



Developing inland China: Do heterogeneous coastal foreign direct investments and exports help?



Puman Ouyang
Shunli Yao

ASIA-PACIFIC RESEARCH AND TRAINING NETWORK ON TRADE

Working Paper

NO. 138 | DECEMBER 2013

The Asia-Pacific Research and Training Network on Trade (ARTNeT) is an open regional network of research and academic institutions specializing in international trade policy and facilitation issues. IDRC, UNCTAD, UNDP, ESCAP and WTO, as core network partners, provide substantive and/or financial support to the network. The Trade and Investment Division of ESCAP, the regional branch of the United Nations for Asia and the Pacific, provides the Secretariat of the network and a direct regional link to trade policymakers and other international organizations.

The ARTNeT Working Paper Series disseminates the findings of work in progress to encourage the exchange of ideas about trade issues. An objective of the series is to publish the findings quickly, even if the presentations are less than fully polished. ARTNeT Working Papers are available online at www.artnetontrade.org. All material in the Working Papers may be freely quoted or reprinted, but acknowledgment is requested, together with a copy of the publication containing the quotation or reprint. The use of the working papers for any commercial purpose, including resale, is prohibited.

Disclaimer:

The designations employed and the presentation of the material in this Working Paper do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area, or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. Where the designation “country or area” appears, it covers countries, territories, cities or areas. Bibliographical and other references have, wherever possible, been verified. The United Nations bears no responsibility for the availability or functioning of URLs. The views expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the United Nations. The opinions, figures and estimates set forth in this publication are the responsibility of the author(s), and should not necessarily be considered as reflecting the views or carrying the endorsement of the United Nations. Any errors are the responsibility of the author(s). Mention of firm names and commercial products does not imply the endorsement of the United Nations.



Developing inland China: Do heterogeneous coastal foreign direct investments and exports help?

Puman Ouyang and Shunli Yao*

Please cite this paper as: Puman Ouyang and Shunli Yao (2013). Developing inland China: Do heterogeneous coastal foreign direct investments and exports help?

ARTNeT Working Paper Series No. 138, September, 2013, Bangkok, ESCAP.

Available at www.artnetontrade.org.

* Puman Ouyang is a researcher at the Research Institute of Economics and Management, Southwestern University of Finance and Economics, Chengdu. Shunli Yao is a researcher at the Institute for Applied International Trade, University of International Business and Economics, Beijing. This work was carried out with the aid of a grant from the International Development Research Centre (IDRC), Canada, and is part of an ARTNeT Phase III Research Programme initiative. The technical support of the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific and ARTNeT Secretariat is gratefully acknowledged. Any remaining errors are the responsibility of the authors who can be contacted at ouyangpm@swufe.edu.cn or shunliyao@yahoo.com.

Abstract: By applying panel estimation models to Chinese provincial level data for 1993-2008, this paper examine the impacts of China's coastal foreign direct investment (FDI) and exports on its inland regions. The results show that coastal FDI has overall positive interregional impacts, while coastal exports do not. Cooperative joint ventures generate positive impacts, but little impact is produced by wholly foreign-funded enterprises. In the case of equity joint ventures, there may even be negative impacts. The interregional impacts do not exhibit any differences across FDI origins or exporters' ownership status. The authors attribute these findings to the protectionist behaviour of state-owned enterprises participating in equity joint ventures as well as to the prevalence of processing exports.

JEL classification: F23, O33, R11, R12.

Keywords: Foreign direct investment, exports, interregional spillovers, China.

Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| 1. Introduction | 3 |
| 2. Background: FDI, exports and interregional interactions | 5 |
| 2.1. <i>Mechanisms of coastal-inland interactions</i> | 5 |
| 2.2. <i>Key reform initiatives during 1993-2008</i> | 8 |
| 2.3. <i>Specific FDI and exports: Implications for interregional spillovers</i> | 9 |
| 2.4. <i>Interregional impact estimation</i> | 12 |
| 3. Econometric model specification | 13 |
| 4. Data and measurement | 16 |
| 4.1. <i>Data</i> | 16 |
| 4.2. <i>Effective coastal FDI and exports</i> | 16 |
| 4.3. <i>Other independent variables</i> | 17 |
| 4.4. <i>Summary statistics</i> | 18 |
| 5. Interregional impacts: Overall FDI and exports, 1993-2008 | 19 |
| 6. Interregional impacts: Heterogeneous FDI and exports, 2002-2007 | 23 |
| 6.1. <i>Do the organizational forms of coastal FDI matter?</i> | 23 |
| 6.2. <i>Do the origins of coastal FDI matter?</i> | 25 |
| 6.3. <i>Does ownership of exporting companies matter?</i> | 26 |
| 7. Conclusion | 27 |
| References | 29 |

List of tables

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 1. GDP, FDI and exports: coastal vs. inland provinces..... | 15 |
| Table 2. Summary statistics of key variables..... | 18 |
| Table 3. Fixed-effect estimation of interregional impacts from overall coastal FDI and exports | 20 |
| Table 4. Random effect estimation of interregional impacts from overall coastal FDI and exports | 21 |
| Table 5. Robustness checks | 22 |
| Table 6. Interregional impacts by various modes of FDI..... | 24 |
| Table 7. Interregional impacts by FDI origin | 25 |
| Table 8. Interregional impacts by exporter ownership..... | 26 |

1. Introduction

China's coastal regions have formed the country's front line in implementing its open-door policy during the country's reform era. Comprising 40% of the total population and 30% of the total land area, the coastal regions attract 90% of the country's foreign direct investment (FDI) inflows and export trade. Support for this uneven development strategy in favour of the coastal regions has been justified by, among other reasons, the belief that the coastal economic boom would subsequently spread back into the inland regions.

It is well understood that FDI and exports benefit Chinese local area economies. However, there is no consensus that they will necessarily benefit other regions, as their positive spatial spillovers may be offset by the negative impact of their competition with inland regions for talent and resources. On the one hand, China's coastal FDI inflow and exports have sustained very strong performance for almost 20 years. On the other hand, the widening income disparity between the coastal and inland regions has long been of concern among Chinese policymakers who are trying to steer the country towards a harmonious society. In the wake of the recent global financial crisis, rebalancing the economy by reducing its heavy reliance on foreign demand as well as by improving efficiency and upgrading the quality of FDI and exports has become a policy priority. The new Government of China, under Xi Jinping and Li Keqiang, is working on a blueprint for a new round of comprehensive reform. Against this backdrop, this paper attempts to answer the question of whether or not China's coastal FDI inflow and export trade really contribute to inland development through positive spatial spillovers that are large enough to offset the competition effects.

Studies carried out on China's coastal and inland development have mainly focused on relative regional disparity. For example, Zhang and Zhang (2003) found that the role of FDI and export trade play an important role in contributing to the widening regional inequality in China while Su and Chang (2013) explored the issue of convergence in per capita income between the eastern and western provinces. This paper, however, studies how the level of inland economic development has been affected by coastal FDI and exports. The spatial impacts of coastal FDI and exports on inland economies are estimated by focusing on the impacts generated by different modes of FDI and exports, i.e., FDI by type of local partnership and by origin, and exports by ownership of trading companies. This approach is used in this study because different types of FDI and exports interact with the inland

economy through different mechanisms, and could generate very different spatial impacts.

Given the co-existence of a positive spillover effect and a negative competition effect on the inland generated by coastal FDI and exports, it is difficult to predict in theory the net impacts. Nevertheless, the stylized features of the Chinese foreign trade and investment regimes can help in speculating on possible outcomes of this empirical investigation of the issue. First, the bulk of Chinese exports constitute processing goods with low domestic value-added. This implies that true Chinese export activities are not as intensive as the export volume suggests, and that domestic spillover of production technology and management know-how could be limited.

Second, China's technology-for-market policy requires high-tech foreign investors who are seeking access to the Chinese market to form equity joint ventures (EJVs) with domestic firms, mostly state-owned enterprises (SOEs). As far as intellectual property rights protection is concerned, wholly foreign-funded enterprises (WFFEs) are the best form of overseas investment. EJVs make possible the maximum transfer of production technology and management know-how from foreign investors to local partners. In-between are the cooperative joint ventures (CJVs). China's high-tech sectors are dominated by monopolistic SOEs. So the Chinese partners in high-tech EJVs are mostly SOEs. They benefit from foreign partners' transfers of technology and know-how, but also have an interest and the ability to protect themselves from leaks to other firms, including firms in other regions, and from competition. Therefore, EJVs may not do better than other forms of foreign investment.

Third, FDI with advanced technology normally comes from advanced countries. For the same reason, FDI originating from advanced countries may not necessarily do better than lower-tier countries in interregional technology spillovers.²

预览已结束，完整报告链接和二维码如下：

https://www.yunbaogao.cn/report/index/report?reportId=5_6841

