співпраці та взаємодії вплив на обраних областях діяльності компанії, є істотним. У статті представлені результати емпіричного із посиланням на це питання.
Ключові слова: співпраця, взаємодія, промислові підприємства.
SUMMARY
It is possible to say that company cooperation with other companies is a core distinctive competency for business success and has a very big influence on their activity. Thanks to them firms can optimize the resource usage and production capacity, improve the quality, shorten the production cycles as well as improve the profitability. Thus, it should be underlined that the cooperation and collaboration have a positive influence on many areas of the company's functionality. They improve its competitive position and allow creation of the adequate strategy enabling achievement of targets which would be difficult to achieve in autonomic activity. That's why the research concerning cooperation and collaboration impact on the chosen areas of company activity, is essential. The paper presents the empirical results with the reference to this issue.
Key words: cooperation, collaboration, industrial enterprise.

RETHINKING FDI-BASED DEVELOPMENT IN THE POST-GLOBAL CRISIS ERA

Ozturk Ibragim, Marmara University, Professor, Istanbul , Turkey

I. CHANGING DESTINATION OF FDI

In the post-global crisis era, countries positioned to take greater advantage from foreign investment activity in 2010 are largely from emerging economies, with the 'BRIC+T' nations (Brazil, Russia, India, China, Turkey) performing "particularly well." Their three most prominent assets for foreign investors include an "attractive combination of **market growth, improved availability of skills and competitive cost levels."** For the first time on record, the four BRIC countries--together with the U.S. and its largest single consumer market--comprise the top five destination countries for foreign investment.
It seems that this newer trend will continue in the future. Is this a good or bad news?

II. FDI, GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT

In the past several decades since 1960, the inflow of foreign direct investment (FDI) and the growth of multinational enterprise (MNE) activities have increasingly been regarded as one of the defining characteristics of the world economy and an **engine of economic growth** in developing countries such as Turkey.
In that regard, MNE-related externalities have been attracting increased interest from developing countries because of the perceived benefits in terms of the **injection of capital, technology and knowledge, as well as the potential generation of economic growth in host countries.** Key MNE externalities include the **knowledge spillovers and linkages** from multinationals (MNEs) to domestic firms in host countries. The nature of these MNE externalities may either arise from pure market transactions (e.g., through MNE vertical linkages) or else through knowledge spillovers which take non-market or nonmonetary form.
The less developed a country is, the greater the need for such MNE externalities, as a means to alleviate resource and skill constraints normally associated with underdevelopment. Developing countries actively seek FDI to strengthen industrial competitiveness and enhance their growth prospects.
As a result, developing country attitudes towards FDI have changed, with dramatic improvements in the FDI policy regimes. Governments in developing countries have not only reduced barriers to FDI but have also been offering special incentives to attract foreign firms and foster relationships between MNEs and local firms.

III. HOME COUNTRY EXPECTATIONS / DETERMINANTS OF FDI

Through FDI, foreign investors benefit from utilizing their firm-specific assets and resources efficiently, such as technology and managerial know-how. Foreign companies are motivated by a whole range of factors.
Here are the basic stylized facts about FDI

1. **Attractive combination of growth,**
2. **Improved availability of skills and**
3. **Competitive cost levels.**

Secondary factors

4. Political stability,
5. Economy's degree of openness, accessibility,
6. Ease of currency conversion, repatriation of profits,
7. Infrastructure,
8. Availability of natural resources,
9. Level of education, quality of human capital,
10. Macro economic factors: fiscal deficit, inflation, trade openness, etc.
11. Socio-political stability and favorable business operating conditions.

IV. HOST COUNTRY EXPECTATIONS

As a **catch-up mechanism**, FDI's role in narrowing the gap in production technology and marketing techniques between developing and developed countries.

1. Access to capital to finance growth
2. Acquiring advanced technology,
3. Managerial expertise,
4. Employment and productivity,
5. Human resource development,
6. Global marketing networks,
7. Best-practice systems of corporate governance,
8. Export diversification and gain of foreing currency,

V. EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE ON THE POTENTIAL BENEFITS OF FDI

WIN-WIN STRATEGY? It is a '**Yes-but' paradigm**! Its quality and fairness is conditional upon…..Anyway, the bulk of pie goes to home country.
YES.....Inventory of potential FDI contributions to a host economy

1. L**earning curve effect**,
2. **Productivity spillovers**,
3. **Exports catch up** with the quality frontier,
4. **Higher unit values** due to multinationals' superior technology and marketing techniques.

Warning: However, there is no evidence of FDI increasing the similarity between the developing and the high-income export structure.

5. **Higher-quality inputs** to local suppliers. So, FDI may benefit indigenous producers of final goods and allow them to upgrade their exports.
6. **Welfare effect:** Brings new products, improved quality, and/or lower prices to consumers in the host country.
7. Provides **additional resources** (capital, technology, and management) to raise the level of domestic output.
8. Provides technologies, management techniques, and quality control processes that potentially allow the host economy to undertake completely **novel activities**,
9. Allow local firms to engage in existing activities more efficiently and offer better/cheaper goods to consumers or inputs to producers to penetrate international markets and earn foreign exchange and/or allow competitive
10. Allows substitution of imports.

BUT.....these benefits depend on the **conditions of the host economy**, e.g.

1. Level of domestic investment/savings,
2. Mode of entry (merger & acquisitions or Greenfield (new) investments),
3. Sector involved,
4. Country's ability to regulate foreign investment.
5. Degree of openness (that not protected or sheltered from competition.)

OPENNES AND COMPETITION: This is because, FDI in protected markets does not meets expectations. The term "**tariff jumping investment**," which might imply replication of plants of similar size and sophistication across borders, does not adequately capture the dissimilarities in management and production processes. **For both economic and technological reasons, attracting foreign investment to serve a protected local market failed to serve as an effective infant industry strategy.** FDI that was oriented toward protected domestic markets and prevented from being integrated into the parent's global sourcing network by mandatory joint venture and domestic content requirements would not have such a positive effect.

CASE STUDIES:

It should be noted that there have not been so many cases since the 1970s that countries developed via FDI-MNE activities.

JAPAN, SOUTH KOREA, TURKEY: WHAT DOES HISTORY TELL US?

FDI in Japanese and Korean Development: Amount insignificant, with maximum effectiveness

CASE-I: JAPAN

The amount of foreign capital invested directly in Japan from 1899 to 1931 was not large. It is not radically different even today.

FDI flows into Japan have surged since the latter half of the 1990s. From 1990 to 1996, direct investment in Japan hovered at an average of $1 billion annually. This figure reached the $3 billion mark in 1997 and came to $12.7 billion in 1999 (on a balance of payments basis). This inflow has since decreased, but is still at a high level compared to past years - around $6 billion to $9 billion per year through 2004.

The recent rise in inward FDI since 2003 is driven by several factors:

Deregulation of state and private sectors,

Foreign acquisitions of companies because of corporate bankruptcies

Changing legal framework supporting mergers and acquisitions.

Decline in cross-shareholding has put more shares on the market;

The global push to reorganize industries encourages entry into Japan by foreign firms;

The yen's appreciation makes Japanese assets more attractive.

However, the impact in terms of learning curve effect was very great indeed. It is clear that foreign direct investment:

Participated in and stimulated a broad range of business endeavor, often employing advanced methods,

Provided valuable knowledge about western technology and management practice,

Affected the internal economic geography.

Despite the low realization of FDI, case study evidence shows that foreign firms helped to develop such strategic industries as semiconductors and to raise productivity through the transfer of technology and managerial know-how. The case of Deming, guru of brand and productivity management, at around 1960s is a case in this topics.

CASE-II: KOREA

Throughout Korea's economic development, FDI has played a negligible role. Even in 1996, FDI accounted for less than 1 percent of total domestic fixed capital formation in Korea, far less than in the Southeast Asian countries. Case study evidence shows, however, that despite its quantitative insignificance FDI has had a significant impact on the quality of Korean economic development by spinning out skilled workers and managers and through technical guidance of subcontractors.

In a world of trade barriers and amidst the Cold War, they succeeded in putting certain conditionalities on FDI inflows so as to guarantee the benefits of FDI. Also, rather than attracting FDI, these countries preferred to learn from foreign experts and then indigenize it. Lastly, they kept their national saving rate as high as possible, at around no less then 30 percent of their gross domestic product (GDP).

Japan and Korea: temporary preference for barrowing, limited amount of capital resources were channeled to industries vital to long-term economic growth. Emphasis on learning curve effect from foreign experts.

In the 1980s, however, annual average FDI in Korea increased from US$ lOO million to over $800 million. Following a contraction that lasted until 1993, FDI resumed an upward trend, reaching $3 billion in 1997 and a record $5.1 billion in 1998.

For the sectoral distribution of FDI inflow into Korea, the manufacturing sector was the largest recipient during the early liberalization period, absorbing 67.4 percent of total inward FDI during 1962-86. This trend continued until 1993,when the share of the manufacturing sector exceeded 65 percent of total FDI inflow. The share of manufacturing as a percentage of total FDI has remained at approximately 55 percent since 1996.

More investment took place in the heavy and chemical industries. Since the mid-l980s, FDI in labor-intensive and low-technology industries, such as textiles and clothing, has fallen significantly because of the rise in labor costs.

Instead, the electrical and electronics sector and transport equipment and chemicals are receiving increased amounts of foreign investment. Since 1997, foreign food companies increased their investment in Korea by acquiring domestic food companies and their distribution networks.

The composition of FDI in the service sector has also changed. The hotel business used to be the largest subsector in terms of cumulated FDI up to the early 1990s. Since the mid-I990s, FDI in wholesale and retail trade as well as financing and insurance increased remarkably.

Despite the small amount of FDI in Korea relative to the size of its economy, it was foreign firms that brought the key technology and constructed the basis for such industries as electronics and pharmaceuticals. For example, subsidiaries of foreign semiconductor firms contributed to the growth of domestic firms into major players in the world market by spinning out skilled workers and managers as well as through technical guidance to subcontractors, bringing in new capital goods and technology, introducing advanced management know-how, conducting in-house R&D, and enhancing competition.

CASE-III TURKEY: QUA VADIS?

Let's study the case of Turkey. The country has opened its markets to foreign competition and FDI inflows partly since 1980s, particularly since the early 2000s. By attracting FDI, Turkey expects to finance its development, create employment, direct local production to export markets, transfer technology and so on. As of 2006-2008, Turkey succeeded in attracting $15-20 billion in FDI per annum and has become one of the top 17 recipient countries. Since 2002, Turkey has attracted almost 80 billion dollars of FDI as of 2011. The score in 2011 is over 10 billion dollars.

We can argue that in the last decade, Turkey has been successful in attracting FDI when compared to 1990s, when Turkey lagged behind other emerging countries in terms of the volume and quality of FDI inflows. On the other hand, comparatively speaking, Turkey has been still behind most of other emerging market economies since 2002.

Side effects of FDI inflows in Turkey:

First of all, main characteristics of FDI are that the bulk of inflows go to privatization projects of state enterprises, finance, retail and real estate sectors, and finally to manufacturing. As of today, the bulk of FDI goes to already working sectors rather than to the green field investments. Therefore employment creation effect is weak.

Second, it seems that FDI inflows have substituted for domestic savings, rather than strengthening it, and that therefore the domestic saving rate has declined to well below 15 percent of GDP. While short-term credit based consumption rose sharply recently, the current low level of domestic savings fails to finance the gross fixed capital formation at some 23-25 percent of GDP. It is not surprising, therefore, that, as the saving-investment gap widens, Turkey's current account deficit (CAD) rises exponentially as well.

FDI and sectoral composition in Turkey (2002-2010)

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Agriculture	0	1	6	7	6	9	41	49	78
Industry	165	539	329	829	2.100	5.116	5.174	3.778	3.082
Mining	2	13	73	40	122	337	151	89	195
Manufacturing	95	440	190	785	1.866	4.211	3.955	1.565	874
Food and related industry	14	249	78	68	608	766	1.252	196	149
Paper and related industries	0	0	11	23	52	60	64	92	17
Chemicals	8	9	38	174	601	1.109	200	339	102
Machine tools	13	16	6	13	54	48	226	223	64
Transportation equipments	34	145	27	106	63	70	77	233	39
Electricity and gas	68	86	66	4	112	568	1.068	2.124	2.040
Services	406	156	855	7.699	15.533	14.012	9.532	2.423	3.198
Construction	0	8	3	80	222	285	336	208	384
Wholesale and retail	75	58	72	68	1.166	165	2.085	389	324
Logistics, comm., and transp.	1	1	639	3.285	6.696	1.117	170	382	204
Finance	246	51	69	4.018	6.957	11.662	6.069	497	1603
Real estate	0	3	3	29	99	560	641	560	298
Health and social sectors	4	21	35	74	265	177	149	101	114
Total	571	696	1.190	8.535	17.639	19.137	14.733	6.001	6.415

Third, export implication of FDI led import penetration into Turkish markets is much stronger. In order to export 100 units of goods, Turkey has to carry out at least 80 units in average. This rate increases in high-tech sectors while decreases in labor intensive, low value added sectors. In Turkey's major export sectors such as automobile, consumer electronics, Turkey has been in net deficit position. Turkey's export surplus is still coming from labor intensive garment, textile sectors. A domestic based, classical industry, where wages are low, social security is weak and unregistered economy is wide.

The fourth and worst news is that, after a decade of efforts to attract FDI, the share of high-tech in Turkey's overall export remains just at some 3 percent. Medium-tech technologies at some 30 percent, the remaining share of export comprises low tech products, in which Turkey is a price taker and therefore has to accept very low returns under global competition. Horizontal technology transfer is quite weak whereas vertical transfer is quite sufficient in order to increase the quality of supply from the local subsidiaries of MNES.

VI. TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER

Two ways in which FDI transfers technology to the host-country based firms is via MNE **backward linkages**, and **labor mobility**. There are several ways in which technology flows occur, either through arms-length means (such as through licensing) or through trade in intermediate goods, plant and equipment or even products or services should possess a minimum threshold stock of knowledge that will allow it to absorb MNE externalities.

With regard to **backward linkages and spillovers**, MNEs generally avoids horizontal **technology transfer**, insisting upon whole or majority ownership of their plants to keep what they called "leakage" of technology and management procedures to a minimum.

In the **vertical direction**, however, they worked closely with suppliers in the host country (foreign-owned and indigenously owned suppliers) to increase those suppliers' productivity, ensure low rejection rates for their inputs, generate lower prices, improve management, and build team spirit.

At the macro level, high growth countries may attract more FDI as opposed to FDI causing this high growth. If this is the case, the coefficients on cross-section estimates are likely to overstate the positive impact of foreign investment. As a result, one might find evidence of positive externalities from foreign investment where no externalities do occur.

For developing countries, these studies find no indication of the existence of positive horizontal externalities. Conclude that the effects are mostly negative. An explanation for this result might be that **MNEs minimize technology leakages to competitors while simultaneously tend to improve the productivity of suppliers by transferring knowledge to them.** This argument points to the notion that if FDI were to generate spillovers, **they are more likely to be vertical rather than horizontal in nature (not in the same sector).**

Simply speaking, we want to transfer, they want to protect…

VII. WHAT SHOULD / COULD BE DONE?

A) Regulation of investment

Regulation is only as effective as a country's ability to enforce it. The cost of implementation may be prohibitive for many countries. Hence

(i) Bilateral and multilateral support, alongside multi-stakeholder participation, is vital for the formulation of such agreements.

(ii) **Rule-based, non-discriminatory policy**: National legislation can support better investment security for local markets, fair competition and corporate responsibility through defining equitable, secure, non-discriminatory, and transparent investment practices.

(iii) Ethical and socially responsible FDI can be encouraged through national, bilateral and international investment guidelines and regulation e.g. consumer rights, information provision, commercial probity, labor standards and corporate culture.

(**Warning:** Whilst there is concern that increased regulation could deter new foreign investors, there is evidence, such as in Eastern Europe, that tighter regulation of corporate, environmental and labor standards has not affected FDI growth.)

B) National Capacity building

*** STRATEGY AND FOCUS REQUIRED**: Sectors targeted by investment promotion agencies receive on average more than twice as much FDI inflows than non-targeted sectors.

Inter-firm linkages represent a good basis for **knowledge spillovers**.

Linkages could be motivated via market size, local content regulations, the size and technological capability of local firms.

Government policies foster MNE vertical linkages via **procurement strategies** of foreign affiliates as well as the manner with which local sourcing increases in intensity over time.

Labor mobility in tech. transfer: This depends on the type of training given to the labor force as well as to labor mobility. That is, absorptive capacity is a determinant factor to FDI impact at the host country level.

(i) FDI tends to increase output growth through higher productivity in technological leader countries and through capital accumulation in technological laggards.
(ii) FDI is an important vehicle for transferring technology and higher growth only when the host country has a minimum threshold level of development in their location factors, inter alia in the level of human capital, physical infrastructure, financial markets,
(iii) policies favoring free trade and education are adopted to encourage export oriented FDI.

prior to be able to internalize the associated benefits of FDI.

C) Absorptive capacity in economic units corresponds to the appropriate supply of **human capital and technological capability** to be able to generate new technologies and consequently use productive resources efficiently.

It includes the **ability to search and select the most appropriate technology** to be assimilated from existing ones available, as well as the activities associated with creating new knowledge.

Absorptive capacity also reflects the ability of economic agents to **integrate the existing and exploitable resources**-technological opportunities – into the production chain, and the foresight to anticipate potential and relevant technological trajectories.

Knowledge accumulation requires the simultaneous presence of **institutions and economic (f)actors** that determine the stock of knowledge in a given location and the efficient use of markets and hierarchies – be they intra-firm, intra-industry or intra-country.

This knowledge is not costless and must be accumulated over time. Hence, **while physical and human capital are necessary conditions for catching-up, the lack of appropriate incentives for production and investment can hinder the success of the technological upgrading.**

An increasingly significant factor in influencing MNE location decisions is the presence of sophisticated, created assets (in the form of developed human capital and domestic firms' technological capabilities) in host countries.

Therefore, public authorities and researchers alike must pay careful attention to the **policy context** within which FDI occurs, to determine whether the investment projects are likely to prove beneficial—or detrimental—to development.

can be promoted by fostering credit/loans and capacity building programs to improve their bargaining power.

Intellectual property right agreements between host countries and foreign investors can also be strengthened to ensure domestic technology transfer and skills development are better incorporated.

VIII. CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

Empirical evidences suggest that

1. **Contribution from FDI in not guaranteed.**
2. **It is *conditional* upon several factors.**
3. **Today it we can benefit from FDI but it is not obviously a *sine qua non-condition* of development.**
4. **Still *domestic factors are defining* in the use and benefit of FDI.**

МЕХАНИЗМЫ ИНФОРМАТИЗАЦИИ УПРАВЛЕНИЯ ЦЕПЯМИ ПОСТАВОК ПРОДУКЦИИ

Омельченко А.В., аспирант, ДонНУ [1]

Масштабная интеграция и новые формы сотрудничества в рамках цепей поставок ориентированы главным образом на сетевые бизнес-структуры, стратегический сорсинг и виртуализацию процессов управления. Эти главенствующие принципы сетевой экономики формируют новые целевые установки и методы интегрированной логистики.

Проблемам развития сетевого и, в том числе, электронного бизнеса посвящены работы известных зарубежных и отечественных учёных, таки как Б. Аникин, Д. Бауэрсокс, Л. Бляхман, А. Канчавели, А. Колобов, М. Окландер, В. Омельченко, М. Постан, Н. Чухрай и др.

Однако, ряду проблем, связанных в частности, с повышением роли информационных посредников в управлении цепями поставок в современных условиях уделяется мало внимания как в зарубежной, так и в отечественной научной литературе. Это подчёркивает важность и актуальность рассматриваемых в данной статье вопросов.

Необходимо подчеркнуть, что в современных условиях возрастает роль информации как экономического ресурса, а управление информационными потоками во многом определяет эффективность всей цепи поставок.

Прямое отношение к усложнению товарообменных операций имеет использование предприятиями информационных технологий и иных, в том числе сопряженных с ними, инновационных решений.

Следует отметить, что применение технических средств коммуникаций открывает новые перспективы для интеграции предприятий, а также позволяет выходить на новые, более сложного уровня товарные обмены, характеризующиеся активностью значительного числа участников. Для примера можно сослаться на такую гибридную форму интеграции, как «виртуальная» корпорация. Виртуальная корпорация (предприятие) представляет сетевую компьютерно-интегрированную организационно-производственную структуру, состоящую из неоднородных компонентов, расположенных в различных местах.

Таблица 1 иллюстрирует тот факт, что в отечественной экономике сеть Интернет недостаточно задействована для связи с поставщиками и потребителями. Обрабатывающая промышленность в этом вопросе более продвинута: около 90% ее предприятий используют эту сеть, причем 40% - в равной степени для размещения заказов на поставки и получения заказов. Однако в 2011 году лишь около 50% предприятий обрабатывающей промышленности имели веб-сайты, что, несомненно, ограничивает их коммуникации, а, значит, и возможности интеграции. [1]

Таблица 1

Число организаций, использовавших сеть Интернет для связи с поставщиками и потребителями товаров (% от общего числа организаций) [1]

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Для связи с поставщиками товаров (работ, услуг) по целям:					
Получение сведений о товарах (работах, услугах)	29,1	34,5	38,7	42,1	48,1
Предоставление сведений о потребностях организации в товарах (работах, услугах)	17,5	22,7	26,2	28,9	32,2
Размещение заказов на товары (работы, услуги)	16,3	20,5	24,1	25,3	28,8
Оплата поставляемых товаров (работ, услуг)	7,9	10,5	13,6	15,5	18,7
Получение электронной продукции	13,4	14,7	16,5	18,2	19,6
Для связи с потребителями товаров (работ, услуг) по целям:					
Предоставление сведений об организации, её товарах	20,3	22,6	25,2	27,8	31,3