

The effects of multinationals on host economies:

A computable general equilibrium (CGE) approach

(Preliminary version)

Latorre Muñoz, María C.
Universidad Complutense de Madrid
E-mail: cmlatorre@estad.ucm.es

Bajo Rubio, Oscar
Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha
E-mail: oscar.bajo@uclm.es

Gómez Gómez-Plana, Antonio
Universidad Pública de Navarra
E-mail: agomezgp@unavarra.es

Summary

An important part of world trade flows is related to the activities of Multinational Enterprises (MNEs). During decades, however, applied trade models have not included MNEs' behaviour. This is often due to lack of data on MNEs' weight in the economies, particularly, if one is to use a general equilibrium approach. This paper aims at offering a response to this situation. In order to do so we extend a well known computable General Equilibrium (CGE) model, namely, the GTAP model, to include MNEs. The extension allows the use of the GTAP database (which supplies data on international trade flows and other macroeconomic and sectoral variables for the world economy) together with data for MNEs supplied by the OECD. This makes it possible to consider MNEs' presence for an important range of OECD countries in a general equilibrium framework.

The CGE nature of the model enables us to include goods and factor market effects simultaneously. Consumer's welfare, which is nearly neglected issue in many studies of MNEs, can also be analysed using this general equilibrium framework. The methodology offers a new insight into the issue which previously had mainly been analysed through econometric techniques and descriptive studies. The current version is a 2-region, 2-factor, 20-sector model. We simulate the differential impact of MNEs and foreign direct investment (FDI) on host, or receiving, economies, according to the sector in which they act and to which FDI flows accrue. The inclusion of both a macro and microeconomic perspective leads to a better understanding of the main outcomes obtained. Having both sides enables the policy-maker to better analyse which sectors are the most important to achieve an increase in GDP and welfare. And what the costs are for the rest of sectors involved in the process. The model is applied to the Czech Republic in which the importance of MNEs' activities is remarkable.

JEL CODES: C-68 (Computable general equilibrium models), F-23 (Multinational firms).

1. Introduction

Most applied trade models have not considered the presence of multinational enterprises (MNEs), which seems to be largely due to data constraints on their activities. But more generally, at the theoretical level, it is probably fair to say that the introduction of MNEs has posed an important challenge to trade models for a long time (Markusen, 2002).

It is clear, however, that MNEs are behind many trade flows. So, for instance, according to the UNCTAD's 2000 *World Investment Report*, (i) one-third of the volume of world trade is made of transactions where MNEs are in one of the two sides of the exchange; and (ii) another one-third is intra-firm trade (i.e., trade within the MNEs, between the parent and the subsidiary, or between affiliates). Accordingly, including MNEs in the picture should improve, in a significant manner, our understanding of international trade flows.

The aim of this paper is analyzing the effects of the entry of MNEs on host countries, for the case of the Czech Republic, a country that has received substantial foreign direct investment (FDI) inflows in the last few years. In addition, the data on MNEs for the Czech Republic are particularly detailed, allowing for a quite detailed degree of sectoral aggregation. We have paid a special attention to a mostly neglected aspect of the impact of MNEs, namely, profit repatriation. Our results suggest that the negative effects of profit repatriation are of an important amount, and might even offset the positive impact of an increase in the capital stock caused by the entry of MNEs in the host economy.

Our empirical methodology makes use of an extension of the GTAP model (Hertel, 1997) to include MNEs. GTAP stands for Global Trade Analysis Project, i.e., the name of a team of researchers working at Purdue University, Indiana, USA, on computable general equilibrium (CGE)

models, which allow for the use of a unique database of the world economy for general equilibrium simulations, namely, the GTAP database. A particular advantage of this extension is that allows us to utilize OECD's (2005) data on MNEs activities. In addition, CGE simulations yield quantitative outcomes and not just qualitative intuitions regarding the effects of MNEs on a specific host economy. This can be particularly useful, giving the existing controversy on the MNEs impact on host countries.

The rest of the paper is organised as follows. The model is briefly summarized in section 2. The simulations performed and the data are described in section 3. The results from the simulations, both at the aggregate and sectoral levels, are presented in section 4. Finally, section 5 concludes.

2. The model

Until very recently, the study of the effects of MNEs on host countries has been based mainly on both econometric techniques and descriptive studies. Although still providing helpful results, these studies constitute a body of research mostly fragmented into separate parts according to the particular effect analyzed. The use of a general equilibrium framework, instead, allows one to concentrate on a number of effects arising from the presence of MNEs, and derive their economy-wide impact in a unified framework.

Our approach is based on a neoclassical CGE model, which incorporates real data into a rigorous theoretical framework. These models are based on the Arrow-Debreu general equilibrium model with some potential extensions, where the interactions among economic agents are presented as a system of equations derived from microeconomic optimisation theory (Shoven and Whalley, 1984, 1992). And these microeconomic optimisation decisions are embedded in a framework representing national accounts identities, i.e., the model also rests on the usual progression of the circular flow of the economy: production, income distribution, and domestic and foreign demand.

Thus, a CGE model yields macroeconomic predictions stemming from its microeconomic aggregation (Devarajan and Robinson, 2005).

In the rest of this section we provide a summary description of the model used for simulations. A more detailed explanation, together with the full set of equations, can be found in Latorre (2007).

As mentioned above, the particular model built for our analysis is a 2-region, 2-factor, 20-sector version of the GTAP model, extended to incorporate MNEs. This extension of the GTAP model considers a host region (the Czech Republic) where MNEs are introduced, and a rest-of-the-world (ROW) region where, in contrast, MNEs are absent, due to lack of data. There is a representative household in each region, whose income stems from the remuneration of all factors of production, together with fiscal revenues from several taxes. In the simulation considering profit repatriation, however, a portion of the remuneration of the foreign capital is deducted from the income of the representative household of the host region and added to that in ROW. In any case, the representative household fully spends his income in investment, government consumption, and public consumption. To simplify, the real levels of investment and public consumption do not change after MNEs entry, but private consumption does.

Regarding firms' behaviour, two main departures from the GTAP standard model arise due to the presence of MNEs. On the one hand, each good in the host economy will be produced not only by domestic firms but also by MNEs. On the other hand, capital, as a factor of production, now can be either foreign or domestic, i.e., the capital stock in the host country can be owned either by domestic firms or by MNEs. Capital is modelled as a specific factor in order to satisfy the extended conclusion in the literature that MNEs have a "very distinctive bundle of capabilities" (Barba Navaretti and Venables, 2004, p. 278), "proprietary assets" (e.g., Caves, 1996, chapters 1 and 2),

and, in general, the idea that MNEs have some “ownership advantages” (Dunning, 1977, 2000), which provide them with a different and superior technology as compared to domestic firms.

For each i good and sector there are, after introducing MNEs, two different “varieties” –a foreign and a domestic one. Thus, in the country hosting MNEs, our model duplicates the sources of production of each good and combines both varieties into a unique composite good i –the “domestic” good, i.e., that available for either final or intermediate consumption. Both MNEs and domestic firms produce under constant returns to scale, using as inputs both domestically-produced and imported intermediate goods, as well as two primary factors, labour and capital. However, both kinds of firms possess different technologies, with MNEs being more capital intensive, and showing a greater reliance on imported intermediates as compared to domestic firms.

Technology would also differ between MNEs and domestic firms due to the assumption of specific capital. So, capital will therefore exhibit a different price according not only to the type of good for which it is used for production, as in the standard GTAP model, but also according to whether it is used for production of either the foreign or the national variety of that particular good. This implies, in turn, that the costs of MNEs versus those of domestic firms will be different so that, in equilibrium, the prices of the different varieties of the same good will also differ. Such a disparity in prices across varieties of the same good implies that goods are not homogenous within the same sector. This violates the condition of homogenous goods necessary for perfect competition to hold, thus creating a climate of competition more appropriate for the presence of MNEs.

The standard GTAP model (and this extension) offers a detailed description of international trade, by taking into account not only the volume of commodities traded, but also transport and insurance services associated with trade flows. Furthermore, trade flows are subject to export subsidies and import tariffs which are specified at the level of commodities and region.

Some final comments relate to primary factor endowments. Labour is fully mobile across sectors and its endowment is exogenously fixed. Capital endowments, in turn, will vary according to MNEs' entry, which is modelled as leading to changes in the capital stock held by foreign MNEs already installed in the host economy.

3. Simulations and data

Two simulations will be run:

- 1) An increase in the foreign share of the capital stock of a particular sector, due to the entry of MNEs, while the capital stock in the rest of sectors remains fixed. Notice that in the case of transition economies, such as the Czech Republic, the idea of MNEs leading to an increase in the capital stock, rather than a mere change in ownership, seems appropriate for at least three reasons. First, because the share of greenfield investments on total FDI inflows is higher than for developed countries (Schöllmann, 2001). Second, due to the evidence of large amounts of obsolete capital stocks in the transition economies, so that even the flows linked to acquisitions need to replace the existing capital stock (Kroska, 2001; Bornstein, 2001). And third, since foreign investors in the Czech Republic have been found to exhibit the highest propensities to invest in gross capital formation (Lizal and Svegnar, 2002). On the other hand, the amount by which foreign capital will be increased in this simulation is 50 per cent, over the capital stock previously held by MNEs in each particular sector. Although such increase might seem excessively high at a first sight, it would not appear to be so extreme, however, if one recalls the growth of FDI inflows in the Czech Republic since transition began.

- 2) A combination of an increase in the capital stock with the effect of repatriation of the remuneration of the extra capital that the entry of MNEs adds. In particular, we still assume a 50 per cent increase in the capital stock of a particular sector as in the previous simulation,

but now its remuneration will not be part of the income of the representative household of the host economy, increasing instead the income of ROW. Notice that, even though “profit repatriation” should be called, strictly speaking, “income repatriation”, we prefer to use that more common term (and will do it henceforth) once it is clear what we really denote.

Regarding the data, and as explained before, our model is an extension of a 2-region, 2-factor, 20-sector version of GTAP. The two regions are the Czech Republic and ROW, the two factors are labour and capital, and the 20 sectors appear in Table 1. Disaggregation to this level was made using the GEMPACK software, resulting in the maximum sectoral disaggregation possible in order to use three different sources of data. The main data source is the GTAP6 Data Base (Dimanaran and McDougall, 2005). Most of the production data for the Czech Republic, however, has been split into a foreign and a national part, where the information to assign each part to national firms and MNEs has been found in OECD (2005) and Czech National Bank (2004).

Table 1 shows the relative importance on the whole Czech economy, of the 20 sectors used in the analysis (in terms of gross output, total capital¹, imports, and exports), as well as the destination of each sector’s production (percentage of its production that goes to intermediates, investment, exports, private consumption, and public consumption), and the sectoral weight of MNEs (in terms of gross output and capital). All the data refer to the year 2001 (i.e., the last year for which the GTAP database is available). It is particularly remarkable the important weight of MNEs in nearly all sectors of the economy; for the economy as a whole, the weights of MNEs in gross production and capital amount to 29.1 and 28.5 per cent, respectively.

The two simulations have been run in five particular sectors of the Czech economy, i.e., a) Chemicals, rubber and plastics (Chemicals, henceforth); b) Motor vehicles; c) Electronics; d) Trade, repair; hotels and restaurants (Trade, henceforth); and e) Finance, insurance, real estate, business

¹ Strictly speaking, “capital” stands for what national accounts statistics denote “property income”.

activities (Finance, henceforth). The choice of sectors has tried to combine their importance as FDI recipients, as well as their relative weight in the overall Czech economy. Also, we incorporate into the analysis not only manufacturing but also services sectors, which is rather uncommon in the empirical literature; and, in the case of manufactures, the particular sectors chosen represent mostly dynamic activities, i.e., they are classified as medium- and high-technology sectors.

Finally, regarding the values of the elasticities needed to calibrate and simulate the model, the elasticity of substitution between labour and capital is set at 10^{-6} in order to fulfil the specific capital assumption². In turn, the elasticity of substitution between national and foreign production is given the same value to that between domestic and imported goods, as supplied by GTAP. For the rest of elasticities, the GTAP values, computed by the GTAP team from econometric evidence, have been also taken; see Hertel (1997) and Dimanaran and McDougall (2005, chapter 20) for details. Finally, due to the Walrasian nature of the model, the monetary variables (values and prices) are set with respect to a numeraire; and, following the usual practice, the Consumer Price Index (CPI) has been taken as the numeraire.

4. Empirical results

In this section we present the results from the two simulations performed, i.e., the entry of MNEs with and without profit repatriation, which will be denoted in the tables below as “MNEs’ entry” and “Profit Rep”, respectively. We first discuss the results on the main aggregate variables, and then the sectoral effects.

4.1 Aggregate results

Table 2 shows the effects of the two simulations on the main aggregate variables, where each column gives the percentage change in real terms with respect to the benchmark (i.e., the initial data

² Notice that this elasticity is set at a 10^{-6} , instead of 0, in order to facilitate the computation of the model.

set) in a particular aggregate variable. The variables considered are: the real wage –the same in all sectors due to the assumption of full labour mobility; the real rental rate of capital –a weighted average of its price in all sectors; the real GDP measured at factor costs; welfare, proxied by the change in real private consumption³; the CPI; and the real value of imports and exports, both measured at international prices.

In nearly all cases the entry of MNEs brings about a decrease in the rental rate of capital together with an increase in the aggregate wage (see columns 1 and 2). A higher volume of capital involves a lower marginal productivity of this production factor (i.e., its real rental rate decreases) and a higher marginal productivity of labour (i.e., a higher real wage). These results are consistent with the theory of international trade under the assumption of specific capital; see, e.g., Jones (1971, 2000, 2002), Mussa (1974), or Neary (1978).

When profit repatriation is included into the simulation, a reduction of the income available for the representative household appears compared to the case with no profit repatriation, since the circular flow of the economy implies that now there is less income available for the remuneration of the domestic representative consumer. Hence, with profit repatriation lower factor remunerations are obtained, i.e., the increase in the wage is smaller, and the decrease in the rental rate of capital is higher. This evolution of factor prices is an important force driving the results for GDP and welfare.

As can be seen for GDP and welfare (columns 3 and 4), both variables experience a small increase in all sectors after the entry of MNEs when there is no profit repatriation, but fall unambiguously in all cases when there is profit repatriation. The less favourable (or more

³ Hertel (1997, chapter 1) explains that percentage changes in welfare can be proxied in this model by the variation in real private consumption, when investment and public consumption are fixed in real terms, as is the case in our simulations. Additionally, the evolution of real private consumption is modelled using a Cobb-Douglas function. Income elasticity is unitary in this type of functions so that increases in private consumption show the same percentage as do variations in the households' income.

unfavourable) results are those for Motor vehicles, since in this case the amount of capital whose benefit is repatriated is the highest among all sectors (see Table 1).

The generalized reduction in the CPI (column 5) associated with profit repatriation and the differentiated result, depending on the sector, in the simulation with no profit repatriation, will be of importance for sectoral results. Finally, the impact of profit repatriation on exports and imports (columns 6 and 7) would depend on the share of imports of the sector where MNEs entry, on the aggregate imports of the whole economy (see Table 1). The impact on foreign trade for manufactures is higher than for the services sectors. Note also, that the impact of profit repatriation on foreign trade is small.

Summing up, the introduction of profit repatriation leads to a very different panorama compared to the mere entry of MNEs. Under profit repatriation, the entry of MNEs may still benefit workers whose wages increase (except for the case of Motor vehicles). However, at the aggregate level the benefits of higher wages are offset by a larger fall in the remuneration of capital. This results in a decrease in GDP and welfare, whose magnitude slightly differs across sectors. Profit repatriation, however, does not affect the volume of external trade.

4.2 Sectoral results

Tables 3, 4, and 5 show, respectively, the effects on production, exports and imports of the 20 sectors representing the Czech economy, following the entry of MNEs in each of the five sectors selected, with and without profit repatriation. As it would seem obvious, the first and main impact of the shock takes place in the sector receiving MNEs. To begin with, we look at the evolution of this particular sector.

The results are not significantly affected by the presence or absence of profit repatriation. In both cases the impact is rather clear. The amount of capital used by the sector receiving MNEs increases significantly as a result of the shock, so its production would always rise (Table 3). Increases in production are of a considerable magnitude except for the case of Finance, which has to do with the fact that the MNEs' share on gross output and capital in Finance is the smallest among the five sectors considered (Table 1). On the other hand, the price of the good sold by the sector receiving MNEs will decrease⁴: The increase in the capital stock strongly reduces its rental rate, driving costs of production and prices down in that sector (notice that sectoral prices in this Walrasian model resemble costs). Because of the fall in its price, the export competitiveness of the sector will improve, which results in a significant increase in its exports (Table 4). Finally, note that production in each sector relies to an important extent on intermediates from the same sector. As a consequence, imports of the sector receiving MNEs also experience an increase (Table 5), since an important amount of intermediates from that sector are imported in order to get its increase in production.

The impact on the rest of sectors tends to be small. The demand side of the model explains the responses of those sectors not receiving MNEs. The evolution of demand, in turn, boils down to the impact of MNEs on two variables, namely, the CPI (which determines exports) and the aggregate level of income (which determines private consumption). There are two broad patterns. One is for most manufacturing sectors, which are highly responsive to the evolution of their own exports –as most of their production is indeed devoted to exports (Table 1). The other applies to most services sectors as well as to Food and Petroleum, whose production responds to the evolution of private consumption.

⁴ The prices of the goods sold by the sector receiving MNEs would show the following percentage variations, for the cases of no profit repatriation and profit repatriation, respectively: Chemicals, -2.33 and -2.21; Motor vehicles, -3.44 and -3.26; Electronics, -1.92 and -1.83; Trade, -2.75 and -2.84; and Finance, -1.48 and -1.54.

So, profit repatriation decreases production (Table 3), in those sectors more dependent on private consumption –Food, Petroleum, and most services sectors, on reducing the income available for private consumption. This contrasts with the simulation considering no profit repatriation, where these private-consumption-oriented sectors increase their production. The reason would be that the remuneration of the new capital brought by the MNEs goes now to the representative household, increasing the income available for private consumption.

The pattern is quite different for most manufactures, which are, in general, more export-oriented. In the simulation including profit repatriation these sectors have higher levels of production than in the other case, since repatriation tends to depress the general price level in the host economy (see the CPI in Table 2), so enhancing the export competitiveness of these sectors (Table 4). On the contrary, in the simulation without profit repatriation, the particular sector where that entry takes place is determinant for the evolution of the CPI. As a consequence, export competitiveness depends on the sector where the shock originates, and manufacturing sectors may increase or reduce production after the entry of MNEs.

Finally, imports tend to follow the production pattern of the corresponding sector (Table 5). For those sectors more responsive to private consumption imports decrease with profit repatriation, while they use to increase in the simulation without profit repatriation. The same applies to most manufactures, whose imports tend to move along with their respective production levels.

To sum up, the entry of MNEs leads to significant effects in the particular sector where they come, with a rather clear pattern: production, exports and imports increase, and the price falls. In turn, the effects on the rest of sectors of the economy tend to be small, with some clear patterns arising according to the demand side of the model.

A sensitivity analysis on the values of several elasticities of the model has been also performed. In general, the above results, both at the aggregate and sectoral levels, are mainly unaffected when moving from a higher to a lower value of those elasticities. The detailed results are presented in Latorre (2007).

6. Concluding remarks

In this paper we have analyzed the effects of the entry of MNEs on a particular host economy, the Czech Republic, which has received significant amounts of FDI in the last few years. The empirical methodology makes use of a CGE model, which is a 2-region, 2-factor, 20-sector version of the GTAP model, extended to incorporate MNEs. Two simulations have been performed: a 50 per cent increase in the capital stock of a particular sector, and a combination of the same increase in the capital stock with the repatriation of the remuneration of the extra capital that the entry of MNEs adds. The two simulations have been run in five sectors, namely, Chemicals, Motor vehicles, Electronics, Trade, and Finance.

The main result found is that the positive effects on GDP and welfare, both at the aggregate and sectoral levels, following the entry of MNEs, might be offset if the extent of profit repatriation is large. This suggests that profit repatriation would be an important issue when analyzing the economic effects of MNEs, despite being mostly neglected in the available empirical literature.

In addition, the results from the simulations show the differential impact of MNEs across sectors, which has two relevant features. The first one is related to the particular sector in which the entry of MNEs takes place, and the second one is related to the different patterns of adjustment to the shock across sectors. Regarding the first one, our results show that patterns are rather similar across sectors with and without profit repatriation, but the size of the effects is related to the particular sector in which MNEs enter. In particular, our empirical analysis suggests that the most

unfavourable results for GDP and welfare are those of Motor vehicles, which should provide relevant information for the policy-maker.

With respect to the second aspect, the model shows that the sectoral patterns of responses to the shock across sectors are related to the demand side of the model. The entry of MNEs will increase the income of the representative household if there is no profit repatriation, but will decrease that income if there is profit repatriation. So, the level of income will determine private consumption, and lead the evolution of those sectors more responsive to private consumption –Food, Petroleum, and most services sectors. On the other hand, the entry of MNEs may rise or lower the general price level of the economy, which will determine sectoral export competitiveness. Since most manufactures are export-oriented, their output levels will respond to the evolution of exports.

To conclude, it is important to note that the results obtained are applicable for a short and medium run period, which is the timing associated to our model. However, in the real world, the positive effects of MNEs entry would usually appear before than the negative effects through profit repatriation. This would suggest that the host economy may benefit from the presence of MNEs for some time but, the sooner profits were repatriated, the sooner their negative effects would develop.

References

Barba Navaretti, G. and Venables A. J. (2004) *Multinational firms in the world economy*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Bornstein, M. (2001) "Post-privatisation enterprise restructuring", *Post-Communist Economies*, vol. 13, pp. 189-203.

Caves, R. E. (1996) *Multinational enterprise and economic analysis* (2nd edition), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Czech National Bank (2004) "2001 foreign direct investment", Annual Reports, available at: http://www.cnb.cz/www.cnb.cz/en/statistics/bop_stat/bop_publications/pzi_books/index.html.

Devarajan, S. and Robinson, S. (2005) "The Influence of computable general equilibrium models on policy", in Kehoe, T. J., Srinivasan, T. N. and Whalley, J. (eds.) *Frontiers in applied general equilibrium modeling: In honor of Herbert Scarf*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 402-428.

Dimanaran, B. V. and McDougall, R. A. (eds.) (2005) *Global Trade, Assistance and Production: The GTAP 6 Data Base*, Center for Global Trade Analysis, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana.

Dunning, J. H. (1977) "The determinants of international production", *Oxford Economic Papers*, vol. 25, pp. 289-330.

Dunning, J. H. (2000) “The eclectic paradigm as an envelope for economic and business theories of MNE activity”, *International Business Review*, vol. 9, pp. 163-190.

Hertel, T. W. (ed.) (1997) *Global Trade Analysis. Modelling and Applications*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Jones, R. W. (1971) “A three-factor model in theory, trade and history”, in Bhagwati, J. N., Jones, R.W., Mundell, R. A. and Vanek, J. (eds.) *Trade, balance of payments and growth: Papers in International Economics in honor of Charles P. Kindleberger*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, pp. 3-21.

Jones, R. W. (2000) *Globalisation and the theory of input trade*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Jones, R. W. (2002) “Trade theory and factor intensities: An interpretative essay”, *Review of International Economics*, vol. 10, pp. 581-603.

Kroska, L. (2001) “Foreign direct investment financing of capital formation in Central and Eastern Europe”, Working Paper No. 67, European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

Latorre, M. C. (2007) “The effects of multinationals on host economies: A computable general equilibrium approach”, PhD Dissertation, Universidad Complutense de Madrid.

Lizal, L. and Svegnar, J. (2002) “Investment, credit rationing, and the soft budget constraint: Evidence from Czech panel data”, *Review of Economics and Statistics*, vol. 84, pp. 353-370.

Markusen, J. R. (2002) *Multinational Firms and the Theory of International Trade*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Mussa, M. (1974) “Tariffs and the distribution of income: The importance of factor specificity, substitutability, and intensity in the short and long run”, *Journal of Political Economy*, vol. 82, pp. 1191-1203.

Neary, J. P. (1978) “Short-run capital specificity and the pure theory of international trade”, *Economic Journal*, vol. 88, pp. 488-510.

OECD (2005) “Measuring globalisation. The role of multinationals in OECD economies. Manufacturing and services”, Paris, available at: http://iris.sourceoecd.org/v1=1587405/cl=30/nw=1/rpsv/statistic/s6_about.htm?jnlissn=16081293.

Schöllmann, W. (2001) “Foreign participation in privatisation: What does it mean? Empirical evidence from the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland”, *Post-Communist Economies*, vol. 13, pp. 373-387.

Shoven, J. B. and Whalley, J. (1984) “Applied general-equilibrium models of taxation and international trade: An introduction and survey”, *Journal of Economic Literature*, vol. 22, pp. 1007-1051.

Shoven, J. B. and Whalley, J. (1992) *Applying General Equilibrium*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Table 1. Definition of sectors and their relative weight in the Czech economy, 2001

	% on gross output	% on capital	% on imports	% on exports	% of sectoral gross output devoted to:					MNEs' % on gross output	MNEs' % on capital
					intermediates	investment	exports	private consumption	public consumption		
01/05 Agriculture, hunting and fishing	3.0	4.5	2.2	1.1	66.9	8.5	8.6	15.5	0.5	0.6	0.6
10/14 Mining and quarrying	1.0	3.1	4.7	0.9	76.4	2.7	19.2	1.8	0.0	18.7	27.3
15/16 Food, beverages and tobacco	7.6	8.3	3.0	2.9	34.6	0.0	9.8	55.5	0.0	31.5	50.9
17/19 Textiles, wearing apparel, leather, footwear	3.1	2.0	5.3	5.7	28.9	0.0	46.5	24.4	0.2	26.5	23.9
20 Wood and wood products, except furniture	1.9	1.8	1.7	4.0	40.2	5.1	50.2	4.5	0.0	23.8	22.0
21/22 Paper; printing, publishing and recorded media	2.4	2.5	3.0	2.8	54.0	7.9	28.5	9.5	0.0	45.3	52.5
23 Petroleum	1.0	0.1	1.4	0.4	74.9	0.0	9.5	15.5	0.0	1.0	1.0
24/25 Chemicals, rubber and plastics	4.4	3.7	12.8	8.7	38.3	3.4	49.2	6.3	2.8	42.6	49.1
26 Non-metallic mineral products	2.6	3.4	2.5	4.5	44.2	13.3	41.7	0.9	0.0	49.0	58.6
27/28 Basic and fabricated metal products	7.6	5.3	9.9	10.7	56.7	8.3	34.6	0.4	0.0	24.0	28.9
34 Motor vehicles	6.5	3.0	7.5	14.1	35.1	2.5	55.8	6.7	0.0	90.7	89.5
35 Other transport equipment	1.1	0.4	1.1	1.5	38.6	17.1	35.0	9.3	0.0	23.0	18.5
30/33 Electronics	2.7	2.0	9.4	6.6	30.7	2.8	62.6	3.6	0.3	63.0	58.8
29 Machinery and equipment n.e.c.	8.6	3.8	20.4	19.5	31.7	3.7	57.9	6.7	0.1	29.3	24.1
36/37 Furniture, manufacturing n.e.c.	1.3	1.1	1.1	1.5	40.6	7.5	30.1	21.9	0.0	29.9	34.3
40/45 Electricity, gas and water supply; construction	11.0	9.9	1.6	2.6	72.2	10.6	6.3	9.8	1.1	11.9	12.6
50/55 Trade, repair; hotels and restaurants	4.1	5.3	1.2	0.6	32.9	50.0	3.9	13.0	0.2	30.8	36.2
60/64 Transport, storage and communication	6.4	8.5	2.6	4.7	58.1	0.2	28.9	12.6	0.2	10.8	9.5
65/74 Finance, insurance, real estate, business activities	11.9	20.6	6.6	4.7	58.6	10.7	10.4	15.8	4.6	22.6	10.7
75-79 NACE Other services	11.7	10.7	1.9	2.5	17.3	11.9	5.7	16.6	48.5	1.0	1.0
01/99 Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	29.1	28.5

Note: Authors' own elaboration from Dimanaran and McDougall (2005), OECD (2005) and Czech National Bank (2004). The definitions of the sectors follow the ISIC Rev 3 Classification

Table 2. Simulation results: Effects on aggregate variables (percent change from benchmark)

	Wage		Rental rate of capital		GDP		Welfare		CPI		Imports		Exports	
	MNEs' entry	Profit Rep	MNEs' entry	Profit Rep	MNEs' entry	Profit Rep	MNEs' entry	Profit Rep	MNEs' entry	Profit Rep	MNEs' entry	Profit Rep	MNEs' entry	Profit Rep
Chemicals	0.23	0.17	-0.55	-0.64	0.30	-0.24	0.61	-0.39	0.08	-0.09	1.30	1.32	1.36	1.38
Motor vehicles	0.05	-0.06	-1.17	-1.30	0.11	-0.69	0.20	-1.28	-0.10	-0.35	0.59	0.62	0.61	0.65
Electronics	0.21	0.16	-0.34	-0.40	0.23	-0.12	0.40	-0.24	0.09	-0.02	0.93	0.95	0.97	0.98
Trade	0.09	0.02	-0.51	-0.61	0.27	-0.30	0.69	-0.38	-0.01	-0.20	0.18	0.20	0.19	0.21
Finance	0.20	0.10	-0.61	-0.71	0.35	-0.31	0.72	-0.52	-0.14	-0.35	0.50	0.52	0.52	0.54

Note: "MNE's entry" stands for the simulation without profit repatriation, and "Profit Rep" stands for the simulation with profit repatriation.

Table 3. Simulation results: Effects on sectoral production (percent change from benchmark)

	Chemicals		Motor Vehicles		Electronics		Trade		Finance	
	MNEs' entry	Profit Rep	MNEs' entry	Profit Rep	MNEs' entry	Profit Rep	MNEs' entry	Profit Rep	MNEs' entry	Profit Rep
Agriculture, hunting and fishing	-0.01	-0.02	0.03	0.02	-0.04	-0.05	0.06	0.05	0.06	0.05
Mining and quarrying	-0.01	0.00	0.00	0.02	-0.01	-0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.02
Food, beverages and tobacco	0.24	-0.16	0.10	-0.49	0.13	-0.12	0.33	-0.09	0.36	-0.13
Textiles, wearing apparel, leather, footwear	-0.05	0.14	0.08	0.37	-0.31	-0.19	0.13	0.34	0.26	0.51
Wood and wood products, except furniture	-0.24	0.07	0.07	0.54	-0.31	-0.11	-0.01	0.32	0.11	0.50
Paper, printing and publishing	-0.12	0.06	0.07	0.35	-0.20	-0.08	0.02	0.22	0.23	0.47
Petroleum	0.16	-0.12	0.04	-0.33	0.09	-0.10	0.21	-0.11	0.22	-0.16
Chemicals, rubber and plastics	13.97	14.30	0.08	0.39	-0.21	-0.07	-0.01	0.21	0.12	0.38
Non-metallic mineral products	-0.14	0.09	0.08	0.43	-0.18	-0.03	0.00	0.25	0.12	0.41
Basic and fabricated metal products	-0.41	0.01	0.08	0.73	-0.42	-0.14	-0.04	0.42	0.20	0.74
Motor vehicles	-0.11	0.03	16.89	17.13	-0.12	-0.02	0.03	0.18	0.17	0.35
Other transport equipment	-0.16	0.01	0.29	0.55	-0.08	0.04	0.19	0.37	0.35	0.56
Electronics	-0.20	0.13	0.07	0.56	17.95	18.20	-0.01	0.34	0.21	0.62
Machinery and equipment n.e.c.	-0.18	0.02	1.80	2.12	-0.16	-0.02	0.06	0.28	0.24	0.50
Furniture, manufacturing n.e.c.	-0.05	0.04	0.08	0.22	-0.21	-0.15	0.14	0.23	0.24	0.35
Electricity, gas and water supply; construction	0.05	-0.12	0.09	-0.15	0.03	-0.08	0.23	0.06	0.33	0.13
Trade, repair; hotels and restaurants	0.06	-0.22	0.18	-0.22	0.00	-0.17	5.65	5.39	0.59	0.25
Transport, storage and communication	-0.12	-0.08	0.11	0.17	-0.13	-0.10	0.12	0.17	0.18	0.23
Finance, insurance, real estate, business activities	-0.02	-0.08	0.05	-0.02	-0.05	-0.08	0.10	0.04	2.12	2.05
Other services	0.03	-0.09	0.05	-0.13	0.00	-0.08	0.12	-0.01	0.18	0.03

Note: see Table 2.

Table 4. Simulation results: Effects on sectoral exports (percent change from benchmark)

	Chemicals		Motor vehicles		Electronics		Trade		Finance	
	MNEs' entry	Profit Rep	MNEs' entry	Profit Rep	MNEs' entry	Profit Rep	MNEs' entry	Profit Rep	MNEs' entry	Profit Rep
Agriculture, hunting and fishing	-0.57	0.36	-0.03	1.36	-0.46	0.14	-0.46	0.54	-0.37	0.78
Mining and quarrying	-0.04	0.02	0.00	0.09	-0.03	0.01	-0.03	0.04	-0.03	0.05
Food, beverages and tobacco	-1.01	0.65	-0.02	2.49	-0.83	0.24	-0.73	1.05	-0.45	1.61
Textiles, wearing apparel, leather, footwear	-0.35	0.35	0.04	1.10	-0.57	-0.11	-0.14	0.62	0.06	0.93
Wood and wood products, except furniture	-0.28	0.09	0.05	0.62	-0.33	-0.08	-0.07	0.34	0.05	0.52
Paper; printing and publishing	-0.28	0.14	0.02	0.66	-0.32	-0.04	-0.14	0.31	0.07	0.60
Petroleum	-0.12	0.12	0.00	0.35	-0.13	0.03	-0.11	0.16	-0.05	0.27
Chemicals rubber and plastics	15.09	15.38	0.05	0.49	-0.25	-0.06	-0.08	0.23	0.05	0.41
Non-metallic mineral products	-0.15	0.05	0.04	0.34	-0.20	-0.07	-0.03	0.19	0.07	0.32
Basic and fabricated metal products	-0.34	0.01	0.06	0.59	-0.34	-0.11	-0.04	0.34	0.15	0.59
Motor vehicles	-0.20	0.05	21.26	21.71	-0.21	-0.04	-0.03	0.24	0.15	0.47
Other transport equipment	-0.30	0.11	0.24	0.86	-0.19	0.08	0.03	0.47	0.20	0.70
Electronics	-0.22	0.13	0.05	0.59	17.11	17.37	-0.05	0.33	0.16	0.60
Machinery and equipment n.e.c.	-0.24	0.07	1.70	2.17	-0.20	0.00	-0.01	0.32	0.18	0.56
Furniture, manufacturing n.e.c.	-0.44	0.29	0.04	1.14	-0.53	-0.05	-0.21	0.58	-0.03	0.88
Electricity, gas and water supply; construction	-0.68	0.24	0.00	1.38	-0.53	0.07	-0.35	0.64	-0.10	1.04
Trade, repair; hotels and restaurants	-0.80	0.20	0.12	1.64	-0.68	-0.02	11.22	12.40	0.18	1.43
Transport, storage and communication	-0.36	0.06	0.09	0.73	-0.32	-0.04	-0.07	0.39	0.03	0.56
Finance, insurance, real estate, business activities	-0.58	0.31	0.08	1.44	-0.47	0.12	-0.35	0.60	6.37	7.47
Other services	-0.75	0.09	0.09	1.37	-0.73	-0.18	-0.22	0.69	0.27	1.33

Note: see Table 2.

Table 5. Simulation results: Effects on sectoral imports (percent change from benchmark)

	Chemicals		Motor vehicles		Electronics		Trade		Finance	
	MNEs' entry	Profit Rep	MNEs' entry	Profit Rep	MNEs' entry	Profit Rep	MNEs' entry	Profit Rep	MNEs' entry	Profit Rep
Agriculture, hunting and fishing	0.31	-0.23	0.05	-0.74	0.22	-0.13	0.31	-0.27	0.26	-0.40
Mining and quarrying	0.06	-0.05	0.01	-0.15	0.04	-0.03	0.07	-0.05	0.06	-0.07
Food, beverages and tobacco	0.83	-0.56	0.11	-1.94	0.61	-0.29	0.76	-0.72	0.62	-1.08
Textiles, wearing apparel, leather, footwear	0.30	-0.20	0.07	-0.67	0.13	-0.19	0.35	-0.19	0.34	-0.27
Wood and wood products, except furniture	-0.06	-0.03	0.04	0.09	-0.12	-0.10	0.06	0.10	0.11	0.15
Paper; printing and publishing	0.07	-0.07	0.06	-0.15	-0.01	-0.10	0.15	0.00	0.25	0.08
Petroleum	0.25	-0.21	0.05	-0.56	0.18	-0.12	0.29	-0.22	0.26	-0.34
Chemicals, rubber and plastics	10.24	10.26	0.07	0.03	-0.07	-0.09	0.08	0.05	0.16	0.13
Non-metallic mineral products	-0.06	0.09	0.08	0.30	-0.06	0.04	0.04	0.19	0.11	0.29
Basic and fabricated metal products	-0.30	-0.04	0.02	0.42	-0.32	-0.15	-0.05	0.23	0.10	0.43
Motor vehicles	0.06	-0.01	3.87	3.79	0.07	0.02	0.12	0.05	0.14	0.05
Other transport equipment	0.05	-0.09	0.17	-0.03	0.05	-0.04	0.23	0.08	0.29	0.12
Electronics	-0.07	0.06	0.08	0.28	10.55	10.66	0.07	0.21	0.21	0.38
Machinery and equipment n.e.c.	0.01	-0.07	0.79	0.69	-0.01	-0.06	0.13	0.05	0.19	0.10
Furniture, manufacturing n.e.c.	0.31	-0.22	0.07	-0.71	0.17	-0.17	0.35	-0.21	0.33	-0.32
Electricity, gas and water supply; construction	0.38	-0.30	0.06	-0.93	0.26	-0.18	0.39	-0.33	0.34	-0.49
Trade, repair; hotels and restaurants	0.46	-0.35	0.11	-1.08	0.32	-0.20	1.43	0.60	0.49	-0.49
Transport, storage and communication	0.15	-0.11	0.04	-0.35	0.11	-0.06	0.17	-0.11	0.15	-0.17
Finance, insurance, real estate, business activities	0.29	-0.20	0.10	-0.61	0.20	-0.12	0.32	-0.19	2.67	2.06
Other services	0.47	-0.15	0.02	-0.91	0.41	0.01	0.29	-0.38	0.09	-0.68

Note: see Table 2.