

**Privatization, State  
Capitalism, and State  
Ownership of Business in  
the 21<sup>st</sup> Century**

**Other titles in Foundations and Trends® in Finance**

*Executive Compensation*

Raghavendra Rau

ISBN: 978-1-68083-296-9

*Three Branches of Theories of Financial Crises*

Itay Goldstein and Assaf Razin

ISBN: 978-1-68083-084-2

*The Economics and Finance of Hedge Funds: A Review of the Academic Literature*

Vikas Agarwal, Kevin A. Mullally, and Narayan Y. Naik

ISBN: 978-1-68083-156-6

# Privatization, State Capitalism, and State Ownership of Business in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century

---

**William L. Megginson**

Professor and Price Chair in Finance

University of Oklahoma

Saudi Aramco Chair Professor in Finance

King Fahd University of Petroleum & Minerals

[wmegginson@ou.edu](mailto:wmegginson@ou.edu)

**now**

the essence of knowledge

Boston — Delft

# Foundations and Trends® in Finance

*Published, sold and distributed by:*

now Publishers Inc.  
PO Box 1024  
Hanover, MA 02339  
United States  
Tel. +1-781-985-4510  
www.nowpublishers.com  
sales@nowpublishers.com

*Outside North America:*

now Publishers Inc.  
PO Box 179  
2600 AD Delft  
The Netherlands  
Tel. +31-6-51115274

The preferred citation for this publication is

W. L. Megginson. *Privatization, State Capitalism, and State Ownership of Business in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. Foundations and Trends® in Finance, vol. 11, no. 1–2, pp. 1–153, 2017.

ISBN: 978-1-68083-339-3

© 2017 W. L. Megginson

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission of the publishers.

Photocopying. In the USA: This journal is registered at the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc., 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923. Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use, or the internal or personal use of specific clients, is granted by now Publishers Inc for users registered with the Copyright Clearance Center (CCC). The 'services' for users can be found on the internet at: [www.copyright.com](http://www.copyright.com)

For those organizations that have been granted a photocopy license, a separate system of payment has been arranged. Authorization does not extend to other kinds of copying, such as that for general distribution, for advertising or promotional purposes, for creating new collective works, or for resale. In the rest of the world: Permission to photocopy must be obtained from the copyright owner. Please apply to now Publishers Inc., PO Box 1024, Hanover, MA 02339, USA; Tel. +1 781 871 0245; [www.nowpublishers.com](http://www.nowpublishers.com); [sales@nowpublishers.com](mailto:sales@nowpublishers.com)

now Publishers Inc. has an exclusive license to publish this material worldwide. Permission to use this content must be obtained from the copyright license holder. Please apply to now Publishers, PO Box 179, 2600 AD Delft, The Netherlands, [www.nowpublishers.com](http://www.nowpublishers.com); e-mail: [sales@nowpublishers.com](mailto:sales@nowpublishers.com)

# Foundations and Trends<sup>®</sup> in Finance

Volume 11, Issue 1–2, 2017

## Editorial Board

### Editor-in-Chief

**Sheridan Titman**

University of Texas at Austin

United States

### Associate Editors

Josef Zechner

*WU Vienna University of Economics  
and Finance*

Francis Longstaff

*UCLA*

# Editorial Scope

## Topics

Foundations and Trends<sup>®</sup> in Finance publishes survey and tutorial articles in the following topics:

- Corporate Finance
  - Corporate Governance
  - Corporate Financing
  - Dividend Policy and Capital Structure
  - Corporate Control
  - Investment Policy
  - Agency Theory and Information
- Financial Markets
  - Market Microstructure
  - Portfolio Theory
  - Financial Intermediation
  - Investment Banking
  - Market Efficiency
  - Security Issuance
  - Anomalies and Behavioral Finance
- Asset Pricing
  - Asset-Pricing Theory
  - Asset-Pricing Models
  - Tax Effects
  - Liquidity
  - Equity Risk Premium
  - Pricing Models and Volatility
  - Fixed Income Securities
- Derivatives
  - Computational Finance
  - Futures Markets and Hedging
  - Financial Engineering
  - Interest Rate Derivatives
  - Credit Derivatives
  - Financial Econometrics
  - Estimating Volatilities and Correlations

## Information for Librarians

Foundations and Trends<sup>®</sup> in Finance, 2017, Volume 11, 4 issues. ISSN paper version 1567-2395. ISSN online version 1567-2409. Also available as a combined paper and online subscription.

# Contents

---

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction and Overview</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1	Megatrends in Privatization and State Ownership Examined in This Survey . . . . .	5
1.2	Organization of the Survey . . . . .	11
<b>2</b>	<b>Empirical Research on Privatization of State Owned Enterprises</b>	<b>13</b>
2.1	Recent (Since 2004) Research Examining Privatization’s . . .	24
2.2	Recent Studies Examining Non-Performance Aspects of Privatization—Determinants of Timing of Divestment, Fraction Sold, and Offer Pricing . . . . .	41
<b>3</b>	<b>Empirical Research on State Capitalism and State Ownership of Business Assets</b>	<b>47</b>
3.1	Recent Research Examining Types of State Ownership . . .	51
3.2	Recent Research Studying Determinants of the Level of State Ownership . . . . .	58
3.3	Recent Research Examining State versus Private Ownership: Valuation and Efficiency . . . . .	63
3.4	Recent Research Investigating the Impact of State Ownership on Corporate Financial Policies . . . . .	91

<b>4 Empirical Research on State Ownership and Financial Markets and Institutions</b>	<b>105</b>
4.1 Research Examining the Impact of Sovereign Wealth Fund Investment on Target Companies . . . . .	106
4.2 Summary of Recent Empirical Studies of State Owned Banks, Guarantees, Bailouts . . . . .	113
4.3 Recent Research Examining Political Connections . . . . .	125
<b>5 Summary and Conclusions</b>	<b>137</b>
<b>Acknowledgments</b>	<b>141</b>
<b>References</b>	<b>143</b>



# Privatization, State Capitalism, and State Ownership of Business in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century

William L. Megginson

*Price College of Business, University of Oklahoma, USA;*  
[wmegginson@ou.edu](mailto:wmegginson@ou.edu)

---

## ABSTRACT

This study summarizes the economic and political developments relating to privatization, state capitalism, and state ownership of business since 2000 and then surveys the extensive recent research examining these issues empirically. Through the early 21<sup>st</sup> century, there was an unambiguous global trend towards reducing government ownership of business enterprise, but this trend has since at least been slowed, and perhaps even reversed. We discuss the factors that have promoted a global resurgence of state ownership, then define and analyze the new ideology labeled “state capitalism.” Recent research examines whether privatization improves the operating and financial performance of divested companies, as well as when, where and how governments decide to privatize individual companies and how these sales are priced. All the performance studies surveyed document significant improvements after companies are divested. Recent academic and professional research categorizes and evaluates various types of state owners; examines determinants of the level of state ownership; studies how state ownership impacts the valuation of corporate assets and examines the relative

efficiency of state versus private ownership; and assesses how state ownership impacts corporate financial policies, especially capital investment. This research highlights that different types of state owners have very different impacts on corporate value and performance, and that state ownership generally has a significant, and mostly pernicious, impact on corporate investment and financial policies. The separate effect of state ownership on corporate valuation is less clear-cut. This survey also summarizes recent empirical research examining the relationship between state ownership of business assets and financial markets and institutions, and also surveys the literature examining political connections between politicians and corporate managers. Sovereign wealth fund research yields essentially benign findings, but almost all studies examining state-owned banking show that state ownership reduces banks' efficiency. All the financial markets and institutions studies examined highlight the distortive effects and economic costs of bailouts and guarantees, and almost all the political connections studies find that these connections are privately beneficial but socially costly. Finally, the research surveyed here convinces the author that "state capitalism" is an essentially failed model.

---

# 1

---

## Introduction and Overview

---

Half-way through the second decade of the twenty-first century, is State involvement increasing or decreasing in the business affairs of the world? At the start of this millennium, it appeared that an ongoing wave of privatizations and market-oriented reforms worldwide was steadily reducing the sway of government over business activity, and particularly the direct state ownership of business enterprises. Then the world appeared to change: the economic rise of a China dominated by state-owned enterprises, the seemingly inexorable rise in global oil prices fueled by national oil companies wholly-owned by non-democratic countries, and the re-emergence of autocratic states (Russia, Iran, Venezuela) rife with cronyism all seemed to point to a world heading towards State Capitalism, where governments sometimes owned but always promoted the interest of national champions in key industries, discouraged inward foreign direct investment, and restricted competition. So which view is correct? Is the state's role in global business increasing or decreasing, and what does this portend for global welfare?

This article will provide an overview of economic and political developments relating to privatization, state capitalism, and state ownership of business, and will then survey the extensive recent research examining privatization and state ownership. As a general rule, I will not cite

work produced earlier than 2005, since this literature has already been surveyed in Megginson and Netter (2001); Gupta *et al.* (2001); Shirley and Walsh (2001); Djankov and Murrell (2002); and Megginson (2005), among others. Similarly, I will not generally re-cite articles discussed in survey articles on privatization in transition economies (Estrin *et al.*, 2009); state-ownership and privatization of banking worldwide (Megginson, 2005); the impact of privatization on global capital markets (Megginson, 2010); the rise of sovereign wealth funds as international investors (Megginson and Fotak, 2015; Gao *et al.*, 2017); the relative efficiency of state versus private provision of health care services (Mühlenkamp, 2013); or the promises and perils of privatization in developing economies (Estrin and Pelletier, 2015). As the reader will doubtless note, this article is plenty long even without integrating already-surveyed articles into this summary paper.

Anyone attempting to write a survey article on a theme as broad as privatization and state ownership of business, even one concentrating on research generated over the past dozen years, must confront the challenge of organizing and presenting the mass of published research and working papers, and also put this research into the context of real economic developments. I will adopt a policy of categorizing the post-2004 research into three principal areas: (1) empirical privatization studies; (2) theoretical and empirical studies examining the level, type, and valuation impact of state ownership of business enterprises; and (3) empirical research examining the impact of state ownership on financial markets and institutions, plus the private and public social welfare implications of political connections between politicians and business executives. As an organizing principle, I will summarize the objectives, sample/methodologies, and results of key empirical and theoretical studies in each section of this paper in the form of eleven tables spread throughout the three topical sections. Over 100 articles are summarized in these tables, and presenting this information in tabular form allows me to economize on textual discussions of each paper's objectives and findings and concentrate instead on synthesizing the research in text discussions. The perceptive reader will soon note that many of these articles are presented in two different tables, since any particular article may analyze, say, both the determinants of why companies are selected

for privatization and the effectiveness of privatization in improving company performance, or both the determinants of the level of state ownership in a particular country or industry and the valuation effect of that state ownership.

In order to place this research into real economic context, I will begin each section with a statistical overview. This will involve showing, as examples, how much privatization has actually occurred over the past dozen years and predicting where the policy is headed worldwide, as well as examining the current level of state ownership in various regions and industries and assessing how state-owned enterprises are valued relative to privatized and always-private companies.

### **1.1 Megatrends in Privatization and State Ownership Examined in This Survey**

Viewed from a high level of abstraction, seven major themes can be observed by anyone studying the evolution of privatization and state ownership of business in the early years of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. These themes will be addressed, directly or indirectly, in various sections of this survey, and are presented in bullet form below. Given these conflicting influences, it is difficult to compute whether the net level of state ownership and influence has truly increased or decreased during this millennium.

- **The rise of China as a global economic power and as a competing model of business ownership and organization.** In 2000, China's GDP at market prices was \$1.21 trillion, and represented only about 3.6% of world GDP; by 2015 these values had reached \$11.06 *trillion* and 17.52%, respectively. Over this period, China became the world's leading manufacturer, leading exporter, and by some measures (such as GDP measured at purchasing power parity), the world's largest economy. Besides the sheer growth in economic weight, China's reliance on and support for state-owned and/or state-influenced "national champions" in key industrial sectors has prompted many observers to conclude that the country is explicitly adopting the same model of "state

capitalism” that earlier Asian pioneers used successfully in their take-off phases. Other nations, such as Brazil, India, Russia, and Singapore have also risen to global prominence with business sectors dominated or heavily influenced by government-controlled companies.

- **Outside of China—and Russia—state ownership of business assets has increasingly taken the form of portfolio equity investment by governments and state-owned investment funds, rather than direct ownership/operation of state-owned enterprises.** The historic use of state-owned enterprises as tools of government industrial policy has been well documented. What is far less appreciated is the high frequency with which governments have been buying equity in listed and unlisted private firms. Contrary to public perceptions and despite the worldwide success of state privatizations, over the 2001-2012 period governments actually *acquired* more assets through stock purchases (\$1.52 trillion) than they sold through share issue privatizations and direct sales (\$1.48 trillion).<sup>1</sup> Much of this state investment was channeled through sovereign wealth funds—which grew from less than \$1 trillion in assets under management in 2000 to over \$6 trillion AUM in early 2016—and the vast bulk of these stock purchases have been cross-border transactions. At the same time, another set of governments has continued actively privatizing SOEs and other state assets through public share offerings and direct asset sales. Figure 1.1 shows the annual value of state purchases of equity (nationalizations) and sales of assets and equity (privatizations) between 1988 and 2013. The world has thus been witnessing two powerful, simultaneous, and apparently contradictory economic phenomena over recent years: continuing sales of state-owned assets and enterprises to private investors by

---

<sup>1</sup>Reported in Megginson (2013, Figure 3.2), based on data from the Thomson Reuters SDC Platinum M&A database and Privatization Barometer (<http://www.privatizationbarometer.net>). During 2013, state asset sales (privatizations) reverted to the pre-2001 historical pattern, exceeding state purchases by more than \$50 billion, and the relative dominance of privatization over state purchases of corporate equity has increased since then.



**Figure 1.1:** Worldwide Sales of State-owned Enterprises and Assets (Privatizations and Sales) and Purchases of Privately-owned Stock by Governments (Nationalizations and Investments), 1988-2011.

Source: *The Economist*, Setting out the Store (January 11, 2014). <http://www.economist.com/news/briefing/21593458-advanced-countries-have-been-slow-sell-or-make-better-use-their-assets-they-are-missing>

some governments, coupled with increasingly large purchases of private, often listed, corporate equity by other governments.

- **The “middle innings” (2005-2014) of the early 21<sup>st</sup> century were transformed, financially and economically, by a massive rise in global oil prices that shifted power and wealth to (mostly) non-democratic petroleum exporting nations and their wholly state-owned national oil companies.** The rise in oil prices from below \$25 per barrel in 2004 to a high of \$147/barrel in 2008 and an average of over \$100/barrel for 2010-14, when multiplied by period-average global production of about 90 million barrels per day, enriched a set of countries with rentier economies dominated by state-owned enterprises, and gave these societies unprecedented sway over the world’s most important

commodity. On the other hand, the collapse in oil prices that began in 3Q2014 and continues to the present day presages an even more dramatic likely shift in global economic power, and probably a surge in privatization of the formerly sacrosanct NOCs, beginning with Saudi Aramco in 2018.

- **The Global Financial Crisis of 2008-10, and governments' subsequent policy responses, reversed—at least temporarily—the long term trend towards lower state intervention in and ownership of business.** The sudden collapse of Lehman Brothers in September 2008, following a slower but almost equally corrosive meltdown of the US subprime mortgage lending market, triggered a global financial and economic crisis unmatched since the Great Depression of the 1930s. In response, many governments took emergency action to rescue banks and other financial institutions, often partially nationalizing these in the process. Outside the United States, governments have been slow to unwind these ownership stakes, which has halted the long-term trend towards lower state ownership of business in many countries, particularly Europe. Rescues of American banks through capital infusions by the federal government put the United States in the odd position of being the world's largest government buyer of corporate equity during 2008 and 2009, and subsequently the world's largest privatizer during 2009, 2010, and 2012. In immediate response to the crisis, the world's major central banks flooded markets with liquidity and sharply lowered interest rates, and later embarked on a series of increasingly unorthodox actions—particularly quantitative easing—designed to rekindle economic growth and avoid deflation. The financial distortions and record low interest rates engendered by these policies endure to the present day, though most of the world's key central banks began modest tightening in 2017.
- **The economic and political unity of Europe increased significantly after the introduction of the euro in 1999 and the expansion of the European Union by ten member**



**states in 2004, but Europe entered an extended period of instability and crisis after 2011.** The introduction of the euro as the currency of most continental European countries went far more smoothly than predicted, and seemed to function synergistically for Eurozone member state for over a decade. Then financial crises in Spain, Portugal, Ireland and, especially Greece ushered in a seemingly endless round of “rescues” by the European Central Bank, the IMF, and member states—particularly Germany. The austerity measures imposed as a condition for these rescues, though perhaps necessary, have yielded low or negative economic growth and rising political tensions throughout much of Europe. The “Brexit” vote in June 2016 appeared to symbolize Europe’s disarray and increasing disunity, though continental European elections in France and elsewhere in 2017 suggested the enduring relevance of the European Union as a political force and the euro as a global currency.

- **Privatizations continued after 2000, and in some years even accelerated, but the pattern of global privatizations shifted from secondary-share public offerings in western Europe to a wide variety of divestment methods in emerging markets, especially China.** European privatizations represented roughly half of the world’s total value of all divestments during the years 1988-2000, the “Golden Age of Privatization,” but the total value of European privatizations dropped sharply during 2001-03, and Europe’s share of global privatization proceeds has averaged less than 25% since 2009. Instead, emerging market countries such as Turkey, Brazil, Russia, India and especially China took over as leading privatizers most years—with the United States leading the world in 2009, 2010, and 2012. Furthermore, China almost uniquely privatizes companies by allowing SOEs to raise capital by selling newly-issued primary shares to investors, thus diluting state ownership only indirectly by increasing total shares outstanding, rather than having the state sell its existing shareholdings directly to investors. This policy hugely increased the size and liquidity of China’s stock market, but also

forced the government to shut down China's IPO market during 2005-07 as it implemented a major split-share structure reform that allowed state-controlled investors to exchange their heretofore non-tradable shareholdings for tradable shares. As a core global economic policy, privatization remains in robust health, with a record \$320 billion being raised through privatization sales in 2015, and over \$1.189 *trillion* being raised between January 2012 and December 2016 (Megginson, 2017).

- **The types of assets privatized since 2004 has broadened to include far more infrastructure assets and smaller state-owned enterprises.** While governments have long included certain infrastructure assets in their divestment programs, the scale of infrastructure divestment has increased massively since 2004, particularly in the Middle East and Asia. Governments have taken to selling airports, telecom networks, seaports, and even entire electricity grids either to specialist operating companies or globally active institutional investors seeking long-lived investments with stable cash flows. Unsurprisingly, such assets are much more likely to be divested via an asset sale—often involving an auction—than via a share issue privatization.

Unsurprisingly, the academic research examining privatization and state ownership has also evolved rapidly over the past dozen years, mirroring the momentous political, financial, and economic events described above. The number and quality of empirical studies examining Chinese state-owned enterprises and investment funds have increased dramatically; the perceptive reader will note that over a third of the studies cited in this survey employ Chinese data exclusively. New empirical methodologies have been adopted, allowing much better identification of economic, financial and policy event-dates and impacts. Two examples of this empirical innovativeness are the implementation of difference-in-difference estimation techniques and the search for quasi-natural experiments such as major policy changes or unexpected market valuation shocks. Nonetheless, the difficulty of sorting out causality continues to bedevil privatization research, and it often remains unclear whether

and how macroeconomic and political innovations lead to changes in the level of privatization or whether privatization itself is one of the core elements of political and economic change. Many more researchers have examined how state ownership impacts corporate financial policies—such as capital investments, cash holdings, and the cost of capital—than in previous years, thus allowing for better estimation of the overall impact of government ownership of or influence on the financial management of target companies.

Entirely new avenues of research have also emerged since 2000. Soon after sovereign wealth funds rose to prominence as global investors in 2007-08, the first of a series of empirical studies appeared examining both the announcement-period stock market returns of target companies and the long-run impact of SWF investment on operating performance. Several empirical studies examining the impact of state ownership and privatization in that most important of global industries—petroleum exploration, production, and refining—were produced and published after oil prices began rising sharply in 2005. Perhaps most intriguingly, the new millennium has seen growing research interest in the importance of political connections between politicians and business executives in both state and privately-owned businesses. While it has long been known that political connections were valuable for the companies and politicians involved, recent research has also documented the social welfare costs such connections might impose on the overall economy.

## **1.2 Organization of the Survey**

This paper is organized as follows. First, I will survey the recent empirical privatization research in section 2, beginning with a summary of studies examining whether divestment improves the performance of newly privatized companies, but also encompassing related research assessing which companies will be privatized, as well as when, how, to whom, and at what price the state enterprises will be divested. Second, I will summarize the empirical and theoretical research examining the level, type, and valuation impact of state ownership in the world's major economic regions in section 3. This summary will also assess research examining the relative efficiency of state versus private ownership, and

the effect of state ownership on observed corporate financial policies, such as capital investment and cash holdings. This will be the longest and most amorphous body of literature surveyed. Third, I will summarize the empirical research examining the intersection of state ownership and finance in section 4. This will begin with the literature assessing the rise of sovereign wealth funds, then will survey research examining the efficiency of state owned banks—as well as the related issues of the effectiveness and welfare implications of state bailouts of failing banks and government loan and deposit guarantees—and will conclude by summarizing research questioning the private and public social welfare implications of political connections between politicians and business executives. Section 5 concludes.

## References

---

- Acemoglu, D., S. Johnson, A. Kermani, J. Kwak, and T. Mitton. 2016. “The value of connections in turbulent times: Evidence from the United States.” *Journal of Financial Economics*. 121: 368–391.
- Acharya, V., D. Anginer, and J. Warburton. 2013. “The end of market discipline? Investor expectations of implicit state guarantees”. Working paper, New York University.
- Allen, F., J. Qian, and M. Qian. 2005. “Law, finance, and economic growth in China”. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 77: 57–116.
- Ang, J. S. and D. K. Ding. 2006. “Government ownership and the performance of government-linked companies: The case of Singapore”. *Journal of Multinational Financial Management*. 16: 64–88.
- Avsar, V., C. Karayalcin, and M. A. Ulubasoglu. 2011. “State-owned enterprises, political ideology, and redistribution”. Working paper, Deakin University.
- Bailey, W., W. Huang, and Z. Yang. 2011. “Bank loans with Chinese characteristics: Some evidence on inside debt in a state-controlled banking system”. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*. 46: 1795–1830.
- Belloc, F., A. Nicita, and S. M. Sepe. 2014. “Disentangling liberalization and privatization policies: Is there a political trade-off?” *Journal of Comparative Economics*. 42: 1033–1051.

- Berger, A. N., G. R. G. Clarke, R. Cull, L. Klapper, and G. Udell. 2005. "Corporate governance and bank performance: A joint analysis of the static, selection, and dynamic effects of domestic, foreign, and state ownership". *Journal of Banking & Finance*. 29: 2179–2221.
- Berkman, H., R. A. Cole, and L. J. Fu. 2010. "Political connections and minority-shareholder protection: Evidence from Securities-Market regulation in China". *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*. 45: 1391–1417.
- Berkman, H., R. A. Cole, and L. J. Fu. 2012. "Improving corporate governance where the state is the controlling block holder: Evidence from China". *European Journal of Finance*. online: 1–26.
- Berkowitz, D. and Y. Semikolenova. 2005. "Privatization with government control: Evidence from the Russian oil sector". Working paper, University of Pittsburgh.
- Bertoni, F. and S. Lugo. 2014. "The effect of sovereign wealth funds on the credit risk of their portfolio companies". *Journal of Corporate Finance*. 27: 21–35.
- Beuselinck, C., L. Cao, M. Deloof, and X. Xia. 2017. "The value of government ownership during the global financial crisis". *Journal of Corporate Finance*. 42: 481–493.
- Borisova, G., P. Brockman, J. Salas, and A. Zagorchev. 2012. "Government ownership and corporate governance: Evidence from the EU". *Journal of Banking & Finance*. 36: 2917–2934.
- Borisova, G., V. Fotak, K. Holland, and W. Megginson. 2015. "Government ownership and cost of debt: Evidence from government investments in publicly traded firms". *Journal of Financial Economics*. 118: 168–191.
- Borisova, G. and W. L. Megginson. 2011. "Does government ownership affect the cost of debt? Evidence from privatization". *Review of Financial Studies*. 24: 2693–2737.
- Borisova, G. and P. Yadav. 2015. "Government ownership, informed trading, and private information". *Journal of Corporate Finance*. 33: 195–211.
- Bortolotti, B. and M. Faccio. 2009. "Government control of privatized firms". *Review of Financial Studies*. 22: 2907–2939.

- Bortolotti, B., V. Fotak, and W. Megginson. 2015. "The sovereign wealth fund discount: Evidence from public equity investments". *The Review of Financial Studies*. 28: 2993–3035.
- Boubakri, N., J.-C. Cosset, and O. Guedhami. 2005. "Postprivatization corporate governance: The role of ownership structure and investor protection". *Journal of Financial Economics*. 76: 369–399.
- Boubakri, N., J.-C. Cosset, O. Guedhami, and W. Saffar. 2011. "The political economy of residual state ownership in privatized firms: Evidence from emerging markets". *Journal of Corporate Finance*. 17: 244–258.
- Boubakri, N., J.-C. Cosset, and W. Saffar. 2013. "The role of state and foreign owners in corporate risk-taking: Evidence from privatization". *Journal of Financial Economics*. 95: 202–236.
- Boubakri, N., S. El Ghouli, O. Guedhami, and W. Megginson. 2015. "The market value of government ownership". Working paper, American University of Sharjah.
- Boubakri, N., O. Guedhami, D. Mishra, and W. Saffar. 2012. "Political connections and the cost of equity capital". *Journal of Corporate Finance*. 18: 541–559.
- Brown, C. O. and S. Dinç. 2005. "The politics of bank failures: Evidence from emerging markets". *Quarterly Journal of Economics*. 120: 1413–1442.
- Brown, D., J. Earle, and Á. Telegdy. 2006. "The productivity effects of privatization: Longitudinal estimates from Hungary, Romania, Russia, and Ukraine". *Journal of Political Economy*. 114: 61–99.
- Brown, D., J. Earle, and Á. Telegdy. 2015. "Where does privatization work? Understanding the heterogeneity in estimated firm performance effects". Working paper, George Mason University.
- Calomiris, C. W., R. Fisman, and Y. Wang. 2010. "Profiting from government stakes in a command economy: Evidence from Chinese asset sales". *Journal of Financial Economics*. 96: 399–412.
- Caprio, G., L. Laeven, and R. Levine. 2007. "Governance and Bank Valuation". *Journal of Financial Intermediation*. 16: 584–617.

- Carney, R. W. and T. B. Child. 2013. "Changes to the ownership and control of East Asian corporations between 1996 and 2008: The primacy of politics". *Journal of Financial Economics*. 107: 494–513.
- Chen, D., D. Jiang, A. Ljungqvist, H. Lu, and M. Zhou. 2015. "State capitalism vs. private enterprise". Working Paper, Nanjing University.
- Chen, G., M. Firth, Y. Xin, and L. Xu. 2008. "Control transfers, privatization, and corporate performance: Efficiency gains in China's listed companies". *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*. 43: 161–190.
- Chen, G., M. Firth, Y. Xin, and L. Xu. 2009. "Does the type of ownership matter? Evidence from China's listed companies". *Journal of Banking and Finance*. 33: 171–181.
- Chen, Q., X. Chen, K. Schipper, Y. Xu, and J. Xue. 2012. "The sensitivity of corporate cash holdings to corporate governance". *Review of Financial Studies*. 25: 3610–3644.
- Chen, R., S. El Ghouli, O. Guedhami, and H. Wang. 2014. "Do state and foreign ownership affect investment efficiency? Evidence from privatizations". *Journal of Corporate Finance*: forthcoming.
- Cheng-Han, T., D. W. Puchniak, and U. Varotttil. 2015. *State-owned enterprises in Singapore: Historical insights into a potential model for reform*. National University of Singapore: NUS Law School Working Paper 2015/003.
- Chernykh, L. 2008. "Ultimate ownership and control in Russia". *Journal of Financial Economics*. 88: 169–192.
- Chong, A., J. Guillen, and F. López-de-Silanes. 2011. "Privatization and labor policies". *Journal of Public Economics*. 95: 1119–1130.
- Cooper, M. J., H. Gulen, and A. Ovtchinnikov. 2010. "Corporate political contributions and stock returns". *Journal of Finance*. 65: 687–724.
- Cull, R. and L. C. Xu. 2005. "Institutions, ownership, and finance: the determinants of profit reinvestment among Chinese firms". *Journal of Financial Economics*. 77: 117–146.



- Dewenter, K. L., X. Han, and P. H. Malatesta. 2010. "Firm value and sovereign wealth fund investments". *Journal of Financial Economics*. 98: 256–278.
- Ding, I. S. 2005. "Politicians and banks: Political influences on government-owned banks in emerging markets". *Journal of Financial Economics*. 77: 453–479.
- Ding, I. S. and N. Gupta. 2011. "The decision to privatize: finance and politics". *Journal of Finance*. 66: 241–269.
- Djankov, S. and P. Murrell. 2002. "Enterprise restructuring in transition: a quantitative survey". *Journal of Economic Literature*. 40: 739–792.
- Dos Santos, I. 2015. "On investment efficiency: Privatization decisions and ethnicity". Working paper, HEC Montreal.
- Duchin, R. and D. Sosyura. 2012. "The politics of government investment". *Journal of Financial Economics*. 106: 24–48.
- Eller, S. L., P. R. Hartley, and K. B. Medlock Iii. 2011. "Empirical evidence on the operational efficiency of national oil companies". *Empirical Economics*. 40: 623–643.
- Estrin, S., J. Hanousek, E. Kòcenda, and J. Svejnar. 2009. "The effects of privatization and ownership in transition economies". *Journal of Economic Literature*. 47: 699–728.
- Estrin, S. and A. Pelletier. 2015. *Privatization in developing countries*. What are the lessons of experience? Economics, Private Sector—Professional Evidence, and Applied Knowledge Series (EPS-PEAKS) Topic Guide.
- Faccio, M., R. W. Masulis, and J. J. McConnell. 2006. "Political connections and corporate bailouts". *Journal of Finance*. 61: 2597–2635.
- Fan, J. P. H., T. J. Wong, and T. Zhang. 2007. "Politically connected CEOs, corporate governance, and post-IPO performance of China's newly partially privatized firms". *Journal of Financial Economics*. 84: 330–357.
- Firth, M., C. Lin, and H. Zou. 2010. "Friend or foe? The role of the state and mutual fund ownership in the split shares structure reform in China". *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*. 45: 685–706.

- Firth, M., P. Malatesta, Q. Xin, and L. Xu. 2012. "Corporate investment, government control, and financing channels: Evidence from China's listed companies". *Journal of Corporate Finance*. 18: 433–450.
- Fisman, R. 2001. "Estimating the value of political connections". *American Economic Review*. 91: 1095–1102.
- Fisman, R. and Y. Wang. 2015. "Corruption in Chinese privatizations". *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization*. 31: 1–29.
- Gagliardi, T., G. Gianfrate, and R. Vincenzi. 2014. "Sovereign wealth funds' investments: The bondholders' perspective". Working paper, Bocconi University.
- Gan, J., Y. Guo, and C. Xu. 2014. "China's decentralized privatization and change of control rights". Working paper, Cheung Kong Graduate School of Business, Beijing.
- Gao, X., V. Fotak, and W. Megginson. 2017. "A financial force to be reckoned with? An overview of sovereign wealth funds". In: D. J. Cumming, I. Filatochev, J. Reinecke, G. Wood, Eds. *Oxford Handbook of Sovereign Wealth Funds*, forthcoming.
- Gao, X. and W. Megginson. 2016. "Changing Chinese share-issue privatization listing strategies". Working paper, University of Oklahoma.
- Giannetti, M. and L. Laeven. 2009. "Pension reform, ownership structure, and corporate governance: Evidence from a natural experiment". *Review of Financial Studies*. 22: 4092–4127.
- Goldman, E., J. Rocholl, and J. So. 2009. "Do politically connected boards affect firm value?" *Review of Financial Studies*. 22: 2331–2358.
- Goyal, A., S. Jategonkar, W. Megginson, and C. Muckley. 2016. "Why do privatized firms pay higher dividends?" Working paper, University of Oklahoma.
- Gropp, R., C. Gruendl, and A. Guettler. 2014. "The impact of public guarantees on bank risk-taking: Evidence from a natural experiment". *Review of Finance*. 18: 457–488.
- Gropp, R., H. Hakenes, and I. Schnabel. 2011. "Competition, risk-shifting, and public bail-out policies". *Review of Financial Studies*. 24: 2084–2120.

- Gul, F. A., J.-B. Kim, and A. A. Qiu. 2010. "Ownership concentration, foreign shareholding, audit quality, and stock price synchronicity: Evidence from China". *Journal of Financial Economics*. 95: 425–442.
- Gupta, N. 2005. "Partial privatization and firm performance". *Journal of Finance*. 60: 987–1015.
- Gupta, S., C. Schiller, H. Ma, and E. R. Tiongson. 2001. "Privatization, labor and social safety nets". *Journal of Economic Surveys*. 15: 647–69.
- Guriev, S., A. Kolotilin, and K. Sonin. 2009. "Determinants of Nationalization in the oil sector: A theory and evidence from panel data". *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organizations*. 27: 301–323.
- Hartley, P. R. and K. B. Medlock Iii. 2013. "Changes in the operational efficiency of national oil companies". *Energy Journal*. 34: 27–57.
- Holland, K. 2016. "Are all government owners viewed the same? Evidence from government acquisitions of publicly traded firms". Working paper, Purdue University.
- Houston, J. F., L. Jiang, C. Lin, and Y. Ma. 2014. "Political connections and the cost of bank loans". *Journal of Accounting Research*. 52: 193–243.
- Houston, J. F., C. Lin, and Y. Ma. 2011. "Media ownership, concentration and corruption in bank lending". *Journal of Financial Economics*. 100: 326–350.
- Huang, Z., L. Li, G. Ma, and J. Qian. 2014. "The political economy of corporate finance: Evidence from 're nationalization' in China". Working paper, Tsinghua University, Beijing.
- Huyghebaert, Q. Q. and L. Sun. 2014. "Financing decisions after partial privatization in China: Can a stock market quotation really provide discipline?" *Journal of Financial Intermediation*. 23: 27–46.
- Iannotta, G., G. Nocera, and A. Sironi. 2013. "The impact of government ownership on bank risk". *Journal of Financial Intermediation*. 22: 152–176.
- Jaslowitzer, P., W. Megginson, and M. Rapp. 2016. "Disentangling the Effects of State Ownership on Investment – Evidence from Europe". Working paper, University of Oklahoma.

- Jiang, G., C. M. C. Lee, and H. Yue. 2010. "Tunneling through intercorporate loans: The China experience". *Journal of Financial Economics*. 98: 1–20.
- Julio, B. and Y. Yook. 2012. "Political uncertainty and corporate investment cycles". *Journal of Finance*. 67: 45–83.
- Karolyi, A. and A. Taboada. 2011. "The influence of government in cross-border bank mergers". Working paper, Cornell University.
- Karolyi, A. and R. Liao. 2011. "What is different about government controlled acquirers in cross-border acquisitions?" Working paper, Cornell University.
- Karolyi, A. and R. Liao. 2015. "State capitalism". *s global reach: Evidence from foreign acquisitions by state-owned companies*, *Journal of Corporate Finance*. forthcoming.
- Khwaja, A. I. and A. Mian. 2005. "Do lenders favor politically connected firms? Rent provision in an emerging financial market". *Quarterly Journal of Economics*. 120: 1371–1411.
- Knill, A., B.-S. Lee, and N. Mauck. 2012. "Sovereign wealth fund investment and the return-to-risk relationship of their target firms". *Journal of Financial Intermediation*. 21: 315–340.
- Kotter, J. and U. Lel. 2011. "Friends or foes? Target selection decisions of sovereign wealth funds and their consequences". *Journal of Financial Economics*. 101: 360–381.
- La Porta, R., F. López-de-Silanes, and A. Shleifer. 2001. "Government ownership of banks". *Journal of Finance*. 56: 265–301.
- Li, B., W. Megginson, Z. Shen, and Q. Sun. 2016. "Do share issue privatizations really improve firm performance in China?" Working paper, Fudan University, Shanghai.
- Li, K., T. Wang, Y.-L. Cheung, and P. Jiang. 2011. "Privatization and risk sharing: Evidence from the split share structure reform in China". *Review of Financial Studies*. 24: 2499–2525.
- Li, X., X. Liu, and Y. Wang. 2012. "A model of China's state capitalism". Working paper, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology.
- Liao, J. and M. Young. 2012. "The impact of residual government ownership in privatized firms: New evidence from China". *Emerging Markets Review*. 13: 338–351.

- Liao, L., B. Liu, and H. Wang. 2014. "China's secondary privatization: perspectives from the split-share structure reform". *Journal of Financial Economics*. 113: 500–518.
- Lin, C., Y. Ma, P. Malatesta, and Y. Xuan. 2011. "Ownership structure and the cost of corporate borrowing". *Journal of Financial Economics*. 100: 1–23.
- Lin, C. and D. Su. 2008. "Industrial diversification, partial privatization and firm valuation: Evidence from publicly listed firms in China". *Journal of Corporate Finance*. 14: 405–417.
- Lin, H.-C. M. and H. Bo. 2012. "State ownership and financial constraints on investment of Chinese listed firms". *European Journal of Finance*. 18.
- Liu, Q. and A. Siu. 2011. "Institutional and Corporate Investment: Evidence from investment-implied return on capital in China". *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*. 46: 1831–1864.
- Meggison, W. 2010. "Privatization and finance". *Annual Review of Financial Economics*. 2(6): 6.1–6.30.
- Meggison, W. L. and V. Fotak. 2015. "Rise of the fiduciary state: A survey of sovereign wealth fund research". *Journal of Economic Surveys*. 29: 733–778.
- Meggison, W. 2005. *The Financial Economics of Privatization*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Meggison, W. L. 2017. "Major privatization deals and trends of 2015 and 2016". Privatisation Barometer 2016 Report (Milan).
- Meggison, W. L. and J. M. Netter. 2001. "From state to market: a survey of empirical studies on privatization". *Journal of Economic Literature*. 39: 321–389.
- Meggison, W., B. Ullah, and Z. Wei. 2014. "State ownership, soft budget constraints, and cash holdings: Evidence from China's privatized firms". *Journal of Banking and Finance*. 48: 276–291.
- Milhaupt, C. T. and W. Zheng. 2015. "Beyond ownership: State capitalism and the Chinese firm". *Georgetown Law Journal*. 103: 665–722.
- Mohsni, S. and I. Otchere. 2013. "Risk-taking behavior of privatized banks". Working paper, Carleton University, Ottawa.

- Morck, R., D. Wolfenzon, and B. Yeung. 2005. "Corporate governance, economic entrenchment, and growth". *Journal of Economic Literature*. 43: 655–720.
- Morck, R., M. D. Yavuz, and B. Yeung. 2011. "Banking system control, capital allocation, and economy performance". *Journal of Financial Economics*. 100: 264–283.
- Mühlenkamp, H. 2013. "From state to market revisited: More empirical evidence on the efficiency of public (and privately-owned) enterprises". Working paper, Munich Personal RePEc.
- Nguyen, L., M. Skully, and S. Perera. 2012. "Government ownership, economic development, regulation and bank stability—International evidence". Working paper, Monash University.
- O'Toole, C. M., E. L. W. Morgenroth, and T. T. Ha. 2016. "Investment efficiency, state-owned enterprises and privatization: Evidence from Viet Nam in Transition". *Journal of Corporate Finance*. 37: 93–108.
- Oum, T., N. Adler, and C. Yu. 2006. "Privatization, corporatization, ownership forms and their effects on the performance of the world's major airports". *Journal of Air Transport Management*. 12: 109–121.
- Piotroski, J. D. and T. Zhang. 2014. "Politicians and the IPO decision: the impact of impending political promotions on IPO activity in China". *Journal of Financial Economics*. 111: 111–136.
- Santos, J. E. 2016. "Privatisation prices: The role of prior restructuring and emerging private ownership structure". Working paper, University of Madeira, Portugal.
- Sapienza, P. 2004. "The effects of government ownership on bank lending". *Journal of Financial Economics*. 72: 357–384.
- Shirley, M. and P. Walsh. 2001. "Public vs private ownership: The current state of the debate". Working paper, World Bank Group, Washington, DC.
- Shleifer, A. 1998. "State versus private ownership". *Journal of Economic Perspectives*. 12: 133–150.
- Subramanian, K. and W. Megginson. 2017. "Employment protection laws and privatization". Working paper, Indian School of Business.

- Tan, Y., X. Tian, X. Zhang, and H. Zhao. 2014. "Privatization and innovation: Evidence from a quasi-natural experiment in China". Working paper, Shanghai University of Finance.
- Tsui, K. K. 2010. "More oil, less democracy: Evidence from worldwide crude oil discoveries". *Economic Journal*. 121: 89–115.
- Vining, A. R., A. E. Boardman, and M. A. Moore. 2014. "The theory and evidence pertaining to local government mixed enterprises". *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics*. 84: 53–86.
- Wei, Z., F. Xie, and S. Zhang. 2005. "Ownership structure and firm value in China's privatized firms: 1991-2001". *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*. 40: 87–108.
- Wolf, C. 2009. "Does ownership matter? The performance and efficiency of state oil vs. private oil (1987-2006)". *Energy Policy*. 37: 2642–2652.
- Wolf, C. and M. Pollitt. 2008. "Privatising national oil companies: Assessing the impact on firm performance". Working paper, University of Cambridge.
- Zinnes, C., Y. Eilat, and J. Sachs. 2001. "The gains from privatization in transition economies: Is 'change of ownership' enough?" *IMF Staff Papers*. 48: 146–170.