

Determinants of FDI for Spanish regions: Evidence using stock data

by

Mariam Camarero
Laura Montolio
and
Cecilio Tamarit

July 2018

Working Papers in Applied Economics

WPAE-2018-09

Determinants of FDI for Spanish regions: Evidence using stock data.*

Mariam Camarero ^{a†}, Laura Montolio [‡] and Cecilio Tamarit [§]

May 6, 2018

Abstract

After two decades of academic debate on the factors that determine FDI, the discussion still remains open. This article empirically investigates the determinants of FDI activity from a macroeconomic point of view, using Spanish regional data (NUTS 2) for the period 2004-2013. We apply the Poisson Pseudo-Maximum-Likelihood estimator with country-origin fixed effects in a gravity framework. The empirical analysis revealed the following allocation patterns: FDI locational strategies in the Spanish regions are determined significantly by the economic potential and competitiveness of the regions and, in a lesser extent, by the productive capacity. We also confirm the adequacy of using the stock of FDI and obtain an improved specification of the model compared to previous empirical literature based on FDI flows. The results allow us to draw some policy implications about the prospective promotion of incoming FDI at the subnational level.

Keywords: Foreign Direct Investment determinants; PPML; Gravity model; Spanish regions
JEL classification: F21, R12, C23

*The authors are grateful to Matilde Mas Ivars for kindly providing data of the Valencian Institute of Economic Research (Ivie). We are also indebted to Isaac Barbero and Emilio Carmona from the Spanish Ministry of Economy, for providing us with the extended version of FDI stock data from the DATAINVEX database. Furthermore, we would like to thank Jeffrey Bergstrand, Estrella Gómez, Rafael Llorca and María Rochina for kindly providing advice with technical doubts as well as the comments and suggestions gathered from the XIII and XIV Inteco Workshops (Valencia), the ETSG 2017 19th Annual Conference (Florence), the XLIII International Conference on Regional Science (Seville), 42nd Simposio of Economic Analysis (SAE-Barcelona) and the 5th International Symposium in Computational Economics and Finance (ISCEF-Paris). We also acknowledge the financial support from the Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness (BES-2015-072395 and ECO2014-58991-C3-2-R and ECO2017-83255-C3-3-P projects). All remaining errors are ours.

^{†a}Corresponding author: University Jaume I and INTECO, Department of Economics, Campus de Riu Sec, E-12080 Castellón (Spain). camarero@uji.es. ORCID: 0000-0003-4525-5181

[‡]University of València and INTECO, Department of Applied Economics II, Av. dels Tarongers, s/n Eastern Department Building E-46022 Valencia, Spain. ORCID: 0000-0003-0386-910X

[§]University of València and INTECO, Department of Applied Economics II, Av. dels Tarongers, s/n Eastern Department Building E-46022 Valencia, Spain. ORCID: 0000-0002-0538-9882

1. Introduction and motivation

Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) has become the engine of the globalization process. It is broadly accepted that this type of investment has beneficial effects in terms of job creation and technological transfers. Therefore, most governments in the world, either at a national or regional level, have promoted generous policies to attract FDI on their soil. However, there is no current consensus in the literature about the drivers of FDI and, therefore, the most effective policies for its promotion. In the European case, the significant increase in FDI flows after the launching of the euro gave rise to mounting and persistent external imbalances¹, and examining the factors that attract direct investment has become a "hot topic" in the rebalancing debate in the Eurozone, that is far from being solved empirically. Thus, there is a growing body of research that provides empirical evidence not only on the factors that determine FDI, but also about the existence of significant disparities in its distribution across countries.

Indeed, the peripheral European countries became massive capital importers until the outbreak of the crisis and Spain was by far the largest capital importer in absolute terms. Figure 1 presents the inward FDI stocks² and inflows to Spain during the period 1970-2014. Until the mid-eighties FDI was negligibly small. Since then, FDI inflows began to increase after the Spanish entry in the EU in 1986 (and the European Monetary System in 1989) and later with the creation of the monetary union. In particular, FDI inflows have increased from US\$ 4.570,7 million in 1987 to US\$ 76.992,5 million in 2008. Exchange rate stability has been crucial in the reduction of risk and, then, the increase of the general attractiveness of the country as an investment destination. However, the impressive upward trend in FDI inflows was disrupted by the global financial crisis in 2008. Since 2008, FDI inflows have declined. However, the bar graph in Figure 1 shows that although the FDI inward stock has slightly declined, it remains large and suggests that Spain is still an attractive host country for FDI. Even during the crisis, the value of the stock is maintained (at least in nominal terms) and only decreases with some delay, in 2013-2014.

Although there is an extensive empirical literature at the country-level for developed countries³, the evidence about the determinants of FDI at the regional level is quite recent and scarce (Kandogan (2012), Villaverde and Maza (2012) and Chan et al. (2014)). This scarcity mainly derives from the lack of data. Some efforts have been made, however, to collect and streamline data for regions by regional statistical offices. Studies reveal regional disparities in the distribution of FDI and, in this regard, the case of Spain clearly arises as a prominent example.

Looking at Figure 2, we can observe that the regional distribution of FDI is highly concentrated.

¹According to Bertola et al. (2013), there were two primary and interrelated causes explaining these imbalances: First, the monetary union created optimistic expectations regarding the rapid convergence of the peripheral countries with the core ones in the Eurozone. Second, the introduction of the euro eliminated the exchange-rate risk and induced investors to disregard country-specific bankruptcy risks. Both causes generated an investment and credit boom in the periphery and implied a large-scale reallocation of capital from the core to the periphery that materialized as current-account deficits.

²Note that data on inward FDI stock is only available since 1980.

³Mainly OECD countries, since traditionally they have represented a prominent share of world's FDI flows (Bénassy-Quéré et al. (2007) and Talamo (2007)).

The map shows total inward FDI in each of the 17 Spanish regions ⁴ during the period of analysis. FDI seems to be attracted mainly to four regions over the period 2004-2013. Of these, Madrid has been by far the largest recipient of inward FDI in Spain (almost 3500 million euros), followed by Catalonia (with 1048 millions), Asturias (304 millions) and the Basque Country (237 millions). Extremadura has attracted the lowest amount of FDI (an average of 6 millions). Another stylized fact, also related to the regional distribution of FDI, has to do with the geography of FDI: with the exception of the region of Madrid, the other regions that concentrate more FDI are in the coast. In addition, potential regional spillovers may influence Aragon's and Navarra's FDI (due to their closeness to Catalonia and Valencia in the case of the former and to the Basque Country in the case of the latter).

Finally, Figure 3 shows the main source-countries of FDI in Spain. The largest stock of FDI has come from the US (2601 million euros, in average, what represents the 19% of inward FDI stock in Spain), followed by France, the UK and Germany, that jointly represent over 60% of the total. Together with Mexico, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, Switzerland and Portugal they constitute the largest foreign investors in Spain.

In this context, examining the factors that attract FDI in Spain seems very pertinent. Indeed, the analysis of FDI determinants at the regional level within a country may be of special interest for countries with a federal structure where regional authorities have a key role in designing policies to encourage FDI. Moreover, the motivation for studying FDI from a regional standpoint comes from the fact that a lot of interesting characteristics are hidden at more aggregate levels. More importantly, FDI determinants and effects may be localized and, thus, a regional analysis may be more appropriate to obtain better-grounded results.

This paper seeks to contribute to the existing literature by providing further insights on the determinants of inward FDI activity from a macroeconomic point of view using Spanish regional data for the period 2004-2013. The FDI data used in this paper has been extracted from *DataInVex*, a rich and under-exploited database that provides FDI data on FDI stocks and flows broken down by autonomous communities or regions (NUTS 2) for the Spanish economy. Our aim is to shed some light on the increasing and heterogeneous patterns of inward FDI that the Spanish regions have attracted since the launching of the euro. We estimate an extended gravity model using the Poisson Pseudo-Maximum Likelihood (PPML) estimator in a gravity framework. We rely on PPML estimator because produces unbiased and consistent estimates when the dependent variable comprises of a large proportion of zero observations as is the case in the present study.

Furthermore, we use inward FDI stock data, as an alternative to flows, because stocks are much less volatile than flows. This is a salient feature of our study as our hypothesis is that this variable is the most suitable for empirical studies, as Wacker (2013) has recently corroborated. Flows are more volatile not only due to the existence of economic shocks but because they are also very dependent on individual large-scale investment decisions. For the sake of comparison, we replicate the analysis

⁴We do not account for Ceuta and Melilla.

using inward FDI flows for a longer data span (1995-2013).

A complete understanding of the factors that determine FDI seems pertinent given the interest of many countries currently facing financial constraints to attract FDI in their quest to foster economic activity. In this context, FDI stocks, as an alternative to flows, provide a better approximation to the long-run behavior of investment decisions, the ones really relevant for the generation of growth.

The reminder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews the theoretical approaches and reports the main determinants of FDI, whereas section 3 presents the empirical literature. Section 4 provides a description of the variables and the data sources. Section 5 describes the models to be estimated together with the results and, finally, Section 6 concludes.

2. Theoretical background

From a theoretical point of view, the so-called eclectic or *OLI paradigm* put forward by Dunning (1977, 1979) has been considered the standard workhorse theoretical framework within this strand of literature. Dunning suggests that three types of advantages influence the foreign investment decision of a multinational enterprise (MNE): Ownership, Location, and Internalization (OLI). *Ownership advantages* concern the importance of a firm owning firm-specific assets, both tangible and intangible, such as pioneering technology, specific know-how, and management skills, which provide MNEs with essential advantages over local firms. *Locational advantages* refer to all those factors a specific location owns that make it more attractive for foreign investment. Finally, *Internalization advantages* refer to those kinds of advantages that make more profitable for a firm to carry out transactions internally (i.e. through a wholly-owned subsidiary) rather than through licensing or joint-venture agreements. Due to imperfect RD markets and the subsequent asymmetric information, the firm having the ownership advantage is the one able to assess more accurately this advantage and may prefer to exploit it by itself instead to share it or sell it at a discount. A firm only having *Ownership advantages* will export its production but if it has also *Locational advantages* will tend to produce abroad through joint-ventures or licensing. However, the best option for a firm exhibiting the three advantages at the same time (*Ownership, Locational and Internationalization advantages*) is to go multinational.

In fact, a combination of ownership advantages, locational and internalization characteristics appear to be significant FDI determinants in many empirical studies. Here, it is worth to note that while *Ownership and Internationalization advantages* are essentially of a microeconomic nature, *Locational advantages* generally correspond to macroeconomic variables. Focusing on locational advantages, Dunning (2000) identifies four main motives that encourage MNEs to engage in foreign production: market seeking, resource seeking, efficiency seeking and strategic assets seeking. Market seeking motives correspond to FDI that aims at supplying the local market or markets in adjacent territories. The host market size, its per capita income and consumer demand (all of them to take advantage of the economies of scale) are the main reasons behind market seeking FDI. Resource

seeking companies are those investing abroad in order to obtain cheap natural resources and/or unskilled labour. Hence, locational decisions depend on factor endowments differences. Efficiency seeking investment is designed to promote a more efficient division of labor or specialization of assets by MNEs. Finally, strategic asset seeking FDI searches for resources such as technology, skilled workers and assets that can support development of a firm's worldwide and weaken the competitive position of its competitors.

With the incorporation of multinational firms into the general equilibrium trade models from mid 1980s onwards, it became possible to base empirical work on theoretical predictions regarding the relationship between MNE activity and home and host countries characteristics (Barba Navaretti and Venables (2004)). The *proximity vs. scale* framework for analyzing FDI is based on the new trade theory and allowed to explain the existence of two basic types of FDI, namely horizontal (market-oriented) and vertical (export-oriented) FDI. The first type of FDI is explained using the proximity-concentration hypothesis which explains the trade-off between maximizing proximity to customers and concentrating production to achieve scale economies (Horstmann and Markusen (1987)). In this regard, horizontal FDI (or HFDI) may imply duplication of the entire production process in several countries. In contrast, the second type (or VFDI) is explained by using the factor-proportions hypothesis which accounts for the existence of vertically integrated firms with geographically fragmented production. Therefore, vertical FDI implies only a part of the firm's organization is implanted in the foreign market (see Faeth (2009)). In terms of HFDI, the most important factor to attract FDI is the size and growth of the host country whereas VFDI mainly looks for cost competitiveness. VFDI is conducted in order to minimize production costs in the host country and then to export the output produced to the home country or to third countries. Hence, the most important location factor for VFDI is resource endowment. Helpman (1984, 1985) showed that countries' differences in relative factor endowments (the so-called factor-proportions hypothesis) explained VFDI.

Combining vertical and horizontal motivations for FDI, Ethier and Markusen (1996) and Markusen and Maskus (2002) formulated the *knowledge-capital model*. Markusen and Venables (1998) explain the knowledge-capital model through two tradeoffs. The first and key tradeoff is between the scale economy gains that come from dividing up production and spatially dispersing it to be near customer concentrations. The second trade-off concerns productive factors. The so-called VFDI strives to place each stage of production in the nation where it is cheapest. However, it is important to make some remarks at this point. It can be misleading to think of the former literature as a proper FDI theory. In fact, it is a Foreign Affiliate Sales (FAS) literature as qualified by Markusen and Maskus in their 2002 book ⁵. More recent contributions to this theoretical approach allow for heterogeneous firms. Helpman et al. (2004) consider firms that have different productivities and fixed costs of establishing "beachhead" in various markets. The most competitive firms tend to sell much more and thus tend to find the transport-cost-saving aspect of FDI especially attractive. This would

⁵Markusen and Maskus (2002).

explain the widely spread phenomenon that FDI is dominated by large firms. Carr et al. (2001) provided the first empirical test of the knowledge-capital model's hypotheses. Using a panel of data (US outbound and inbound affiliate sales in many nations from 1986 to 1994), they find evidence for both the horizontal and vertical motivations for FDI. Blonigen et al. (2003) question their econometrics, which, when corrected, no longer support the vertical motivations for MNE activity. Overall, under the knowledge-capital model, similarities in market size, factor endowments and transport costs were determinants of HFDI, while differences in relative factor endowments determined VFDI. The knowledge-capital model has recently been extended to explain other forms of FDI such as export-platform FDI (see Ekholm et al. (2007); Bergstrand and Egger (2004)) which is used to serve the neighboring markets of the host country. To sum up, while recent Eaton-Kortum (Ricardian) type models have been extended to motivate gravity equations for multinational production (MP) of firms either in isolation from trade flows (Ramondo (2014)) or with trade flows (Ramondo and Rodríguez-Clare (2013)), theoretical foundations for FDI per se are limited primarily to Bergstrand and Egger (2007).⁶

Indeed, a third strand of the theoretical literature on FDI determinants is the one based on the *gravity approach* to FDI. Theoretical foundations for FDI are limited basically to Bergstrand and Egger (2007) and Head and Ries (2008). These papers provide general equilibrium theories for FDI and not FAS⁷. In this case as in gravity models applied to trade flows, the main explanatory variables are geographical location (due to its effects on transport costs) and the size of the country, crucial when economies of scale are recognized to exist in the activities of MNEs. The gravity model states that the closer two countries are (geographically, economically and culturally) the higher will be the FDI activity between them. Recent papers have provided some micro foundations for the gravity FDI specification. Head and Ries (2008) develop a model of cross-border M&A activity where a mother company has a randomly assigned advantage in controlling the company in the host country, but faces a disadvantage in monitoring technology that gets more severe with geographical distance. Bergstrand and Egger (2007) add internationally mobile capital to the "knowledge-capital" model and find that a "modified" gravity model fits the data better. Similarly to Head-Ries, the Bergstrand-Egger model stresses the importance of relative distance. In this case, the amount of expected FDI between two nations depends upon the bilateral distance relative to some measure of the host and home nation's distance to alternative FDI sources and destinations. Kleinert and Toubal (2010) provide the theoretical underpinnings of the gravity equation applied to the analysis of FAS showing that gravity equations can be used to discriminate between different theoretical approaches, namely, two proximity-concentration models of HFDI with homogenous (Brainard (1997)) or heterogeneous firms (Helpman et al. (2004)) and a two-country factor proportions model of fragmentation that explains VFDI and based on Venables (1999).

⁶While Markusen and Maskus (2002) knowledge-capital model is about FAS, Bergstrand and Egger (2007) is about both, FAS and proper FDI.

⁷Recently, theory has been directed, as well as empirical work, to FAS, starting with Brainard (1997) and continuing to Ramondo et al. (2015)

In this very similar theoretical framework, the relationship between FDI and trade has been put forward, among others, in Helpman et al. (2004) and from an empirical point of view in Camarero and Tamarit (2004) and Camarero et al. (2018). Therefore, many of the FDI drivers can be connected to the ones for trade. In this very same vein, changes in interest rates and exchange rates have been identified as additional FDI determinants. The role of these variables is explained by the risk diversification hypothesis of MNE, as firms are risk averse and, therefore, are trying to diversify business risk.

Lastly, it is important to consider also the influence of political variables on FDI. The strategies adopted by companies and their performance on international markets are largely determined by institutions (i.e. the "rules of the game" as in Busse and Hefeker (2007)). In this context, foreign investment can be regarded as a "game" in which the players are the multinational firm and the government of the host country, or as a contest between governments to attract FDI (Faeth (2009)). Policy variables such as corporate tax rates, tax concessions, tariffs and other fiscal and financial investment incentives have thus been posited to have an effect on FDI.

Briefly stated, the literature suggests a variety of theoretical models explaining FDI that do not necessarily replace each other (see Blonigen (2005), Faeth (2009) and Assunção et al. (2011) for a thorough literature review on FDI determinants). Therefore, in the next Section we review the wide range of factors that can be considered in empirical studies in order to find the determinants of FDI. These factors involve both micro (e.g., organizational aspects) and macro (e.g., resource allocation) dimensions and call for a very accurate empirical validation.

3. A brief survey of the empirical literature on regional FDI determinants

The location determinants of FDI have been largely explored in the empirical literature using different approaches. Blonigen and Piger (2014) make an extensive overview of the empirical determinants of FDI literature. As we have already stressed before, although sometimes difficult, it is important to distinguish between proper FDI and FSA, being the latter derived from the Multi-national Production (MP) theory. Even if in this review we may not always make this distinction explicitly, we are aware of its relevance and will use it in the selection of the econometric specification as well as in the choice of the variables used in Section 5. Since this study aims to identify the factors that best explain inward FDI to a particular region, it concentrates on the macro dimension of the locational variables.

This section will emphasize the revision of the regional analyses. However, in order to set up a taxonomy of the empirical research on FDI determinants, we will single out a few recent studies on specific areas (OECD, EU...) to focus immediately on country-specific analyses. The latter are developed both at national and regional levels. It is important to stress that the variables involved at national and regional level studies may be different due to data availability but also to theoretical considerations. More specifically, *market seeking* variables, related to the size of the host market

are less relevant at a regional level, as the FDI project will be serving the whole nation, so the specific location of the FDI within the country must be due to other variable more closely related to *endowment differences* or distinct *geographical or political characteristics*. At the same time, many variables, such as the exchange rate or country-risk considerations have full sense at the national level but not at the regional one. In order to uncover the specific variables at play at the regional level, we will review the empirical literature at our disposal. It is worth mentioning that studies carried out at the national level have been the most prolific. Therefore, first, we will review the main studies that analyze FDI determinants for groups of countries; second, we will report the most significant studies at the country level; then we will summarize the main results of previous regional studies and finally, we will review the literature for the Spanish case.

The lion's share of the literature dealing with the FDI determinants focuses on the OECD since traditionally they have been representing an outstanding share of the world FDI inflows.

Recent research by Economou et al. (2017) using both static and dynamic panel techniques over the period 1980-2012 has identified lagged FDI, market size, gross capital formation and corporate taxation as robust FDI determinants for OECD countries. Moreover, Bruno et al. (2016) estimate OLS, Poisson and Heckman models on a gravity framework for 34 OECD countries over 1985-2013. They conclude that GDP, GDP per capita and EU membership affect positively FDI inflows. Although they focus on modelling flows, they also replicate the estimations for FDI stocks and find qualitatively similar results.

Other recent country-group studies have focused on European Union countries and, in particular Central and Eastern European Countries, (CEEC) after the 2004 enlargement. They try to unravel the specific importance of this economic integration process on FDI. Bevan and Estrin (2004) use panel data techniques in a gravity framework to examine the determinants of FDI in CEECs for the period 1994-2000. They identify unit labor costs, gravity factors, market size and proximity as the most important drivers of FDI. Besides, announcements about EU accession proposals have been found to have an impact on FDI for the future member countries.

Similarly, Demekas et al. (2007) use both FDI flows and stocks to explain inward FDI in 16 European transition economies, applying cross-section as well as dynamic panel data techniques. In addition to gravity factors, they control for host country policy variables as FDI determinants. They find that gravity factors, trade and foreign exchanges liberalization as well as infrastructure reforms encourage FDI, while high unit labor costs, corporate taxes and import tariffs discourage it.

For the case of EU countries, Canton and Solera (2016) estimates a Heckman two-step selection procedure in the context of a gravity model for the period 2003-2014. His findings suggest that business climate and product market regulations play a key role on attracting greenfield investment in the EU.

Far less research has been carried out concerning the factors that attract FDI within a particular country, that is, at a *regional level*. Moreover, most of these studies at the subnational level have been

conducted in large countries (most of them in China, but also in other countries such as the US), and only rarely in smaller countries. Using provincial panel data from China, Chan et al. (2014) examine all possible flows of causality involving FDI and a set of potential determinants, both in the short and in the long run. In a context of error correction models with Granger causality tests they show that in both the short and the long run, GDP growth directly influences FDI, while growth in local infrastructure and local investment have indirect but not direct influence.

In the case of the US, Kandogan (2012) investigates within-country regional locational decisions of multinationals. He uses states within the US as regions and applies multiple regression analysis for both FDI stock and flows as dependent variable. They identify unemployment rate, market size, per capita income, income growth and state regulations as the main determinants of FDI.

Although to a lesser extent, regional studies within small countries can also be found in the empirical literature. This is the case of Chidlow et al. (2009), that using a multinomial logit model investigate the location determinants of FDI inflows in the Polish regions. The authors claim that knowledge-seeking factors alongside market and agglomeration factors act as the main drivers for FDI inflows into the Mazowieckie region, while efficiency and geographical factors encourage FDI to other areas of Poland. Similarly, Dimitropoulou et al. (2013) analyze FDI projects in UK regions to identify the main determinants of the location choices of these investments. Using multinomial and conditional logit models, they find that existing regional specialization is the single most important determinant of inward FDI. Focusing on Croatian regions, Kersan-Skabic and Tijanic (2014) apply static (random effects estimator) and dynamic panel data methodologies to analyze their attractiveness as FDI locations. They conclude that FDI inward stocks are attracted to Croatia by education, infrastructure, the manufacturing industry and the capital city region, while unemployment and EU-border regions have a negative effect on FDI.

In the case of Spain, although most of the empirical evidence has been obtained at the national level ⁸, since the early 1990's the regional perspective has also been brought to the forefront of this field of research. Egea Román and López Pueyo (1991) conduct a cluster analysis for the period 1985-1989 and conclude that per capita and per employee income, human capital and the productive structure are the main drivers of FDI. In contrast, the unemployment rate, infrastructure endowment and subsidies are not found significant. Pelegrín (2002), using three different methodologies (OLS, LS with fixed effects and GLS), estimates a FDI equation for the period 1993-1998. Three key determinants of FDI location are identified, namely, market size, human capital and public incentives; however, infrastructures are not significant while labour costs have a positive coefficient. In another paper, Pelegrín and Bolancé (2008) finds that agglomeration economies and the concentration of R&D activities are important drivers for manufacturing FDI in a model estimated using GLS. Using the same methodology together with instrumental variables, Rodríguez and Pallas (2008) show that real GDP, human capital, sectoral export potential and the differential between labor productivity

⁸some examples of these studies are Bajo-Rubio and Sosvilla-rivero (1994), Pelegrín (2003) and Martínez-Martín (2011), among others

and the cost of labor are key factors in explaining the regional distribution of FDI during the period 1993-2002.

More recently, Villaverde and Maza (2012) analyze the regional distribution of FDI in Spain and its main determinants between 1995 and 2005/2008 by means of panel data techniques, namely by GLS and two stage GLS. The econometric analysis reveals that factors such as economic potential, labour conditions and competitiveness are important for attracting FDI both at aggregate and sectoral levels.

Finally, Gutiérrez-Portilla et al. (2016) estimate a FDI equation by GMM and GLS over the period 1997-2013, and show that FDI inflows in Spain are mainly determined by market size, the level of human capital in interaction with wages, and the characteristics of Madrid as capital of the nation. The research is conducted not only for the whole period and total FDI but also for two sub-periods (pre-crisis and crisis) and areas of origin (Europe and America).

Our paper contributes to the existing literature in different respects. First, we use a testing framework based on the gravity model embedding competing theoretical approaches. Second, despite the amount of empirical work that has analyzed the factors that determine FDI, the majority has focused on the evolution of flows. To the best of our knowledge, there are no empirical papers dealing with regional FDI determinants based on stock data. Overall, from the above literature review it can be inferred that the main FDI determinants in Spain are those related to market-seeking (i.e. market size) and resource-seeking (i.e. human capital, labor market conditions and physical infrastructure endowment). Third, unlike baseline estimates in earlier studies using ordinary least squares (OLS) or Heckman two-stage selection procedure, we use the pseudo-Poisson maximum likelihood (PPML) estimator proposed by Silva and Tenreyro (2006) which provides robust results.

In the next two sections, adopting a regional perspective, we shed more light on this statement using FDI stock data. The existence of an updated and largely unexploited database developed by the Spanish Ministry of Economy (DataInvex) calls for further research in this field.

4. Data and stylized facts

In this section, and prior to present the empirical results, we describe the variables we have chosen for the analysis based on the previous literature discussion, both from a theoretical and empirical point of view. In addition, we describe their sources and point to some stylized facts. More detailed variable definitions and data sources can be found in Table 2, while Tables 3 and 4 report some basic descriptive statistics and the correlations, respectively. All the variables are in logarithms.

The dependent variable is bilateral inward FDI stock from the origin countries towards the Spanish regions for the period 2004-2013⁹. They have been obtained from *DataInvex* from the Spanish Ministry of Economy, Industry and Competitiveness that provides data on FDI disaggregated by

⁹We do not include FDI information of ETVE (Empresas de Tenencia de Valores Extranjeros-brokers) firms because they are considered instrumental companies whose existence obeys to fiscal optimization strategies within a business group and in many cases their investments lack direct economic effects.

regions. Unlike the vast majority of the literature on this field, we use bilateral FDI stock as our dependent variable. We argue that stocks are much less volatile than flows, especially in relatively small countries ¹⁰. This volatility has its origin not only in the existence of economic shocks, but also on individual large-scale investment decisions. However, we have also applied the analysis to inward flows (that are available from 1995) for the sake of comparison. Furthermore, FDI stocks (as a valuation of the cumulative FDI) provide a better approximation to the long-run behavior of investment decisions, the ones really relevant to capture growth and the dynamic effects of economic integration. In the same vein, Baldwin et al. (2008) argue that factors such as stock market fluctuations or exchange rate volatility cause short-run variability on FDI flows that may not always be linked to the explanatory variables and therefore lead to worse model fit for flows than for stocks.

Our dataset is annual and covers the period 2004-2013. Hence, we have a balanced panel with dimension $n=680$ (17 regions $\times$ 40 countries, that is, all possible bilateral relationships) and $T=10$. The number of observations is $n \times T=6800$. Table 1 reports the countries included in the study. We assume zero FDI in case of non-reported data as in Canton and Solera (2016) and treat negative values of FDI stock as zero following Gouel et al. (2012). As the latter point out, negative stock values have not real economic meaning but are generally the consequence of accounting methods.

In search of the main determinants of inward FDI in the Spanish regions, we have chosen a set of explanatory variables that capture the main factors likely to attract FDI, considering not only the theoretical models but also the empirical studies previously discussed. These variables include factors describing labour market characteristics, the degree of openness, as well as capital endowment, both physical and human¹¹. The variables considered are the following:

Market size (MS): proxied by GDP per capita. Most of the literature considers this variable a robust determinant of FDI. From Dunning's OLI framework, to the HFDI theory (i.e. the proximity-concentration hypothesis) as well as the Knowledge Capital Model. As market's size increases, so do the prospects of higher demand (greater purchasing power), better market opportunities for the firms and potentially higher returns on their capital. In this regard, market-seeking are among the main motives for investors to undertake FDI. Larger markets in the host region do not only denote good economic performance, but also allow for a reduction in the cost of entry through the exploitation of economies of scale. Hence, we would expect to find a positive relationship between market size and FDI.

Labour productivity (LP): defined as GDP per total employment, the role of this variable would be also in line with the OLI framework, HFDI and the Knowledge Capital Model. If the number of workers is relatively scarce, labour productivity (and wages) would be low and hence, the marginal return to capital would be relatively high and FDI would become attractive. In such a context, we would expect a positive effect on FDI.

Wage (W): defined as employee's compensation per hour worked, calculated as the ratio of total

¹⁰Bénassy-Quéré et al. (2007), p.769).

¹¹It should be noted that the choice of variables was somewhat restricted by the availability of disaggregated Spanish data.

compensation per hours worked. The effect of wages in the host country is somewhat ambiguous in the literature: If VFDI activities are the dominant driving force it should be expected a negative relationship. However, if the driving force is HFDI it would be expected a positive relationship between the wage level and FDI (indicating the need for a qualified workforce in the foreign affiliate production and higher sales).

Unemployment Rate (UR): defined by the annual unemployment rate. The effect of the unemployment rate on FDI could be either positive or negative. High levels of unemployment may draw in efficiency-seeking FDI by increasing the availability of labour and the willingness of employees to work harder and for lower wages. However, unemployment can also reduce FDI by restricting incomes and spending power in host country markets. Furthermore, higher unemployment could also signal less competitive conditions and a lower quality of life that tend to discourage foreign investors.

Human capital (HC): proxied by the share of population with tertiary education. Again, the effect of HC on FDI can be argued to be positive or negative. The positive relationship accords with the OLI framework and the proximity-concentration HFDI theory. All other things being equal, regions with highly-skilled workers would be expected to compete more favorably than others in attracting FDI. Indeed, qualified workers attract FDI oriented to industrial sectors with higher demand and technology. Hence, higher human capital is expected to have a positive effect on FDI. However, if FDI was oriented to activities with a very low value added (following VFDI theories), it would seek cheap and less qualified workers. Hence, a negative association between skilled labour and FDI could also be expected.

Trade openness (OP): defined by the sum of bilateral exports plus imports over GDP. According to the OLI framework, the HFDI and the Knowledge Capital Model, a reduction of barriers to external trade and, in general, a business-friendly economic climate would increase investment in general, thus attracting FDI as well. In addition, it is expected that MNEs would invest in trade-partner markets with whom they are already familiar. Numerous empirical studies suggest that trade (imports and exports) complements rather than substitutes FDI. Much of FDI is export oriented and may also require the import of complementary, intermediate and capital goods. In either case, the volume of trade is enhanced and thus trade openness is generally expected to be a positive and significant determinant of FDI.

Differences in Relative Factor Endowments (RFE): proxied by differences in per capita GDP between the host and the source country. Following, Mitze et al. (2008), the variable takes a minimum of zero for equal factor endowments in the two regions. According to the Knowledge-Capital model, differences in relative factor endowments determine VFDI. Vertical or export-oriented FDI is conducted in order to minimize production costs in the host country and then to export the output produced to the home country or to third countries. In this regard, the most important location factors are resource endowments.

Infrastructure (RI,GCF): proxied by road infrastructure (RI) and gross capital formation (GCF).

According to market-seeking and/or efficiency-seeking FDI, multinationals would look for regions with good infrastructure as it is needed for market access and it leads to higher productivity. The empirical evidence usually supports a positive relationship between infrastructure variables and FDI.

It is worth to note that the above variables can be subject to sparse cross-dependencies and cross-correlations that may lead to collinearity problems in the estimation of the model giving to misleading results. In our case, the correlations matrix as well as some preliminary analysis indicated the presence of some collinearity. Hence following Villaverde and Maza (2012) we implement an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) to reduce the initial number of explanatory variables to a set of non-collinear factors. Following Hair et al. (2010), firstly, we examine the data adequacy for conducting factor analysis by computing the Kaiser Meyer Olkin statistic (KMO). The KMO ranges from 0 to 1, with 0,50 considered the minimum threshold for a suitable for factor analysis. In our case, the KMO statistic is found to be 0.5611 which indicates that the dataset is adequate for conducting factor analysis. Furthermore, in order to conduct EFA, the literature establishes that the sample size should be 100 or larger and that the ratio of observations per variable would be preferably 10:1 (Hair et al. (2010)). Our sample fulfills both criteria.

After diagonalizing the correlation matrix we obtain new variables, the factors, non correlated among them. Deriving from the analysis of the eigenvalues and using as a criterium the cut-off value of greater than 1, we can get the number of factor to be retained (see Table 5). Our results show that the nine FDI determinants initially considered can be reduced to three significant factors explaining 66.96% of the cumulative variance of the nine original variables. As a next step, we examine the Pattern Matrix to identify the three factors with their constituent parts in Table 6. When examining the factor loadings greater than 0.5 in absolute value we can easily identify their location and provide names for each factor. It can be observed that gdp per capita, labour productivity, human capital and wage belong to the first factor. It appears that all the first factor elements look like they are directly related to the region's economic potential. That is why we call this factor *Economic or Market potential*. The second factor includes unemployment rate, road infrastructure and capital infrastructure. We call this factor *Productive capacity*. Finally, the third factor consists of trade openness and differences in relative factor endowments and we call it *Competitiveness*. We can now extract each factor scores and run the regression model specification with the factors as additional determinants of FDI.

In the next Section we turn to the specification of the empirical model used in this paper, the empirical methodology and the results found.

5. Econometric specification, methodology and estimation results

Although the gravity model (Anderson and van Wincoop (2003)) has been extensively employed by the trade literature to explain bilateral trade flows, its use to study bilateral FDI flows and FAS has

been quite restricted until recently with the exceptions of the seminal papers by Eaton and Tamura (1994) and Wei (2000). One reason is that the transposition of the gravity model to study overseas investments was not supported by the theory. As our variable of interest is FDI and not FAS, we focus on the developments made by Head and Ries (2008), Bergstrand and Egger (2007) and Kleinert and Toubal (2010). In fact, Kleinert and Toubal (2010) refer to three different theoretical models of FAS to derive gravity equations that can yield an aggregate FDI equation. In particular, they rely on an horizontal model where firms can serve the foreign market j either by producing abroad or by exporting. They represent aggregate sales of foreign affiliates from firm i in j as follows:

$$n_i p_{ij} x_{ij} = n_i p_{ii}^{1-\sigma} \tau^{(1-\sigma)(1-\epsilon)} (1-\mu) Y_j P_j^{(\sigma-1)} \quad (1)$$

where n_i is the number of firms, p_{ij} the good price of firm i ; x_{ij} is country j 's consumption of variety from country i , τ_{ij} are the distance costs, Y_j the market size of country j and P_j the price index of country j .

According to Kleinert and Toubal (2010), the home country's market capacity can be denoted $s_i = n_i p_{ii}^{1-\sigma}$, while country's j 's equivalent is $m_j = (1-\mu) Y_j P_j^{\sigma-1}$, and $AS_i = n_i p_{ij} x_{ij}$ is bilateral foreign affiliates production. They express distance costs (τ_{ij}) as an increasing function of geographical distance between i and j , that is, $\tau_{ij} = \tau D_{ij}^{\eta_1}$. Then, equation 1 can be rewritten as:

$$AS_{ij} = s_i (\tau D_{ij}^{\eta_1})^{(1-\sigma)(1-\epsilon)} \quad (2)$$

where τ represents the unit distance costs and $\eta_1 > 0$.

The gravity equation can be then obtained by log-linearizing equation 2:

$$\ln(AS_{ij}) = \alpha_1 + \zeta_1 \ln(s_i) - \beta_1 \ln(D_{ij}) + \zeta_i \ln(m_j) \quad (3)$$

where $\alpha_1 = (1-\sigma)(1-\epsilon) \ln(\tau)$ and $\beta_1 = (\sigma-1)(1-\epsilon) \eta_1$.

This setting is enlarged using some additional variables following Blonigen and Piger (2014). Moreover, as the variable we are interested in is inward FDI, most of the relevant determinants should be related to the destination countries or regions (Blonigen et al. (2007)).

Silva and Tenreyro (2006) argue that estimating a log-linearized equation like the one shown in Equation 3 by Ordinary Least Square (OLS) results in bias. The conditional distribution of the dependent variable is altered and estimation by OLS would produce misleading estimates, as the t-values of the estimated coefficients cannot be trusted.

They have proposed instead a Poisson Pseudo-Maximum Likelihood (PPML) estimator which deals with this problem and provides consistent estimates of the original nonlinear model. The PPML estimator has a number of additional desirable properties. First, it is consistent under the presence of fixed effects; this is an important issue for the gravity approach since most theory-

consistent models require the inclusion of fixed effects. Second, the PPML estimator naturally includes observations for which the FDI value is zero.

Actually, data in many country-pairs involve zero investment flows. In particular, in this study the proportion of zero inward FDI stock constitutes the 22,09% of the total¹². Ignoring this number of zeros would lead to misleading results.

Model specifications like the one in Equation 3 do not incorporate absolute zero flows since the natural logarithm of zero is undefined and is consequently dropped. Therefore, we rely on PPML estimator proposed by Silva and Tenreyro (2006) which takes the following general form:

$$y_i = \exp[X_i\beta]\epsilon_i \quad (4)$$

In this equation, y_i is a dependent variable such that $y_i \geq 0$ and $E[\epsilon_i|x_i]$. Since we are using a count variable as dependent, i.e. a variable that is discrete and non-negative, the PPML method is an appropriate estimator with an increasing recognition in the empirical literature. Therefore, we rely on this estimator in the present paper.

Following the above discussions, the PPML estimator in the context of the current study would take the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} FDI_{ijt} &= \beta_0 + \beta_{1k}X_{ikt} + \beta_2Z_{ijt} + \beta_{3l}D_l + \psi_j + \psi_t + \epsilon_{ijt} \\ t &= 1, \dots, T, k = 1, \dots, K, l = 1, \dots, L \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where FDI_{ijt} represents inward FDI stock received by region i from country j in any period t . Matrix X_{ikt} denotes all k FDI macroeconomic determinants specific to the region and correspond to the factors "Economic Potential" and "Productive capacity" more closely associated with HFDI, while Z_{ijt} contains bilateral determinants such as trade openness and differences in factor endowments which are included in factor "Competitiveness" mostly related to VFDI. D_l stands for dummy variables. We have included in the analysis a group of dummies that try to capture not only the traditional gravity ones, but also other that represent institutional differences either internal or external, related to the European Union. that are relevant from the point of view of the regions. We denote *Distance* the geographical distance between the reporting country and the specific region; *Landlocked* takes the value 1 when the region has not access to the sea, and 0 for coastal regions; *FIS* takes the value 1 for those regions with special fiscal regime (Basque Country, Navarre and the Canary Islands) and 0 for the remaining ones; *OBJ1* is one for the regions Objective 1 according to the criteria of the European Structural Funds and 0 otherwise; *Capital1* and *Capital2* stand, respectively, for two dummy variables that represent Madrid and Barcelona, respectively. Finally, *Crisis* is a dummy that captures the international financial crisis period.

¹²This proportion of zero FDI flows corresponds to the 2004-2013 period. For the 1995-2013 period the proportion of zero FDI inflows is 11,66%

We also include country-origin fixed effects ψ_j to capture all those fixed effects of the investors, as well as time fixed effects ψ_t to control for business cycle effects over the sample period. ϵ_{ijt} is an error term such that $\epsilon_{ijt} \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$. Note that β_{1k} and β_{3l} are two vectors of k and l coefficients, respectively, associated to the explanatory region-specific variables and the dummies.

More formally, our empirical specification and the expected signs of the FDI determinants are as follows:

$$FDI_{ijt} = f \left(\begin{matrix} MS_{it} & LP_{it} & W_{it} & UR_{it} & HC_{it} & OP_{ijt} & RFE_{ijt} & RI/GCF_{it} \\ (+) & (+) & (+/-) & (+/-) & (+/-) & (+) & (+/-) & (+) \end{matrix} \right) \quad (6)$$

Previously in Section 4 we have conducted an exploratory factor analysis in order to reduce the above-mentioned explanatory variables to a set of non-collinear factors. We identified the following factors: *Economic potential*, *Productive capacity* and *Competitiveness*.

Therefore, taking into account the theoretical and empirical surveys of the literature as well as the main stylized facts, the present study proposes the following testing hypotheses:

- For the explanatory variables:
 - H1:** Economic potential positively influences the decision of a MNE to invest, that is, $\beta_{11} > 0$
 - H2:** The relationship between productive capacity and inward FDI will be positive, so that $\beta_{12} > 0$.
 - H3:** Competitiveness has a positive influence on inward FDI, $\beta_2 > 0$.
- For the dependent variable:
 - H4:** FDI stock data are more appropriate than flows in econometric FDI analysis.

Table 7 reports the results for the Poisson-Pseudo Maximum Likelihood estimator for different model specifications including the factors in logarithms. Column (1) presents the estimated coefficients for the baseline model; columns (2)-(7) are alternative augmented versions of the basic model in order to test for additional FDI determinants, represented by the dummies described above.

According to the overall indicator for the model's "fit", R^2 , shows that all the specified models have a similar explanatory power of FDI (around 83 – 88%).

Taking a closer look at the estimated coefficients, FDI is positively and significantly related to the three factors: economic potential, productive capacity and competitiveness of the regions. Similar results were also found by Villaverde and Maza (2012) for the case of Spain.

Column (2) includes two traditional gravity factors, *Distance* and *Landlocked*. Unexpectedly, *Distance* is found to have no significant impact on inward FDI unlike the traditional empirical literature on gravity models but the coefficient has the expected negative sign. On a second thought, these results seem quite sensible as the distance may be important at a national level, but at the regional one is not relevant to explain the heterogeneous location of FDI across regions. As for

the estimated coefficient of the dummy variable *Landlocked*, this one is found to be negative, as expected, but statistically non-significant. As this latter result may seem at odds with the general findings in gravity literature at a first glance, further analysis is needed.

In column (3) we extend the model to include a dummy variable *FIS* to control for those regions with different fiscal system (i.e. The Basque Country, Navarra and the Canary Islands). We find that the dummy is significant but the sign is negative, so that differences in fiscal regime may cause a negative effect on FDI. Trying to capture other institutional effects, we also consider the role that the European structural policies may have on the regions and whether the affluence of European funds may stimulate FDI toward these regions. We have denoted this variable *OBJ1* and find a significant a positive effect in specification (4).

Column (5) includes a dummy for the two regions with the largest cities where the large majority of the MNE headquarters are located: Madrid (*Capital1*) and Barcelona (*Capital2*). In columns (5) to (8) the two dummies for Madrid and Catalonia have a positive and very significant influence on inward FDI. We should also emphasize that once these two dummies are included, the effects of fiscal (*FIS*) and Objective 1 (*Obj1*) variables disappear. Also the significance of the first factor (*Economic potential*) and the second factor, *Productive Capacity* in equations (6) to (8)) become insignificant. The third factor, *Competitiveness* remains positive and significant. Finally, Madrid's coefficient is larger probably due to the fact that taxes are lower in this region or just because it is the capital of the country.

Finally, the global financial crisis is found to be non-significant (see equation (7)), suggesting some degree of persistence on the behaviour of the FDI stock: although FDI flows decreased during the crisis, the stock has maintained its total size, as reflected in the aggregated data shown in Figure 1.

Overall, the models in columns (5) to (8) present the highest R^2 and the lowest *AIC* and would be candidates to our chosen specifications.

We replicate the estimations for FDI inflows for the sake of comparison. Results are presented in Table 8. Even though we do not consider all the alternative models to be strictly comparable, the interpretation of the estimation results is in a similar vein. We find that economic potential, productive capacity and competitiveness are positive and significant determinants of FDI. Gravity factors included in column (2) are not significant in this specification nor in specifications (3) and (4). *FIS* also has a negative and significant impact on FDI in columns (3) and (4) and, as before, those regions that receive structural funds from the European Union attract more FDI. Column (6) confirms that Madrid and Catalonia attract more FDI in line with the FDI regional distribution presented previously. Lastly, the dummy variable included in model (7) representing the financial crisis has, surprisingly, a significant effect. This is not surprising, as the financial crisis affects the flows of FDI but the stock is only affected in a lesser extent. Ramsey's Reset test Ramsey (1969) can be considered a general misspecification and omitted variable test for the estimated models, both for the FDI stock and flow specifications. This is essentially a test for the correct specification of the

conditional expectation, by testing the significance of an additional regressor constructed as $(x'b)^2$, where b denotes the vector of estimated parameters (Silva and Tenreyro (2006)). The corresponding p-values are reported at the bottom of Tables 7 and 8, respectively.

In the specifications using FDI inflows, the test rejects the null hypothesis of a good specification. This means that these models are either inappropriate due to its functional form or that some relevant information is missing. In contrast, models (5), (6) and (7) estimated using FDI stocks pass the RESET test at different levels of significance. Therefore, these results support our hypotheses that FDI stock data are more appropriate than flows for the econometric analysis of FDI determinants.¹³

6. Concluding remarks

In the last decades, understanding the factors that determine FDI has attracted an intense academic and policy-oriented interest. This paper feeds the discussion conducting an empirical investigation to identify the main macroeconomic driving forces for FDI activity directed towards the Spanish regions. In addition to the regional dimension itself, this paper makes three contributions to the literature: first, our research represents one of the first attempts to find the main determinants of inward FDI into Spanish regions using FDI stock instead of flows. We have compared, for the sake of robustness, the estimation results using the two definitions of FDI and concluded that the stocks model was the correct model specification. Second, we use the PPML estimator which produces unbiased and consistent estimates when the dependent variable includes a large proportion of zero observations, as it turns out to be our case. Third, we have implemented an exploratory factor analysis to reduce the number of explanatory variables and avoid collinearity problems in the estimation.

We have identified three factors as FDI determinants that, according to the variables they include, were labelled as economic potential, productive capacity and competitiveness. The first two factors are more closely related to HFDI while the third one to VFDI. The empirical analysis revealed the following allocation patterns: as expected, FDI locational strategies in the Spanish regions are determined significantly by the relative competitiveness of the regions and, in to lesser extent, by the productive capacity or the market size. This is a sensible outcome since FDI at the regional level cannot be expected to be market seeking but an efficiency seeking one, intending to fit in the global value chains developed by the multinational production strategies of transnational companies. Therefore, at a regional level the FDI drivers are linked to vertical strategies, where endowment differentials and trade openness have shown themselves to be vital. This finding supports

¹³We have subjected our estimates to a robustness check. We have also estimated our specifications using FDI inflows for all the period available, 1995-2013. However, as FDI stock data are only available from 2004 to 2013, we have presented in the text the baseline estimations for FDI inflows for this shorter period (2004-2013). Similar results have been obtained for the whole sample of the flows variables: the results show that the sign and magnitude of the coefficients remain considerably stable. Moreover, the specifications do not pass the RESET test. We have also repeated the exercise of all the before-mentioned estimations applying OLS instead of PPML, and again, the results obtained point to a superior performance of the PPML method compared to OLS. All these results are not reported in the paper but are available from the authors upon request

the view of a complementary relationship between trade and FDI, a result common to the majority of empirical studies on trade-FDI linkages. Furthermore, our analysis shows that the allocation of FDI depends upon the geographical position of each region, in the sense that FDI tends to be placed in coastal areas.

Finally, the findings in this paper give some clues about the factors that regions should emphasize in order to attract FDI. Results point out to regional competitiveness factors as the most efficient ways for a region to attract FDI. Given the loading of each variable inside this factor, we think that future policies should promote internationalization and factor endowment improvements with a special emphasis in increasing human capital and labour productivity as some of the most efficient ways for a region to attract FDI.

References

- Anderson, J. E. and van Wincoop, E. (2003). Gravity with Gravitas : A Solution to the Border Puzzle. *The American Economic Review*, 93(1):170–192.
- Assunção, S., Forte, R., and Teixeira, A. (2011). Location Determinants of FDI: a Literature Review. Faculdade De Economia Universidade do Porto, Working Papers No. 433.
- Bajo-Rubio, O. and Sosvilla-rivero, S. (1994). An Econometric Analysis of Foreign Direct Investment in Spain, 1964-89. *Southern Economic Journal*, 61(1):104–120.
- Baldwin, R. E., Di Nino, V., Fontagné, L., De Santis, R. A., and Taglioni, D. (2008). Study on the Impact of the Euro on Trade and Foreign Direct Investment. *European Economy Economics Paper*, 321.
- Barba Navaretti, G. and Venables, A. J. (2004). *Multinational Firms in the World Economy*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.
- Bénassy-Quéré, A., Coupet, M., and Mayer, T. (2007). Institutional determinants of foreign direct investment. *World Economy*, 30(5):764–782.
- Bergstrand, J. H. and Egger, P. (2004). A Knowledge-and-Physical-Capital Model of International Trade, Foreign Direct Investment, and Outsourcing: Part I, Developed Countries. Notre Dame University. Manuscript.
- Bergstrand, J. H. and Egger, P. (2007). A knowledge-and-physical-capital model of international trade flows, foreign direct investment, and multinational enterprises. *Journal of International Economics*, 73(2):278–308.
- Bertola, G., Driffill, J., James, H., Sinn, H. W., Sturm, J. E., and Valentinyi, Á. (2013). EEAG (2013), The EEAG Report on the European Economy, "European Imbalances". *CESifo Group Munich*, pages 55–72.
- Bevan, A. A. and Estrin, S. (2004). The determinants of foreign direct investment into European transition economies. *Journal of Comparative Economics*, 32(4):775–787.
- Blonigen, B. A. (2005). A review of the empirical literature on FDI determinants. *Atlantic Economic Journal*, 33(4):383–403.
- Blonigen, B. A., Davies, R. B., and Head, K. (2003). Estimating the Knowledge-Capital Model of the Multinational Enterprise: Comment. *The American Economic Review*, 93(3):980–994.
- Blonigen, B. A., Davies, R. B., Waddell, G. R., and Naughton, H. T. (2007). FDI in space: Spatial autoregressive relationships in foreign direct investment. *European Economic Review*, 51(5):1303–1325.
- Blonigen, B. a. and Piger, J. M. (2014). Determinants of foreign direct investment. *Canadian Journal of Economics*, 47(3):775–812.
- Brainard, S. L. (1997). An Empirical Assessment of the Proximity-Concentration Trade-off Between Multinational Sales and Trade. *American Economic Review*, 87(4):520–544.
- Bruno, R., Campos, N., Estrin, S., and Tian, M. (2016). Technical Appendix to "The Impact of Brexit on Foreign Investment in the UK ". Gravitating Towards Europe : An Econometric Analysis of the FDI Effects of EU Membership. Retrieved from http://cep.lse.ac.uk/pubs/download/brexit03_technical_paper.pdf.
- Busse, M. and Hefeker, C. (2007). Political risk, institutions and foreign direct investment. *European Journal of Political Economy*, 23(2):397–415.
- Camarero, M., Gómez-Herrera, E., and Tamarit, C. (2018). New Evidence on Trade and FDI: how Large is the Euro Effect? *Open Economies Review*, 29(2):451–467.

- Camarero, M. and Tamarit, C. (2004). Estimating the Export and Import Demand for Manufactured Goods: The Role of FDI. *Review of World Economics/Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv*, 140(3):347–375.
- Canton, E. and Solera, I. (2016). Greenfield Foreign Direct Investment and Structural Reforms in Europe: What Factors Determine Investments? *European Economy Discussion Paper*, 8022.
- Carr, D. L., Markusen, J. R., and Maskus, K. E. (2001). Estimating the Knowledge-Capital Model of the Multinational Enterprise. *The American Economic Review*, 91(3):693–708.
- Chan, M. W. L., Hou, K., Li, X., and Mountain, D. C. (2014). Foreign direct investment and its determinants: A regional panel causality analysis. *Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance*, 54(4):579–589.
- Chidlow, A., Salciuvienė, L., and Young, S. (2009). Regional determinants of inward FDI distribution in Poland. *International Business Review*, 18(2):119–133.
- Demekas, D. G., Horváth, B., Ribakova, E., and Wu, Y. (2007). Foreign direct investment in European transition economies- The role of policies. *Journal of Comparative Economics*, 35(2):369–386.
- Dimitropoulou, D., McCann, P., and Burke, S. P. (2013). The determinants of the location of foreign direct investment in UK regions. *Applied Economics*, 45(27):3853–3862.
- Dunning, J. (1977). Trade, Location of Economic Activity and the MNE: a Search for an Eclectic Approach. *The International Allocation of Economic Activity*, pages 395–418.
- Dunning, J. H. (1979). Explaining Changing Patterns of International Production: In Defence of the Eclectic Theory. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 41(4):269–295.
- Dunning, J. H. (2000). The eclectic paradigm as an envelope for economic and business theories of MNE activity. *International Business Review*, 9(2):163–190.
- Economou, F., Hassapis, C., Philippas, N., and Tsionas, M. (2017). Foreign Direct Investment Determinants in OECD and Developing Countries. *Review of Development Economics*, 21(3):527–542.
- Egea Román, M. P. and López Pueyo, C. (1991). Un estudio sobre la distribución geográfica de la inversión extranjera directa en España. *Información Comercial Española*, 696-697:105–118.
- Ekholm, K., Forslid, R., and Markusen, J. (2007). Export-platform Foreign Direct Investment. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 5:776–795.
- Ethier, W. J. and Markusen, J. R. (1996). Multinational firms, technology diffusion and trade. *Journal of International Economics*, 41(1-2):1–28.
- Faeth, I. (2009). Determinants of foreign direct investment - A tale of nine theoretical models. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 23(1):165–196.
- Gouel, C., Guimbard, H., and Laborde, D. (2012). A Foreign Direct Investment database for global CGE models. CEPII Working Paper.
- Gutiérrez-Portilla, P., Maza, A., Villaverde, J., Hierro, M., and Es, P. G. (2016). Foreign direct investment in the Spanish regions: What are the influencing factors? *Journal of Regional Research*, 35(67):67–83.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., and Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate Data Analysis*. Pearson Prentice Hall, 7th edition.
- Head, K. and Ries, J. (2008). FDI as an outcome of the market for corporate control: Theory and evidence. *Journal of International Economics*, 74(1):2–20.

- Helpman, E. (1984). A Simple Theory of International Trade with Multinational Corporations. *Journal of Political Economy*, 92(3):451–471.
- Helpman, E. (1985). Multinational Corporations and Trade Structure. *Review of Economic Studies*, LII(3):443–457.
- Helpman, E., Melitz, M. J., and Yeaple, S. R. (2004). Export versus FDI. *American Economic Review*, 94(1):300–316.
- Horstmann, I. J. and Markusen, J. R. (1987). Strategic Investments and the Development of Multinationals. *International Economic Review*, 28(1):109–121.
- Kandogan, Y. (2012). Regional foreign direct investment potential of the states within the US. *Journal of Economics and Business*, 64(4):306–322.
- Kersan-Skabic, I. and Tijanic, L. (2014). Regional Determinants of Foreign Direct Investments in Croatia. *Transylvanian Review of Administrative Sciences*, (SI):70–89.
- Kleinert, J. and Toubal, F. (2010). Gravity for FDI. *Review of International Economics*, 18(1):1–13.
- Markusen, J. R. and Maskus, K. E. (2002). Discriminating Among Alternative Theories of the Multinational Enterprise. *Review of International Economics*, 10(4):694–707.
- Markusen, J. R. and Venables, A. J. (1998). Multinational firms and the new trade theory. *Journal of International Economics*, 46(2):183–203.
- Martínez-Martín, J. (2011). General equilibrium long-run determinants for Spanish FDI: A spatial panel data approach. *SERIEs*, 2(3):305–333.
- Mitze, T., Alecke, B., and Untiedt, G. (2008). Trade, FDI and Cross-Variable Linkages: A German (Macro-) Regional Perspective. *Munich Personal RePEc Archive*, (12245).
- Pelegrín, A. (2002). Inversión extranjera directa. Factores determinantes de la localización regional. *Papeles de Economía Española*, 93:122–133.
- Pelegrín, A. (2003). Regional Distribution of Foreign Manufacturing Investment in Spain. Do agglomeration economies matter? Institut d’Economia de Barcelona. Working paper. 6.
- Pelegrín, A. and Bolancé, C. (2008). Regional Foreign Direct Investment in Manufacturing. Do Agglomeration Economies Matter? *Regional Studies*, 42(4):505–522.
- Ramondo, N. (2014). A quantitative approach to multinational production. *Journal of International Economics*, 93(1):108–122.
- Ramondo, N. and Rodríguez-Clare, A. (2013). Trade, Multinational Production, and the Gains from Openness. *Journal of Political Economy*, 121(2):273–322.
- Ramondo, N., Rodríguez-Clare, A., and Tintelnot, F. (2015). Multinational Production: Data and Stylized Facts. *American Economic Review. Papers and Proceedings*, 105(5):530–536.
- Ramsey, J. (1969). Testing for Specification Errors in Classical Linear Least-Squares Regression Analysis. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, 31(2):350–371.
- Rodríguez, X. A. and Pallas, J. (2008). Determinants of foreign direct investment in Spain. *Applied Economics*, 40(19):2443–2450.
- Silva, J. S. and Tenreyro, S. (2006). The log of gravity. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 88(4):641–658.
- Talamo, G. M. (2007). Institution , FDI and the Gravity Model. *University of Palermo, Department of Political Studies. Manuscript*.

- Venables, A. J. (1999). Fragmentation and multinational production. *European Economic Review*, 43(4-6):935–945.
- Villaverde, J. and Maza, A. (2012). Foreign direct investment in Spain: Regional distribution and determinants. *International Business Review*, 21(4):722–733.
- Wacker, K. M. (2013). On the measurement of FDI and its relationship to activities of multinational corporations. *ECB Working Paper No.1614*.
- Wei, S.-J. (2000). How taxing is corruption on international investors? *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 82(1):1–11.

Table 1: Countries included in the study

OECD countries	Developing countries
Germany	Argentina
Austria	Brazil
Belgium	China
Denmark	India
Slovenia	Russia
Estonia	Singapore
Finland	Hong Kong
France	
Greece	
Hungary	
Ireland	
Italy	
Luxembourg	
Norway	
Netherlands	
Poland	
Portugal	
Czech Republic	
Slovak Republic	
United Kingdom ¹⁴	
Sweden	
Australia	
Canada	
Chile	
Korea	
United States	
Iceland	
Israel	
Japan	
Mexico	
New Zealand	
Switzerland	
Turkey	

Notes: Included as countries of origin.

¹⁴Since the 2016 referendum vote to leave the EU, the UK is on course to leave the EU by April 2019.

Table 2: Data description and source

Variable name	Description	Source
$FDlin_{ijt}$	Real inward FDI stock, in millions of euros	Datainvox
$FDlinflow_{ijt}$	Real inward FDI flows, in millions of euros	Datainvox
MS_{it}	Real Gross Domestic Product per capita, in millions of euros	INE
LP_{it}	GDP per total employment	INE
W_{it}	Employee's compensation per hour worked, calculated as the ratio of total compensation per hours worked	Eurostat
UR_{it}	Unemployment rate	INE
HC_{it}	Share of population with Tertiary Education ¹⁵	Valencian Institute of Economic Research (Ivie) ¹⁶
OP_{it}	Sum of bilateral exports and imports as a share of GDP (%), in millions of euros	DataComex
RFE	Differences in per capita GDP.	INE, World Bank
RI	Motorways kilometers	Eurostat
GCF	Gross capital formation (% of GDP)	Ivie, INE

¹⁵Tertiary Education includes "FP II", "Anteriores al Superior" and "Superiores".

¹⁶Fundación Bancaja e Ivie (Instituto Valenciano de Investigaciones Económicas). Capital Humano en España y su distribución provincial. Enero de 2014. Database available on: <http://www.ivie.es/es/banco/caphum/series.php>.

Table 3: Descriptive statistics

Variable		Mean	Std.dev.	Min.	Max.	Obs.
FDlin	Overall	358.6012	2257.498	0	40791.36	N=6800
	Between		2195.144	0	31796.75	n =680
	Within		532.9345	-9566.742	12817.06	T=10
FDlinflow	Overall	22.78182	339.5265	0	20077.88	N=6800
	Between		157.0873	0	2753.129	n =680
	Within		301.0557	-2383.987	17991.02	T=10
MS	Overall	10.07444	0.1984721	9.627751	10.4695	N=6800
	Between		0.1872902	9.724158	10.4003	n=680
	Within		0.0660303	9.930478	10.17119	T=10
LP	Overall	10.92269	0.2909312	10.51423	12.14515	N=6800
	Between		0.2733148	10.69501	11.93376	n=680
	Within		0.100194	10.16375	11.13407	T=10
W	Overall	2.652185	0.1483929	2.280587	2.972094	N=6800
	Between		0.113143	2.486465	2.882529	n=680
	Within		0.0961044	2.433455	2.777213	T=10
UR	Overall	2.571763	0.5106668	1.551809	3.589612	N=6800
	Between		0.2490601	2.169776	3.050044	n=680
	Within		0.4459056	1.877304	3.337457	T=10
HC	Overall	-1.658593	0.2183017	-2.176158	-1.203947	N=6800
	Between		0.2057122	-1.97792	-1.251782	n=680
	Within		0.0734448	-1.89477	-1.503462	T=10
OP	Overall	-6.225724	1.846777	-17.53277	-1.688068	N=6800
	Between		1.795098	-13.80036	-1.850836	n=680
	Within		0.4387203	-9.958136	-2.554924	T=10
RFE	Overall	9.283584	0.9922034	1.205339	11.15071	N=6800
	Between		0.8646531	6.249901	11.06872	n=680
	Within		0.4876805	2.998235	11.5906	T=10
RI	Overall	6.310715	0.8909865	4.043051	7.808729	N=6800
	Between		0.8820387	4.476074	7.730031	n=680
	Within		0.1299785	4.476074	6.534186	T=10
GCF	Overall	3.531668	0.3296509	2.939734	4.089817	N=6800
	Between		0.3234744	2.993033	3.99595	n=680
	Within		0.0645953	3.374157	3.695127	T=10

Notes: All the continuos variables are in logarithms apart from inward FDI stock and flow.

Table 4: Cross-correlation table

Variables	MS	LP	W	UR	HC	OP	RFE	RI	GCF
MS	1.000								
	6800								
LP	0.606 (0.000)	1.000							
	6800								
W	0.571 (0.000)	0.714 (0.000)	1.000						
	6800	6800							
UR	-0.617 (0.000)	-0.019 (0.124)	0.179 (0.000)	1.000					
	6800	6800	6800						
HC	0.648 (0.000)	0.648 (0.000)	0.777 (0.000)	-0.150 (0.000)	1.000				
	6800	6800	6800	6800					
OP	0.176 (0.000)	0.122 (0.000)	0.161 (0.000)	-0.096 (0.000)	0.255 (0.000)	1.000			
	6800	6800	6800	6800	6800				
RFE	-0.031 (0.010)	-0.037 (0.002)	-0.049 (0.000)	-0.000 (0.986)	-0.030 (0.013)	-0.015 (0.228)	1.000		
	6800	6800	6800	6800	6800	6800			
RI	-0.2557 (0.000)	0.0413 (0.0007)	-0.0084 (0.4895)	0.2178 (0.000)	-0.0562 (0.000)	0.1529 (0.000)	-0.0127 (0.295)	1.000	
	6800	6800	6800	6800	6800	6800	6800		
GCF	-0.636 (0.000)	-0.451 (0.000)	-0.342 (0.000)	0.227 (0.000)	-0.202 (0.000)	-0.056 (0.000)	0.024 (0.045)	0.2890 (0.000)	1.000
	6800	6800	6800	6800	6800	6800	6800	6400	

Table 5: Factor analysis. Total variance explained.

Factors	Eigenvalue	% Variance	Cumulative % variance
1	3.20882	0.3565	0.3565
2	1.67928	0.1866	0.5431
3	1.13838	0.1265	0.6696
4	0.85907	0.0955	0.7651
5	0.79525	0.0884	0.8534
6	0.68700	0.0763	0.9298
7	0.44873	0.0499	0.9796
8	0.13254	0.0147	0.9943
9	0.05092	0.0057	1.0000

Notes: The three extracted factors are shown in bold.

Table 6: Factor analysis. Rotated component matrix.

Variable	Factor 1 (Economic potential)	Factor 2 (Productive capacity)	Factor 3 (Competitiveness)	Communalities
MS	0.6997	-0.6566	0.0482	0,9231
LP	0.8046	-0.0568	-0.0166	0,6509
HC	0.8808	-0.1301	0.0657	0,797
OP	0.0480	-0.0877	0.7626	0,5915
RFE	-0.0527	-0.0475	-0.7440	0,5585
UR	0.0965	0.8444	-0.0638	0,7263
W	0.9277	0.1298	0.0310	0,8785
RI	0.0471	0.6448	0.0815	0,4246
GCF	-0.3424	0.5982	0.0330	0,4761

Notes: The variables loading on each factor are shown in bold.

Table 7: PPLM Estimates of the Spanish inward FDI stock determinants.

Variables	Dependent variable: Inward FDI stock							
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Economic Potential	1.133*** (7.435)	1.167*** (7.056)	1.105*** (6.937)	1.150*** (6.322)	0.152 (0.768)	0.215 (0.740)	0.215 (0.740)	0.141 (0.782)
Productive capacity	0.387*** (0.387)	0.397*** (3.451)	0.039 (0.236)	-0.023 (-0.132)	0.209* (1.737)	0.138 (0.739)	0.138 (0.739)	0.133 (1.216)
Competitiveness	0.555*** (2.698)	0.547*** (2.773)	0.559*** (2.735)	0.603*** (3.375)	0.513*** (2.731)	0.583*** (3.511)	0.583*** (3.511)	0.610*** (3.081)
Distance		-0.496 (-0.611)	-0.300 (-0.334)	-0.399 (-0.582)		-0.782 (-1.156)	-0.782 (-1.156)	
Landlocked		-0.037 (-0.161)	-0.408 (-1.207)	-0.489 (-1.337)		-2.024*** (-4.297)	-2.024*** (-4.297)	-2.000*** (-4.531)
FIS			-2.318*** (-4.018)	-2.490*** (-3.913)		-0.363 (-0.420)	-0.363 (-0.420)	
OBJ1				1.565** (2.290)		0.154 (0.169)	0.154 (0.169)	
Capital1					2.647*** (4.572)	3.994*** (3.994)	3.994*** (4.154)	4.104*** (6.960)
Capital2					1.582*** (3.310)	0.992* (1.825)	0.992* (1.825)	1.123*** (2.657)
Crisis						0.424 (0.810)	0.424 (0.810)	
R ²	0.832	0.830	0.860	0.861	0.874	0.881	0.881	0.883
Investing country FE (<i>j</i>)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	491	491	491	491	491	491	491	491
RESET test <i>p</i> - values	0.0001	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0942	0.0334	0.0334	0.0138
AIC	563485.1	561425	529389.3	512978.1	476469.9	422141.1	422141.1	428320.9


Notes: Country pair clustered standard errors are in parentheses. *, ** and *** denote significance at 10%, 5%, and 1% significance levels, respectively. Factors are included in logarithms.

Table 8: PPLM Estimates of the Spanish FDI inflow determinants for the period 2004-2013.

Variables	Dependent variable: FDI inflow					
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Economic Potential	1.750*** (10.464)	1.729*** (9.436)	1.633*** (9.137)	1.684*** (9.448)	0.561*** (2.028)	0.561*** (2.028)
Productive capacity	0.873*** (5.252)	0.850*** (5.192)	0.483*** (2.464)	0.405*** (1.916)	0.910*** (3.530)	0.910*** (3.530)
Competitiveness	0.404*** (2.341)	0.419*** (2.471)	0.396*** (2.351)	0.462*** (2.659)	0.403*** (2.204)	0.403*** (2.204)
Distance		0.524 (0.739)	0.618 (0.836)	0.143 (0.240)	-0.596 (-1.184)	-0.596 (-1.184)
Landlocked		-0.055 (-0.291)	-0.359 (-1.593)	-0.424*** (-1.788)	-1.300*** (-2.598)	-1.300*** (-2.598)
FIS			-1.888*** (-3.849)	-2.081*** (-4.077)	1.329 (1.333)	1.329 (1.333)
OBJ1				1.653*** (2.813)	0.176 (0.322)	0.176 (0.322)
Capital1					4.374*** (5.097)	4.374*** (5.097)
Capital2					1.538*** (2.167)	1.538*** (2.167)
Crisis					1.067*** (2.059)	1.067*** (2.059)
R^2	0.696	0.698	0.700	0.700	0.707	0.707
Investing country FE (i)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	616	616	616	616	616	616
RESET test p -values	0.0000	0.0000	0.0028	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
AIC	43452.17	43371.6	42542.78	41738.91	38421.31	38421.31

Notes: Country pair clustered standard errors are in parentheses. *, ** and *** denote significance at 10%, 5%, and 1% significance levels, respectively. Factors are included in logarithms.

Figure 1: Foreign Direct Investment in Spain.



Source:UNCTAD database.

Figure 2: Spatial Distribution of Average Inward FDI Stock (2004-2014).




Figure 3: Main investors in Spain: Average FDI for the 2004-2014 period, in percent.

