



Leonid Kosals, Heiko Pleines (eds.)

Governance Failure and Reform Attempts after the Global Economic Crisis of 2008/09

Case Studies from Central and Eastern Europe

Leonid Kosals, Heiko Pleines (eds.)

**Governance Failure and Reform
Attempts after the Global Economic
Crisis of 2008/09**

Case Studies from Central and Eastern Europe

CHANGING EUROPE

Edited by Dr. Sabine Fischer, Dr. Heiko Pleines and
Prof. Dr. Hans-Henning Schröder

ISSN 1863-8716

- 2 *David Lane, György Lengyel, Jochen Tholen (eds.)*
Restructuring of the Economic Elites after State Socialism
Recruitment, Institutions and Attitudes
ISBN 978-3-89821-754-5
- 3 *Daniela Obradovic, Heiko Pleines (eds.)*
The Capacity of Central and East European Interest Groups to
Participate in EU Governance
ISBN 978-3-89821-750-7
- 4 *Sabine Fischer, Heiko Pleines (eds.)*
Crises and Conflicts in Post-Socialist Societies
The Role of Ethnic, Political and Social Identities
ISBN 978-3-89821-855-9
- 5 *Julia Kuszniir, Heiko Pleines (eds.)*
Trade Unions from Post-Socialist Member States in EU Governance
ISBN 978-3-89821-857-3
- 6 *Sabine Fischer, Heiko Pleines (eds.)*
The EU and Central & Eastern Europe
Successes and Failures of Europeanization in Politics and Society
ISBN 978-3-89821-948-8
- 7 *Sabine Fischer, Heiko Pleines (eds.)*
Civil Society in Central and Eastern Europe
ISBN 978-3-8382-0041-5
- 8 *Zdenka Mansfeldová, Heiko Pleines (eds.)*
Informal Relations from Democratic Representation to Corruption
Case Studies from Central and Eastern Europe
ISBN 978-3-8382-0173-3
- 9 *Leonid Kosals, Heiko Pleines (eds.)*
Governance Failure and Reform Attempts after the
Global Economic Crisis of 2008/09
Case Studies from Central and Eastern Europe
ISBN 978-3-8382-0336-2

Leonid Kosals, Heiko Pleines (eds.)

**GOVERNANCE FAILURE AND REFORM
ATTEMPTS AFTER THE GLOBAL
ECONOMIC CRISIS OF 2008/09**

Case Studies from Central and Eastern Europe

ibidem-Verlag
Stuttgart

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.d-nb.de> abrufbar.

ISSN: 1863-8716

ISBN-13: 978-3-8382-6336-6

© *ibidem*-Verlag / *ibidem* Press
Stuttgart, Germany 2014

Alle Rechte vorbehalten

Das Werk einschließlich aller seiner Teile ist urheberrechtlich geschützt. Jede Verwertung außerhalb der engen Grenzen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes ist ohne Zustimmung des Verlages unzulässig und strafbar.

Dies gilt insbesondere für Vervielfältigungen, Übersetzungen, Mikroverfilmungen und elektronische Speicherformen sowie die Einspeicherung und Verarbeitung in elektronischen Systemen.

All rights reserved

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in or introduced into a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form, or by any means (electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise) without the prior written permission of the publisher.

Any person who does any unauthorized act in relation to this publication may be liable to criminal prosecution and civil claims for damages.

Contents

List of Figures	7
List of Tables	8
Preface	9
PART I. FINANCIAL AND MONETARY POLICY. BEYOND UNIVERSAL MODELS?	
<i>Vytautas Kuokštis</i>	
1. Baltic Variety of Capitalism as an Explanation of the Success of Internal Devaluation	13
<i>Ewa Dąbrowska</i>	
2. Economic Sovereignty and Development or Sound Money and Market Equilibrium? Conflicting Narratives in the Russian Monetary and Financial Policy During the Crisis	29
<i>Olena Danylenko</i>	
3. Institutional Determinants of Confidence in National Currency and Monetary Policy Credibility. The Case of Ukraine	49
<i>Alexandru Leonte</i>	
4. Studying Fiscal Policy Effects Using a Simple DSGE Model	71
<i>Vera Jotanovic</i>	
5. The Secret Behind the Last Financial Crisis. Why Were Some Countries Hit Worse than the Others?	95
PART II. BANKS, FINANCE AND PUBLIC INTEREST. CULTURAL DIMENSIONS	
<i>Narcis Tulbure</i>	
6. Neoliberalism and the Crisis of Indebtedness. The Problematization of Credit-Based Affluence in Contemporary Romania	115
<i>Jakhongir Imamnazarov</i>	
7. Conceptual Framework of Sustainability of Islamic Financial Institutions amid Global Financial and Economic Crisis	143

PART III. GOOD AND BAD GOVERNANCE.

ACTORS AND RULES

Lili Di Puppo

8. Anti-Corruption Policies in Georgia.
The Construction of an Image of Success 161

Eduard Klein

9. Academic Corruption and Reform in Russia and Ukraine 173

Tetiana Kostiuchenko

10. Interlocks Between Political and Business Elite Groups and
Their Impact on the Income of Ukrainian Enterprises in 2007–2009 191

Valeriya Zaozerna

11. Trends of Corporate Governance in Post-Socialist States 213

About the Authors 233

List of Figures

3-1: Comparison of Projected and Actual Inflation	62
3-2: Comparison of Projected and Actual Exchange Rate	63
3-3: Inflation Rates, 1991–1999 (in %)	65
5-1: Risk Rating: Crisis Period	104
5-2: Risk Rating: Pre-Crisis Period	104
5-3: Growth Rates: Crisis Period	105
5-4: Growth Rates: Pre-Crisis Period	105
5-5: Risk Rating: Crisis Period	106
5-6: Risk Rating: Pre-Crisis Period	106
5-7: Liberalization: Crisis Period	107
5-8: Liberalization: Pre-Crisis Period	107
10-1: Comparison of Centralities and Income of Enterprises	199
10-2: Two-Mode Network. Political Actors with Their Affiliations in State and Business Institutions	202
10-3: Interorganizational Network of Political and Business Institutions. Degree Centrality	203
10-4: Interorganizational Network of Political and Business Institutions. Betweenness Centrality	204
10-5: Interorganizational Network of Political and Business Institutions. Clustering the Network	205

List of Tables

1-1: Comparison of Slovenia and Estonia	18
1-2: Corporate Governance in Estonia and the UK	19
1-3: SME Share of Employment and Value Added	20
3-1: Comparison of Projected and Actual Inflation	63
3-2: Comparison of Projected and Actual Exchange Rate	63
3-3: Inflation Rates, 1991–1999 (in %)	65
3-4: Turnover of the NBU’s Governors (TOR)	68
4-1: Calibrated Parameters	90
4-2: Parameter Prior and Posterior Distributions	91
9-1: Question: What is your attitude towards the abolition of admission exams at universities and replacing them on the basis of a Unified State Exam at the end of the 11 th grade? (in %)	179
9-2: Question: Did the amount of bribery, ‘blat’ and other abuses during admissions increase or decrease since the introduction of the Unified State Exam process? (in %)	180
9-3: Political Science Approaches and their Assessment of Corruption	186
10-1: TOP10 Organizations by Degree and Betweenness Centralities	197
10-2: Clusters of Organizations (According to the Girvan-Newman Algorithm)	201
10-3: Legend for the Codes of Nodes in Actor-by-Affiliation 2-Mode Dataset	207
10-4: Degree & Betweenness Centralities	209
10-5: Net Income and Profits of Enterprises in 2007–2009	211
11-1: Legal Requirements for Board Independence	224
11-2: Legal Requirements for Minority Shareholder Protection	226
11-3: Legal Requirements for Internal Audit	227
11-4: Legal Requirements for Disclosure Rules	228
11-5: Legal Requirements on Codes of Ethics	228
11-6: Stock Exchanges’ Corporate Governance-Related Self-Regulation	229
11-7: Overall Evaluation of the Corporate Governance in Poland, Russia and Ukraine	230

Preface

This book presents a selection of the papers discussed at the Changing Europe Summer School on 'The Impact of the Global Economic Crisis on Central and Eastern Europe. Economic, political and social aspects' held at the National Research University—Higher School of Economics in Moscow in August 2011. Organized since 2006 by the Research Centre for East European Studies (Forschungsstelle Osteuropa) at the University of Bremen, the Changing Europe Summer School has every year invited twenty to thirty young academics from different disciplines of the social sciences and the humanities to share their research on Central and Eastern Europe. Our main goal is to give them a chance to present and discuss their research projects as well as to help them become more closely integrated into the academic community. Participants are selected by means of an anonymous review process that is kindly supported by the members of our international review panel (for more information on the Changing Europe Summer Schools, see www.changing-europe.de). The results of each Summer School are published in this book series.

It goes without saying that this book would not have been possible without ample support. First of all, our thanks go to the participants themselves, whose enthusiasm and knowledge made the Summer School a truly worthwhile event. We would also like to thank all the referees who aided us in the selection process for appropriate participants. We are additionally grateful to all those who helped to organize the Summer School and the book production, namely Anastasiya Dubova (organizational support), Judith Janiszewski (style editing), Eduard Klein (organizational support), Benjamin Law (additional language editing), Matthias Neumann (typesetting and layout) and Ksenia Pacheco (organizational support).

Moscow and Bremen, February 2012

The Editors

***Part I. Financial and Monetary Policy.
Beyond Universal Models?***

1. Baltic Variety of Capitalism as an Explanation of the Success of Internal Devaluation¹

1.1. Introduction

During the recent crisis the three Baltic countries became the centre of attention of international financial media. Before 2008, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania were among the fastest growing economies in Europe. Along with high growth based on the expansion of domestic demand fuelled by credit booms, the three Baltic countries built up massive macroeconomic imbalances that manifested themselves in increasing inflation, real estate price bubbles, as well as very large current account deficits. As a result, the global financial crisis struck particularly hard in the Baltics. In 2009, Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia were among the top four countries in the world in terms of GDP contraction (along with Ukraine).

Apart from massive economic imbalances and the subsequent economic contraction, the three Baltic countries also presented an interesting empirical and theoretical puzzle. Namely, they all chose to defend the fixed exchange rate regimes and instead of currency devaluation opted for the so-called internal devaluation, which aims to rebuild competitiveness via austerity measures and nominal wage reduction (deflation). The majority of outside economic and financial analysts in 2009 were of the opinion that this strategy was doomed to failure or at least very likely to end this way.² For instance, Bengt Dennis, the former central bank governor of Sweden and an advisor to the Latvian government, said:

No one knows if there will be a devaluation tomorrow or in a few months—the time frame is always uncertain—but we have moved beyond the question of whether there will be a devaluation and should instead focus on how it will be carried out.³

1 Earlier versions of this chapter were presented at the following PhD summer schools (both in 2011): '(What) Have We Learned? New Perspectives on the Political Economy of Finance and Regulation' at the University of Paris VIII on 9–11 May and EAEPE Summer School at the University of Rome III on 4–8 July. The author thanks Pasquale Tridico, Anastasia Nesvetailova and Maksim Nikitin for valuable comments.

2 Kuokštis, Vytautas / Vilpišauskas, Ramūnas: Economic Adjustment to the Crisis in the Baltic States in Comparative Perspective, Conference paper presented at the 7th Pan-European International Relations Conference, September 2010, Stockholm, <http://stockholm.sgjr.eu/uploads/Economic%20Adjustment%20to%20the%20Crisis%20in%20the%20Baltic%20States%20in%20Comparative%20Perspective.pdf>, accessed 22 May 2011.

3 Nylande, Johan: Bengt Dennis. Latvia Will Devalue Currency, in: The Swedish Wire, 2 June 2009, <http://www.swedishwire.com/business/213-bengt-dennis-latvia-will-devalue>

Similarly, Nouriel Roubini claimed that ‘at this point, a currency and financial crisis is pretty much unavoidable.’⁴ Nevertheless, a couple of years after these predictions, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania still keep their fixed exchange rates—in fact, Estonia managed to fulfil the Maastricht criteria and from 1st of January 2011 is the 17th member of the Eurozone.

This naturally raises a question: why were the Baltic countries able to implement internal devaluation contrary to the consensus expectations? The literature trying to answer this question is rather scant. Purfield and Rosenberg maintain that this came down to a couple of unique conditions: flexibility of the economic structure, shallow financial markets with a few players limiting scope for speculation against currencies, close integration with Nordic financial systems, and fast fiscal adjustment.⁵ Kuokštis and Vilpišauskas⁶ argue for a more politically and historically informed perspective, stressing the multiple functions of fixed exchange rates (anchoring macroeconomic stability, but also reflecting national sentiments as well as relating to the broad euro-integration project), a particular climate of ideas (further adding to the support for fixed exchange rates and legitimizing fiscal consolidation as the only viable policy option) as well as a low capacity for social action on the part of the general society (which limited contestation of drastic fiscal consolidation measures).

This study offers another possible interpretation and argues for the importance of taking into account the functional logic of capitalist systems in the Baltic States. In doing so, it starts from the Varieties of Capitalism (VoC) framework, and uses it to reveal how the functional logic of capitalist system’s working in the Baltics contributed to the success of the strategy of internal devaluation—even if it did not determine it. (In this analysis, success of the internal devaluation strategy is defined as the ability to preserve currency stability, and does not include other aspects, such as economic development or societal cohesion.) Overall, the chapter serves two purposes: in addition to providing an explanation for the developments during the crisis, it also presents a test case for the validity and usefulness of the Varieties of Capitalism approach in another setting. Despite—and perhaps because of—its wide recent popularity, it has attracted numerous criticisms, such as its functionalism and economic determinism. In highlighting the functional logic of the Baltic capitalist system, the chapter illustrates the fruitfulness of the VoC framework in a broad sense.

4 Roubini, Nouriel: Latvia’s Currency Crisis Is a Rerun of Argentina’s, in: FT.com, 10 June 2009, <http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/95df08fe-55f3-11de-ab7e-00144feabdc0.html#axzz16uuaG9Jc>

5 Purfield, Catriona / Rosenberg, Christoph B.: Adjustment under a Currency Peg. Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania during the Global Financial Crisis 2008–09, IMF Working Paper WPI/10/213, 2010.

6 Kuokštis, Vytautas / Vilpišauskas, Ramūnas: Economic Adjustment to the Crisis in the Baltic States in Comparative Perspective, Conference paper presented at the 7th Pan-European International Relations Conference, September 2010, Stockholm, <http://stockholm.sgir.eu/uploads/Economic%20Adjustment%20to%20the%20Crisis%20in%20the%20Baltic%20States%20in%20Comparative%20Perspective.pdf>, accessed 22 May 2011.

Section 1.2 presents the Varieties of Capitalism framework. Section 1.3 presents the dominant treatment of Baltic capitalisms as liberal market economies in the literature along with a critical discussion. In Section 1.4 the case for a distinct Baltic version of capitalism with its own functional logic is presented, and lessons for Baltic adjustment during the crisis are drawn.

1.2. Varieties of Capitalism Approach

The study of what one could call a capitalist variety started with Andrew Shonfield's *Modern Capitalism*, and intensified after the economic problems experienced by the Western economies in the 1970s.⁷ The fall of the Soviet Union gave an additional boost to the study of capitalist varieties. Before that, many researchers focused on comparing socialism and capitalism. Since socialism was now gone and discredited, attention naturally turned to the way capitalism worked in different countries.

The most popular perspective on capitalist diversity is the Varieties of Capitalism paradigm developed by Peter Hall and David Soskice, which focuses on two ideal types of capitalism—liberal market economies (LMEs) and coordinated market economies (CMEs)—each representing a different form of coordination. In the empirical reality, the US is closest to the LME type, while Germany and Japan are paradigmatic cases of a CME. According to Nölke and Vliegenthart,

although there are a number of comparative capitalism alternatives that propose a much larger number of types of capitalism, most authors still prefer to depart from the juxtaposition of CMEs and LMEs.⁸

This approach attributes primary importance to firms, rather than governments or labour. In providing motivation for their framework, Hall and Soskice note that they want 'to bring firms back into the centre of analysis of comparative capitalism'⁹. Accordingly, the main focus is on the problem of coordination, which arises due to firms' engagement in relational activities (with their suppliers, labour force, other firms, stakeholders, etc.). A firm's 'success depends substantially on its ability to coordinate effectively with a wide range of actors.'¹⁰ Nevertheless, there is no single way to solve these coordination problems. Hall and Soskice focus on two ideal types: in LME's, 'firms coordi-

7 Bohle, Dorothee / Greskovits, Bela: Varieties of Capitalism and Capitalism 'tout court', in: *European Journal of Sociology*, 2009 (vol. 50), no. 3, pp. 355–386.

8 Nölke, Andreas / Vliegenthart, Arjan: Enlarging the Varieties of Capitalism. The Emergence of Dependent Market Economies in East Central Europe, in: *World Politics*, 2009 (vol. 61), no. 4, pp. 670–702, here p. 670.

9 Soskice, David W. / Hall, Peter A.: An Introduction to Varieties of Capitalism, in: Soskice, David W. / Hall, Peter A. (eds.): *Varieties of Capitalism: The Institutional Foundations of Comparative Advantage*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001, pp. 1–68, here p. 4.

10 *Ibid.*, here p. 6.

nate their activities primarily via hierarchies and competitive market arrangements¹¹; in contrast, in CMEs 'firms depend more heavily on non-market relationships to coordinate their endeavours with other actors and to construct their core competencies.'¹²

Another important feature—and arguably the most innovative aspect—of the VoC approach is the focus on institutional complementarities: 'two institutions can be said to be complementary if the presence (or efficiency) of one increases returns from (or efficiency of) the other.'¹³ Hall and Soskice focus on five sub-systems (industrial relations, vocational training and education, corporate governance, inter-firm relations, relationship with employees) and demonstrate how in different capitalisms coordination problems are solved by highlighting the way different institutional spheres interact. Thus, for instance, in CMEs high employment and unemployment protection creates motivation for employees (and firms) to invest more into specific skill education and specific assets because, first, employees do not face that high a risk of being fired and, accordingly, firms face lower risks of employee 'poaching'. This is also reinforced by a specific type of investment financing—in CMEs, close relations between firms and banks ensure longer time horizons for investments. The process works quite differently in LMEs: high flexibility of labour markets and reliance on the stock market as a control mechanism imply short-term investment horizons, low motivation to invest in specific assets and specific skills (hence the drive towards general skills education).

The focus on complementarities has several important implications. First, it stresses institutional continuity and the distinctiveness of the two different types of capitalism. Therefore, globalization does not imply a simple convergence of different models of capitalism into one—quite the opposite, it only reinforces those institutional complementarities that different capitalisms already have (hence the concept of comparative institutional advantage instead of Ricardian comparative advantage). More specifically, LMEs specialize in radical innovation, while CMEs have their comparative advantage in incremental innovation. Furthermore, given institutional complementarities, there is no 'best' or 'optimal' form of capitalism, but 'hybrid' or less pure types of capitalisms are expected to perform worse than 'pure' types. In fact, both types of capitalism can be successful in terms of economic performance.

1.3. Type of Capitalism in the Baltic Countries. Close Proximity to LMEs

Recently researchers have tried to extend the VoC framework beyond Western political economies and see whether its main tenets hold in different settings and whether

11 *Ibid.*, here p. 8.

12 *Ibid.*, here p. 8.

13 *Ibid.*, here p. 17.

they help understand institutional developments and patterns. The newly emerging post-soviet capitalist systems have also been subject to this type of investigations. Before proceeding, one should state that some researchers find that it is not useful to apply Western concepts to the study of the East European institutional set-up. The 'neoclassical sociologists' argue that Eastern European capitalist systems are not sufficiently similar to the Western ones to be analysed using the same conceptual framework.¹⁴ As will be seen, certain unique features of the East European capitalisms (and the Baltic one in particular) do indeed cause problems for a straightforward application of the VoC framework.

Regarding the Baltic states, although findings have not been unequivocal, most scholars come to the conclusion that these countries—and primarily (or at least) Estonia—represent the LME type of capitalism.¹⁵ Buchen¹⁶ analyses two post-communist countries—Slovenia and Estonia—and describes them as essentially two antipodes of the paths of transition within the new EU member states. While Estonia opted for the most radical transition, Slovenia pursued a much more gradual approach—as revealed, for instance, by the nature, extent and pace of the privatization policies undertaken in these countries. While both countries could be seen as star performers amongst the new EU member countries (or at least as belonging to the best performing ones, if one considers such aspects as GDP development, corruption perception and competitiveness indices), they seem to have achieved these results in radically different ways. Subsequently, Buchen focuses on five sub-systems (institutions) first formulated by Hall and Soskice and compares Slovenia and Estonia to the ideal types of LME and CME, the empirical paradigmatic cases of the UK and Germany, as well as among themselves.

In general, Buchen finds very strong similarities between Estonia and the LME type on the one hand and Slovenia and the CME capitalism on the other. For instance, while trade union membership declined in both countries (as well as across the whole region), its fall was much more dramatic in Estonia than in Slovenia. Furthermore, in terms of social security, industrial relations, and skill education policy choices, Estonia displays remarkable similarities to the LME type.

14 Norkus, Zenonas: Lietuva tarp Estijos ir Slovėnijos, in: *Politologija*, 2008 (vol. 49), no. 1, pp. 42–84, here p. 53.

15 Feldmann, Magnus: Emerging Varieties of Capitalism in Transition Countries. Industrial Relations and Wage Bargaining in Estonia and Slovenia, in: *Comparative Political Studies*, 2006 (vol. 39), no. 7, pp. 829–854; Buchen, Clemens: Estonia and Slovenia as Antipodes, in: Lane, David / Myant, Martin (eds.): *Varieties of Capitalism in Post-Communist Countries*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007, pp. 65–89; Norkus, Zenonas: Lietuva tarp Estijos ir Slovėnijos, in: *Politologija*, 2008 (vol. 49), no. 1, pp. 42–84.

16 Buchen, Clemens: Estonia and Slovenia as Antipodes, in: Lane, David / Myant, Martin (eds.): *Varieties of Capitalism in Post-Communist Countries*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007, pp. 65–89.

Table 1-1: Comparison of Slovenia and Estonia

	Estonia (Baltic)	Slovenia
Industrial relations	Firm-level wage setting, accompanied by weak unions and employers organizations; low employee loyalty	Industry-wide wage bargaining; unions and employers strongly cohesive; neocorporatism is a formal practice
Corporate governance	Neither a pure shareholder nor a perfect stakeholder approach	Stakeholder approach to corporate governance with insiders and state influence
Inter-firm relations	No significant attempts at cooperation 'beyond the market'	Trust necessary for inter-firm cooperation still low, but institutional structure supports inter-firm relations
Social security systems	Policy of very low replacement rates and expenditures similar to LMEs in the 1990s, although somewhat higher later Duration of benefits same as in the UK	Built CME-like system with a generous replacement rate, relatively high overall expenditures, and a long maximum duration of payments
Vocational training	Abolishing older vocational education systems, movement towards general skills education	Introduction of a dual system of apprenticeships, similar to the German one

Sources: Buchen, Clemens: *Estonia and Slovenia as Antipodes*, in: Lane, David / Myant, Martin (eds.): *Varieties of Capitalism in Post-Communist Countries*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007, pp. 65–89; Norkus, Zenonas: *Lietuva tarp Estijos ir Slovėnijos*, in: *Politologija*, 2008 (vol. 49), no. 1, pp. 42–84.

Norkus has applied an essentially similar strategy in order to place the Lithuanian type of capitalism in a comparative context. Norkus generally confirms Buchen's findings on Estonia and even provides some more details—for instance, he includes a measure for employee loyalty and demonstrates that it is the lowest in Estonia (and Lithuania) among the new EU member countries, while it is highest in Slovenia.¹⁷ Besides, employment duration is also much lower in Lithuania and Estonia compared to Slovenia. Overall, Norkus concludes that Lithuania essentially belongs to the same type as Estonia. In fact, with regard to some measures (for instance, liberalism of industrial relations), Lithuania is even more 'liberal' than Estonia, although it deviates more from the ideal-LME in other dimensions (for instance, financial development and social security), and apparently represents a less pure LME type than Estonia does.

Buchen and Norkus discuss additional observations that corroborate their conclusions about the Baltic capitalisms as LMEs. First, as already mentioned, both Estonia and Slovenia have achieved good results in terms of economic development, employment

¹⁷ Norkus, Zenonas: *Lietuva tarp Estijos ir Slovėnijos*, in: *Politologija*, 2008 (vol. 49), no. 1, pp. 42–84, here p. 58.

and competitiveness. Furthermore, Estonia was more successful than Lithuania. This is consistent with the VoC prediction concerning the efficiency of 'pure' types of capitalism due to the effects of institutional complementarities and, conversely, worse results in the case of less coherent types. Second, Estonia (and Lithuania) on the one hand and Slovenia on the other are developing distinct comparative advantages. Buchen writes that 'Slovenian trade figures reveal a comparative advantage in typical CME-sectors, such as road vehicles, electric machinery and rubber manufacturing.'¹⁸ Estonia, on the other hand, had comparative disadvantages in exactly these sectors. A related point further strengthening these conclusions are FDI patterns. While Slovenia attracted FDI mainly into manufacturing, Estonia primarily received such flows in financial intermediation and real estate sectors. These observations are also consistent with the VoC predictions concerning different institutional comparative advantages that give basis for the development of different comparative trade advantages.

The very same scholars that characterized Baltic capitalisms as LMEs also recognize certain problems, however. First, while with regard to many dimensions (sub-systems) Baltic countries do remind of the LME type, there is one area where there are striking differences, namely corporate governance. In discussing this sub-system, Buchen breaks it down into three dimensions: ownership structure, management, and representation of stakeholders. Regarding the first two dimensions, Estonia departs strongly from the LME ideal type.

Table 1-2: Corporate Governance in Estonia and the UK

Estonia	UK
<i>Ownership structure</i>	
largest voting block very big; considerable foreign ownership, declining insider ownership	largest voting block rather small; overall dispersed
<i>Management</i>	
Two-tier board structure with management and supervisory board	One-tier management board
<i>Representation of stakeholders</i>	
Voluntary	Voluntary

Source: Buchen, Clemens: *Estonia and Slovenia as Antipodes*, in: Lane, David / Myant, Martin (eds.): *Varieties of Capitalism in Post-Communist Countries*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007, pp. 65–89, here p. 73.

A related point is the fact that financial systems in the Baltic countries are very underdeveloped in comparison to the Western LMEs, but also the Western CMEs (although Estonia has one of the highest stock market capitalization rates among the new EU member states). This is especially true in terms of stock market development (capitalization and liquidity), while on credit-to-GDP ratio the Baltic countries have been

18 Buchen, Clemens: *Estonia and Slovenia as Antipodes*, in: Lane, David / Myant, Martin (eds.): *Varieties of Capitalism in Post-Communist Countries*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007, pp. 65–89, here p. 81.

catching up lately, as they experienced rapid credit booms in the pre-crisis period. Furthermore, other related indicators of stock market liquidity present a similar picture.

Besides, the ownership structure in the Baltic countries is very different from LMEs, to quote Norkus:

In Estonia, and especially Lithuania, a very popular legal corporate form is the private company, whose owners are also managers (directors). Such a company's stocks are not traded on the stock market, and 'outsiders' cannot purchase its stock. In this regard, post-communist capitalism is different from both the LME 'stockholders' capitalism, where corporate control over managers is ensured by the threat of 'hostile takeover' and managers aim to improve their positions on the managers' labour market, and from CME 'stakeholders capitalism', where managers supervision is carried out by banks that have enough human resources to competently fulfil this function.¹⁹

It is possible to add further insights to this observation. The table below reveals that the Baltic countries (especially Estonia) distinguish themselves in terms of importance of small and medium enterprises (SME) in the economy. They surpass all the new EU member states in terms of employment and share of value added by SME (with the only exception that Slovenia scores higher than Lithuania in terms of value added). In fact, the Baltic countries have the highest share of SME in non-financial business employment and value added in the whole EU, as Table 1-3 demonstrates.

Table 1-3: SME Share of Employment and Value Added

	Number of persons employed	Value added
Bulgaria	72.6	53.2
Czech Republic	68.9	56.7
Estonia	78.1	75.1
Latvia	75.6	71.1
Lithuania	72.9	58.5
Hungary	70.9	50.2
Poland	69.8	48.4
Romania	60.8	48.4
Slovenia	66.4	60.6
Slovakia	54.0	44.5
Germany	60.6	53.2
UK	54.0	51.0
EU-27	67.1	57.6

Source: Schmiemann, Mangred: *Enterprises by Size Class. Overview of SMEs in the EU*, Eurostat—Statistics in Focus, 2008, no. 31, http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY_OFFPUB/KS-SF-08-031/EN/KS-SF-08-031-EN.PDF

The second problem when characterizing Baltic countries as LMEs is the fact that they, just as the other new EU member states, are importers, and not exporters, of capital.

19 Norkus, Zenonas: Lietuva tarp Estijos ir Slovėnijos, in: *Politologija*, 2008 (vol. 49), no. 1, pp. 42–84, here p. 70.

This point is related to the wider issue of the Baltic states economic underdevelopment and the lack of innovation capacity. One should remember that the LME and CME types were formulated based on the reality of developed Western developed economies. For instance, what should one make of the division in terms of innovation types between CMEs and LMEs (incremental vs. radical innovation) in countries that hardly innovate at all? Norkus himself recognizes this:

countries of medium development (leaving undeveloped countries aside) are not able to compete in the sophisticated technology diffusion process as creators and exporters of radically new technologies.²⁰

Furthermore, regarding comparative advantage, the Baltic countries are not exporting high-technology goods, but focusing on services, resource- and unskilled-labour intensive products (agricultural goods, timber, textiles, furniture with low value added).

Finally, with regard to important dimensions (social protection) the Baltic countries are actually more liberal than the Western LMEs. For instance, unemployment benefits as percentage of GDP stand at 0.17 in the UK and only 0.02 in Estonia.²¹ Knell and Srholec use a factor analysis to arrive at a typology of post-communist capitalisms based on the level of coordination in the economy (the level of coordination is broken down into three components: level of social cohesion; labour market regulation; business regulation).²² Interestingly, all three Baltic countries and especially Estonia are found to be more 'liberal' in terms of social cohesion than the United Kingdom, and Estonia surpasses the US, while Latvia and Lithuania are essentially on par with the latter. While on labour market regulation the Baltic countries get much more liberal scores than the UK and the US, one must bear in mind that formal labour market regulation in the Baltic countries is not indicative of the true situation—in fact, labour markets in the Baltic countries are very liberal and flexible, as witnessed, for instance, during the last crisis when salaries decreased substantially (as will be described below). Finally, regarding business regulation, the Baltic countries are in between the UK and the US—here one must stress that this index includes stock market capitalization relative to the banking sector in the economy, which naturally decreases the liberality of the Baltic score.

The above-mentioned authors have tried to address these concerns. Their main argument is that the Baltic countries are currently immature LMEs—they do not yet have all the model's characteristics. In Norkus' words, it was simply impossible to

²⁰ Ibid., here p. 73.

²¹ Buchen, Clemens: *Estonia and Slovenia as Antipodes*, in: Lane, David / Myant, Martin (eds.): *Varieties of Capitalism in Post-Communist Countries*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007, pp. 65–89, here p. 78.

²² Knell, Mark / Srholec, Martin: *Diverging Pathways in Central and Eastern Europe*, in: Lane, David / Myant, Martin (eds.): *Varieties of Capitalism in Post-Communist Countries*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007, pp. 40–64.

reform all sub-systems at once. This is why Buchen and Norkus focus on general trends of convergence, also taking into account certain legacies from the Socialist past. For instance, while Estonia has a relatively high employment protection level as a legacy of the Soviet regime, it has declined over time. Taking this perspective, one should expect further convergence of the Baltic models towards the LME type. Therefore, Norkus interprets the recent reforms in Lithuania (pensions and higher education) as well as the development of credit as signs of convergence towards the LME type—presumably to better serve its functional requirements.

Are these arguments convincing? There are some serious doubts about this. First and foremost, given the lack of a fundamental feature—highly developed financial markets and related forms of ownership—it is doubtful whether one can still describe the Baltic countries as LMEs (even if immature). Based on exactly this point—the very low stock market capitalization levels—David Lane argues that ‘one might conclude that the stock market as a coordinator of the economy (in Hall and Soskice’s terms) can be ruled out for all the post-socialist societies.’²³ Furthermore, there are doubts as to whether the Baltic countries are simply displaying incongruent institutions and are along the way of eliminating these incongruencies to converge onto the LME type. Take the case of comparative advantage, for instance—there is no long-term trend that would show the Baltic countries moving out of their current comparative advantages into more complex products and developing innovation capacities.²⁴

1.4. Baltic Variety of Capitalism

Given what has been said, is it possible to formulate an alternative interpretation? Could we describe the Baltic countries as representing a distinct model of capitalism—i.e. neither LME nor CME and neither a ‘bastard’ or ‘hybrid’ type? One should proceed carefully with such an exercise, of course: there is a danger of an excessive multiplication of different capitalisms (finally one could even end up with as many capitalisms as there are countries, which would hardly serve any analytical purposes). Nölke and Vliegenthart laid out the following conditions:

In order to qualify as a distinct variety of capitalism, three conditions have to be met: (1) the existence of an alternative overall economic coordination mechanism closely related to (2) a relatively stable set of institutions based on marked institutional complementarities, that leads to (3) a set of specific comparative advantages (in relationship to CME

23 Lane, David: *Post-State Socialism. A Diversity of Capitalisms?*, in: Lane, David / Myant, Martin (eds.): *Varieties of Capitalism in Post-Communist Countries*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007, pp. 13–39, here p. 24.

24 Bohle, Dorothee / Greskovits, Bela: *Neoliberalism, Embedded Neoliberalism and Neocorporatism. Towards Transnational Capitalism in Central-Eastern Europe*, in: *West European Politics*, 2007 (vol. 30), no. 3, pp. 443–466.

and LME) and a superior economic performance over comparable, but less pure, socio-economic systems.²⁵

Here, it is useful to briefly summarize Nölke's and Vliegenthart's investigation. They propose to conceptualize the Visegrad countries (Czech Republic, Slovakia, Poland, Hungary) as representing a different variety of capitalism—namely dependent market economies, or DMEs. In their words, 'the common denominator of the third variety is the fundamental dependence of the ECE economies on investment decisions by transnational corporations.'²⁶ In DMEs, the primary method of coordination is hierarchical decision-making by TNCs. Based on the functional needs and preferences of TNCs, Nölke and Vliegenthart show how different elements of DMEs fit together: corporate governance reflects the hierarchical nature of TNC-subsidiary relationship; industrial relation regimes are not entirely liberal (to ensure certain level of employee loyalty and satisfaction), but not as cohesive as in CMEs due to the preference for low labour costs; innovation activities are also heavily controlled by TNCs. Overall, Nölke and Vliegenthart seek to stress the fact that DMEs are not simply bastard types or converging to either CME or LME. Instead, they represent a more or less stable model with its own coordination mechanism, internal logics and distinct comparative advantage—'an assembly platform for semistandardized industrial goods'²⁷.

What is the logic of the Baltic model? The first thing to note is that the Baltic countries do not represent the DME-type either. While there are certain similarities (notably, high dependence on foreign capital and a relatively high share of foreign ownership), on many dimensions the Baltic countries are different. First, employment and unemployment protection levels are much lower, industrial relations are much more liberal, skills are oriented towards general knowledge (this is exactly the reason why the Baltic countries were characterized as LMEs). Furthermore, in contrast to Visegrad DMEs, the Baltic countries do not have a comparative advantage in the assembly of semi-industrial goods. David Lane notes that all three Baltic countries had a medium share of primary products in their exports. On the contrary, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary along with Slovenia were the only four countries that had 'low primary exports similar to the profiles of high-income industrialized countries'²⁸.

The main elements of the Baltic model are the following: comparative advantage in services, manufacturing of non-complex, resource or unskilled labour-inten-

25 Nölke, Andreas / Vliegenthart, Arjan: Enlarging the Varieties of Capitalism. The Emergence of Dependent Market Economies in East Central Europe, in *World Politics*, 2009 (vol. 61), no. 4, pp. 670–702, here p. 676.

26 *Ibid.*, here p. 676.

27 *Ibid.*, here p. 676.

28 Lane, David: *Post-State Socialism. A Diversity of Capitalisms?*, in: Lane, David / Myant, Martin (eds.): *Varieties of Capitalism in Post-Communist Countries*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007, pp. 13–39, here p. 29.