

PRODUCTIVITY SPILLOVERS AND MULTINATIONAL ENTERPRISES: IN SEARCH OF A SPATIAL DIMENSION

Marcella Nicolini
DIG, Politecnico of Milano and
ISLA, Università “L. Bocconi”, Milano

Laura Resmini
Università della Valle d'Aosta, Aosta (Italy)
and ISLA, Università “L. Bocconi”, Milano

This version: July 2007

Abstract

In this paper we analyse whether and to what extent MNEs can generate positive externalities for the host economies by allowing for spatial dependence patterns in TFP growth rates at sectoral and regional level. To this respect, we use spatial econometric techniques, which allow us to identify not only the type of spatial dependence governing this phenomenon and to estimate it consistently, but also clusters and other “anomalies” in the patterns of productivity spillovers. We found evidence of positive spillovers from MNEs operating in the region, and negative spillovers from MNEs outside the region. The latter are however limited to specific groups of regions, such as the capital regions and regions bordering with former EU-15 countries. Therefore, we can conclude that there seems to be a regional channel for FDI spillovers.

Key words: foreign direct investment, productivity growth, spatial spillovers

JEL codes: F23, O40, R11.

Marcella Nicolini, DIG, Politecnico of Milan, via G. Colombo, 40 – I-20100 Milano Tel. ++39 02 2399 2749 – Fax ++39 02 2399 2710 – e-mail: marcella.nicolini@polimi.it (Corresponding author)

Laura Resmini, ISLA, Università “L. Bocconi”, via Sarfatti, 25 – I-20136 Milano. Tel. ++39 02 5836 5409 – Fax ++39 02 5836 5439 – e-mail: laura.resmini@unibocconi.it

PRODUCTIVITY SPILLOVERS AND MULTINATIONAL ENTERPRISES: IN SEARCH OF A SPATIAL DIMENSION

1. Introduction

There seems to be a widely held assumption that multinational enterprises generate benefits that spill over to the host economy, resulting in productivity growth through several channels. The latter includes backward and forward linkages with local firms, – through which multinational firms may foster the entry and development of local suppliers and final goods producing firms (Markusen and Venables, 1999) – competition and demonstration effects (Wang and Blomstrom, 1992; Glass and Saggi, 2001), as well as movements of labour force from multinationals to local firms (Fosfuri, Motta and Ronde, 2001).

The transmission of spillovers from MNEs to domestic firms, however, is not automatic; rather, it is affected by several factors, the most important of which is distance broadly defined in order to encompass both the economic and the geographical dimension. Economic distance concerns relative backwardness and absorptive capacity and determines whether and to what extent local firms eventually benefit from FDI-induced spillovers (Findlay, 1978; Glass and Saggi, 1998). Geographical distance, instead, affects the transmission costs, thus reducing the possibilities for indigenous firms located far from multinational enterprises to reap such benefits. While the former explains *spatial heterogeneity* in FDI spillovers, the latter may generate *spatial dependence*.¹ The existing empirical literature concerned with determining spillover effects has seldom discussed spatial heterogeneity, both across and within countries, and has largely ignored spatial correlation effects, despite such considerations are vital in modelling externalities, mainly when seeking to distinguish between local and interregional effects (Driffield, 2006).²

In this paper we combine the two approaches. In particular, we analyse whether and to what extent MNEs can generate positive externalities for the host economies by allowing for spatial dependence patterns in TFP growth rates at sectoral and regional level. In order to achieve this research objective we use spatial econometric techniques, which allow us to identify not only the type of spatial dependence governing this phenomenon and to estimate it

¹ Spatial heterogeneity refers to the impact of being located in one specific point in space, i.e. a country or a region, while spatial dependence refers to the effects of being located closer or further away from other locations. This technical distinction corresponds to the more traditional distinction between absolute and relative location (Abreu, de Groot, and Florax, 2004).

²To this respect, Keller (2002), and Helpman and Coe (1995) are exceptions.

consistently, but also clusters and other “anomalies” in the patterns of productivity spillovers. There has been, at least in our knowledge, no spatial econometric study on the impact of MNEs on aggregate TFP; therefore, we aim at filling this gap.³

Several reasons support our approach. First of all, the non-automaticness of the transmission of FDI spillovers at firm level, due to the existence of several conditionalities (Nicolini and Resmini, 2006), raise doubts on the fact that FDI spillovers may overcome local firms’ boundaries and enhance growth at more aggregate levels. Secondly, the consideration of spatial dependence does not only provide additional insights on the geographical pattern of distribution of FDI spillovers, but it even changes the quantitative estimates of the marginal effect exerted by MNEs. Positive (negative) spatial spillovers induce dissemination and feedback effects that magnify (reduce) the direct impact of MNEs on TFP growth rates. Therefore, disregarding spatial dependence may lead to an omitted variable bias and potentially misleading inference on the role played by MNEs in enhancing growth. Thirdly, spatial autocorrelation allows accounting for variation in the dependent variable arising from latent and unobservable variables. Indeed in the case of TFP models, the appropriate choice of explanatory variables may be problematic, not only conceptually, but also empirically given that data on these variables are not always accessible and/or reliable. Spatial autocorrelation may thus act as a proxy to all these omitted variables and catch their effect. This is particularly useful in case of transition countries, where explanatory variables at regional and sectoral level are quite scarce. Finally, in presence of positive spatial spillovers, the location of foreign firms within a country may no longer matter. Consequently, the public good nature of such benefits would raise the question on how to insure that FDI promotion policies will be at the efficient level, given the incentive of all to free ride on the efforts of others in attracting MNEs.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes our data set and the method we use to construct our measure of aggregate TFP and its corresponding growth rate. In section 3 we apply spatial data analysis techniques to investigate overall spatial patterns in the data and the presence of clusters and outliers. Section 4 discusses the estimated model and the econometric issues related to it. Section 5 presents our empirical results and section 6 concludes.

³ Very recently, it has been recognized that spatial dependence may play a role as a determinant of MNEs location patterns (Bloningen et al. 2004; Coughlin et al. 2000; Baltagi et al. 2006).

2. Data and Methods

The data used in this study constitute an unbalanced panel with annual information on more than 40,000 domestic manufacturing firms and about 10,000 foreign owned firms located in three transition countries, namely Bulgaria, Poland, and Romania. The choice of these countries is not casual, but it responds to precise research criteria. At the beginning of the transition phase, Bulgaria, Poland and Romania had very similar technological levels and managerial skills; despite that, they have followed very different paths towards open market economy, whereby Poland became a member of the European Union in 2004, while Bulgaria and Romania had to wait other three years before joining the EU. During the transition phase, FDI have flown into these countries according to the pace and the deepness of the structural reforms implemented in each country included in the sample (Resmini, 2000). Consequently, Poland has rapidly become one of the most important FDI recipients in the area, while Bulgaria and Romania fail to attract a substantial stock of foreign capitals, at least till the end of the 1990s. Yet, the sectoral composition of FDI varies across countries according to their degree of development, with Poland attracting more medium high and high tech foreign firms than Bulgaria and Romania, which seem to be particularly attractive for MNEs operating in traditional labour intensive manufacturing sectors (Pusterla and Resmini, 2007). Therefore, in discussing the effects of MNEs on aggregate TFP, the choice of the above mentioned countries allows us to control for different degrees of FDI penetration and sectoral composition, ruling out the possibility that the observed effects may depend on FDI (sectoral) intensity only.

The main source of our data is Amadeus database, published by Bureau Van Dijk, which besides standard financial information gives details on several qualitative variables, such as ownership characteristics, industry classification, and geographical location within countries. Only firms whose ownership can be properly identified have been included in the sample. To this respect, firms with a share of foreign ownership greater than 10 per cent have been classified as foreign affiliates, while all other firms with a percentage of foreign ownership below 10 per cent have been classified as domestic.

Our analysis considers the period from 1998 to 2003 and focuses on manufacturing firms only. According to the recent studies on productivity growth using longitudinal research data, a large proportion of aggregate productivity growth is attributable to resource allocation, which mainly occurs within manufacturing sectors (Bartelsman and Doms, 2000). Moreover, the latter have been attracting a large number of MNEs since the early of transition, while FDI

flows in either primary or tertiary sectors have been quite scarce because of strict regulations, and other impediments removed very recently.⁴

Given the nature of our data, in order to obtain an aggregate measure for TFP, we have to solve two methodological issues: how to recover plant level TFP, and how to aggregate them. We discuss each in turn.

Typically, plant level TFP is measured using the TFP residual ($\ln \omega$) computed as the difference between the log of output ($\ln Q$) and the contribution of inputs ($\beta' \ln X$):

$$\ln \omega = \ln Q - \beta' \ln X \quad (1)$$

where (1) represents either the gross output or the value-added production function.

The standard procedure for estimating eq. (1) is to deflate the output or the value-added variable by replacing the unknown firm price index with the price index of the industry each firm belongs to (Aitken and Harrison, 1999; Olley and Pakes, 1996; Levinsohn and Petrin, 2003). However, this solution has been considered not only imperfect, but mainly inappropriate, since the resulting measures are “*contaminated by variation in factor prices and demand shocks*” (Katayama et al. 2006, pag. 2). Recent methodologies have been developed in order to take the omitted output price bias into account (Klette and Griliches, 1996; De Loecker, 2005; Katayama et al., 2006), while a formal solution for the omitted input price bias as well as the endogeneity of firms’ product choice (Bernard et al., 2005) has not been developed, yet (Van Beveren, 2007). Without denying the existence of these methodological issues, Mairesse and Jaumandreu (2005), taking advantages of two unique panel-data samples which include information on firm price indexes, demonstrate that the elasticities of factors of production included in a simple Cobb-Douglas production function vary more with the estimation procedures than with the particular specification of the production function equation, being the latter a real output function, a revenue function deflated either by individual prices or industry price, and a not deflated revenue function. This result downgrades the importance of the omitted variable biases claimed by other scholars, at least at empirical level.

These considerations yield us to assume eq. (1) is a two factor Cobb-Douglas (not deflated) revenue function and apply the semi parametric estimation technique developed by Olley and Pakes (1996), which has been proved to be, among the existing alternatives, a good estimation

⁴ Although our sample does not consider the entire population of firms operating in the considered countries over period, its representativeness is fairly good, as it is shown in the Appendix.

procedure of firm level production functions (Van Beveren, 2007; Levinsohn and Petrin, 2005).⁵ By applying this two step procedure on a sectoral base, we obtained sector-specific labour and capital intensities.⁶ We then fitted eq. (1) and constructed the individual error terms, which were the logs of our estimated plant TFP.⁷ Discrete changes in (1) have been computed as log changes over the period (Levinsohn and Petrin, 2005), i.e.:

$$\ln \omega_t - \ln \omega_{t-1} \quad (2)$$

Starting from (2) an aggregate measure of TFP changes may be obtained. In so doing, a weight α_i is applied in order to take into account firm heterogeneity, thus yielding to the following approximation:

$$\sum_i \alpha_i (\ln \omega_{it} - \ln \omega_{it-1}) \quad (3)$$

where i denotes the N plants in the sector/economy. For α_i , Tornqvist (1936) suggests averaging beginning and ending period shares in total output: $\alpha_i = \frac{s_{it} + s_{it-1}}{2}$.⁸ A principle feature of this approximation is that it allows to group plants in any subaggregates without affecting the measure of aggregate TFP growth. Given the structure of our databases, we consider three subgroups of firms, i.e., continuing firms, exiting firms and entrant firms. The former are active all over the period, therefore TFP changes and shares can be observed both in t and $t-1$. Exiting (entrant) firms, instead, contribute to aggregate TFP from $t-1$ to the time they exit (from the time they enter to t). Therefore, we can not observe either shares or TFP levels in t and $t-1$, respectively. As suggested by Petrin and Levinsohn (2005), averaging shares maintain a good way to minimize potential errors, while missing information on TFP levels can be forecasted using values of $\ln \omega$ observed immediately after (before) the entry (exit). Therefore, our measure for aggregate TFP changes assumes the following form:

$$\Omega_{t-1,t} = \sum_{i \in C} \frac{s_{it} + s_{it-1}}{2} (\ln \omega_{it} - \ln \omega_{it-1}) + \sum_{i \in E} \frac{s_{it}}{2} (\ln \hat{\omega}_{it} - \ln \omega_{it-1}) + \sum_{i \in X} \frac{s_{it-1}}{2} (\ln \omega_{it} - \ln \hat{\omega}_{it-1}) \quad (4)$$

⁵ Alternative procedures include fixed effects estimations, instrumental variables and GMM, Levinsohn and Petrin (2003) semiparametric techniques. See Van Beveren (2007) for an overview.

⁶ Two sectors, namely manufacturing of refined petroleum products (NACE 23) and recycling (NACE 37), were excluded because the small number of firms operating in these sectors made it impossible to apply the Olley and Pakes procedure.

⁷ In so doing we recover the information on productivity of firms active in period t but with zero investments. In fact, omitting plants with zero investment would have meant omitting plants with low or declining productivity, thus introducing a sample bias in the next steps, i.e. the construction of an aggregate TFP measure and the analysis of the impact of FDI spillovers on it.

⁸ This approximation is preferred by a number of scholars. See Levinsohn and Petrin (2005) for an in-depth discussion of the advantages of this approximation with respect to other possible aggregations available in the literature.

where C indicates continuing firms, E entrant firms and X exiting firms.

We use eq. (4) to retrieve TFP changes in 21 manufacturing sectors in 30 NUTS II regions⁹ belonging to Bulgaria, Poland and Romania over the period 1998-2003. Eventually we end up with 630 observations. In the econometric section we explore the role MNEs can play as a determinant of these changes.

3. Exploratory analysis

In Figure 1 we have plotted the growth rates of TFP over the 1998-2003 period against the level of TFP in 1998. We observe a negative correlation in Romania, indicating a slight tendency to convergence, and a positive but very small correlation in Poland and Bulgaria, indicating an even slighter tendency to divergence. Of course, these opposite tendencies cancel each other out when we consider the whole sample.¹⁰ Figure 2 is a scatterplot of the growth rates of TFP against a measure of MNEs in the 1998.¹¹ In this case the correlation is more pronounced and always positive, consistent with the hypothesis that higher FDI is associated with more technological transfer. As before, this relationship varies across countries, being more pronounced in Poland and Romania than in Bulgaria. Overall, this indicates that spatial heterogeneity does occur.

[insert Figure 1 and Figure 2 about here]

The spatial distribution of TFP growth at regional level can be seen in figure 3.¹² Regions with high growth rates over this period are Sofia region in Bulgaria (BG04), Timis region in Romania (RO05), the three Polish regions bordering with Germany (Dolnoslaskie (PL01), Lubuskie (PL04), and Zachodniopomorskie (PL16)), and the Wielkopolskie (PL15) and Slaskie region (PL12). Note that these regions are not among those which lag behind in term of TFP in 1998. Therefore, our sample indicates that a divergent trend characterizes growth patterns at regional level. However, country differences still occur: Romania is characterized

⁹ Several studies have emphasized that the transition process yields to both regional and sectoral changes. These studies belong to an emerging body of literature focusing on regional performance following transition, i.e. detecting losing and winning regions (Traistaru, Njikamp and Resmini, 2003, Resmini, 2003; Petrakos, 2000).

¹⁰ An explanation for this unusual result might be the fact the level of TFP in 1998 may not adequately reflect the level of development available over the period 1998-2003, since Bulgaria and Romania experienced rapid changes in the early 2000s. If we plot the average of TFP over the period, patterns of convergence and divergence persist and become clearer.

¹¹ How we construct MNE measures is explained in the next section.

¹² Changes in (and levels of) TFP in region r have been constructed as an output share weighted average of the productivity changes (levels) of all sectors active in that region.

by a convergence growth process, while Poland and Bulgaria show very weak patterns of divergence.¹³

[insert Figure 3 about here]

Spatial autocorrelation can be defined as the coincidence of value similarities in locational similarity (Anselin, 2001). There is positive spatial autocorrelation when high or low values of a variable tend to cluster together in space, and negative spatial autocorrelation when high values of a variable are surround by low value and vice versa. In order to display visually spatial autocorrelation, the Moran scatterplot can be used (Anselin, 1996), which plots the spatial lag Wx over x , where x is either the TFP level or the TFP growth rate and W is a row standardized spatial weights matrix.¹⁴ As Figures 4 and 5 shows, both levels and growth rates of TFP are spatially correlated. The positive correlation is stronger in levels than in growth rates and tends to be stable over time. A vertical pattern also emerges from Figure 4, indicating that industries with same levels of TFP in 1998 have experienced different TFP growth rates over the period. This phenomenon is due to the presence of either traditionally highly geographical concentrated sectors, such as the Tobacco industry, or underrepresented manufacturing sectors in transition countries. We refer here to the communication equipment (Nace 32), electrical machinery (Nace 31) and medical, precision and optical instruments (Nace 33). We decide to take these sectors into the sample in order to not introduce factors of distortion in the subsequent analysis.

To summarize, our explanatory analysis suggests the data are not randomly distributed, but follow a systematic spatial pattern. This feature is taken into account in our econometric estimations that are presented next.

[insert Figures 4 and 5 about here]

4. Model specification

This section discusses the empirical specification used in this study. We specify a regression equation (log form) as follows:

$$\Delta TFP_{sr}^{03,98} = \alpha_0 + \beta_1 TFP_{sr}^{98} + \beta_2 LQ_{sr}^{98} + \beta_3 size_{sr}^{98} + \beta_4 MNE_{sr}^{98} + \beta_5 (TRADE_s^{98} * LQ_{sr}^{98}) + \beta_6 \Delta PPI_s^{03,98} + \beta_7 HR_r^{98} + \varepsilon_{sr} \quad (5)$$

¹³ It is worth noticing that in Bulgaria divergence patterns are driven by the exceptional performance of the Sofia region, which is on a growth trajectory completely different from the rest of the country. When Sofia region is not considered, patterns of convergence clearly emerge.

¹⁴ A detailed description of the spatial weight matrix W is given in section 4.

according to which the growth rate of TFP of sector s in region r over the 1998-2003 period ($\Delta TFP_{sr}^{03,98}$) is expressed as a function of a number of sectoral and regional characteristics measured at the beginning of the period in order to minimize possible endogeneity problems. Sectoral characteristics, always measured at regional level, include the initial level of TFP (TFP_{sr}^{98}), the relative concentration of the sector, measured by the traditional location quotient (LQ_{sr}^{98}), the average size of firms ($size_{sr}^{98}$), a measure of MNE activity (MNE_{sr}^{98}), whose construction will be discussed below, a measure of trade openness ($TRADE_s^{98}$), obtained as the ratio of export and import over the output of the sector. This measure has been interacted with the location quotient in order to give it a regional dimension, otherwise impossible to obtain. Finally, we consider the variation of the production price index ($\Delta PPI_s^{03,98}$) in order to understand the role played by the price component in TFP changes, thus (partially) correcting for possible measurement errors in the construction of the dependent variable. Regional characteristics concern mainly the human capital endowment, proxied by the human resources devoted to science and technology activities (HR_r^{98}) while α_0 is the constant and ε_{sr} the error term.

We used existing literature to justify eq. (5). The cumulative effects of continuous production, learning by doing and human capital are important issues in productivity growth studies (Islam, 1995; Nelson and Phelps, 1966; Benhabib and Spiegel, 1994). We use the initial level of TFP and the human resource variable to capture these effects. New technologies are diffused through a variety of channels, the most important of which are international trade and MNEs (Coe and Helpman, 1995; Xu, 2000; Xu and Wang, 1999; Keller, 2002). Finally, the findings that firms geographically clustered are more productive because of agglomeration economies (Henderson, 2001) justify the inclusion in the set of the explanatory variables of the location quotient, a traditional measure of industry concentration.

The measurement of inward investment that are used as potential sources of externalities are foreign firms' shares in sector s and region r 's total employment ($E_{sr}^f / \sum_s E_{sr}$) weighted by the importance of the sector as a client/supplier of all other manufacturing sectors, itself included, as indicated by the input-output tables.¹⁵ We thus end up with the following four measures for MNEs:

¹⁵ We used the latest available national Input Output tables at two digit level for each country. This strategy implies that supplier and client relationships occur within sectors as well. This is not too unrealistic, given the

$$MNE_for_{sr}^{98} = \alpha_{ss} * \frac{E_{sr}^f}{\sum_s E_{sr}} \quad (6)$$

$$MNE_for_{k\neq s,r}^{98} = \sum_{k\neq s} \alpha_{sk} * \frac{E_{kr}^f}{\sum_k E_{kr}} \quad (7)$$

$$MNE_back_{k\neq s,r}^{98} = \sum_{k\neq s} \omega_{sk} * \frac{E_{kr}^f}{\sum_k E_{kr}} \quad (8)$$

$$MNE_back_{sr}^{98} = \omega_{ss} * \frac{E_{sr}^f}{\sum_s E_{sr}} \quad (9)$$

Eq. (7) and (8) measure foreign firm penetration in upstream and downstream industries, thus accounting for forward and backward linkages, respectively. α_{sk} (ω_{sk}) is the share of sector k output (input) that is supplied (sold) to sector s , as indicated by the input-output tables. Eqs. (6) and (9) have the same meaning as eq. (7) and (8) respectively, but refer to foreign firms operating in the same sector (and region).

4.1 Econometric Issues

Within the approach outlined here three potential econometric issues may arise, i.e. multicollinearity among the explanatory variables, endogeneity between FDI spillover variables and the dependent variable and spatial autocorrelation.

Two reasons suggest the presence of multicollinearity. First of all, manufacturing sectors are strongly interrelated, as indicated by the input-output tables.¹⁶ This implies that eqs. (6)-(9) can not be included simultaneously in eq. (4). Therefore, we estimate the effects of downstream MNEs on TFP changes separately from those of upstream MNEs. Secondly, MNEs might be very sensitive to a number of variables included in the right hand side of eq. (4), namely the initial level of TFP, the degree of relative concentration and openness of the manufacturing sector they belong to, and the human resource endowment of a region, as suggested by previous empirical studies on FDI location in transition countries (Campos and

level of aggregation we work with. This concept can be clarified if we consider the following two sub-sectors, i.e. cotton fibres and cotton fabrics. Although they reflect different stages of the same production chain, these two sub-sectors belong to the same two digit manufacturing sector, i.e. textiles (Nace 17). We are aware that this specification did not allow us fully to capture intra-sectoral spillovers, which also stem from foreign activity taking place at the same production stage as domestic firms. These spillovers derive from imitation and or demonstration effects, as well as from personnel training and mobility. However, it is likely that multinational firms try to minimize them, because they involve the transmission of specific knowledge to their local competitors (Haskel et al., 2002).

¹⁶ According to input-output tables, each sector has at the same time both client and supplier relationships with other manufacturing sectors; the intensity of these relationships is often very similar.

Kinoshita 2003, Resmini, 2000; Pusterla and Resmini, 2007). In order to avoid severe multicollinearity problems, we first regressed the MNE variables on the other explanatory variables and then used the residuals of these regressions as a proxy for MNEs in eq. (4).¹⁷

Concerning endogeneity, we can not exclude a priori that inward FDI is co-determined with productivity changes. Theoretically, foreign firms are attracted to industries and locations where there is potential for significant productivity improvements. We think that it is perhaps unlikely in transition countries, and the estimation of the reverse regression definitively excludes that TFP changes over the 1998-2003 period have been affected by MNE location choice in 1998.¹⁸ Further endogeneity due to omitted variables can easily be controlled for through spatial econometric techniques.

At this purpose, two specifications are usually considered: the spatial error model (SEM) and the spatial lag model (SAR).¹⁹ In the former, spatial dependence is restricted to the error term. This implies that spatial dependence works through omitted variables with a spatial dimension, i.e. climate, common rules and institutions, and exogenous shocks. Therefore, the error term in eq. (4) would have the following form:

$$\begin{aligned}\varepsilon_{sr} &= \lambda W \varepsilon_{sr} + \mu_{sr} \\ \varepsilon_{sr} &= (I - \lambda W)^{-1} \mu_{sr}\end{aligned}\tag{10}$$

where λ is the parameter indicating the extent of the spatial correlation between the errors, W is the squared matrix defining the interaction among regions, and μ is an *i.i.d.* error component.

Spatial lag models, instead, assume that spatial dependence occurs through the dependent variable. This implies that TFP changes in one sector and region depend on TFP changes in neighbouring regions, in addition to the explanatory variables already identified. In order to account for this second form of spatial dependence, the set of the explanatory variables should also include the spatially lagged dependent variable, i.e. $\rho W \Delta TFP_{sr}^{03,98}$ where ρ is the parameter indicating the extent of the spatial dependence.

¹⁷ Residuals, by definition, are the portion of the variation of the dependent variable not explained by the explanatory variables. Thus, in our case, they pick up the effects of FDI not related to the other explanatory variables on changes in TFP proxy.

¹⁸ See the appendix for further details.

¹⁹ See Anselin (2003), Le Sage (1998) and Elhorst (2003) for a comprehensive discussion about the characteristics of these models.

In both cases, the spatial weights, i.e. the elements of the matrix W , are inversely related with distance. We choose spatial weights which are proportional to the size of the economies – proxied by the population of the neighbouring regions – and the inverse of their bilateral great circle distance. By convention, the matrix has zero on the main diagonal and it is row standardized, so that it is relative and not absolute distance that matters.²⁰ In formulas:

$$\begin{aligned} w_{ij}^* &= POP_j * d_{ij}^{-1} \\ w_{ii}^* &= 0 \\ w_{ij} &= w_{ij}^* / \sum_j w_{ij}^* \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

The estimation of eq. (4) by OLS would result, in the first case, in unbiased but inefficient estimates, and in the second case in biased and inconsistent estimates. Instead, both models can be estimated using maximum likelihood (Anselin, 1988). Specific tests (LM tests) help in choosing the right specification for spatial dependence.

5. Empirical findings

Table 1 shows the results for various specifications used in order to explore the existence and the nature of spatial dependence. Column (1) reports the results of the OLS estimation, while column (2) and (3) the results of spatial lag and spatial error model, respectively. Column (4) and (5) present the results of the spatial error model estimates with spatial fixed effects and sectoral fixed effects. The upper part of the table shows estimates with a measure of MNEs in upstream manufacturing sectors, while the impact of MNEs in downstream sectors is shown in the lower part of the table.

Spatial diagnostics are provided at the end of columns (1) and (2). In the first column, we report two tests for spatial dependence: the Moran's I test, and the Lagrange multiplier tests for spatial error dependence in OLS residuals. The Moran's I statistic for regression residuals is a general test for detecting spatial dependence, but it does not allow to discriminate between spatial dependence and spatial error models. The statistics is significant at the 1% level in both specifications, indicating that the residuals from OLS regressions are spatially autocorrelated and that the standard model is miss-specified. Therefore, we estimate eq. (4) by using either spatial lag model (column 2) or spatial error model (column 3). The Lagrange

²⁰ As robustness check, we implement our econometric analysis also with alternative weight matrices. We employ a matrix in which each element is proportional to the GDP of the area and inversely related to the distance, and a contiguity matrix. Results are strongly robust. The results provided in the next section are obtained with the matrix defined in (11), while the results with alternative matrices are available upon request.

Multiplier tests confirm that the errors are spatially autocorrelated, and that accounting for the spatial lag of the dependent variable is not appropriate. On the base of these results, the spatial error model seems to be the most appropriate, as confirmed by the R^2 and the log likelihood, which are better in the SEM than in the SAR specification.

Our results indicate that changes in aggregate TFP are positively affected by the human resources devoted to science and technology activities, the relative concentration of the industry, and the average size of firms belonging to the sector. As expected, variation in production prices does affect TFP, while the initial level of TFP and the degree of openness do not seem to be able to exert any impact on TFP changes.²¹ The technology superiority of MNEs spreads to the local economy only within the same manufacturing sector, as indicating by the positive coefficients of the variables measuring the importance of foreign firms in each manufacturing sectors. Also the coefficients of the variables for MNEs operating in upstream and downstream sectors enter positively, yet they are not significant. This result changes when we control for spatial heterogeneity by introducing regional specific dummies (column 4). To test the validity of these restrictions (i.e. if dummy variables should be introduced into the model) the F test has been performed. It allows us to reject the null hypothesis that the restricted and unrestricted specifications are the same. When regional fixed effects are considered, both MNE variables become significant at the conventional levels. The magnitude of intra and inter-sectoral spillovers is the same, regardless of the position of the MNEs in the production value chain (i.e. upstream or downstream). It is worth noticing that these coefficients are larger than the coefficients reported in column (1); therefore, we can conclude that the presence of spatial spillovers magnified the impact exerted by MNEs. Finally, the restrictions are relaxed for sectoral dummies too, and the complete unrestricted model is estimated (last column of table 2). In this case, however, the test F is not significant; therefore the constraint of not including sectoral dummies is valid.²²

[insert Table 1 about here]

In table 2, we further refine our model by controlling for two specific geographical patterns detected in the exploratory analysis (section 3). In particular, we want control for both country patterns and spatial dependence in the TFP initial levels. This has implied, first, to interact the

²¹ While the latter result is quite surprisingly, the former indicates that manufacturing sectors in transition countries have not accumulated enough experience to generate further increases in TFP.

²² The poor explanatory power of specification (4) may be explained by the fact that sectoral heterogeneity is already captured by explanatory variables; therefore, adding sectoral fixed effects may generate multicollinearity problems that worsen the goodness of fit of the model.

TFP level variables with the country dummy variables, and, secondly, to spatially lag these new variables. In so doing we found a strong evidence of spatial spillovers generated by Polish regions, as indicated by the coefficients of the spatially lag TFP variable interacted with a dummy for Poland, which is positive and statistically significant in all specifications. The results concerning the other explanatory variables do not change substantially. However, it is also worth noticing that the coefficient of spatial autocorrelation becomes less significant, indicating that by introducing country patterns and controlling for spatial spillovers in TFP levels we reduce the omitted variable bias responsible for spatial dependence. As before, sectoral fixed effects are not supported by data.

[insert Table 2 about here]

5.1 Spatial spillovers and MNEs

The previous discussion has suggested that MNEs located in the region can exert, on average, a positive effect on changes in sectoral TFP. This result is not new in the literature, and support the idea that local firms, as a whole, can take advantages from proximity with MNEs. However, recent developments in economics of agglomeration have shown that some externalities and, namely, pecuniary externalities, are not necessarily localized, since they arise from imperfect competition in presence of market-mediated linkages among firms (Fujita and Thisse, 2002). Therefore, it is not unrealistic to assume that spillovers generated by MNEs can overcome regions' boundaries to the extent foreign firms interact with indigenous firms, consumers and workers located in other regions.

In order to control for this hypothesis, we create spatially lagged variables for MNEs operating either in the same or in other manufacturing sectors, which should take into account the effect of MNEs operating in neighbouring regions.²³ Table 3 shows the results of this cross regressive model with regional and sectoral fixed effects. Two features are worth noticing. First of all, the coefficients of the spatially lagged spillover variables enter negatively, though they are significant only for MNEs operating downstream in the production value chain within the same manufacturing sector. Secondly, the coefficients of the spillover variables for MNEs located in the same region maintain their positive sign,

²³ When adding spatially lagged variables, the matrix of exogenous variable can suffer from multicollinearity problems. In order to identify possible collinear relationships in this matrix, we applied the method set forth in Belsey, Kull and Welsch (1980). Exogenous variables are not collinear.

though one of them, i.e. MNEs in downstream sectors, turns on being insignificant. Overall, these results suggest that FDI spillovers tend to be localized.²⁴

[insert Table 3 about here]

Finally, we investigate whether and to what extent the negative impact of MNEs located outside the region is generalized or driven by particular groups of regions. To accomplish this task we interact the spatially lagged MNE variables with different regional dummy variables. In particular we consider the following types of regions: *i)* capital regions; *ii)* regions bordering with the former EU-15; *iii)* most dynamic regions, i.e. regions with the highest TFP level in 1998 and with the highest TFP growth rates over the period; *iv)* less dynamic regions, i.e. regions with the lowest TFP level in 1998 and the lowest TFP growth rate over the period;²⁵ *v)* Polish regions. Results for the cross regressive model in pool and with spatial fixed effects are shown in table 4, which reports the coefficients for the MNE variables, only. This new set of estimates indicates that the negative impact exerted by MNEs is confined to a specific group of regions, which includes the capital regions and, though to a lesser extent, the regions bordering with the former EU-15 countries, as indicated by the negative and significant sign of the coefficients of the spatially lagged MNE variables interacted with the dummy variable in specification (1) and (2) of table 4.

There are at least two possible explanations for these results, which do not necessarily mutually exclude. The first is that MNEs located along the former EU-15 borders are likely to have more strict relationships with firms operating in the EU-15 regions than in other regions of transition countries, which, therefore, do not reap any externalities and suffer from the lack of potential business with technologically advanced partners. Secondly, in transition countries, the capital regions usually catalyze most of the economic activity of their own countries, either because of legacy from the past or because the lack of other important industrial poles. This suggests that capital regions, in order to sustain their development, may draw resources - both in terms of qualified labour and productive firms – from neighbouring regions. This effect may be further exacerbated by MNEs enterprises. Therefore, being located close to the capital regions, which usually host most of foreign firms located in their own country does not help in enhancing TFP growth rates.

[insert Table 4 about here]

²⁴ Similar results were obtained by Girma and Wakelin (2000) and Driffield (2006), though with different methodologies.

²⁵ These regions are, respectively, those in the upper-right and bottom-left quadrants of figure 3.

6. Summary and conclusions

This paper investigated the hypothesis that MNEs are important channels for technology diffusion and, consequently, important determinants of TFP growth rates. Our investigation used data on foreign manufacturing firms operating in Bulgaria, Poland and Romania covering the period 1998-2003. Distinctive features of our work were, on the one hand, the consideration of TFP at aggregate level, and, on the other hand, the inclusion of spatial effects, and, therefore, the explicit consideration of both spatial dependence and spatial heterogeneity. This is the first time this methodology is proposed and applied to the analysis of FDI induced spillovers. It allows us to conclude that FDI spillovers do exist and that their intensity is further magnified by spatial autocorrelation.

Our results, based on panel data estimation, indicate that spillovers from MNEs occur both within and across complementary manufacturing sectors at regional level. We also find some evidence of negative spillovers outside the region, though limited to specific groups of regions, such as the capital regions and regions bordering with former EU-15 countries. Therefore, we can conclude that there seems to be a regional channel for FDI spillovers.

Besides MNEs, there are other characteristics of sectors and regions able to affect changes in aggregate TFP. In particular, we found that relatively concentrated sectors with large firms in regions well endowed with human capital enjoy high TFP growth rates. The latter are also positively affected by neighbouring regions' TFP levels, but only in Poland. Bulgaria and Romania do not show any significant spatial autocorrelation pattern working through TFP levels. Spatial autocorrelation, however, do exist in all countries, but it works through omitted variables with a spatial dimension, as indicated by diagnostics tests on spatial autocorrelation in the error term.

These results open interesting perspectives on the policy side. The expectations of regional spillovers from MNEs support the existence of FDI promotion policies implemented at regional level. However, the existence of possible negative spillovers from MNEs located in some neighbouring regions suggests that MNEs location should be carefully planned in order to avoid regional policies to attract FDI may generate opposite results, thus vanishing the objectives they wish to obtain.

References

- Abreu M, de Groot H. and R. Florax (2004), "Space and Growth", Tinbergen Institute discussion paper TI 2004-129/3
- Abreu M, de Groot H. and R. Florax (2005), "Spatial Patterns of Technology Diffusion: An Empirical Analysis Using TFP", Tinbergen Institute discussion paper 05-079/3.
- Aitken B. and A. Harrison (1999), "Do Domestic Firms Benefit from Direct Foreign Investment? Evidence from Venezuela", *American Economic Review*, 89 (3), pp. 605-618.
- Anselin L. (2003), "Spatial Externalities, Spatial Multipliers and Spatial Econometrics", *International Regional Science Review*, 26 (2), pp. 153-166.
- Anselin L. (2001), "Spatial Econometrics", in Baltagi B. (ed.), *A Companion to Theoretical Econometrics*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, pp. 310-330.
- Baltagi B., Egger P. and M. Pfaffermayr (2006), "Estimating Regional Trade Agreement Effects on FDI in an interdependent world", paper presented at the 8th ETSG Annual Conference, Vienna, 7-9 September 2006.
- Bartelsman E. and M. Doms (2000), "Understanding Productivity: Lessons from Longitudinal Microdata", *Journal of Economic Literature*, 38 (3), pp. 569-94.
- Belsey D., Kuh E. and R.E. Welsch (1980), *Regression Diagnostic*, New York: John Wiley & Son Inc.
- Benhabib J. and Spiegel (1994), "The Roles of human capital in economic development: evidence from aggregate cross-country data", *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 34, pp. 143-173.
- Bernard A., Redding S. and P. Schott (2005), "Products and Productivity", NBER working paper n. 11575.
- Bloningen B., Davis R., Waddell G. and H. Naughton (2004), "FDI in space: spatial autoregressive relationships in foreign direct investment", NBER working paper n. 10939.
- Campos, N. and Y. Kinoshita (2003), "Why does FDI Go Where It Goes? New Evidence from the Transition Economies", IMF working paper n. 03/228
- Coe D.T. and H. Helpman (1995), "International R&D spillovers", *European Economic Review*, 39, pp. 859-887.
- Coughlin C., E. Segev (2000), "Foreign direct investment in China: a spatial econometric study", *The World Economy*, 23 (1), 1-23.
- De Loecker J. (2005), "Product Differentiation, Multi-Product Firms and Structural Estimation of Productivity", mimeo.
- Driffield N. (2006), "On the Search for Spillovers from Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) with Spatial Dependency", *Regional Studies*, 40 (1), pp. 107-119.
- Elhorst J. P. (2003), "Specification and Estimation of Spatial Panel Data Models", *International Regional Science Review*, 26 (3), pp. 255-68
- Fosfuri A., Motta M. and T. Ronde (2001), "Foreign direct investment and spillovers through workers' mobility", *Journal of International Economics*, 53, pp. 205-222.
- Girma S. and K. Wakelin (2000), "Are there regional spillovers from FDI in the UK?", GEP research paper n. 00/16, University of Nottingham.

- Girma S. and K. Wakelin (2001), "Regional underdevelopment: is FDI a solution? A semiparametric analysis", CEPR discussion paper n. 2995.
- Glass A. and K. Saggi (1998), "International technology transfer and the technology gap", *Journal of Development Economics*, 55, pp. 369-398.
- Glass A. and K. Saggi (2001), "Multinational firms and technology transfer", World Bank policy research working paper n. 2067.
- Haskel J., Pereira S. and M. Slaughter (2002), "Does Inward Foreign Direct Investment Boost the Productivity of Domestic Firms?", NBER working paper n. 8724.
- Islam N. (1995), "Growth Empirics: a Panel Data Approach", *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 60, pp. 1127-1170.
- Katayama H., Lu S. and J. Tybout (2006), "Firm-level productivity studies: illusions and a solution" mimeo.
- Klette T.J. and Z. Griliches (1996), "The inconsistency of common scale estimators when output prices are unobserved and endogenous", *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 11 (4), pp. 343-361.
- Le Sage J. (1998), *The Theory and Practice of Spatial Econometrics*, mimeo downloadable at: <http://www.rri.wvu.edu/WebBook/LeSage/spatial/wbook.pdf>.
- Levinsohn J. and A. Petrin (2003), "Estimating Production Functions Using Inputs to Control for Unobservables", *Review of Economic Studies*, 70, pp. 317-341.
- Mairesse J. and J. Jaumandreu (2005), "Panel-data estimates of the production function and the revenue function: what difference does it make?", *Scandinavian Journal of Economics*, 107 (4), pp. 651-672.
- Markusen J. and A. Venables (1999), "Foreign Direct Investment as a Catalyst for Industrial Development", *European Economic Review*, 43 (2), pp. 335-356.
- Nelson R. and E. Phelps (1966), "Investment in Humans, Technology Diffusion, and Economic Growth", *The American Economic Review*, 56 (1), pp. 69-75.
- Nicolini M. and L. Resmini (2006), "Multinational enterprises and spillovers in the CEECs: a microeconomic approach", paper presented at the 46th ERS Conference, Volos, August 30th – September 3rd, 2006.
- Olley S. and A. Pakes (1996), "The Dynamics of Productivity in the Telecommunication Equipment Industry", *Econometrica*, 64 (6), pp. 1263-1297.
- Peri G. and D. Urban (2004), "Catching-up to foreign technology? Evidence on the Veblen-Gerschenkron effect on foreign investments", NBER working paper n. 10893.
- Petrin A. and J. Levinshon (2005), "Measuring Aggregate Productivity Growth using Plant-Level Data", NBER working paper n. 11887.
- Pusterla F. and L. Resmini (2007), "Where Do Foreign Firms Locate in Transition Countries? An Empirical Investigation", *The Annals of Regional Science*, forthcoming.
- Resmini L. (2007), "Regional Patterns of Industry Location in Transition Countries: Does Economic Integration with the EU matter?", *Regional Studies*, forthcoming.
- Resmini, L. (2000), "The Determinants of Foreign Direct Investment into the CEECs: New Evidence from Sectoral Patterns", *The Economics of Transition*, 8 (3), pp. 665-689.

- Sjoholm F. (1999), "Productivity growth in Indonesia: the role of regional characteristics and direct foreign investments", *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 47, pp. 559-584.
- Tornqvist L. (1936), "The Bank of Finland's consumption price index", *Bank of Finland Monthly Bulletin*, 1-8
- Traistaru, I., Njikamp P. and L. Resmini (eds) (2003), *The new emerging geography in Transition Countries*, Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Van Beveren I. (2007), "Total Factor Productivity Estimation: a Practical Review", Licos, discussion paper n. 182.
- Wang J. and M. Blomstrom (1992), "Foreign direct investment and technology transfer: a simple model", *European Economic Review*, 36, pp. 137-155.
- Xu B. (2000), "Multinational enterprises, technology diffusion, and host country productivity growth!", *Journal of Development Economics*, 62, pp. 477-93.
- Xu B. and J. Wang (1999), "Capital goods trade and R&D spillovers in the OECD", *Canadian Journal of Economics*, 32, pp. 1179-1192.

Figure 1. Aggregate TFP patterns of growth by country (1998-2003)




Figure 2. Aggregate TFP growth and MNEs




Figure 3. Aggregate TFP changes by country and region




Figure 4. Moran I scatterplot of TFP levels (1998 and 2003)




Figure 5. Moran I scatterplot of TFP growth rates over the period




Table 1 Estimation results: OLS vs. spatial models

	OLS		SAR - Pool		SEM - Pool		SEM spatial FE		SEM all FE	
	coeff.	t-stat	coeff.	t-stat	coeff.	t-stat	coeff.	t-stat	coeff.	t-stat
constant	-0.77**	-2.544	-0.80***	-2.671	-0.71**	-2.383	-	-	-	-
TFP level	-0.00	-0.122	-0.372	-0.122	-0.01	-0.705	0.00	0.372	0.00	0.288
HRST	0.25***	2.90	0.25***	2.866	0.24***	2.833	-	-	-	-
LQ	0.05***	2.72	0.05***	2.687	0.05***	2.722	0.05***	2.643	0.06***	2.996
avg size	0.03**	2.37	0.03**	2.247	0.03**	2.197	0.03***	2.595	0.03**	2.468
openness*LQ	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.026	0.00	0.044	-0.01	-0.201	0.04	1.084
Var PPI	0.14**	2.45	0.13**	2.258	0.14**	2.197	0.60***	3.905	0.55***	3.859
MNE_forw same sect	0.03*	1.88	0.03*	1.897	0.03**	1.958	0.05***	2.722	0.01	0.843
MNE_forw other sect	0.01	1.10	0.02	1.255	0.02	1.233	0.05**	2.378	0.03	1.521
spat. Autocorr coeff.	-	-	0.23**	2.415	0.26***	2.675	0.25***	2.619	0.23**	2.463
<i>n. obs</i>	630		630		630		630		630	
<i>R squared</i>	0.0415		0.0407		0.0500		0.1368		0.0744	
<i>adj. R squared</i>	0.0292		0.0283		0.0428		0.0844		-0.0161	
<i>log likelihood</i>			-322.35		-322.16		-511.848		-533.728	
<i>Moran I</i>	3.047***									
<i>LM (error)</i>	6.79***		12.11***							
<i>test F on fixed effects</i>							F[29,593]=1.94***		F[50,573]=0.61	
constant	-0.77**	-2.567	-0.79***	-2.674	-0.70**	-2.358	-	-	-	-
TFP level	-0.00	-0.275	-0.00	-0.502	-0.01	-0.838	0.00	0.088	-0.00	-0.089
HRST	0.25***	2.89	0.25***	2.85	0.24***	2.800	-	-	-	-
LQ	0.05***	2.65	0.05***	2.60	0.05***	2.67	0.05***	2.480	0.05***	2.702
avg size	0.03***	2.39	0.03**	2.58	0.03**	2.22	0.03***	2.675	0.03***	2.602
openness*LQ	-0.00	-0.000	0.00	0.038	0.00	0.08	-0.00	0.056	0.04	0.960
Var PPI	0.14**	2.458	0.13**	2.302	0.14**	2.24	0.63***	4.035	0.57***	4.007
MNE_back same sect	0.02*	1.90	0.03**	2.00	0.03**	2.15	0.05***	2.826	0.01	0.548
MNE_back other sect	0.02	1.44	0.02	1.43	0.02	1.28	0.05**	2.298	0.04**	2.21
spat. Autocorr coeff.	-	-	0.23***	4.144	0.26***	2.636	0.26***	2.779	0.24**	2.463
<i>n. obs</i>	630		630		630		630		630	
<i>R squared</i>	0.0424		0.041		0.0563		0.1377		0.0789	
<i>adj. R squared</i>	0.0301		0.0287		0.0442		0.0854		-0.0111	
<i>log likelihood</i>			-322.05		-321.70		-511.65		-532.15	
<i>Moran I</i>	3.121***									
<i>LM (error)</i>	7.050***		2947.88***							
<i>test F on fixed effects</i>							F[29,593]=1.94***		F[50,573]=0.29	

*, **, *** indicates significance level at 10, 5, and 1 per cent, respectively.

Table 2. Estimation results: cross regressive models with spatially lagged TFP levels

	spatial FE		all FE		spatial FE		all FE	
	coeff.	t-stat	coeff.	t-stat	coeff.	t-stat	coeff.	t-stat
TFP level*BG	-0.00	0.035	-0.02	-0.702	-0.00	-0.152	-0.02	-0.713
TFP level*PL	0.01	0.897	0.01	1.298	-0.00	-0.270	-0.01	-0.506
TFP level*RO	-0.06	-1.332	-0.08*	-1.870	-0.06	-1.251	-0.08	-1.555
W-TFP level*BG	-	-	-	-	-0.02	-0.250	-0.06	-0.741
W-TFP level*PL	-	-	-	-	0.07**	2.38	0.06**	2.539
W-TFP level*RO	-	-	-	-	0.01	0.056	0.00	0.006
HRST	-	-	-	-				
LQ	0.05***	2.593	0.06***	2.963	0.06***	2.846	0.06***	3.322
avg size	0.03**	2.484	0.03**	2.296	0.03**	2.39	0.02**	2.022
openness*LQ	-0.00	-0.135	0.04	1.120	-0.00	-0.149	0.04	1.093
Var PPI	0.53***	3.349	0.44***	3.010	0.51***	3.188	0.39**	2.548
MNE_forw same sect	0.05***	2.794	0.01	0.871	0.05**	2.547	0.01	0.76
MNE_forw other sect	0.05**	2.387	0.03	1.576	0.05**	2.455	0.03*	1.736
spat. Autocorr coeff.	0.23**	2.463	0.22**	2.249	0.20**	2.065	0.18*	1.782
<i>n. obs</i>	630		630		630		630	
<i>R squared</i>	0.140		0.082		0.146		0.09	
<i>adj. R squared</i>	0.084		-0.0116		0.0871		-0.0077	
<i>log likelihood</i>	-510.68		-531.01		-507.83		-527.83	
<i>test F on fixed effects</i>	F[29,591]=1.58**		F[50,571]=0.108		F[29,588]=1.76***		F[50,568]=0.22	
TFP level*BG	-0.00	0.035	-0.02	-0.811	-0.00	-0.142	-0.02	-0.666
TFP level*PL	0.01	0.592	0.01	0.944	-0.01	-0.521	-0.01	-0.590
TFP level*RO	-0.06	-1.364	-0.08**	-1.998	-0.06	-1.267	-0.07	-1.472
W-TFP level*BG	-	-	-	-	-0.02	-0.171	-0.08	-1.066
W-TFP level*PL	-	-	-	-	0.07**	2.321	0.06**	2.403
W-TFP level*RO	-	-	-	-	-0.00	-0.000	-0.030	0.307
HRST	-	-	-	-				
LQ	0.05**	2.418	0.05***	2.658	0.05**	2.668	0.06***	2.937
avg size	0.03**	2.571	0.03**	2.428	0.03**	2.478	0.02**	2.160
openness*LQ	0.00	0.005	0.04	0.998	-0.00	-0.000	0.04	0.996
Var PPI	0.56***	3.498	0.46***	3.144	0.53***	3.317	0.39**	2.563
MNE_back same sect	0.05***	2.836	0.01	0.513	0.04***	2.690	0.01	0.459
MNE_back other sect	0.05**	2.312	0.04**	2.225	0.04**	2.193	0.04**	2.215
spat. Autocorr coeff.	0.23**	2.489	0.22**	2.273	0.21**	2.174	0.18*	1.771
<i>n. obs</i>	630		630		630		630	
<i>R squared</i>	0.140		0.086		0.1467		0.0937	
<i>adj. R squared</i>	0.085		-0.065		0.0872		-0.0037	
<i>log likelihood</i>	-510.57		-529.41		-507.83		-526.54	
<i>test F on fixed effects</i>	F[29,591]=1.55**		F[50,571]=0.15		F[29,588]=1.70***		F[50,568]=0.23	

*, **, *** indicates significance level at 10, 5, and 1 per cent, respectively.

Table 3. Cross-regressive models with spatially lagged MNEs.

	spatial FE		all FE	
	coeff.	t-stat	coeff.	t-stat
TFP level*BG	-0.00	0.100	-0.01	-0.573
TFP level*PL	-0.00	0.171	-0.00	-0.115
TFP level*RO	-0.06	-1.307	-0.08*	-1.662
W-TFP level*BG	-0.03	-0.292	-0.05	-0.677
W-TFP level*PL	0.06**	2.219	0.05**	2.084
W-TFP level*RO	0.01	0.099	0.00	0.053
HRST	-	-	-	-
LQ	0.06***	2.948	0.07***	3.492
avg size	0.03**	2.493	0.02**	2.174
openness*LQ	-0.00	-0.076	0.05	1.149
Var PPI	0.50***	3.135	0.38**	2.482
MNE_forw same sect	0.05***	2.625	0.04*	1.922
MNE_forw other sect	0.05**	2.428	0.05**	2.032
W-MNE_forw same sect	-0.05	-1.194	-0.08**	-2.326
W-MNE_forw other sect	-0.05	-1.104	-0.06*	-1.706
spat. Autocorr coeff.	0.18*	1.794	0.20**	2.005
<i>n. obs</i>	630		630	
<i>R squared</i>	0.148		0.099	
<i>adj. R squared</i>	0.086		-0.018	
<i>log likelihood</i>	-507.02		-525.02	
<i>test F on fixed effects</i>	F[29,586]=1.49**		F[50,566]=0.17	
TFP level*BG	-0.00	-0.040	-0.01	-0.451
TFP level*PL	-0.01	-0.400	-0.00	-0.298
TFP level*RO	-0.07	-1.349	-0.08*	-1.630
W-TFP level*BG	-0.04	-0.400	-0.10	-1.291
W-TFP level*PL	0.06**	2.275	0.05**	2.182
W-TFP level*RO	-0.00	-0.033	-0.04	-0.412
HRST	-	-	-	-
LQ	0.06***	2.829	0.06***	3.217
avg size	0.03**	2.517	0.02**	2.077
openness*LQ	-0.00	0.043	0.03	0.667
Var PPI	0.52***	3.278	0.39***	2.592
MNE_back same sect	0.06***	3.222	0.05***	2.681
MNE_back other sect	0.04	1.478	0.03	0.977
W-MNE_back same sect	-0.06*	-0.817	-0.09***	-3.322
W-MNE_back other sect	-0.02	-0.544	-0.01	-0.371
spat. Autocorr coeff.	0.16*	1.633	0.18*	1.851
<i>n. obs</i>	630		630	
<i>R squared</i>	0.150		0.111	
<i>adj. R squared</i>	0.088		0.012	
<i>log likelihood</i>	-506.20		-520.42	
<i>test F on fixed effects</i>	F[29,586]=1.44*		F[50,566]=0.27	

*, **, *** indicates significance level at 10, 5, and 1 per cent, respectively.

Table 4. Cross regressive models with spatial regimes

	pool	spatial FE	pool	spatial FE	pool	spatial FE	pool	spatial FE	pool	spatial FE
	(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)		(5)	
MNE_forw same sect	0.05** (2.546)	0.07*** (3.245)	0.04* (1.993)	0.07*** (3.029)	0.04* (1.853)	0.07*** (3.004)	0.05** (2.189)	0.06*** (2.730)	0.04** (1.977)	0.06*** (2.663)
MNE_forw other sect	0.03** (2.012)	0.07*** (3.088)	0.01 (0.815)	0.06** (2.442)	0.01 (0.510)	0.06** (2.542)	0.03* (1.655)	0.06** (2.275)	0.03 (1.527)	0.06** (2.413)
W-MNE_forw same sect	-0.05 (-1.194)	-0.06 (-1.330)	-0.04 (-1.049)	-0.05 (-1.289)	-0.04 (-1.062)	-0.05 (-1.306)	-0.04 (-1.094)	-0.05 (-1.168)	-0.05 (-0.882)	-0.07 (-1.338)
W-MNE_forw other sect	-0.04 (-0.988)	-0.06 (-1.409)	-0.02 (-0.636)	-0.05 (-1.190)	-0.03 (-0.698)	-0.05 (-1.175)	-0.03 (-0.809)	-0.05 (-1.087)	-0.02 (-0.338)	-0.07 (-1.222)
W-MNE_forw same sect*DUMMY	-0.11** (-2.564)	-0.14** (-2.537)	-0.03 (-0.745)	-0.07* (-1.672)	-0.01 (-0.425)	-0.06 (-1.462)	-0.03 (-1.028)	-0.03 (-0.854)	0.00 (0.080)	0.05 (0.672)
W-MNE_forw other sect*DUMMY	-0.06** (-2.170)	-0.12 (-2.383)	0.04** (2.002)	-0.02 (-0.472)	0.06*** (3.528)	-0.03 (0.834)	-0.01 (-0.652)	-0.01 (-0.137)	-0.03 (-0.684)	0.04 (0.572)
Spat. Autocorrelation coefficient	0.17* (1.668)	0.20** (2.029)	0.17* (1.679)	0.19* (1.887)	0.17* (1.645)	0.19** (1.921)	0.17* (1.702)	0.19** (1.919)	0.17* (1.679)	0.18* (1.828)
n. obs	630	630	630	630	630	630	630	630	630	630
R squared	0.0979	0.158	0.0929	0.152	0.104	0.151	0.087	0.150	0.086	0.149
adj. R squared	0.0728	0.093	0.068	0.087	0.079	0.086	0.062	0.084	0.061	0.083
log likelihood	-525.00	-503.40	-526.75	-505.58	-522.90	-505.96	-528.79	-506.56	-529.01	-506.77
test F on fixed effects	F[29,584]=1.44*		F[29,584]=1.41*		F[29,584]=1.13		F[29,584]=1.48*		F[29,584]=1.48**	
MNE_back same sect	0.05*** (2.673)	0.05*** (2.899)	0.04** (2.372)	0.06*** (3.157)	0.04** (2.308)	0.06*** (3.196)	0.07*** (3.459)	0.07*** (3.649)	0.05*** (2.832)	0.06*** (3.276)
MNE_back other sect	0.04* (1.856)	0.07** (2.228)	0.01 (0.507)	0.05* (1.803)	-0.00 (-0.019)	0.05* (1.726)	0.02 (1.087)	0.04 (1.377)	0.02 (0.979)	0.04 (1.495)
W-MNE_back same sect	-0.06* (-1.706)	-0.05 (-1.635)	-0.06* (-1.728)	-0.06 (-1.849)	-0.05 (-1.635)	-0.06 (-1.817)	-0.05 (-1.625)	-0.06* (-1.728)	-0.06 (-1.516)	-0.09 (-2.042)
W-MNE_back other sect	-0.02 (-0.612)	-0.04 (0.824)	-0.01 (-0.157)	-0.03 (-0.644)	-0.00 (-0.002)	-0.03 (-0.593)	-0.01 (-0.213)	-0.03 (-0.597)	0.01 (0.185)	-0.04 (-0.804)
W-MNE_back same sect*DUMMY	-0.01 (-0.159)	-0.03 (-0.409)	0.03 (0.842)	-0.01 (-0.324)	0.02 (0.676)	-0.02 (-0.619)	-0.06** (-2.147)	-0.06 (-1.782)	0.01 (0.303)	0.05 (1.018)
W-MNE_back other sect*DUMMY	-0.07*** (-2.619)	-0.13** (-1.940)	0.03 (1.473)	-0.05 (-1.149)	0.06*** (3.196)	-0.04 (-0.973)	-0.01 (-0.381)	0.01 (0.373)	-0.020 (-0.589)	0.04 (0.667)
Spat. Autocorrelation coefficient	0.15 (1.511)	0.18* (1.770)	0.15 (1.500)	0.15 (1.467)	0.16 (1.544)	0.17* (1.657)	0.15 (1.483)	0.17* (1.747)	0.15 (1.467)	0.16 (1.611)
n. obs	630	630	630	630	630	630	630	630	630	630
R squared	0.16	0.16	0.093	0.152	0.105	0.151	0.0964	0.158	0.09	0.152
adj. R squared	0.095	0.095	0.068	0.086	0.0797	0.086	0.0713	0.093	0.065	0.086
log likelihood	-502.60	-502.59	-526.43	-505.52	-522.57	-505.71	-525.38	-503.46	-527.29	-505.66
test F on fixed effects	F[29,584]=1.44*		F[29,584]=1.38*		F[29,584]=1.11		F[29,584]=1.46**		F[29,584]=1.44*	

DUMMY is defined as follows: (1) capital regions = 1, 0 otherwise; (2) BEU regions=1, 0 otherwise; (3) most dynamic regions=1, 0 otherwise; (4) less dynamic regions =1, 0 otherwise; (5) Polish regions =1, 0 otherwise. *, **, *** indicates significance level at 10, 5, and 1 per cent respectively. Estimations include also all the explanatory variables shown in eq. (5).

Appendix

Table A.1. Representativeness of the sample: distribution of manufacturing employment

	By region	By sector
1998	0.89 (p>0.000)	0.89 (p>0.000)
2003	0.97 (p>0.000)	0.72 (p>0.000)

Correlation with official data (EUROSTAT)

Table A2. MNEs vs. TFP changes: the reverse regression

	Estimated coefficients for TFP changes			
	(1)		(2)	
	coeff.	t-prob.	coeff.	t-prob.
Dep. Var.				
MNE_forw same sect	0.184	0.1033	0.177	0.1083
MNE_forw other sect	0.076	0.5542	0.08	0.5104
MNE_back same sect	0.198	0.1223	0.191	0.1277
MNE_back other sect	0.107	0.3678	0.133	0.2613

OLS estimates. (1) includes all the other regressors shown in eq. (5), while specification (2) includes as exogenous variable TFP changes only.