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• Large increase in FDI during recent decades

• An extensive literature searches for positive effects of FDI on growth and productivity:
  • Direct productivity effects (on acquired firms)
  • Knowledge spillovers from foreign-owned companies to domestic

• Micro literature typically focuses on single country. Results differ by developed/emerging countries.

• Identification is a serious issue: selection and simultaneity
Selecting more or less productive firms

- Firm carefully decide in which firms to invest
- Corporate finance literature suggest under-performing firms are likely targets
- Empirically it appears that multinationals target more productive firms
Spillovers

- Why would there be spillovers? Suggested stories: imitation, labor mobility, competition (positive/negative), forward or backward linkages

- More selection: Multinationals drive out weak domestic firms \( \Rightarrow \) domestic firms are becoming more productive on average with increased multinational presence in the host economy—spurious spillover

- Simultaneity: a host of sector, time, firm unobserved variables potentially affect productivity:
  - country-time effects: reform may increase productivity and open economy for investment at the same time;
  - sector-time effects: technological breakthroughs, sector specific: cell phones, Internet, etc.
Aims of this paper:

- Provide evidence on firm-level productivity effects of FDI:
- Direct and Spillover effects of FDI
- Decompose spillover effects into “knowledge” spillovers and “competition” effects on domestic firms
- Backward (from foreign customers) and forward (from foreign suppliers) spillovers (compare to literature)
- Accounting for selection and simultaneity
Methodological contributions

- Multiple country setting: control for sector-year patterns (simultaneity).
- Industrial vs Financial owners
- Exploit 4 digit sector classification:
- Address endogeneity using a new instrument.
ORBIS database provided by Bureau van Dijk (BvD) (worldwide)

Public firms are less than 1 percent of the data as opposed to COMPUSTAT, which is all public

We use manufacturing only (to compare to literature)

We use unconsolidated accounts.

Collected from official registers, annual reports, and newswires

Data shows fully list of direct and indirect shareholders and subsidiaries, company’s degree of independence, its ultimate owner, all in time series

Foreign Ownership (FO): For a firm i, $FO_i$ is the sum of all percentages of direct ownership by foreigners.

We distinguish between:

- Industrial-FDI: Parent company industrial.
- Financial-FDI: Parent company is a bank, financial company, private equity, mutual fund, or other financial institution.
Distribution of FDI Among Foreign Owned Firms: Developed Countries

(a) Industrial FDI

(b) Financial FDI
Distribution of FDI Among Foreign Owned Firms: Emerging Market Countries

(c) Industrial FDI

(d) Financial FDI

Fons-Rosen, Kalemli-Ozcan, Sorensen, Villegas and Volosovych
Quantifying Productivity Gains from Foreign Investment
Are foreign-owned firms more productive? (Direct Effects)

Simple measure of productivity: Value Added

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LHS:</td>
<td>VA/L</td>
<td>VA/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firms:</td>
<td>Manuf.</td>
<td>Manuf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Ownership</td>
<td>0.494***</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.011)</td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm fixed</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector fixed</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country-Year fixed</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fons-Rosen, Kalemli-Ozcan, Sorensen, Villegas and Volosovych
Quantifying Productivity Gains from Foreign Investment
Total Factor Productivity (TFP)

$$\log TFP_{i,t} = \log(Y_{i,t} - M_{i,t}) - \alpha_1 \log L_{i,t} - \alpha_2 \log K_{i,t}$$

- $\alpha_1$ and $\alpha_2$ estimated, by country-sector, using the non-parametric approach of Levinsohn and Petrin (2003) and Wooldridge (2009) (WLP).
TFP density distribution by foreign ownership: Developed Countries
TFP density distribution by foreign ownership: Emerging Countries
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Control for sector- and country-level trends

- Typical regression in (single-country) literature:

\[
\log TFP_{i,s,t} = \beta FO_{i,s,t} + \alpha_i + \delta_t + \epsilon_{i,s,t}
\]

where \(i\): firm, \(s\): sector and \(t\): time. (Or, differences, rather than firm fixed-effect.)

- We estimate:

\[
\log TFP_{i,s,c,t} = \beta FO_{i,s,c,t} + \alpha_i + \delta_{c,t} + \phi_{s,t} + \epsilon_{i,s,c,t}, \tag{1}
\]

where \(TFP_{i,s,c,t}\) is total factor productivity and \(\delta_{c,t}\) and \(\phi_{s,t}\) are country-year and sectoral-year fixed effects, respectively

- (Controlling for sector-year patterns potentially important)
Potential bias if foreign investors target firms with predicted growing productivity (a potential firm-year effect).
We construct new instrument.
Start at sectoral level.

1. Define sector, country *financial* investment as

\[ I_{c,s,t}^F = \frac{\sum_{i \in c,s} FO_{i,t}^F \times Y_{i,0}}{\sum_{i \in c,s} Y_{i,0}}. \]

2. We assume that financial investors are passive investors who invest based on forecasted profit growth, but who do not actively change production.
Define industrial investment $I_{c,s,t}^I = \frac{\sum_{i \in c,s} FO_i^I \times Y_{i,0}}{\sum_{i \in c,s} Y_{i,0}}$

We assume industrial investment is determined by the same profit motive as financial investment,

plus a term “A” which reflects further profit from active management (increased market power, etc.)

$\sum_{i \in c,s} FO_i^I \times Y_{i,0}$

(2) $I_{c,s,t}^I = b \times I_{c,s,t}^F + \delta \times A_{c,s,t} + e_{c,s,t}$
If we know coefficient $b$, we can use

$$I^I_{c,s,t} - b \cdot I^F_{c,s,t} = \delta \cdot A_{c,s,t} + \text{error}$$

as an exogenous instrument (at sector, country, year level) because endogenous $E$ term has disappeared.

So we proceed as follows:

1. Regress $I^I_{c,s,t}$ on $I^F_{c,s,t}$ and take residuals $\Rightarrow W_{c,s,t}$

2. $W_{c,s,t} = I^I_{c,s,t} - \hat{b} \cdot I^F_{c,s,t}$

(had we had very long firm-level time series, would want to at firm level)
We assume that impact of sectoral exogenous investment is proportional to initial foreign ownership.

Generate $Z_{it} = FO_{i0} \cdot W_{c,s,t}$ and use as instrument where $FO_{i0}$ is non-time varying initial FO of firm $i$.

Type of instrument first suggested by Acemoglu and Johnson (2007).

Recall: firm fixed effect in regressions removes levels effects, so endogeneity of $FO_{i0}$ is not a problem in general.
### Table: Are Foreign Firms more Productive? (dep. var. log TFP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Developed</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GLS &amp; IV</td>
<td>GLS &amp; IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>log(FO)</td>
<td>0.007** (0.003)</td>
<td>0.031** (0.014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta_2 ) log(FO)</td>
<td>0.023 (0.017)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm Fixed Eff</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Stage Results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-Test</td>
<td>770.24</td>
<td>237.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obs</td>
<td>402,137</td>
<td>402,137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Do domestic firms benefit (productivity) from foreign companies?

Ambiguous evidence on spillover effects (horizontal):

Explanations:
- Absorptive capacity: human capital, local financial markets.
- Competition/rivalry.

We argue that to identify spillover effects we have to:
- Separate positive knowledge spillovers from negative competition effects: precise sectoral FDI measure is needed
- Address potential simultaneity concerns by including sector-year fixed effects
Traditionally the literature on spillovers has estimated:

$$\log TFP_{i,s,t} = \beta Spillover_{s,t} + \alpha_i + \delta_t + \epsilon_{i,s,t}$$

We estimate:

$$\log TFP_{i,s,c,t} = \beta Spillover_{s,c,t} + \alpha_i + \delta_{c,t} + \phi_{s,t} + \epsilon_{i,s,c,t}$$

$$\phi_{s,t} \text{ sector } \times \text{ year fixed effects (dummies).}$$

$$\delta_{c,t} \text{ country } \times \text{ year fixed effects (dummies).}$$
Usual horizontal spillover (2-digit sectors):
\[ Spillover_{s,t} = \sum_{i \in s} \omega_{i,t} FO_{i,t} \]
where \( \omega_{i,t} = \frac{Y_{i,t}}{\sum_{i \in s} Y_{i,t}} \)

Our spillover measures: **finer level of aggregation: 4 digit**

\[ SpilloverCompetition_{s4,t} = \sum_{i \in s4} \omega_{i,t} FO_{i,t} \]
- where “s4” refers to the four-digit sector classification.

\[ SpilloverKnowledge_{s4,t} = \sum_{i \in s2, \notin s4} \omega_{i,t} FO_{i,t} \]
Motivation
Data
Conclusion

Sample
Direct Effects
Instrumental Variables
Spillover Effects
**Horizontal Spillovers - 4 digit**
Vertical Spillovers
Firm Heterogeneity

29 Manufacture of Motor Vehicles

- 2910 Car Manufacturer
- 2931 Manuf. Electrical Equipment for Motor vehicle

27 Manufacture of Electrical Equipment
Are There Positive Spillover Effects on TFP from Foreign Ownership? (Domestic firms only.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPENDENT VARIABLE</th>
<th>Developed</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>log(TFP)</td>
<td>log(TFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>log(TFP)</td>
<td>log(TFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>log(TFP)</td>
<td>log(TFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spillover_{s2}</td>
<td>0.026**</td>
<td>-0.061***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td>(0.014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spillover_Competition_{s4}</td>
<td>-0.028***</td>
<td>-0.080***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spillover_Knowledge_{s4}</td>
<td>0.020**</td>
<td>-0.078***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
<td>(0.018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector2dig-Year Fix Eff.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector4dig-Year Fix Eff.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Does increasing FO imply higher market shares?
(Otherwise, competition story maybe not true)

\[ \log MS_{i,s,c,t} = \alpha + \beta_1 FO_{i,s,c,t} + \alpha_i + \delta_{c,t} + \phi_{s,t} + \epsilon_{i,s,c,t} \]  

(2)

- where MS: share of firm “i” output in total sectoral output in her country.
### Competition Spillover Channel: Output Market Shares (2nd stage displayed only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPENDENT VARIABLE</th>
<th>Developed ( \log MS_{4\text{dig}} )</th>
<th>Emerging ( \log MS_{4\text{dig}} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \log FO )</td>
<td>0.042** (0.017)</td>
<td>0.214* (0.125)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>402,137</td>
<td>72,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firms</td>
<td>59,306</td>
<td>12,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm Fix Eff.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ctry-4dig-Year F.E.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-Test</td>
<td>770.24</td>
<td>43.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Failure to find positive horizontal spillovers lead researchers to search for vertical spillovers:

**Vertical Measures**

\[
\text{Backward}_{s,t} = \sum_{k \neq s} \alpha_{sk} \text{Horizontal}_{k,t}
\]

\[
\text{Forward}_{s,t} = \sum_{m \neq s} \sigma_{mk} \text{Horizontal}_{m,t}
\]

where \( \alpha_{sk} \): proportion of sector “s” output supplied to (customer) sector “k”, and \( \sigma_{mk} \) is the share of inputs purchased by sector “s” from (upstream, supplier) sector “m”
## Vertical Spillovers

### Dependent Variable: Firm Productivity

**Sample:** Domestic Firms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Developed (1)</th>
<th>Emerging (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Backward Spillover</td>
<td>0.063**</td>
<td>0.076**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.023)</td>
<td>(0.034)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forward Spillover</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>-0.089**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.030)</td>
<td>(0.038)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal Spillover</td>
<td>0.014*</td>
<td>-0.057***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>357,995</td>
<td>55,565</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Firm Fixed Effects: yes  
Country-Year Fixed Effects: yes  
Sector2dig-Year Fixed Effects: yes
## Firm Heterogeneity: Spillovers by TFP fractiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spillover × Quartile</th>
<th>Developed</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spillover × 1st Quartile</td>
<td>$-0.036^{**}$</td>
<td>$-0.157^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.014)</td>
<td>(0.030)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spillover × 2nd Quartile</td>
<td>$-0.009$</td>
<td>$-0.094^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spillover × 3rd Quartile</td>
<td>$-0.021^{**}$</td>
<td>$-0.060^{**}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
<td>(0.018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spillover × 4th Quartile</td>
<td>$-0.070^{***}$</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.016)</td>
<td>(0.038)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge × 1st Quartile</td>
<td>$-0.008$</td>
<td>0.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
<td>(0.046)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge × 2nd Quartile</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>$-0.073^{**}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
<td>(0.029)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge × 3rd Quartile</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>$-0.203^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.014)</td>
<td>(0.031)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge × 4th Quartile</td>
<td>0.072^{**}</td>
<td>$-0.052$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.031)</td>
<td>(0.056)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So is FDI important for aggregate growth?

- Calculate effect of a doubling (huge change!) of foreign ownership from current levels in percent of aggregate assets implied by our point estimates.
- Developed countries: total effect of 1.1 percent
  0.9 percent if the insignificant coefficient to Spillover_Forward is set to 0).
- Emerging countries: total effect of –0.4 percent
  (–1.2 percent if the insignificant coefficient to FO is set to 0).

FDI is not of first-order importance for economic growth.
Thank you for listening!