 1997. "Czech Privatization: From Public Ownership to Public Ownership in Five Years?" *Eastern European Economics*, Vol. 35, No. 2, March-April, pp. 64-83.
- . 1998. "A Case Study: The Czech Privatization and Subsequent Structural Changes in Capital Ownership and Property Rights," in United Nations, Economic Commission for Europe, *Economic Survey of Europe in 1998*, No. 2, pp. 103-109. New York and Geneva.
- Meyer, Klaus E. 2000. "International Production Networks and Enterprise Transformation in Central Europe," *Comparative Economic Studies*, Vol. 42, No. 1, Spring, pp. 135-150.
- Pankow, Julian, Lubomir Dimitrov, and Piotr Kozarewski. 1999. *Effects of Privatization on Industrial Enterprises in Bulgaria*. Report No. 34. Warsaw: Center for Social and Economic Research.
- Pohl, Gerhard, Robert E. Anderson, Stijn Claessens, and Simeon Djankov. 1997. *Privatization and Restructuring in Central and Eastern Europe: Evidence and Policy Options*. Technical Paper No. 368. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.
- Rojec, Matija. 2000. "Restructuring and Efficiency Upgrading with FDI," in Hunya (ed.), pp. 130-149.
- Rutkowski, Jan J. 1996. *Changes in the Wage Structure during Economic Transition in Central and Eastern Europe*. Technical Paper No. 340. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.

- Shleifer, Andrei, and Robert W. Vishny. 1997. "A Survey of Corporate Governance," *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 52, No. 2, June, pp. 737-783.
- Simoneti, Marko, Saul Estrin, and Andreja Böhm (eds.). 1999. *The Governance of Privatization Funds: Experiences of the Czech Republic, Poland, and Slovenia*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Szalavetz, Andrea. 1996. *Measuring the Restructuring Performance of Firms in the Transition Economies: Problems and Methodology in the Second Phase of Industrial Transformation*. Working Paper No. 69. Budapest: Institute for World Economics, Hungarian Academy of Sciences.
- . 1997. *The Reliability of Hard Indicators for Measuring Restructuring Performance*. Working Paper No. 82. Budapest: Institute for World Economics, Hungarian Academy of Sciences.
- Szany, Miklós. 2000. "The Role of FDI in Restructuring and Modernization: An Overview of the Literature," in Hunya (ed.), pp. 50-80.
- Turnock, David (ed.). 1998. *Privatization in Rural Eastern Europe: The Process of Restitution and Restructuring*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Wegren, Stephen K. (ed.). 1998. *Land Reform in the Former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe*. London: Routledge.
- Williamson, Oliver E. 1986. *Economic Organization: Firms, Markets, and Policy Control*. Brighton, UK: Wheatsheaf Books.

Davidson Institute Working Paper Series

CURRENT AS OF 8/02/00

Publication	Authors	Date of Paper
<i>No. 327 Post Privatization Enterprise Restructuring</i>	<i>Morris Bornstein</i>	<i>July 2000</i>
<i>No. 326 Who is Afraid of Political Instability?</i>	<i>Nauro F. Campos and Jeffrey B. Nugent</i>	<i>July 2000</i>
<i>No. 325 Business Groups, the Financial Market and Modernization</i>	<i>Raja Kali</i>	<i>June 2000</i>
<i>No. 324 Restructuring with What Success? A Case Study of Russian Firms</i>	<i>Susan Linz</i>	<i>July 2000</i>
<i>No. 323 Priorities and Sequencing in Privatization: Theory and Evidence from the Czech Republic</i>	<i>Nandini Gupta, John C. Ham and Jan Svejnar</i>	<i>May 2000</i>
<i>No. 322 Liquidity, Volatility, and Equity Trading Costs Across Countries and Over Time</i>	<i>Ian Domowitz, Jack Glen and Ananth Madhavan</i>	<i>March 2000</i>
<i>No. 321 Equilibrium Wage Arrears: Institutional Lock-In of Contractual Failure in Russia</i>	<i>John S. Earle and Klara Z. Sabirianova</i>	<i>June 2000</i>
<i>No. 320 Rethinking Marketing Programs for Emerging Markets</i>	<i>Niraj Dawar and Amitava Chattopadhyay</i>	<i>June 2000</i>
<i>No. 319 Public Finance and Low Equilibria in Transition Economies; the Role of Institutions</i>	<i>Daniel Daianu and Radu Vranceanu</i>	<i>June 2000</i>
<i>No. 318 Some Econometric Evidence on the Effectiveness of Active Labour Market Programmes in East Germany</i>	<i>Martin Eichler and Michael Lechner</i>	<i>June 2000</i>
<i>No. 317 A Model of Russia's "Virtual Economy"</i>	<i>R.E Ericson and B.W Ickes</i>	<i>May 2000</i>
<i>No. 316 Financial Institutions, Financial Contagion, and Financial Crises</i>	<i>Haizhou Huang and Chenggang Xu</i>	<i>March 2000</i>
<i>No. 315 Privatization versus Regulation in Developing Economies: The Case of West African Banks</i>	<i>Jean Paul Azam, Bruno Biais, and Magueye Dia</i>	<i>February 2000</i>
<i>No. 314 Is Life More Risky in the Open? Household Risk-Coping and the Opening of China's Labor Markets</i>	<i>John Giles</i>	<i>April 2000</i>
<i>No. 313 Networks, Migration and Investment: Insiders and Outsiders in Tirupur's Production Cluster</i>	<i>Abhijit Banerjee and Kaivan Munshi</i>	<i>March 2000</i>

<i>No. 312 Computational Analysis of the Impact on India of the Uruguay Round and the Forthcoming WTO Trade Negotiations</i>	<i>Rajesh Chadha, Drusilla K. Brown, Alan V. Deardorff and Robert M. Stern</i>	<i>March 2000</i>
<i>No. 311 Subsidized Jobs for Unemployed Workers in Slovakia</i>	<i>Jan. C. van Ours</i>	<i>May 2000</i>
<i>No. 310 Determinants of Managerial Pay in the Czech Republic</i>	<i>Tor Eriksson, Jaromir Gottvald and Pavel Mrazek</i>	<i>May 2000</i>
<i>No. 309 The Great Human Capital Reallocation: An Empirical Analysis of Occupational Mobility in Transitional Russia</i>	<i>Klara Z. Sabirianova</i>	<i>May 2000</i>
<i>No. 308 Economic Development, Legality, and the Transplant Effect</i>	<i>Daniel Berkowitz, Katharina Pistor, and Jean-Francois Richard</i>	<i>February 2000</i>
<i>No. 307 Community Participation, Teacher Effort, and Educational Outcome: The Case of El Salvador's EDUCO Program</i>	<i>Yasuyuki Sawada</i>	<i>November 1999</i>
<i>No. 306 Gender Wage Gap and Segregation in Late Transition</i>	<i>Stepan Jurajda</i>	<i>May 2000</i>
<i>No. 305 The Gender Pay Gap in the Transition from Communism: Some Empirical Evidence</i>	<i>Andrew Newell and Barry Reilly</i>	<i>May 2000</i>
<i>No. 304 Post-Unification Wage Growth in East Germany</i>	<i>Jennifer Hunt</i>	<i>November 1998</i>
<i>No. 303 How Does Privatization Affect Workers? The Case of the Russian Mass Privatization Program</i>	<i>Elizabeth Brainerd</i>	<i>May 2000</i>
<i>No. 302 Liability for Past Environmental Contamination and Privatization</i>	<i>Dietrich Earnhart</i>	<i>March 2000</i>
<i>No. 301 Varieties, Jobs and EU Enlargement</i>	<i>Tito Boeri and Joaquim Oliveira Martins</i>	<i>May 2000</i>
<i>No. 300 Employer Size Effects in Russia</i>	<i>Todd Idson</i>	<i>April 2000</i>
<i>No. 299 Information Complements, Substitutes, and Strategic Product Design</i>	<i>Geoffrey G. Parker and Marshall W. Van Alstyne</i>	<i>March 2000</i>
<i>No. 298 Markets, Human Capital, and Inequality: Evidence from Rural China</i>	<i>Dwayne Benjamin, Loren Brandt, Paul Glewwe, and Li Guo</i>	<i>May 2000</i>
<i>No. 297 Corporate Governance in the Asian Financial Crisis</i>	<i>Simon Johnson, Peter Boone, Alasdair Breach, and Eric Friedman</i>	<i>November 1999</i>
<i>No. 296 Competition and Firm Performance: Lessons from Russia</i>	<i>J. David Brown and John S. Earle</i>	<i>March 2000</i>
<i>No. 295 Wage Determination in</i>	<i>Peter J. Luke and Mark E. Schaffer</i>	<i>March 2000</i>

<i>Russia: An Econometric Investigation</i>		
<i>No. 294: Can Banks Promote Enterprise Restructuring?: Evidence From a Polish Bank's Experience</i>	<i>John P. Bonin and Bozena Leven</i>	<i>March 2000</i>
<i>No. 293: Why do Governments Sell Privatised Companies Abroad?</i>	<i>Bernardo Bortolotti, Marcella Fantini and Carlo Scarpa</i>	<i>March 2000</i>
<i>No. 292: Going Public in Poland: Case-by-Case Privatizations, Mass Privatization and Private Sector Initial Public Offerings</i>	<i>Wolfgang Aussenegg</i>	<i>December 1999</i>
<i>No. 291: Institutional Technology and the Chains of Trust: Capital Markets and Privatization in Russia and the Czech Republic</i>	<i>Bruce Kogut and Andrew Spicer</i>	<i>March 1999</i>
<i>No. 290: Banking Crises and Bank Rescues: The Effect of Reputation</i>	<i>Jenny Corbett and Janet Mitchell</i>	<i>January 2000</i>
<i>No. 289: Do Active Labor Market Policies Help Unemployed Workers to Find and Keep Regular Jobs?</i>	<i>Jan C. van Ours</i>	<i>February 2000</i>
<i>No. 288: Consumption Patterns of the New Elite in Zimbabwe</i>	<i>Russell Belk</i>	<i>February 2000</i>
<i>No. 287: Barter in Transition Economies: Competing Explanations Confront Ukranian Data</i>	<i>Dalia Marin, Daniel Kaufmann and Bogdan Goroehowskij</i>	<i>January 2000</i>
<i>No. 286: The Quest for Pension Reform: Poland's Security through Diversity</i>	<i>Marek Góra and Michael Rutkowski</i>	<i>January 2000</i>
<i>No. 285: Disorganization and Financial Collapse</i>	<i>Dalia Marin and Monika Schnitzer</i>	<i>October 1999</i>
<i>No. 284: Coordinating Changes in M-form and U-form Organizations</i>	<i>Yingyi Qian, Gérard Roland and Chenggang Xu</i>	<i>May 1999</i>
<i>No. 283: Why Russian Workers Do Not Move: Attachment of Workers Through In-Kind Payments</i>	<i>Guido Friebel and Sergei Guriev</i>	<i>October 1999</i>
<i>No. 282: Lessons From Fiascos in Russian Corporate Governance</i>	<i>Merritt B. Fox and Michael A. Heller</i>	<i>October 1999</i>
<i>No. 281: Income Distribution and Price Controls: Targeting a Social Safety Net During Economic Transition</i>	<i>Michael Alexeev and James Leitzel</i>	<i>March 1999</i>
<i>No. 280: Starting Positions, Reform Speed, and Economic Outcomes in Transitioning Economies</i>	<i>William Hallagan and Zhang Jun</i>	<i>January 2000</i>
<i>No. 279 : The Value of Prominent Directors</i>	<i>Yoshiro Miwa & J. Mark Ramseyer</i>	<i>October 1999</i>

<i>No. 278: The System Paradigm</i>	<i>János Kornai</i>	<i>April 1998</i>
<i>No. 277: The Developmental Consequences of Foreign Direct Investment in the Transition from Socialism to Capitalism: The Performance of Foreign Owned Firms in Hungary</i>	<i>Lawrence Peter King</i>	<i>September 1999</i>
<i>No. 276: Stability and Disorder: An Evolutionary Analysis of Russia's Virtual Economy</i>	<i>Clifford Gaddy and Barry W. Ickes</i>	<i>November 1999</i>
<i>No. 275: Limiting Government Predation Through Anonymous Banking: A Theory with Evidence from China.</i>	<i>Chong-En Bai, David D. Li, Yingyi Qian and Yijiang Wang</i>	<i>July 1999</i>
<i>*No. 274: Transition with Labour Supply</i>	<i>Tito Boeri</i>	<i>December 1999</i>
<i>No. 273: Sectoral Restructuring and Labor Mobility: A Comparative Look at the Czech Republic</i>	<i>Vit Sorm and Katherine Terrell</i>	<i>November 1999</i>
<i>*No. 272: Published in: Journal of Comparative Economics "Returns to Human Capital Under the Communist Wage Grid and During the Transition to a Market Economy" Vol. 27, pp. 33-60 1999.</i>	<i>Daniel Munich, Jan Svejnar and Katherine Terrell</i>	<i><u>October</u> <u>1999</u></i>
<i>No. 271: Barter in Russia: Liquidity Shortage Versus Lack of Restructuring</i>	<i>Sophie Brana and Mathilde Maurel</i>	<i>June 1999</i>
<i>No. 270: Tests for Efficient Financial Intermediation with Application to China</i>	<i>Albert Park and Kaja Sehart</i>	<i>March 1999</i>
<i>No. 269a: Russian Privatization and Corporate Governance: What Went Wrong?</i>	<i>Bernard Black, Reinier Kraakman and Anna Tarassova</i>	<i>May 2000</i>
<i>No. 269: Russian Privatization and Corporate Governance: What Went Wrong?</i>	<i>Bernard Black, Reinier Kraakman and Anna Tarassova</i>	<i>September 1999</i>
<i>No. 268: Are Russians Really Ready for Capitalism?</i>	<i>Susan Linz</i>	<i>September 1999</i>
<i>No. 267: Do Stock Markets Promote Economic Growth?</i>	<i>Randall K. Filer, Jan Hanousek and Nauro Campos</i>	<i>September 1999</i>
<i>No. 266: Objectivity, Proximity and Adaptability in Corporate Governance</i>	<i>Arnoud W.A Boot and Jonathan R. Macey</i>	<i>September 1999</i>
<i>No. 265: When the Future is not What it Used to Be: Lessons from the Western European Experience to</i>	<i>Nauro F. Campos, Gerard Hughes, Stepan Jurajda, and Daniel Munich</i>	<i>September 1999</i>

<i>Forecasting Education and Training in Transitional Economies</i>		
<i>No. 264: The Institutional Foundation of Foreign-Invested Enterprises (FIEs) in China</i>	<i>Yasheng Huang</i>	<i>September 1999</i>
<i>No. 263: The Changing Corporate Governance Paradigm: Implications for Transition and Developing Countries</i>	<i>Erik Berglof and Ernst-Ludwig von Thadden</i>	<i>June 1999</i>
<i>No. 262: Law Enforcement and Transition</i>	<i>Gerard Roland and Thierry Verdier</i>	<i>May 1999</i>
<i>No. 261: Soft Budget Constraints, Pecuniary Externality, and the Dual Track System</i>	<i>Jiahua Che</i>	<i>June 2000</i>
<i>No. 260: Missing Market in Labor Quality: The Role of Quality Markets in Transition</i>	<i>Gary H. Jefferson</i>	<i>July 1999</i>
<i>No. 259: Do Corporate Global Environmental Standards in Emerging Markets Create or Destroy Market Value</i>	<i>Glen Dowell, Stuart Hart and Bernard Yeung</i>	<i>June 1999</i>
<i>No. 258: Public Training and Outflows from Unemployment</i>	<i>Patrick A. Puhani</i>	<i>June 1999</i>
<i>No. 257: Ownership Versus Environment: Why are Public Sector Firms Inefficient?</i>	<i>Ann P. Bartel and Ann E. Harrison</i>	<i>June 1999</i>
<i>No. 256: Taxation and Evasion in the Presence of Exortion by Organized Crime</i>	<i>Michael Alexeev, Eckhard Janeba and Stefan Osborne</i>	<i>November 1999</i>
<i>No. 255: Revisiting Hungary's Bankruptcy Episode</i>	<i>John P. Bonin and Mark E. Schaffer</i>	<i>September 1999</i>
<i>No. 254: FDI in Emerging Markets: A Home-Country View</i>	<i>Marina v.N Whitman</i>	<i>June 1999</i>
<i>No. 253: The Asian Financial Crisis: What Happened, and What is to be Done</i>	<i>Jeffrey D. Sachs and Wing Thye Woo</i>	<i>January 1999</i>
<i>No. 252: Organizational Law as Asset Partitioning</i>	<i>Henry Hansmann and Reinier Kraakman</i>	<i>September 1999</i>
<i>No. 251: Consumer Behavior Research in Emerging Consumer Markets: the Case of the Optimum Stimulation Level in South Africa</i>	<i>Jan-Benedict E. M. Steenkamp and Steven M. Burgess</i>	<i>September 1999</i>
<i>No. 250: Property Rights Formation and the Organization of Exchange and Production in Rural China</i>	<i>Matthew A. Turner, Loren Brandt, and Scott Rozelle</i>	<i>July 1998</i>

No. 249: <i>Impacts of the Indonesian Economic Crisis: Price Changes and the Poor</i>	<i>James Levinsohn, Steven Berry, and Jed Friedman</i>	<i>June 1999</i>
No. 248: <i>Internal Barriers in the Transition of Enterprises from Central Plan to Market</i>	<i>Charalambos Vlachoutsicos</i>	<i>July 1999</i>
No. 247: <i>Spillovers from Multinationals in Developing Countries: the Mechanisms at Work</i>	<i>Richard E. Caves</i>	<i>June 1999</i>
No. 246: <i>Dynamism and Inertia on the Russian Labour Market: A Model of Segmentation</i>	<i>Irena Grosfeld, Claudia Senik-Leygonie, Thierry Verdier, Stanislav Kolenikov and Elena Paltseva</i>	<i>May 1999</i>
No. 245: <i>Lessons from Bank Privatization in Central Europe</i>	<i>John Bonin and Paul Wachtel</i>	<i>May 1999</i>
No. 244: <i>Nominal-Real Tradeoffs and the Effects of Monetary Policy: the Romanian Experience</i>	<i>Christian Popa</i>	<i>December 1998</i>
No. 243: <i>Privatization, Political Risk and Stock Market Development in Emerging Economies</i>	<i>Enrico C. Perotti and Pieter van Oijen</i>	<i>March 1999</i>
No. 242: <i>Investment Financing in Russian Financial-Industrial Groups</i>	<i>Enrico C. Perotti and Stanislav Gelfer</i>	<i>October 1998</i>
No. 241: <i>Can governments maintain hard budget constraints? Bank lending and financial isolation in Romania</i>	<i>Octavian Carare, Constantijn Claessens, Enrico C. Perotti</i>	<i>January 1999</i>
No. 240: <i>Democratic Institutions and Economic Reform: the Polish Case</i>	<i>John E. Jackson, Jacek Klich, and Krystyna Poznanska</i>	<i>April 1998</i>
No. 239: <i>A Longitudinal Study of IJV Performance in Eastern Europe</i>	<i>Keith D. Brouthers and Gary Bamossy</i>	<i>June 1999</i>
No. 238: <i>Published in: Journal of Business Venturing, "Firm Creation and Economic Transitions" Vol. 14, Iss. 5,6 Sep/Nov 1999, pp. 427-450.</i>	<i>John E. Jackson, Jacek Klich, Krystyna Poznanska</i>	<i>July 1998</i>
No. 237: <i>Analysis of Entrepreneurial Attitudes in Poland</i>	<i>John E. Jackson and Aleksander S. Marcinkowski</i>	<i>March 1997</i>
No. 236: <i>Investment and Finance in De Novo Private Firms: Empirical Results from the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland</i>	<i>Andrzej Bratkowski, Irena Grosfeld, Jacek Rostowski</i>	<i>April 1999</i>
No. 235: <i>Does a Soft Macroeconomic Environment Induce Restructuring on the Microeconomic Level during the Transition Period? Evidence from Investment Behavior of Czech Enterprises</i>	<i>Lubomír Lízal</i>	<i>June 1999</i>

<i>No. 234: Banking Reform in China: Gradually Strengthening Pillar or Fragile Reed?</i>	<u>John Bonin</u>	<i>June 1999</i>
<i>No. 233: Theories of Soft Budget Constraints and the Analysis of Banking Crises</i>	<u>Janet Mitchell</u>	<i>March 1999</i>
<i>No. 232: Unemployment Risk, Precautionary Savings, and Moonlighting in Russia</i>	<u>Alessandra Guariglia and Byung-Yeon Kim</u>	<i>June 1999</i>
<i>No. 231: Investing in Turbulent Times: The Investment Behavior of Polish Firms in the Transition</i>	<u>Josef C. Brada, Arthur E. King, and Chia-Ying Ma</u>	<i>April 1999</i>
<i>No. 230: The End of Moderate Inflation in Three Transition Economies?</i>	<u>Josef C. Brada and Ali M. Kutan</u>	<i>April 1999</i>
<i>No. 229: Back to the Future: The Growth Prospects of Transition Economies Reconsidered</i>	<u>Nauro F. Campos</u>	<i>April 1999</i>
<i>No. 228: The Enterprise Isolation Program in Russia</i>	<u>Simeon Djankov</u>	<i>April 1999</i>
<i>No. 227: Published in: Journal of Comparative Economics, "Ownership Concentration and Corporate Performance in the Czech Republic" 27(3), September 1999, pp. 498-513.</i>	<u>Stijn Claessens and Simeon Djankov</u>	<i>April 1999</i>
<i>No. 226: Unemployment Benefit Entitlement and Training Effects in Poland during Transition</i>	<u>Patrick A. Puhani</u>	<i>March 1999</i>
<i>No. 225: Transition at Whirlpool-Tatramat: Case Studies</i>	<u>Hans Brechbuhl and Sonia Ferencikova</u>	<i>March 1999</i>
<i>No. 224: Measuring Progress in Transition and Towards EU Accession: A Comparison of Manufacturing Firms in Poland, Romania, and Spain</i>	<u>Wendy Carlin, Saul Estrin, and Mark Schaffer</u>	<i>March 1999</i>
<i>No. 223: Product Market Competition in Transition Economies: Increasing Varieties and Consumer Loyalty</i>	<u>Mitsutoshi M. Adachi</u>	<i>March 1999</i>
<i>No. 222: Opaque Markets and Rapid Growth: the Superiority of Bank-Centered Financial Systems for Developing Nations</i>	<u>Rodney Wallace</u>	<i>July 1999</i>
<i>No. 221: Technology Spillovers through Foreign Direct Investment</i>	<u>Yuko Kinoshita</u>	<i>January 1999</i>
<i>No. 220: Managerial, Expertise and Team Centered Forms of Organizing:</i>	<u>Leslie Perlow</u>	<i>January 1999</i>

<i>A Cross-Cultural Exploration of Independence in Engineering Work</i>		
<i>No. 219: Household Structure and Labor Demand in Agriculture: Testing for Separability in Rural China</i>	<u>Audra J. Bowlus and Terry Sicular</u>	<i>January 1999</i>
<i>No. 218: Competing Strategies of FDI and Technology Transfer to China: American and Japanese Firms</i>	<u>W. Mark Fruin and Penelope Prime</u>	<i>January 1999</i>
<i>No. 217 Published in: Journal of Comparative Economics, “Returns to Mobility in the Transition to a Market Economy” Vol. 27, No. 1, March 1999, pp. 4-</i>	<u>Tito Boeri and Christopher J. Flinn</u>	<i>January 1999</i>
<i>No. 216 Published in: Journal of Comparative Economics, “Labor Market Policies and Unemployment in the Czech Republic.” Vol. 27, No. 1, March 1999, pp. 33-60.</i>	<u>Katherine Terrell and Vit Sorm</u>	<i>November 1998</i>
<i>No. 215 Published in: Journal of Comparative Economics, “Active Labor Market Policies in Poland: Human Capital Enhancement, Stigmatization or Benefit Churning?” Vol. 27, No. 1, March 1999, pp. 61-</i>	<u>Jochen Kluge, Hartmut Lehmann, and Christoph M. Schmidt</u>	<i>December 1998</i>
<i>No. 214 Published in: Journal of Comparative Economics, “Does the Slovenian Public Work Program Increase Participants' Chances to Find a Job?” Vol. 27, No.1, March 1999, pp. 113-</i>	<u>Milan Vodopivec</u>	<i>December 1998</i>
<i>No. 213 Published in: Journal of Comparative Economics, “Effects of Active Labor Market Programs on the Transition Rate from Unemployment into Regular Jobs in the Slovak Republic.” Vol. 27, No. 1, March 1999, pp. 90-</i>	<i>Martina Lubyova and Jan C. van Ours</i>	<i>December 1998</i>
<i>No. 212: The Marketing System in Bulgarian Livestock Production – The Present State and Evolutionary Processes During the Period of Economic Transition</i>	<i>Yordan Staykov, Team Leader</i>	<i>October 1998</i>
<i>No. 211: Bankruptcy Experience in Hungary and the Czech Republic</i>	<i>Janet Mitchell</i>	<i>October 1998</i>
<i>No 210: Values, Optimum Stimulation Levels and Brand Loyalty: New</i>	<i>Steven M. Burgess and Mari Harris</i>	<i>September 1998</i>

<i>Scales in New Populations</i>		
No. 209: <i>Inherited Wealth, Corporate Control and Economic Growth</i>	<i>Randall K. Morck, David A. Stangeland, and Bernard Yeung</i>	September 1998
No. 208: <i>A Cultural Analysis of Homosocial Reproduction and Contesting Claims to Competence in Transitional Firms</i>	<i>Michael D. Kennedy</i>	July 1998
No. 207: <i>From Survival to Success: The Journey of Corporate Transformation at Haier. Forthcoming in Teaching the Dinosaurs to Dance: Organizational Change in Transition Economies ed. Daniel Denison.</i>	<i>Arthur Yeung and Kenneth DeWoskin</i>	July 1998
No. 206: <i>Why Do People Work If They Are Not Paid? An Example from Eastern Europe. Forthcoming in Teaching the Dinosaurs to Dance: Organizational Change in Transition Economies ed. Daniel Denison.</i>	<i>Irina L. Zinovieva</i>	May 1998
No. 205: <i>Firm Ownership and Work Motivation in Bulgaria and Hungary: An Empirical Study of the Transition in the Mid-1990s. Forthcoming in Teaching the Dinosaurs to Dance: Organizational Change in Transition Economies ed. Daniel Denison.</i>	<i>Robert A. Roe, Irina L. Zinovieva, Elizabeth Dienes, and Laurens A. ten Horn</i>	May 1998
No. 204: <i>Human Resource Management in the Restructuring of Chinese Joint Ventures. Forthcoming in Teaching the Dinosaurs to Dance: Organizational Change in Transition Economies ed. Daniel Denison.</i>	<i>Nandani Lynton</i>	April 1998
No. 203: <i>Emergent Compensation Strategies in Post-Socialist Poland: Understanding the Cognitive Underpinnings of Management Practices in a Transition Economy. Forthcoming in Teaching the Dinosaurs to Dance: Organizational Change in Transition Economies ed. Daniel Denison.</i>	<i>Marc Weinstein</i>	March 1998
No. 202: <i>Corporate Transformation and Organizational Learning: The People's Republic of China. Forthcoming in Teaching the Dinosaurs to Dance: Organizational</i>	<i>Meinolf Dierkes and Zhang Xinhua</i>	March 1998

<i>Change in Transition Economies ed. Daniel Denison.</i>		
No. 201: <i>Foreign Direct Investment as a Factor of Change: The Case of Slovakia. Forthcoming in Teaching the Dinosaurs to Dance: Organizational Change in Transition Economies ed. Daniel Denison.</i>	Sonia Ferencikova	February 1998
No. 200: <i>Radical versus Incremental Change: The Role of Capabilities, Competition, and Leaders. Forthcoming in Teaching the Dinosaurs to Dance: Organizational Change in Transition Economies ed. Daniel Denison.</i>	Karen L. Newman	February 1998
No. 199: <i>The Emergence of Market Practices in China's Economic Transition: Price Setting Practices in Shanghai's Industrial Firms. Forthcoming in Teaching the Dinosaurs to Dance: Organizational Change in Transition Economies ed. Daniel Denison.</i>	Douglas Guthrie	February 1998
No. 198: <i>The Application of Change Management Methods at Business Organizations Operating in Hungary: Challenges in the Business and Cultural Environment and First Practical Experiences. Forthcoming in Teaching the Dinosaurs to Dance: Organizational Change in Transition Economies ed. Daniel Denison.</i>	Dr. János Fehér	January 1998
No. 197: <i>Organizational Changes in Russian Industrial Enterprises: Mutation of Decision-Making Structures and Transformations of Ownership. Forthcoming in Teaching the Dinosaurs to Dance: Organizational Change in Transition Economies ed. Daniel Denison.</i>	Igor B. Gurkov	January 1998
No. 196: <i>Understanding and Managing Challenges to the Romanian Companies during Transition. Forthcoming in Teaching the Dinosaurs to Dance: Organizational Change in Transition</i>	Dan Candea and Rodica M. Candea	January 1998

<i>Economies</i> ed. Daniel Denison.		
No. 195: <i>Insider Lending and Economic Transition: The Structure, Function, and Performance Impact of Finance Companies in Chinese Business Groups.</i> Forthcoming in Teaching the Dinosaurs to Dance: Organizational Change in Transition Economies ed. Daniel Denison.	Lisa A. Keister	December 1997
No. 194: <i>Japanese Investment in Transitional Economies: Characteristics and Performance.</i> Forthcoming in Teaching the Dinosaurs to Dance: Organizational Change in Transition Economies ed. Daniel Denison.	Paul W. Beamish and Andrew Delios	November 1997
No. 193: <i>Building Successful Companies in Transition Economies.</i> Forthcoming in Teaching the Dinosaurs to Dance: Organizational Change in Transition Economies ed. Daniel Denison.	Dr. Ivan Perlaki	January 1998
No. 192: <i>Russian Communitariansim: An Invisible Fist in the Transformation Process of Russia.</i> Forthcoming in Teaching the Dinosaurs to Dance: Organizational Change in Transition Economies ed. Daniel Denison.	Charalambos Vlachoutsicos	July 1998
No. 191: <i>Teaching the Dinosaurs to Dance</i>	Michal Cakrt	September 1997
No. 190: <i>Strategic Restructuring: Making Capitalism in Post-Communist Eastern Europe.</i> Forthcoming in Teaching the Dinosaurs to Dance: Organizational Change in Transition Economies ed. Daniel Denison.	Lawrence P. King	September 1997
No. 189: Published in: Regional Science and Urban Economics , "Russia's Internal Border", 29 (5), September 1999.	Daniel Berkowitz and David N. DeJong	July 1998
No. 187: <i>Corporate Structure and Performance in Hungary</i>	László Halpern and Gábor Kórsői	July 1998
No. 186: <i>Performance of Czech Companies by Ownership Structure</i>	Andrew Weiss and Georgiy Nikitin	June 1998
No. 185: <i>Firm Performance in Bulgaria and Estonia: The effects of</i>	Jozef Konings	July 1998

<i>competitive pressure, financial pressure and disorganisation</i>		
No. 184: <i>Investment and Wages during the Transition: Evidence from Slovene Firms</i>	<i>Janez Prasnikar and Jan Svejnar</i>	<i>July 1998</i>
No. 183: <i>Investment Portfolio under Soft Budget: Implications for Growth, Volatility and Savings</i>	<i>Chongen Bai and Yijiang Wang</i>	
No. 181: <i>Delegation and Delay in Bank Privatization</i>	<i>Loránd Ambrus-Lakatos and Ulrich Hege</i>	<i>July 1998</i>
No. 180: <i>Financing Mechanisms and R&D Investment</i>	<i>Haizhou Huang and Chenggang Xu</i>	<i>July 1998</i>
No. 179: <i>Organizational Culture and Effectiveness: The Case of Foreign Firms in Russia</i>	<i>Carl F. Fey and Daniel R. Denison</i>	<i>January 1999</i>
No. 178: <i>Output and Unemployment Dynamics in Transition</i>	<i>Vivek H. Dehejia and Douglas W. Dwyer</i>	<i>January 1998</i>
No. 177: <i>Published in: Economics of Transition, „Bureaucracies in the Russian Voucher Privatization” Vol. 8, No. 1, 2000, pp. 37-57.</i>	<i>Guido Friebel</i>	<i>June 1998</i>
No. 176: <i>Chronic Moderate Inflation in Transition: The Tale of Hungary</i>	<i>János Vincze</i>	<i>June 1998</i>
No. 175: <i>Privatisation and Market Structure in a Transition Economy</i>	<i>John Bennett and James Maw</i>	<i>June 1998</i>
No. 174: <i>Ownership and Managerial Competition: Employee, Customer, or Outside Ownership</i>	<i>Patrick Bolton and Chenggang Xu</i>	<i>June 1998</i>
No. 173: <i>Intragovernment Procurement of Local Public Good: A Theory of Decentralization in Nondemocratic Government</i>	<i>Chong-en Bai, Yu Pan and Yijiang Wang</i>	<i>June 1998</i>
No. 172: <i>Political Instability and Growth in Proprietary Economies</i>	<i>Jody Overland and Michael Spagat</i>	<i>August 1998</i>
No. 171: <i>Published in Post-Communist Economies, “Framework Issues in the Privatization Strategies of the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland” Vol. 11, no. 1 March 1999.</i>	<i>Morris Bornstein</i>	<i>June 1998</i>
No. 170: <i>Published in: European Journal of Political Economy “Privatization, Ownership Structure and Transparency: How to Measure a Real Involvement of the State” 15(4), November 1999, pp. 605-18.</i>	<i>Frantisek Turnovec</i>	<i>May 1998</i>
No. 169 <i>Published in: American</i>	<i>John C. Ham, Jan Svejnar, and</i>	<i>December 1998</i>

<i>Economic Review</i> , “Unemployment and the Social Safety Net during Transitions to a Market Economy: Evidence from Czech and Slovak Men.” Vol. 88, No. 5, Dec. 1998, pp. 1117-1142.	Katherine Terrell	
No. 167: Voucher Privatization with Investment Funds: An Institutional Analysis	David Ellerman	March 1998
No. 166: Published in: Marketing Issues in Transitional Economies , “Value Priorities and Consumer Behavior in a Transitional Economy: The Case of South Africa” ed. Rajeev Batra.	Steven M. Burgess and Jan-Benedict E.M. Steenkamp	August 1998
No. 164: Finance and Investment in Transition: Czech Enterprises, 1993-1994	Ronald Anderson and Chantal Kegels	September 1997
No. 163: European Union Trade and Investment Flows U-Shaping Industrial Output in Central and Eastern Europe: Theory and Evidence	Alexander Repkine and Patrick P. Walsh	April 1998
No. 162: Skill Acquisition and Private Firm Creation in Transition Economies	Zuzana Brixiova and Wenli Li	October 1999
No. 161: Corruption in Transition	Susanto Basu and David D. Li	May 1998
No. 160a: Tenures that Shook the World: Worker Turnover in Russia, Poland and Britain	Hartmut Lehmann and Jonathan Wadsworth	November 1999
No. 160: Tenures that Shook the World: Worker Turnover in the Russian Federation and Poland	Hartmut Lehmann and Jonathan Wadsworth	June 1998
No. 159: Does Market Structure Matter? New Evidence from Russia	Annette N. Brown and J. David Brown	June 1998
No. 158: Structural Adjustment and Regional Long Term Unemployment in Poland	Hartmut Lehmann and Patrick P. Walsh	June 1997
No. 157: Baby Boom or Bust? Changing Fertility in Post-Communist Czech Republic and Slovakia	Robert S. Chase	April 1998
No. 156 Published in: Leadership and Organization Development Journal , “Leading Radical Change in Transition Economies.” Vol. 19, No. 6, 1998, pp. 309-324.	Karen L. Newman	June 1998
No. 155 Published in: Oxford Review	Wendy Carlin and Michael	June 1997

<i>of Economic Policy</i> , “From Theory into Practice? Restructuring and Dynamism in Transition Economies.” Vol. 13, No. 2, Summer 1997, pp. 77-105.	Landesmann	
No. 154: <i>The Model and the Reality: Assessment of Vietnamese SOE Reform—Implementation at the Firm Level</i>	Edmund Malesky, Vu Thanh Hung, Vu Thi Dieu Anh, and Nancy K. Napier	July 1998
No. 153 Published in: <i>Journal of Comparative Economics</i> , “Causes of the Soft Budget Constraint: Evidence on Three Explanations.” Vol. 26, No. 1, March 1998, pp. 104-116.	David D. Li and Minsong Liang	March 1998
No. 152 Published in: <i>Comparative Economic Studies</i> , “Enterprise Restructuring in Russia’s Transition Economy: Formal and Informal Mechanisms.” Vol. 40, No. 2, Summer 1998, pp. 5-52.	Susan J. Linz and Gary Krueger	April 1998
No. 151: <i>Labor Productivity in Transition: A Regional Analysis of Russian Industry</i>	Susan J. Linz	May 1998
No. 150: <i>Tax Avoidance and the Allocation of Credit. Forthcoming in Financial Systems in Transition: The Design of Financial Systems in Central Europe</i> eds. Anna Meyendorff and Anjan Thakor.	Anna Meyendorff	June 1998
No. 149: <i>Commitment, Versatility and Balance: Determinants of Work Time Standards and Norms in a Multi-Country Study of Software Engineers</i>	Leslie Perlow and Ron Fortgang	April 1998
No. 148: <i>Changes in Poland’s Transfer Payments in the 1990s: the Fate of Pensioners</i>	Bożena Leven	June 1998
No. 147: <i>Environmental Protection and Economic Development: The Case of the Huaihe River Basin Cleanup Plan</i>	Robert Letovsky, Reze Ramazani, and Debra Murphy	June 1998
No. 146: <i>Chief Executive Compensation During Early Transition: Further Evidence from Bulgaria</i>	Derek C. Jones, Takao Kato, and Jeffrey Miller	June 1998
No. 145 Published in: <i>Economics of Transition</i> , “Women’s Unemployment	John Ham, Jan Svejnar, and Katherine Terrell	May 1998

<i>During the Transition: Evidence from Czech and Slovak Micro Data,” Vol. 7, No. 1, May 1999, pp. 47-78.</i>		
<i>No. 144: Investment and Wages in Slovenia</i>	<i>Janez Prasnikar</i>	<i>May 1998</i>
<i>No. 143 Published in: Review of Financial Studies, “Optimal Bankruptcy Laws Across Different Economic Systems,” 12(2), Summer 1999, pgs. 347-77.</i>	<i>Elazar Berkovitch and Ronen Israel</i>	<i>March 1998</i>
<i>No. 142: Industrial Policy and Poverty in Transition Economies: Two Steps Forward or One Step Back?</i>	<i>Susan J. Linz</i>	<i>March 1998</i>
<i>No. 141: Collective Ownership and Privatization of China’s Village Enterprises</i>	<i>Suwen Pan and Albert Park</i>	<i>April 1998</i>
<i>No. 140: A Comparative Look at Labor Mobility in the Czech Republic: Where have all the Workers Gone?</i>	<i>Vit Sorm and Katherine Terrell</i>	<i>April 1999</i>
<i>No. 139: The Failure of the Government-Led Program of Corporate Reorganization in Romania</i>	<i>Simeon Djankov and Kosali Ilayperuma</i>	<i>September 1997</i>
<i>No. 138: Ownership and Employment in Russian Industry: 1992-1995</i>	<i>Susan J. Linz</i>	<u><i>March 1998</i></u>
<i>No. 137 Published in: Journal of Political Economy, “Reform Without Losers: An Interpretation of China’s Dual-Track Approach to Transition,” Feb. 2000; Vol. 108, Iss.1; pg. 120</i>	<i>Lawrence J. Lau, Yingyi Qian, and Gerard Roland</i>	<i>November 1997</i>
<i>No. 136 Published in: European Economic Review, “The Political Economy of Mass Privatization and the Risk of Expropriation,” 44(2), February 2000, pgs. 393-421</i>	<i>Klaus M. Schmidt</i>	<u><i>March 1998</i></u>
<i>No. 135: Radical Organizational Change: The Role of Starting Conditions, Competition, and Leaders</i>	<i>Karen L. Newman</i>	<u><i>January 1998</i></u>
<i>No. 134: To Restructure or Not to Restructure: Informal Activities and Enterprise Behavior in Transition</i>	<i>Clifford Gaddy and Barry W. Ickes</i>	<i>May 1998</i>
<i>No. 133: Management 101: Behavior of Firms in Transition Economies</i>	<i>Josef C. Brada</i>	<i>March 1998</i>
<i>No. 132 Published in: Quarterly Journal of Economics, “Interfirm Relationships and Informal Credit in Vietnam,” 114(4), Nov. 1999, pgs.</i>	<i>John McMillan and Christopher Woodruff</i>	<i>February 1998</i>

1285-1320		
No. 131 Published in: Comparative Economic Studies , "Will Restructuring Hungarian Companies Innovate? An Investigation Based on Joseph Berliner's Analysis of Innovation in Soviet Industry." Vol. 40, No. 2, Summer 1998, pp. 53-74.	<u>John B. Bonin and Istvan Abel</u>	March 1998
No. 130: Published in The American Economic Review , "Changing Incentives of the Chinese Bureaucracy." May, 1998.	David D. Li	January 1998
No. 129: Restructuring Investment in Transition: A Model of the Enterprise Decision	Richard E. Ericson	January 1998
No. 128 Published in: Comparative Economic Studies , "Job Rights in Russian Firms: Endangered or Extinct Institutions?" Vol. 40, No. 4, Winter 1998, pp. 1-32.	Susan J. Linz	January 1998
No. 127: Accounting for Growth in Post-Soviet Russia	Daniel Berkowitz and David N. DeJong	January 1998
No. 126 Published in: Economics of Transition , "From Federalism, Chinese Style, to Privatization Chinese Style," 7(1), 1999, pgs. 103-31	Yuanzheng Cao, Yingyi Qian, and Barry R. Weingast	December 1997
No. 125: Market Discipline in Conglomerate Banks: Is an Internal Allocation of Cost of Capital Necessary as Incentive Device? Forthcoming in Financial Systems in Transition: The Design of Financial Systems in Central Europe eds. Anna Meyendorff and Anjan Thakor.	Arnoud W. A. Boot and Anjolein Schmeits	November 1997
No. 124: Financial Discipline in the Enterprise Sector in Transition Countries: How Does China Compare?	<u>Shumei Gao and Mark E. Schaffer</u>	February 1998
No. 123: Considerations of an Emerging Marketplace: Managers' Perceptions in the Southern African Economic Community	Brent Chrite and David Hudson	February 1998
No. 122: A Model of the Informal Economy in Transition Economies	Simon Commander and Andrei Tolstopiatenko	November 1997
No. 121: Local Labour Market Dynamics in the Czech and Slovak	Peter Huber and Andreas Worgotter	November 1997

<i>Republics</i>		
<i>No. 121: Local Labour Market Dynamics in the Czech and Slovak Republics</i>	<i>Peter Huber and Andreas Worgotter</i>	<i>November 1997</i>
<i>No. 119: Institutional Upheaval and Company Transformation in Emerging Market Economies</i>	<i>Karen L. Newman</i>	<i>March 1998</i>
<i>No. 118: Industrial Decline and Labor Reallocation in Romania</i>	<i>John S. Earle</i>	<i>October 1997</i>
<i>No. 117: Notes for an Essay on the Soft Budget Constraint</i>	<i>Lorand Ambrus-Lakatos</i>	<i>January 1997</i>
<i>No. 116: Labor Demand During Transition in Hungary</i>	<i>Gabor Korosi</i>	<i>October 1997</i>
<i>No. 115: Enterprise Performance and Managers' Profiles</i>	<i>Simeon Djankov and Stijn Claessens</i>	<i>December 1997</i>
<i>No. 114b Employment and Wages in Enterprises under Communism and in Transition: Evidence From Central Europe and Russia</i>	<i>Swati Basu, Saul Estrin, and Jan Svejnar</i>	<i>April 2000</i>
<i>No. 114: Employment and Wage Behavior of Enterprises in Transitional Economies</i>	<i>Swati Basu, Saul Estrin, and Jan Svejnar</i>	<i>October 1997</i>
<i>No. 113: Preliminary Evidence on Active Labor Programs' Impact in Hungary and Poland</i>	<i>Christopher J. O'Leary</i>	<i>October 1997</i>
<i>No. 111: Unemployment Benefits and Incentives in Hungary: New Evidence</i>	<i>Joachim Wolff</i>	<i>October 1997</i>
<i>No. 110: Published in: Empirical Economics, "Long-Term Unemployment, Unemployment Benefits and Social Assistance: The Polish Experience" <i>Empirical-Economics</i>; 23(1-2), 1998, pages 55-85.</i>	<i>Marek Gora and Christoph M. Schmidt</i>	<i>April 1997</i>
<i>No. 109 Published in: Industrial and Labor Relations Review, "Markets for Communist Human Capital: Returns to Education and Experience in Post-Communist Czech Republic and Slovakia." Vol. 51, No. 3, April 1998, pp. 401-423.</i>	<u><i>Robert S. Chase</i></u>	<i>October 1997</i>
<i>No. 107: The Worker-Firm Matching in the Transition: (Why) Are the Czechs More Successful Than Others?</i>	<i>Daniel Münich, Jan Svejnar, and Katherine Terrell</i>	<i>October 1997</i>
<i>No. 106 Published in: Journal of Comparative Economics, "Job</i>	<i>Valentijn Bilsen and Jozef Konings</i>	<i>September 1998</i>

<i>Creation, Job Destruction and Growth of Newly Established, Privatized and State-Owned Enterprises in Transition Economies: Survey Evidence from Bulgaria, Hungary, and Romania,” Vol. 26, No.3, September 1998, pp. 429-445.</i>		
<i>No. 105: Getting Behind the East-West [German] Wage Differential: Theory and Evidence</i>	<i>Michael Burda and Christoph Schmidt</i>	<i>May 1997</i>
<i>No. 104: The Birth of the “Wage Curve” in Hungary, 1989-95</i>	<i>Gabor Kertesi and Janos Kollo</i>	<i>October 1997</i>
<i>No. 103: Published in: Journal of Comparative Economics, “Grime and Punishment: Job Insecurity and Wage Arrears in the Russian Federation” 27, 595-617 (1999).</i>	<i>Hartmut Lehmann, Jonathan Wadsworth, and Alessandro Acquisti</i>	<i>October 1997</i>
<i>No. 102: Social Networks in Transition</i>	<i>Lorena Barberia, Simon Johnson, and Daniel Kaufmann</i>	<i>October 1997</i>
<i>No. 101: Depreciation and Russian Corporate Finance: A Pragmatic Approach to Surviving the Transition</i>	<i>Susan J. Linz</i>	<i>November 1997</i>
<i>No. 100: Romanian Financial System Reform</i>	<i>Anna Meyendorff and Anjan V. Thakor</i>	<i>November 1997</i>
<i>No. 99: Proceedings of the Conference on Strategic Alliances in Transitional Economies, held May 20, 1997 at the Davidson Institute</i>	<i>Edited by Cynthia Koch</i>	<i>May 1997</i>
<i>No. 98: Institutions, Strain and the Underground Economy</i>	<i>Daniel Daianu and Lucian Albu</i>	<i>November 1997</i>
<i>No. 97: Structure and Strain in Explaining Inter-Enterprise Arrears</i>	<i>Daniel Daianu</i>	<i>November 1997</i>
<i>No. 96: Resource Misallocation and Strain: Explaining Shocks in Post-Command Economies</i>	<i>Daniel Daianu</i>	<i>November 1997</i>
<i>No. 95: Published in: Finance-a-Uver, “Czech Money Market: Emerging Links Among Interest Rates.” 48(2) 1998 pp. 99-109.</i>	<i>Jan Hanousek and Evzen Kocenda</i>	<i>November 1997</i>
<i>No. 94: Pre-Reform Industry and the State Monopsony in China</i>	<i>Xiao-Yuan Dong and Louis Putterman</i>	<i>October 1997</i>
<i>No. 93: China’s State-Owned Enterprises In the First Reform Decade: An Analysis of a Declining Monopsony</i>	<i>Xiao-Yuan Dong and Louis Putterman</i>	<i>October 1997</i>
<i>No. 92: Expatriate Management in the</i>	<i>Richard B. Peterson</i>	<i>September 1997</i>

<i>Czech Republic</i>		
<i>No. 91: China and the Idea of Economic Reform</i>	<i>Thomas G. Rawski</i>	<i>April 1997</i>
<i>No. 90 Published in: China Economic Review, “China’s State Enterprise Reform: An Overseas Perspective.” Vol. 8, Spring 1997, pp. 89-98.</i>	<i>Thomas G. Rawski</i>	<i>July 1997</i>
<i>No. 89: The Economic Determinants of Internal Migration Flows in Russia During Transition</i>	<u><i>Annette N. Brown</i></u>	<i>July 1997</i>
<i>No. 88: Gender Wage Gaps in China’s Labor Market: Size, Structure, Trends</i>	<i>Margaret Maurer-Fazio, Thomas G. Rawski, and Wei Zhang</i>	<i>July 1997</i>
<i>No. 87: Privatisation in Central and Eastern Europe</i>	<i>Saul Estrin</i>	<i>June 1997</i>
<i>No. 86: Published in : Economics of Transition, “The Effect of Privatization on Wealth Distribution in Russia.” v. 7, no. 2, 1999, pp. 449-65</i>	<i>Michael Alexeev</i>	<i>February 1998</i>
<i>No. 85: Was Privatization in Eastern Germany a Special Case? Some Lessons from the Treuhand</i>	<i>Uwe Siegmund</i>	<i>September 1997</i>
<i>No. 84: Start-ups and Transition</i>	<i>Daniel M. Berkowitz and David J. Cooper</i>	<i>September 1997</i>
<i>No. 83: Which Enterprises (Believe They) Have Soft Budgets after Mass Privatization? Evidence from Mongolia</i>	<i>James Anderson, Georges Korsun, and Peter Murrell</i>	<i>October 1997</i>
<i>No. 82: Published in: European Economic Review, “Unemployment Dynamics and the Restructuring of the Slovak Unemployment Benefit System.” April, 1997.</i>	<i>Martina Lubyova and Jan C. van Ours</i>	<i>June 1997</i>
<i>No. 81: Determinants of Unemployment Duration in Russia</i>	<i>Mark C. Foley</i>	<i>August 1997</i>
<i>No. 80: The Many Faces of Information Disclosure</i>	<i>Arnoud W.A. Boot and Anjan V. Thakor</i>	<i>October 1997</i>
<i>No. 79: Published in: Journal of Finance, “Foreign Speculators and Emerging Equity Markets.”v.22, iss. 2, 2000, pp. 565-613</i>	<i>Geert Bekaert and Campbell R. Harvey</i>	<i>August 1997</i>
<i>No. 78: The Relationship Between Economic Factors and Equity Markets in Central Europe</i>	<i>Jan Hanousek and Randall K. Filer</i>	<i>June 1997</i>
<i>No. 77 Published in: Economics of Transition, “A Gini Decomposition</i>	<i>Thesia I. Garner and Katherine Terrell</i>	<i>May 1998</i>

<i>Analysis of Inequality in the Czech and Slovak Republics During the Transition,” Vol. 6, No.1, May 1998, pp. 23-46.</i>		
<i>No. 76: China’s Emerging Market for Property Rights: Theoretical and Empirical Perspectives</i>	<i>Gary H. Jefferson and Thomas G. Rawski</i>	<i>June 1997</i>
<i>No. 75b: Test of Permanent Income Hypothesis on Czech Voucher Privatization</i>	<i>Jan Hanousek and Zdenek Tima</i>	<i>October 1997</i>
<i>No. 74: Determinants of Performance of Manufacturing Firms in Seven European Transition Economies</i>	<i>Stijn Claessens, Simeon Djankov, and Gerhard Pohl</i>	<i>February 1997</i>
<i>No. 73 Published in: Economics of Transition, “The Restructuring of Large Firms in Slovak Republic.” Vol. 6, No. 1, May 1998, pp. 67-85</i>	<i>Simeon Djankov and Gerhard Pohl</i>	<i>May 1998</i>
<i>No. 72: Law, Relationships, and Private Enforcement: Transactional Strategies of Russian Enterprises</i>	<i>Kathryn Hendley, Peter Murrell, and Randi Ryterman</i>	<i>November 1998</i>
<i>No. 71: Giving Credit Where Credit Is Due: The Changing Role of Rural Financial Institutions in China</i>	<i>Albert Park, Loren Brandt, and John Giles</i>	<i>March 1997</i>
<i>No. 70: Privatization Versus Competition: Changing Enterprise Behavior in Russia</i>	<i>John S. Earle and Saul Estrin</i>	<i>Spring 1997</i>
<i>No. 69: Russian Managers under Storm: Explicit Reality and Implicit Leadership Theories (A Pilot Exploration)</i>	<i>Igor Gurkov</i>	<i>October 1998</i>
<i>No. 68: The Political Economy of Central-Local Relations in China: Inflation and Investment Controls During the Reform Era</i>	<i>Yasheng Huang</i>	<i>Spring 1997</i>
<i>No. 67: Between Two Coordination Failures: Automotive Industrial Policy in China with a Comparison to Korea</i>	<i>Yasheng Huang</i>	<i>Spring 1997</i>
<i>No. 66 Published in: Post-Soviet Geography and Economics, “Red Executives in Russia’s Transition Economy.” Vol. 27, No. 10, November 1996, pp. 633-651.</i>	<i>Susan J. Linz</i>	<i>January 1997</i>
<i>No. 65 Published in: Industrial and Corporate Change, “On the Sequencing of Privatization in Transition Economies.” Vol. 7, No. 1,</i>	<i>Gautam Ahuja and Sumit K. Majumdar</i>	<i>April 1997</i>

1998.		
No. 64: Published in: Journal of Law and Economics , "Foreign Ownership and Profitability: Property Rights, Control and the Performance of Firms in Indian Industry" 42(1), April 1999, pp. 209-38.	Pradeep K. Chhibber and Sumit K. Majumdar	April 1997
No. 63: How Taxing Is Corruption on International Investors?	Shang-Jin Wei	February 1997
No. 62: What Can We Learn from the Experience of Transitional Economies with Labour Market Policies?	Tito Boeri	1997
No. 61: Published in: Accounting Organizations and Society , "Economic Transition, Strategy and the Evolution of Management Accounting Practices: The Case of India" 24(5,6), Jul/Aug 1999, pp. 379-412.	Shannon W. Anderson and William N. Lanen	April 1997
No. 60a: Enterprise Investment During the Transition: Evidence from Czech Panel Data	Lubomír Lizal and Jan Svejnar	December 1997
No. 59: Published in: Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization , "Institutional Environment, Community Government, and Corporate Governance: Understanding China's Township-Village Enterprises." 14(1), April 1998, pages 1-23	Jiahua Che and Yingyi Qian	April 1997
No. 58: From the Grabbing Hand to the Helping Hand	Jiahua Che	<u>Ju</u> <u>ne 2000</u>
No. 57: Published in: Brookings Papers on Economic Activity , "The Unofficial Economy in Transition." 1: 1998.	Simon Johnson, Daniel Kaufmann, and Andrei Schleifer	June 1997
No. 56: Taxes and Government Incentives: Eastern Europe vs. China	Roger H. Gordon and David D. Li	April 1997
No. 55: Corruption and Reform	Susanto Basu and David Li	June 1996
No. 54: Decentralization and the Macroeconomic Consequences of Commitment to State-Owned Firms	Loren Brandt and Xiaodong Zhu	June 1997
No. 53: Published in: The International Journal of Industrial Organization , "Competitive Shocks and Industrial Structure: The Case of	Pankaj Ghemawat and Robert E. Kennedy	May 1997

<i>Polish Manufacturing.</i> ” August, 1999. .		
No. 52: Published in: The Quarterly Journal of Economics , “Insecure Property Rights and Government Ownership of Firms.” May, 1998.	Jiahua Che and Yingyi Qian	May 1997
No. 51: <i>Incentives, Scale Economies, and Organizational Form</i>	Eric Maskin, Yingyi Qian, and Chenggang Xu	May 1997
No. 50: Published in: Post-Soviet-Affairs , “End of the Tunnel? The Effects of Financial Stabilization in Russia” April-June 1997, pages 105-33	Barry W. Ickes, Peter Murrell, and Randi Ryterman	March 1997
No. 49: <i>The Evolution of Bank Credit Quality in Transition: Theory and Evidence from Romania</i>	Enrico C. Perotti and Octavian Carare	October 1996
No. 48: <i>Where Do the Leaders Trade? Information Revelation and Interactions Between the Segments of Czech Capital Markets</i>	Jan Hanousek and Libor Nemecek	May 1997
No. 47: <i>Firms’ Heterogeneity in Transition: Evidence from a Polish Panel Data Set</i>	Irena Grosfeld and Jean-François Nivet	May 1997
No. 46: <i>Strategic Creditor Passivity, Regulation, and Bank Bailouts</i>	Janet Mitchell	May 1997
No. 45a: <i>Decentralization in Transition Economies: A Tragedy of the Commons?</i>	Daniel M. Berkowitz and Wei Li	September 1997
No. 44a: <i>The Information Content of Stock Markets: Why do Emerging Markets have Synchronous Stock Price Movements?</i> (forthcoming in the Journal of Financial Economics).	Randall Morck, Bernard Yeung, and Wayne Yu	February 1999
No. 43: <i>Agency in Project Screening and Termination Decisions: Why Is Good Money Thrown After Bad?</i>	Chong-en Bai and Yijiang Wang	May 1997
No. 42: Published in: Economics of Transition , “Channels of Redistribution: Inequality and Poverty in the Russian Transition.” Vol. 7 (2) 1999.	Simon Commander, Andrei Tolstopiatenko, and Ruslan Yemtsov	May 1997
No. 41: Published in: Economics of Transition , “Labour Market Characteristics and Profitability: Econometric Analysis of Hungarian Exporting Firms, 1986-1995” 6(1),	László Halpern and Gabor Korosi	May 1997

May 1998, pages 145-62		
No. 40: Published in: the Harvard Law Review , “The Tragedy of the Anticommons: Property in the Transition from Marx to Markets.” January 1998.	Michael Heller	February 1997
No. 39: Privatization and Managerial Efficiency	Olivier Debande and Guido Friebel	May 1997
No. 38 Published in: The Quarterly Journal of Economics , “Disorganization.” Vol. 112, No. 4, November 1997, pp. 1091-1126.	Olivier Blanchard and Michael Kremer	January 1997
No. 37: Published in: Economics of Transition , “Transition and the Output Fall.” 7(1), 1999, pages 1-28.	Gérard Roland and Thierry Verdier	March 1997
No. 36: Restructuring an Industry During Transition: A Two-Period Model	Richard Ericson	September 1996
No. 34: The East-West Joint Venture: BC Torsion Case Study	Sonia Ferencikova and Vern Terpstra	December 1998
No. 33 Published in: Journal of Comparative Economics , “Quantifying Price Liberalization in Russia.” Vol. 26, No. 4, December 1998, pp. 735-737.	Daniel Berkowitz, David DeJong, and Steven Husted	December 1998
No. 32: What Can North Korea Learn from China’s Market Reforms?	John McMillan	September 1996
No. 31: Published in : China-Economic-Review , “Towards a Model of China as a Partially Reformed Developing Economy Under a Semifederalist Government.” , 9(1), Spring 1998, pages 1-23.	Yijiang Wang and Chun Chang	March 1997
No. 30: Convergence in Output in Transition Economies: Central and Eastern Europe, 1970-1995	Saul Estrin and Giovanni Urga	February 1997
No. 29: Published in: Economics of Transition , “Altered Band and Exchange Volatility.” Volume 6, no. 1, 1998, 173-181.	Evzen Kocenda	March 1997
No. 28: Published in: Quarterly Journal of Economics , “Public Versus Private Ownership of Firms: Evidence from Rural China.” Volume 113, no. 3, August 1998, 773-808.	Hehui Jin and Yingyi Qian	January 1997
No. 27: East-West Joint Ventures in a	Sonia Ferencikova	March 1997

<i>Transitional Economy: The Case of Slovakia</i>		
No. 26: Published in Economic Analysis “Behavior of a Slovenian Firm in Transition” Vol. 1, no. 1, 1998, 57-73.	Janez Prasnikar	February 1997
No. 25: <i>Cultural Encounters and Claims to Expertise in Postcommunist Capitalism</i>	Michael D. Kennedy	February 1997
No. 24: <i>ZVU a.s.: Investment Funds on the Board of Directors of an Engineering Giant</i>	Tory Wolff	August 1995
No. 23: <i>The Role of Investment Funds in the Czech Republic</i> (joint publication with Czech Management Center)	Dusan Triska	June 1996
No. 22: <i>Czech Investment Fund Industry: Development and Behaviour</i> (joint publication with Czech Management Center)	Richard Podpiera	May 1996
No. 21: <i>Restructuring of Czech Firms: An Example of Gama, a.s.</i> (joint publication with Czech Management Center)	Antonin Bulin	June 1996
No. 20: <i>YSE Funds: A Story of Czech Investment Funds</i> (joint publication with Czech Management Center)	Michal Otradovec	November 1995
No. 19: <i>První Investicni a.s., The First Investment Corporation</i> (joint publication with Czech Management Center)	Jaroslav Jirasek	August 1995
No. 18: <i>PPF a.s., The First Private Investment Fund</i> (joint publication with Czech Management Center)	Michal Otradovec	November 1995
No. 17 Published in: Post-Soviet Geography and Economics , “Russia’s Managers in Transition: Pilferers or Paladins?” Vol. 37, o.7 (September 1996), pp. 397-426.	Susan J. Linz and Gary Krueger	November 1996
No. 16: <i>Banks in Transition—Investment Opportunities in Central Europe and Russia</i> Edited Transcript from 31 May 1996 Conference in New York City	With commentary and edited by Anna Meyendorff	January 1997
No. 15: <i>Marketing in Transitional Economies: Edited Transcript &</i>	Compiled by The Davidson Institute	December 1996

<i>Papers from 1 April 1996 Conference in Ann Arbor, Michigan</i>		
<i>No. 14: Pensions in the Former Soviet Bloc: Problems and Solutions. Published by Council on Foreign Relations. "The Coming Global Pension Crisis" New York, 1997</i>	<i>Jan Svejnar</i>	<i>November 1996</i>
<i>No. 13: Enterprise Restructuring and Performance in the Transition. Forthcoming in Financial Systems in Transition: The Design of Financial Systems in Central Europe eds. Anna Meyendorff and Anjan Thakor.</i>	<i>Lubomir Lizal, Miroslav Singer, and Jan Svejnar</i>	<i>December 1996</i>
<i>No. 12 Published in: Journal of International Marketing, "Executive Insights: Marketing Issues and Challenges in Transitional Economies." Vol. 5, No. 4, 1997, pp. 95-114. Also published in: Marketing Issues in Transitional Economies ed. Rajeev Batra.</i>	<i>Rajeev Batra</i>	<i>April 1997</i>
<i>No. 11: Worker Trust and System Vulnerability in the Transition from Socialism to Capitalism</i>	<i>Andrew Schotter</i>	<i>August 1996</i>
<i>No. 10 Published in: Comparative Economic Studies, "Russian Firms in Transition: Champions, Challengers, and Chaff." Vol. 39, No.2, Summer 1997, pp. 1-36.</i>	<i>Susan J. Linz</i>	<i>July 1996</i>
<i>No. 9: Corporate Debt Crisis and Bankruptcy Law During the Transition: The Case of China</i>	<i>David D. Li and Shan Li</i>	<i>December 1995</i>
<i>No. 8 Published in: Journal of Comparative Economics, "A Theory of Ambiguous Property Rights in Transition Economies: The Case of the Chinese Non-State Sector." Vol. 23, No. 1, August 1996, pp. 1-19.</i>	<i>David D. Li</i>	<i>June 1996</i>
<i>No. 7: The Foreign Economic Contract Law of China: Cases and Analysis</i>	<i>Dong-lai Li</i>	<i>June 1993</i>
<i>No. 3: Bank Privatization in Hungary and the Magyar Kulkereskedelmi Bank Transaction</i>	<i>Roger Kormendi and Karen Schnatterly</i>	<i>May 1996</i>
<i>Replacing Nos. 1-2 & 4-6: Journal of Comparative Economics Symposium</i>	<i>No. 1 "Bank Privatization in Transitional Economies" by Roger</i>	<i>August 1997</i>

<p>on “Bank Privatization in Central Europe and Russia.” Vol. 25, No. 1, August 1997.</p>	<p>Kormendi and Edward Snyder. No. 2 “Transactional Structures of Bank Privatizations in Central Europe and Russia” by Anna Meyendorff and Edward A. Snyder. No. 4 “Bank Privatization in Poland: The Case of Bank Slaski” by Jeffery Abarbaness and John Bonin. No. 5 “Bank Privatization in Post-Communist Russia: The Case of Zhilsotsbank” by Jeffery Abarbanell and Anna Meyendorff and No. 6 “”The Czech Republic’s Commercial Bank: Komerčni Banka” by Edward A. Snyder and Roger C. Kormendi.</p>	
---	---	--